Chapter 3

Inference on $P(X < Y)$ for Exponentiated Family of Distributions

3.1 Introduction

Let $F_X(x, \theta) = F_0^\alpha(x, \theta)$ and $G_Y(y) = F_0^\beta(y, \theta)$, where $F_0(\cdot, \theta)$ is the continuous baseline distribution and $\theta$ may be vector valued, and $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are positive shape parameters. Then, $X$ and $Y$ are said to be belonged to the exponentiated family of distributions (abbreviated as EFD) or the proportional reversed hazard family. If $X$ and $Y$ are independent, then $R = P(X < Y) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$. In particular, we take $F_0(x, \theta) = F_0 \left( \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} \right)$ i.e. the location-scale family. If $\mu = 0$, then $F_0(x, \theta)$ belongs to the scale family and this case was studied in detail by Kakade and Shirke (2007).

If $\tilde{F}(x, \theta) = \tilde{F}_0^\alpha(x, \theta)$ and $\tilde{G}(y, \theta) = \tilde{F}_0^\beta(y, \theta)$ i.e. they belong to the proportional hazard family, then $R = 1 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$.

Kundu and Gupta (2005) and Kakade et al. (2008) considered inferential aspect of $R$ assuming $F_0(x, \theta)$ as exponential and Gumbel distributions respectively. Surles and Padgett (2001) and Raqab and Kundu (2005) considered the same problem for scaled Burr type X distribution that eventually belongs to the exponentiated family of distributions. Awad and Gharraf (1986), Mokhlis (2005) and Rezaei et al. (2010) considered inferential aspect of $R$ for Burr type XII, Burr type III and generalized
Pareto distributions respectively which are nothing but the exponentiated family of
distributions with some baseline distributions.

Our objective in this article is to draw inference, parametric as well as Bayesian,
about $R$ when $X$ and $Y$ belong to the exponentiated family of distributions. We look
into the problem in more general set up under any known baseline distribution not
necessarily restricted to the location-scale family. The problem is also studied for
the baseline distribution unknown through parameter(s), in particular for the folded
Crammer distribution. An outline is also given for inference about $R$ in general case
i.e. when the baseline distributions for $X$ and $Y$ are different through parameter.

The chapter is organized as follows. In section 3.2, we derive the expression of
$R$ for parallel system. Section 3.3 discusses inference about $R$ when the baseline
distribution is completely known. In this section MLE, UMVUE and Bayes estimate
of $R$ have been derived in a general set up. Also Confidence Interval, approximate
as well as exact and Bayesian Credible Intervals have been derived. In section 3.4,
Inference about $R$ for unknown baseline distribution through parameters has been
considered. In particular, the folded Crammer distribution has been attempted and
Confidence limits have been found out using bootstrap methods in section 3.5. In
section 3.6, Bayes estimate of $R$ have been calculated adopting Markov Chain Monte
Carlo (MCMC) approach. An outline is given in section 3.7 for estimation of $R$
in general case. Simulation results have been discussed in Section 3.8. Section 3.9
concludes.

### 3.2 Expression of $R$ for parallel system

A system consisting of $n$ units is said to be parallel if at least one of the units must
succeed for the system to succeed. If $X_1$, $X_2$, ..., $X_n$ are the life lengths of the units,
then the life length of the system is $X_{(n)} = \text{max} (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n)$. The following
theorem holds for parallel system when the life length of each unit belongs to the
exponentiated family of distribution.
Theorem 3.2.1 If the $X_i$ are independent and belong to the exponentiated family of distribution \(EFD(x, \alpha_i)\), for \(i = 1, 2, ..., n\), then \(X_{(n)} = \max (X_1, X_2, ..., X_n)\) is distributed as the \(EFD(x, \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i)\).

Remark 3.2.1 If the baseline distribution is normal, then Gupta and Gupta (2008) called it as power normal and their theorem 3.1 is particular case of the above theorem.

If any one or both of $X$ and $Y$ is realized as resultant of a parallel system, then with the help of theorem 3.2.1, one can find out the expression for $R$.

3.3 Inference about $R$ when the baseline distribution is completely known

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$. If we transform the random variables $U = -\ln F_0(X)$ (i.e. $U = \xi(X)$) and $V = -\ln F_0(Y)$ (i.e. $V = \xi(Y)$), then $U$ and $V$ follow independent exponential distributions with parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ respectively. Therefore, all the results of $R$ for independent exponential distributions will follow. Moreover, $R = P(X < Y) = P(U < V)$. We summarize inferential results in sequel.

3.3.1 Maximum Likelihood Estimator of $R$

Writing $W_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} U_i = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln F_0(X_i)$ and $W_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln F_0(Y_i)$, we obtain the MLE of $R$ is

$$\hat{R}_1 = \frac{n}{W_2} \frac{W_2}{W_1 + \frac{n}{W_2}}. \quad (3.3.1)$$

Here $\underline{X} = (X_1, X_2, ..., X_m)$ is a random sample from $EFD(\alpha)$ and $\underline{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n)$ is a random sample from $EFD(\beta)$ and the MLE of $\alpha$ is $\hat{\alpha} = -\frac{m}{W_1}$ and that of $\beta$ is $\hat{\beta} = -\frac{n}{W_2}$. 
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**Theorem 3.3.1** If \( \hat{R}_1 \) is the MLE of \( R \), then

\[
\Var(\hat{R}_1) \cong R^2(1-R)^2 \left[ \frac{m^2}{(m-1)^2(m-2)} + \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^2(n-2)} \right] \cong R^2(1-R)^2 \left[ \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right]
\]

**Proof:** \( \Var(\hat{R}_1) \cong \left[ \frac{\partial \hat{R}_1}{\partial \alpha} \right]_{\alpha=\beta=\beta}^2 \Var(\hat{\alpha}) + \left[ \frac{\partial \hat{R}_1}{\partial \beta} \right]_{\alpha=\beta=\beta}^2 \Var(\hat{\beta})\). Now, \( \Var(\hat{\alpha}) = \frac{m^2\alpha^2}{(m-1)^2(m-2)} \), \( \Var(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{n^2\beta^2}{(n-1)^2(n-2)} \), \( \left[ \frac{\partial \hat{R}_1}{\partial \alpha} \right]_{\alpha=\beta=\beta} = \frac{\beta^2}{(\alpha+\beta)^4} \) and \( \left[ \frac{\partial \hat{R}_1}{\partial \beta} \right]_{\alpha=\beta=\beta} = \frac{\alpha^2}{(\alpha+\beta)^4} \). Hence, \( \Var(\hat{R}_1) \cong R^2(1-R)^2 \left[ \frac{m^2}{(m-1)^2(m-2)} + \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^2(n-2)} \right] \cong R^2(1-R)^2 \left[ \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right] \), since \( R = \frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta} \).

### 3.3.2 Uniformly Minimum Variance Unbiased Estimator of \( R \)

Since \( (W_1, W_2) \) is a complete sufficient statistic for \( (\alpha, \beta) \), using theorem ??, the UMVUE of \( R \), say \( \hat{R}_2 \), can be obtained [see also the result of Tong (1974, 1975)] as

\[
\hat{R}_2 = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} (-1)^s \frac{(m-1)! (n-1)!}{(m+s-1)! (n-s-1)!} \left( \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right)^s \quad \text{if } W_2 < W_1
\]

\[
= 1 - \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} (-1)^s \frac{(m-1)! (n-1)!}{(m+s-1)! (n-s-1)!} \left( \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right)^s \quad \text{if } W_1 < W_2.
\]

This can also be expressed in the following form

\[
\hat{R}_2 = F \left( 1, -(m-1); n, \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right) \quad \text{if } W_2 < W_1
\]

\[
= 1 - F \left( 1, -(n-1); m, \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right) \quad \text{if } W_1 < W_2,
\]

where \( F(\alpha, \beta; \gamma, z) \) is the Gauss hypergeometric function given by

\[
F(\alpha, \beta; \gamma, z) = 1 + \frac{\alpha \beta}{\gamma \cdot 1} z + \frac{\alpha (\alpha + 1) \cdot \beta (\beta + 1)}{\gamma (\gamma + 1) \cdot 2} z^2 + \ldots.
\]


Now, we are interested to find out the variance of \( \hat{R}_2 \). From Blight and Rao (1974)
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and Ghosh and Sathe (1987), the Bhattacharya bound converges to the variance of UMVUE for the family of exponential distributions. Hence,

$$\text{Var}(\hat{R}_2) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tau_{ij}^2 \frac{A_i^2 B_j^2}{\tau_{ij}^2},$$

where $\tau_{ij}^2 = (-1)^{i+j} \frac{(i\beta-j\alpha)}{(n+\beta)^{i+j+1}}$, $A_i^2 = \frac{(m+i-1)!}{(m-1)!} \alpha^i$, $B_j^2 = \frac{(n+j-1)!}{(n-1)!} \beta^j$.

### 3.3.3 Bayes Estimator of $R$

**Conjugate Prior Distributions:**

We obtain the Bayes estimator of $R$ under the assumption that the shape parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are random variables for both the populations. It is assumed that $\alpha$ and $\beta$ have independent gamma prior with pdfs:

$$\pi(\alpha) = \frac{b_1^{a_1}}{\Gamma(a_1)} \alpha^{a_1-1} e^{-b_1 \alpha}; \alpha > 0,$$

and

$$\pi(\beta) = \frac{b_2^{a_2}}{\Gamma(a_2)} \beta^{a_2-1} e^{-b_2 \beta}; \beta > 0,$$

$a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 > 0$ respectively. The prior pdfs of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are as follows:

$$\alpha/W_1 \sim \text{Gamma}(a_1 + m, b_1 + W_1),$$

$$\beta/W_2 \sim \text{Gamma}(a_2 + n, b_2 + W_2).$$

Since apriori $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are independent, the posterior pdf of $R$ becomes

$$f_R(r) = c \frac{r^{a_1+m-1}(1-r)^{a_2+n-1}}{(b_1 + W_1)r + (b_2 + W_2)(1-r)}^{m+n+a_1+a_2}$$

for $0 < r < 1$,

$$= 0 \text{ otherwise},$$

where $c = \frac{1}{B(a_1 + m, a_2 + n)(b_1 + W_1)^{a_1+m}(b_2 + W_2)^{a_2+n}}$.

Here, the Bayes estimator of $R$ with respect to the squared error loss function is

$$\hat{R}_3 = E \left[ R/(W_1, W_2) \right]$$

$$= \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right) \delta_1 \left( \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1 + \delta_2} \right) F \left( \delta_1 + \delta_2, \delta_1; \delta_1 + \delta_2 + 1, 1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right) \text{ if } \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$$

$$= \left( \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \delta_2 \left( \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1 + \delta_2} \right) F \left( \delta_1 + \delta_2, \delta_2 + 1; \delta_1 + \delta_2 + 1, 1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \text{ if } \lambda_2 < \lambda_1,$$
where $\delta_1 = a_1 + m, \lambda_1 = b_1 + W_1, \delta_2 = a_2 + n$ and $\lambda_2 = b_2 + W_2$.

It is to be noted that the Bayes estimator $\hat{R}_3$ depends on the parameters of the prior distributions of $\alpha$ and $\beta$. These parameters could be estimated by means of an empirical Bayes procedure, see Lindley (1969) and Awad and Gharraf (1986). Given the random samples $(X_1, X_2, ..., X_m)$ and $(Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n)$, the likelihood functions of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are gamma densities with parameters $(m + 1, W_1)$ and $(n + 1, W_2)$ respectively.

Hence it is proposed to estimate the prior parameters $a_1$ and $b_1$ from the samples by $m + 1$ and $W_1$. Similarly, $a_2$ and $b_2$ could be estimated from the samples by $n + 1$ and $W_2$. Therefore, the Bayes estimator of $R$ with respect to the squared error loss function could be given as

$$\hat{R}_4 = \left( \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right)^{2n+1} \left( \frac{2n+1}{2m+2n+2} \right) F \left( 2m+2n+2, 2m+1; 2m+2n+3, 1 - \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right) \text{ if } W_1 \leq W_2$$

$$\hat{R}_5 = \left( \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right)^{2n+1} \left( \frac{2n+1}{2m+2n+2} \right) F \left( 2m+2n+2, 2m+2n+2; 2m+2n+3, 1 - \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right) \text{ if } W_2 < W_1.$$

**Non Informative Prior Distributions:**

In this subsection we obtain the Bayes estimator of $R$ under the assumption that the shape parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are random variables having independent noninformative priors $\pi_1(\alpha) \propto \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and $\pi_2(\beta) \propto \frac{1}{\beta}$ respectively.

Hence, the Bayes estimator with respect to the squared error loss function will be

$$\hat{R}_5 = \left( \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right)^m \left( \frac{m}{m+n} \right) F \left( m+n, m+1; m+n+1, 1 - \frac{W_1}{W_2} \right) \text{ if } W_1 < W_2$$

$$\hat{R}_5 = \left( \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right)^n \left( \frac{m}{m+n} \right) F \left( m+n, n; m+n+1, 1 - \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right) \text{ if } W_2 \leq W_1.$$

### 3.3.4 Interval Estimation of $R$

**Approximate Confidence Interval**

It is to be noted that the MLE $\hat{R}_1$ is asymptotically normal with mean $R$ and variance $\sigma^2_{\hat{R}_1} \approx R^2(1 - R)^2 \left[ \frac{m^2}{(m-1)^2(m-2)} + \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^2(n-2)} \right] \approx R^2(1 - R)^2 \left[ \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right]$. Hence an
approximate 100(1 − γ)% confidence interval for \( R \) would be \((L_1, U_1)\), where

\[
L_1 = \hat{R}_1 - \tau_{\gamma/2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \hat{R}_1 (1 - \hat{R}_1)},
\]

and

\[
U_1 = \hat{R}_1 + \tau_{\gamma/2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \hat{R}_1 (1 - \hat{R}_1)},
\]

with \( \tau_{\gamma/2} \) being the upper \( \gamma/2 \) point of the standard normal distribution.

**Exact Confidence Interval**

Notice that \( 2\alpha W_1 \) and \( 2\beta W_2 \) are two independent chi-square random variables with \( 2m \) and \( 2n \) degrees of freedom. Now, \( \hat{R}_1 \) can be rewritten as

\[
\hat{R}_1 = \left( 1 + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\beta}} \right)^{-1} = \left( 1 + \frac{m \alpha}{n \beta} F_1 \right)^{-1},
\]

where \( F_1 = \frac{\beta W_2}{\alpha W_1} \) is an \( F \) distributed random variable with \((2n, 2m)\) degrees of freedom. We see that \( F_1 = \frac{W_2}{W_1} R \). Using \( F_1 \) as a pivotal quantity, we obtain a 100(1 − γ)% confidence interval for \( R \) as \((L_2, U_2)\), where

\[
L_2 = F_1^{-1} (2n, 2m) \left[ F_1^{-1} (2n, 2m) + \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right]^{-1},
\]

and

\[
U_2 = F_1^{-1} (2n, 2m) \left[ F_1^{-1} (2n, 2m) + \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right]^{-1}.
\]

### 3.3.5 Bayesian Credible Intervals

**Conjugate Prior Distributions:**

Assuming \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are independent, we have seen in subsection 3.3.3 that the posterior distributions of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) corresponding to gamma priors are gamma with parameters
(2m + 1, 2W_1) and (2n + 1, 2W_2), respectively. Thus 4\alpha W_1 and 4\beta W_2 are independent chi-square random variables with 2(2m + 1) and 2(2n + 1) degrees of freedom. Thus

\[ F_2 = \frac{4\beta W_2}{4\alpha W_1} = \frac{W_2}{W_1} \frac{R}{1 - R} \]

is an \( F \)-distributed random variable with \([2(2n + 1), 2(2m + 1)]\) degrees of freedom. Using \( F_2 \) as a pivotal quantity, we obtain a 100(1 - \( \gamma \))% Bayes credible interval for \( R \) as \((L_3, U_3)\), where

\[
L_3 = F_{(1-\frac{\gamma}{2})}(2(2n + 1), 2(2m + 1)) \left[ F_{(1-\frac{\gamma}{2})}(2(2n + 1), 2(2m + 1)) + \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right]^{-1},
\]

and

\[
U_3 = F_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(2(2n + 1), 2(2m + 1)) \left[ F_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(2(2n + 1), 2(2m + 1)) + \frac{W_2}{W_1} \right]^{-1}.
\]

Non-informative Prior Distributions:

We have seen in subsection 3.3.3 that assuming independence and non-informative prior distributions for \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), the posterior distributions of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are gamma with parameters \((m, W_1)\) and \((n, W_2)\), respectively. Therefore, \( 2\alpha W_1 \) and \( 2\beta W_2 \) are independent chi-square random variables with \( 2m \) and \( 2n \) degrees of freedom. Thus

\[ F_3 = \frac{2\beta W_2}{2\alpha W_1} = \frac{W_2}{W_1} \frac{R}{1 - R} \]

is an \( F \)-distributed random variable with \((2n, 2m)\) degrees of freedom. Using \( F_3 \) as a pivotal quantity, we obtain a 100(1 - \( \gamma \))% Bayes credible interval for \( R \) with lower and upper bounds exactly the same as those given in subsection 3.3.4.

3.4 Inference about \( R \) when the baseline distribution is unknown through parameter
Maximum Likelihood Estimation on $R$

To compute the MLE of $R$, we have to obtain the MLEs of $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Suppose $(X_1, X_2, ..., X_m)$ is a random sample from $f_X(\alpha, \theta)$ and $(Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n)$ is a random sample from $g_Y(\beta, \theta)$. Hence, the underlying log-likelihood function is

$$l(\alpha, \beta, \theta) = m \ln \alpha + n \ln \beta + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \{\ln f_0(x_i, \theta) + (\alpha - 1) \ln F_0(x_i, \theta)\}$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \{\ln f_0(y_j, \theta) + (\beta - 1) \ln F_0(y_j, \theta)\}$$

Then the MLE of $\alpha$ is to be obtained from the relation

$$\hat{\alpha}(\theta) = \frac{m}{-\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln F_0(x_i, \theta)}$$

and that of $\beta$ is from

$$\hat{\beta}(\theta) = \frac{n}{-\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln F_0(y_j, \theta)}$$

and the MLE of components of $\theta$ are to be obtained by solving the equations

$$\frac{\partial l(\alpha, \beta, \theta)}{\partial \theta_t} = 0; \ t = 1, 2, ..., k.$$  

An estimate $\hat{R}$ of $R$ is to be obtained from expression replacing $\alpha$ and $\beta$ by $\hat{\alpha}(\hat{\theta})$ and $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\theta})$ respectively. Here we will use delta method to obtain approximate confidence intervals of $R$.

Let us write

$$W = \begin{pmatrix}
  a_{\alpha\alpha} & a_{\alpha\beta} & a_{\alpha1} & a_{\alpha2} & \cdots & a_{\alpha k} \\
  a_{\alpha\beta} & a_{\beta\beta} & a_{\beta1} & a_{\beta2} & \cdots & a_{\beta k} \\
  a_{\alpha1} & a_{\beta1} & a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1k} \\
  a_{\alpha2} & a_{\beta2} & a_{12} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2k} \\
  \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
  a_{\alpha k} & a_{\beta k} & a_{1k} & a_{2k} & \cdots & a_{kk}
\end{pmatrix}$$

where $a_{ij}$ represents the elements of matrix $W$. 

$\text{Let us write}$

$\text{where } a_{ij} \text{ represents the elements of matrix } W.$
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\[
\begin{pmatrix}
W_{11} & W_{12} \\
W_{12}^{'} & W_{22}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where 
\(-a_{aa} = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 l(\alpha, \beta, \theta)}{\partial \alpha^2}\right), -a_{ab} = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 l(\alpha, \beta, \theta)}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta}\right), -a_{bb} = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 l(\alpha, \beta, \theta)}{\partial \beta^2}\right), \text{ and } -a_{ij} = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 l(\alpha, \beta, \theta)}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j}\right); \ i, j = 1, 2, ..., k.
\]

Now, the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of \((\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\theta})\) is given by
\[
V = W^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
W_{11} & W_{12} \\
W_{12}^{'} & W_{22}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Let \(G = (G_1, G_2)^{'}\), with
\[G_1 = \left(\frac{\partial R}{\partial \alpha}, \frac{\partial R}{\partial \beta}\right), \text{ and } G_2 = \left(\frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_1}, \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_2}, ..., \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta_k}\right) = (0, 0, ..., 0).\]
yield the asymptotic variance of \(\tilde{R}\) as \(S_{\Delta}^2(\tilde{R}) = G'VG = G_1 W_{11} G_1\). Here \(\frac{\partial R}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{\beta}{(\alpha + \beta)^2}\) and \(\frac{\partial R}{\partial \beta} = -\frac{\alpha}{(\alpha + \beta)^2}\). Assuming that \(\frac{R - \tilde{R}}{S_{\Delta}(\tilde{R})}\) as a standard normal variate, confidence intervals to \(R\) can be constructed.

\section{3.5 Inference on \(R\) for Exponentiated Folded Crammer Distribution}

Song (2001) and Nanda and Maiti (2007) have considered Folded Crammer distribution as lifetime distribution. Here we consider this distribution for demonstration purpose for relative computational ease.

The Folded Crammer distribution has the density function
\[
f_X(x; \sigma) = \frac{x}{(\sigma + x)^2}; \ x, \sigma > 0
\]
and the distribution function
\[
F_X(x; \sigma) = \frac{x}{\sigma + x}.
\]
Hence the density function of Exponentiated Folded Crammer (EFC) distribution is given by
\[
f(x; \sigma, \alpha) = \alpha \left(\frac{x}{\sigma + x}\right)^{\alpha - 1} \frac{x}{(\sigma + x)^2}; \ x, \sigma, \alpha > 0.
\]
For convenience, we re-parametrized this distribution by defining \(\frac{1}{\sigma} = \lambda\).

Therefore,
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\[
f(x; \lambda, \alpha) = \alpha \lambda (\lambda x)^{(\alpha-1)} (1 + \lambda x)^{-(\alpha+1)}, \quad x > 0, \ \lambda > 0
\]

Maximum Likelihood Estimation of \( R \)

Let \( X \sim EFC(\alpha, \lambda) \) and \( Y \sim EFC(\beta, \lambda) \), where \( X \) and \( Y \) are independent random variables. To compute the MLE of \( R \), first we obtain the MLEs of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). Suppose \((X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m)\) is random sample from \( EFC(\alpha, \lambda) \) and \((Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n)\) is random sample from \( EFC(\beta, \lambda) \). Therefore, the log-likelihood function of the observed samples is

\[
L(\alpha, \beta, \lambda) = (m + n) \ln \lambda + m \ln \alpha + n \ln \beta + (\alpha - 1) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln(\lambda x_i) + (\beta - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln(\lambda y_j)
- (\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln(1 + \lambda x_i) - (\beta + 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln(1 + \lambda y_j)
\]

The MLE’s of \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \lambda \) say \( \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} \) and \( \hat{\lambda} \) respectively, can be obtained as the solutions of \( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha} = 0 \), \( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} = 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \). After calculation, we obtain

\[
\hat{\alpha} = -\frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}} \quad (3.5.2)
\]
\[
\hat{\beta} = -\frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j}} \quad (3.5.3)
\]

and \( \hat{\lambda} \) can be obtained as the solution of the non-linear equation

\[
g(\lambda) = -\left( \frac{m^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}} + \frac{n^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j}} \right) - \left( 1 - \frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}} \right) \times \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}
- \left( 1 - \frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j}} \right) \times \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j} = 0 \quad (3.5.4)
\]

Therefore, \( \hat{\lambda} \) can be obtained as a solution of the non-linear equation of the form

\[
h(\lambda) = \lambda \quad (3.5.5)
\]
where

\[ h(\lambda) = -\left(\frac{m^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}} + \frac{n^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j}}\right) \times \left[ \left(1 - \frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i}}\right) \times \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i} + \left(1 - \frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j}}\right) \times \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j} \right]^{-1}. \]

It can be obtained by using a simple iterative scheme as follows

\[ h(\lambda(j)) = \lambda(j+1) \quad (3.5.6) \]

where \( \lambda(j) \) is the \( j^{th} \) iterate of \( \hat{\lambda} \). The iteration procedure should be stopped when \( |\lambda(j) - \lambda(j+1)| \) is sufficiently small. Once we obtain \( \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \) can be obtained from (3.5.2) and (3.5.3) respectively. Therefore, the MLE of \( R \) become

\[ \hat{R} = \frac{\hat{\beta}}{\hat{\alpha} + \beta} \quad (3.5.7) \]

**Asymptotic distribution and confidence intervals**

In this section, the asymptotic distribution of \( \hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\lambda}) \) and the asymptotic distribution of \( \hat{R} \) are obtained. Based on the asymptotic distribution of \( \hat{R} \), the asymptotic confidence interval of \( R \) is derived. Let us denote the Fisher information matrix of \( \theta = (\alpha, \beta, \lambda) \) as \( I(\theta) = (I_{ij}(\theta)); i, j = 1, 2, 3 \). Therefore,

\[ I(\theta) = -\begin{pmatrix} E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda}\right) \\ E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda}\right) \\ E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \alpha}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \beta}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda^2}\right) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{11} & I_{12} & I_{13} \\ I_{21} & I_{22} & I_{23} \\ I_{31} & I_{32} & I_{33} \end{pmatrix} \text{ (say).} \]

Using the integrals of the form

\[ \int_0^\infty x^{r-1}(1+\lambda x)^{-v}dx = \lambda^{-r}B(r, v - r) \]

for \( 0 < r < v \), where \( B(x, y) \) is the beta function, we have

\[ E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2}\right) = -\frac{m}{n^2}, \quad E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2}\right) = -\frac{n}{\lambda^2}. \]
\[ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} \right) = E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} \right) = 0, \]
\[ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda} \right) = E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \alpha} \right) = \frac{m}{\lambda} - \frac{ma}{\lambda} B(\alpha + 1, 1), \]
\[ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda} \right) = E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \beta} \right) = \frac{n}{\lambda} - \frac{na}{\lambda} B(\beta + 1, 1), \]
\[ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda^2} \right) = -\frac{ma + n\beta}{\lambda^2} + \frac{ma(\alpha + 1)}{\lambda^2} B(\alpha + 2, 1) + \frac{n\beta(\beta + 1)}{\lambda^2} B(\beta + 2, 1). \]

**Theorem 3.5.1**  As \( m \to \infty \) and \( n \to \infty \) and \( \frac{m}{n} \to p \) then
\[ \left[ \sqrt{m}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha), \sqrt{m}(\hat{\beta} - \beta), \sqrt{m}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda) \right] \to N_3 \left( \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{U}^{-1}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda) \right) \]
where
\[
\mathbf{U}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix}
    u_{11} & 0 & u_{13} \\
    0 & u_{22} & u_{23} \\
    u_{31} & u_{32} & u_{33}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
and
\[
u_{11} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{11} = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}, \quad u_{13} = u_{31} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{13} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{a}{\lambda} B(\alpha + 1, 1), \]
\[
u_{22} = -\frac{1}{n} I_{22} = \frac{1}{\beta^2}, \quad u_{23} = u_{32} = -\frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} I_{23} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} + \frac{a}{\sqrt{\beta}} B(\beta + 1, 1), \]
\[
u_{33} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{33} = \frac{a + \beta}{\lambda^2} - \frac{a(\alpha + 1)}{\lambda^2} B(\alpha + 2, 1) - \frac{a^2(\alpha + 2)}{\lambda^2} B(\beta + 2, 1). \]

**Proof:** The proof follows from the asymptotic normality of MLE.

**Theorem 3.5.2**  As \( m \to \infty \) and \( n \to \infty \) and \( \frac{m}{n} \to p \) then
\[ \sqrt{m}(\hat{R} - R) \to N(0, B), \]
where
\[
B = \frac{1}{k(\alpha + \beta)^2} \left[ \beta^2(u_{22}u_{33} - u_{23}^2) - 2\alpha \beta \sqrt{m}u_{23}u_{31} + \alpha^2 p(u_{11}u_{33} - u_{13}^2) \right]
\]
k = \( u_{11}u_{22}u_{33} - u_{11}u_{23}u_{32} - u_{13}u_{22}u_{31} \).

**Proof:** It is clear that
\[
\text{Var}[\sqrt{m}(\hat{R} - R)] = E[\sqrt{m}(\hat{R} - R)]^2
= E \left[ \frac{\alpha \sqrt{m}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) - \beta \sqrt{m}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)}{(\alpha + \beta)(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta})} \right]^2
= E \left[ \frac{\frac{m}{n} \alpha^2[\sqrt{m}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)]^2 + \beta^2[\sqrt{m}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)]^2 - \sqrt{n} 2\alpha \beta [\sqrt{m}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha) \sqrt{m}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)]}{(\alpha + \beta)^2(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta})^2} \right].
\]
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Using Theorem 3.5.1, the consistency and asymptotic normality of MLE, the proof is complete.

Note that Theorem 3.5.2 can be used to construct asymptotic confidence intervals. To compute the confidence interval of $R$, the variance $B$ needs to be estimated. To estimate it, the empirical Fisher information matrix and the MLEs of $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\lambda$ are used, as follows;

$$\hat{u}_{11} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{11} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$$

$$\hat{u}_{13} = \hat{u}_{31} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{13} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\lambda} B(\hat{\alpha} + 1, 1)$$

$$\hat{u}_{22} = -\frac{1}{n} I_{22} = \frac{1}{\beta^2}$$

$$\hat{u}_{23} = \hat{u}_{32} = -\frac{\sqrt{p}}{n} I_{23} = -\frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{\beta}} + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\lambda \sqrt{\beta}} B(\hat{\beta} + 1, 1)$$

$$\hat{u}_{33} = -\frac{1}{m} I_{33} = \frac{\hat{\alpha} + \hat{p} \hat{\beta}}{p \lambda^2} - \frac{\hat{\alpha}(\hat{\alpha} + 1)}{\lambda^2} B(\hat{\alpha} + 2, 1) - \frac{\hat{\beta}(\hat{\beta} + 1)}{p \lambda^2} B(\hat{\beta} + 2, 1).$$

Bootstrap Confidence Limits

In this subsection, we propose to use two confidence limits based on the parametric bootstrap methods; (i) percentile bootstrap method (we call it from now on as Boot-p) based on the idea of Efron (1982), (ii) bootstrap-t method (we refer it as Boot-t from now on) based on the idea of Hall (1988). We illustrate briefly how to estimate confidence limits of $R$ using both methods. **Boot-p Methods:**

**Step 1:** From the sample \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\} \) and \( \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \), compute $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\lambda}$.

**Step 2:** Using $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\lambda}$ generate a bootstrap sample \( \{x_1^*, \ldots, x_m^*\} \) and similarly using $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\lambda}$ generate a bootstrap sample \( \{y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*\} \). Based on \( \{x_1^*, \ldots, x_m^*\} \) and \( \{y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*\} \) compute the bootstrap estimate of $R$ using (3.5.7), say $\hat{R}^*$.

**Step 3:** Repeat step 2, $N$ times.

**Step 4:** Let $G(x) = P(\hat{R}^* \leq x)$, be the cumulative distribution function of $\hat{R}^*$.

Define $\hat{R}_{Boot-p}(x) = G^{-1}(x)$ for a given $x$. The approximate $100(1 - \gamma)\%$ confidence interval of $R$ is given by

\[
\left[ \hat{R}_{Boot-p}(\frac{\gamma}{2}), \hat{R}_{Boot-p}(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}) \right]
\]

**Bootstrap-t Confidence Limits**
Step 1: From the samples \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\} \) and \( \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \), compute \( \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} \) and \( \hat{\lambda} \).

Step 2: Using \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\lambda} \) generate a bootstrap sample \( \{x_1^*, \ldots, x_m^*\} \) and similarly using \( \hat{\beta} \) and \( \hat{\lambda} \) generate a bootstrap sample \( \{y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*\} \). Based on \( \{x_1^*, \ldots, x_m^*\} \) and \( \{y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*\} \) compute the bootstrap estimate of \( R \) using (3.5.7), say \( \hat{R}^* \) and the following statistic:

\[
T^* = \frac{\sqrt{m} (\hat{R}^* - \hat{R})}{\sqrt{V(\hat{R}^*)}},
\]

where \( V(\hat{R}^*) \) is obtained using the expected Fisher information matrix.

Step 3: Repeat step 2, \( N \) times.

Step 4: From the \( T^* \) values obtained, determine the lower and the upper bound of the \( 100(1 - \gamma)\% \) confidence limits of \( R \) as follows: Let \( H(x) = P(T^* \leq x) \) be the cumulative distribution function of \( T^* \). For a given \( x \), define

\[
\hat{R}_{\text{Boot}} - t = \hat{R} + m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{V(\hat{R})H^{-1}x}.
\]

Here also, \( V(\hat{R}) \) can be computed similarly as for the \( V(\hat{R}^*) \). The approximate\( 100(1 - \gamma)\% \) confidence interval of \( R \) is given by

\[
\left[ \hat{R}_{\text{Boot}} - t\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right), \hat{R}_{\text{Boot}} - t\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) \right].
\]

### 3.6 Bayes estimation of \( R \)

In this section, we obtain the Bayes estimation of \( R \) under assumption that the shape parameters \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \lambda \) are random variables. We mainly obtain the Bayes estimate of \( R \) under the squared error loss using the Gibbs sampling technique. It is assumed that \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \lambda \) have independent gamma priors with the parameters \( (a_1, b_1) \), \( (a_2, b_2) \) and \( (a_3, b_3) \) respectively. Based on the above assumptions, we have the likelihood function of the observed data as

\[
L(\text{data}|\alpha, \beta, \lambda) = (\alpha \lambda)^m \prod_{i=1}^{m} (\lambda x_i)^{n-1}(1 + \lambda x_i)^{-(\alpha+1)}.(\beta \lambda)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\lambda y_j)^{\beta-1}(1 + \lambda y_j)^{-(\beta+1)}
\]

Therefore, the joint density of the data, \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \lambda \) can be obtained as

\[
L(\text{data}, \alpha, \beta, \lambda) = L(\text{data}|\alpha, \beta, \lambda) \pi(\alpha)\pi(\beta)\pi(\lambda)
\]
CHAPTER 3. INFEERENCE ON $P(X < Y)$ FOR EXPONENTIATED FAMILY ....49

where $\pi(.)$ is the prior distribution. Therefore, the joint posterior density of $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\lambda$ given the data is

$$L(\alpha, \beta, \lambda|\text{data}) = \frac{L(\text{data}, \alpha, \beta, \lambda)}{\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty L(\text{data}, \alpha, \beta, \lambda) \, d\alpha \, d\beta \, d\lambda}$$

We adopt the Gibbs sampling technique to compute the Bayes estimate of $R$. The posterior pdfs of $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\lambda$ are as follows:

$$\alpha|\beta, \lambda, \text{data} \sim \text{Gamma} \left( a_1 + m, b_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda x_i}{1 + \lambda x_i} \right)$$

$$\beta|\alpha, \lambda, \text{data} \sim \text{Gamma} \left( a_2 + n, b_2 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda y_j}{1 + \lambda y_j} \right)$$

and

$$f_\lambda(\lambda|\alpha, \beta, \text{data}) \propto \lambda^{a_3 + m\alpha + n\beta - 1} e^{-\lambda_1 - (\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln(1 + \lambda x_i) - (\beta + 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln(1 + \lambda y_j)}$$

The posterior pdfs of $\lambda$ are not known, but the plots of them show that they are similar to normal distribution. So to generate random numbers from these distributions, we use the Metropolis-Hastings method with normal proposal distribution. Therefore, the algorithm of Gibbs sampling is as follows:

**step 1:** Start with an initial guess $(\alpha^0, \beta^0, \lambda^0)$.

**step 2:** Set $t = 1$.

**step 3:** Using the Metropolis-Hastings, generate $\alpha^{(t)}$ from $\text{Gamma} \left( a_1 + m, b_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \frac{\lambda^{(t-1)} x_i}{1 + \lambda^{(t-1)} x_i} \right)$.

**step 4:** Using the Metropolis-Hastings, generate $\beta^{(t)}$ from $\text{Gamma} \left( a_2 + n, b_2 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln \frac{\lambda^{(t-1)} y_j}{1 + \lambda^{(t-1)} y_j} \right)$.

**step 5:** Using the Metropolis-Hastings, generate $\lambda^{(t)}$ from $f_\lambda$ with the $N \left( \lambda^{(t-1)}, 1 \right)$ proposal distribution.

**step 6:** Compute $R^t$ from (5.13)

**step 7:** Set $t = t + 1$.

**step 8:** Repeat step 3-7, $T$ times.

Note that in steps 5, we use the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with $q(\lambda^{(t-1)}, \sigma^2)$ proposal distribution as follows:
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1. Let $x = \lambda^{(t-1)}$.

2. Generate $y$ from the proposal distribution $q$.

3. Let $p(x, y) = \min\{1, f_\lambda(y)/f_\lambda(x).q(x)/q(y)\}$.

4. Accept $y$ with the probability $p(x, y)$ or accept $x$ with the probability $1 - p(x, y)$.

Now the approximate posterior mean, and posterior variance of $R$ become

$$\hat{E}(R|\text{data}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} R_t$$

and

$$MSE(R|\text{data}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (R_t - \hat{R})^2$$

respectively.

3.7 Estimation of $R$ in general case

Computing the $R$ when the parameter $\lambda$ is different for $X$ and $Y$, is considered in this section. Surles and Padgett (1998, 2001) considered this case also. In Surles and Padgett (2001), there is no exact expression for $R$, but they presented a bound for it.

Maximum likelihood estimator of $R$

Computing the $R$ when the parameter $\lambda$ is different for $X$ and $Y$, is considered in this section. Surles and Padgett (1998, 2001) considered this case also. In Surles and Padgett (2001), there is no exact expression for $R$, but they presented a bound for it.
3.7.1 Maximum likelihood estimator of $R$

Let $X \sim EFC(\alpha, \lambda_1)$ and $Y \sim EFC(\beta, \lambda_2)$, where $X$ and $Y$ are independent random variables. Therefore,

$$R = \int_0^\infty P(X < Y|Y = y)P(Y = y)dy = \beta \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha+\beta-1}(1 + t)^{-(\beta+1)}\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} + t\right)^{-\alpha} dt = \frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)^\beta F\left(\beta + 1, \alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta + 1, 1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)$$ (3.7.8)

where $F(.)$ is the Gauss hypergeometric function, see Gradshteyn and Ryzhik (2000) (formula 9.100).

To compute the MLE of $R$, Suppose $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m)$ is random sample from $EFC(\alpha, \lambda_1)$ and $(Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n)$ is random sample from $EFC(\beta, \lambda_2)$. Therefore, the log-likelihood function of the observed samples is

$$L(\alpha, \beta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = m \ln \alpha + m \ln \lambda_1 + (\alpha - 1) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln(\lambda_1 x_i) - (\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln(1 + \lambda_1 x_i) + n \ln \beta + n \ln \lambda_2 + (\beta - 1) \sum_{j=1}^n \ln(\lambda_2 y_j) - (\beta + 1) \sum_{j=1}^n \ln(1 + \lambda_2 y_j)$$

The MLE’s of $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ say $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, $\hat{\lambda}_1$ and $\hat{\lambda}_2$ respectively, can be obtained as the solutions of

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha} = 0, \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} = 0, \frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda_1} = 0, \frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda_2} = 0$$

After calculation, we obtain

$$\hat{\alpha} = -\frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^m \ln \frac{\lambda_1 x_i}{1 + \lambda_1 x_i}} \tag{3.7.9}$$

$$\hat{\beta} = -\frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^n \ln \frac{\lambda_2 y_j}{1 + \lambda_2 y_j}} \tag{3.7.10}$$

and $\hat{\lambda}_1$ and $\hat{\lambda}_2$ can be obtained as the solution of the non-linear equation

$$g(\lambda_1) = \frac{m}{\lambda_1} - \left(1 + \frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^m \ln \frac{\lambda_1 x_i}{1 + \lambda_1 x_i}}\right) \times \frac{m}{\lambda_1} - \left(1 - \frac{m}{\sum_{i=1}^m \ln \frac{\lambda_1 x_i}{1 + \lambda_1 x_i}}\right) \times \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{x_i}{1 + \lambda_1 x_i} = 0 \tag{3.7.11}$$
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and

$$g(\lambda_2) = \frac{n}{\lambda_2} - \left(1 + \frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\lambda_2 y_j}{1+\lambda_2 y_j}}\right) \times \frac{n}{\lambda_2} - \left(1 - \frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\lambda_2 y_j}{1+\lambda_2 y_j}}\right) \times \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{y_j}{1+\lambda_2 y_j} = 0$$

(3.7.12)

respectively.

By invariance property of the ML estimators, the MLE of $R$ becomes

$$\hat{R} = \frac{\hat{\beta}}{\hat{\alpha} + \beta} \left(\frac{\hat{\lambda}_2}{\hat{\lambda}_1}\right)^\beta F\left(\hat{\beta} + 1, \hat{\alpha} + \beta, \hat{\alpha} + \beta + 1, 1 - \frac{\hat{\lambda}_2}{\hat{\lambda}_1}\right)$$

(3.7.13)

Asymptotic distribution

The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\lambda}_1, \hat{\lambda}_2)$ is to be obtained using the approach of Theorems 3.5.1 and hence the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{R}$ could be obtained using the approach of 3.5.2. We denote the expected Fisher information matrix of $\theta = (\alpha, \beta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ as $I(\theta) = (I_{ij}(\theta)); i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Therefore

$$I(\theta) = -\begin{pmatrix}
E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda_1}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda_2}\right) \\
E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda_1}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda_2}\right) \\
E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \alpha}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \beta}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_1}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2}\right) \\
E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \alpha}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \beta}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \lambda_1}\right) & E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \lambda_2}\right)
\end{pmatrix}$$

It is easy to see that

$$E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2}\right) = -\frac{m}{\alpha^2}, E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta}\right) = \frac{m}{\lambda_1} - \frac{ma}{\lambda_1} B(\alpha + 1, 1), E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda_1}\right) = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda_2}\right) = 0,$$

$$E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2}\right) = -\frac{m}{\beta^2}, E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha}\right) = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda_1}\right) = 0, E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda_2}\right) = \frac{n}{\lambda_2} - \frac{n}{\lambda_2} B(\beta + 1, 1),$$

$$E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \alpha}\right) = -\frac{m}{\lambda_1} + (\alpha - 1) \frac{m}{\lambda_1} - \frac{ma(\alpha + 1)}{\lambda_1^2} B(\alpha + 2, 1), E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_1}\right) = \frac{m}{\lambda_1} - \frac{ma}{\lambda_1} B(\alpha + 1, 1),$$

$$E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \alpha}\right) = E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \lambda_1}\right) = 0, E\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda_2 \partial \lambda_2}\right) = -\frac{n}{\lambda_2} + (\beta - 1) \frac{n}{\lambda_2} - \frac{n}{\lambda_2} B(\beta + 1, 1),$$

Based on the above Fisher information matrix, it is possible to present confidence intervals of $R$ based on the percentile bootstrap and bootstrap-t method. They are
very similar to those mentioned in Section 3.5. The Bayes estimate of $R$ could be found out using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm assuming two independent gamma priors for $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ following the same procedure as in section 3.6. For saving space, we omit them.

### 3.8 Simulation and discussion

In this section we present some results based on the Monte Carlo simulations to compare the performance of different methods. All computations were performed using R-software and these are available on request from the corresponding author.

We consider to draw inference on $R$ when the baseline distribution of exponentiated distribution is (a) known and (b) unknown through parameters. In our study we take sample sizes $(m, n) = (15, 15), (20, 25), (25, 25), (50, 50)$ and take $(\alpha, \beta) = (3, 0.4), (0.8, 0.4), (1, 1) (0.4, 0.8), (0.4, 3)$ respectively. For the unknown case, we take $\lambda = 0.5, 1.5, 1, 3, 2$. All the results are based on 1000 replications.

We have used the initial estimate to be 1 and the iterative process stops when the difference between the two consecutive iterates are less than $10^{-4}$ for both $\alpha$ and $\beta$ using the iterative equations. We choose the initial estimate to be 1, since for that value exponentiated distribution reduces to the baseline distribution. We obtain the MLE of $R$ substituting $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in the expression.

First we consider the case when the baseline distribution is completely known. We report the estimates of $R$, $\hat{R}_1$, $\hat{R}_2$ and $\hat{R}_4$ using the MLE, UMVUE and empirical Bayes procedure assuming conjugate priors (in each cell first, second and third row respectively), and the average biases and mean squared errors (MSEs) of $R$ in Tables (3.1-3.4) over 1000 replications. We also compute the 95% confidence limits of $R$, both approximate $[(L_1, U_1)]$ and exact $[(L_2, U_2)]$, and Bayesian credible intervals $[(L_3, U_3)]$, and hence report average confidence lengths and coverage proportions (cp) based on 1000 replications in Table 3.5.
Some of the points are quite clear from this experiment. The performance of the MLEs are quite satisfactory with respect to the UMVUEs in terms of biases and MSEs. Though differences are marginal, the MLEs have computational ease. Since for the MLE, the exact distribution is known therefore it can be used to construct confidence intervals. As expected, with the help of prior information, the Bayes estimates of $R$ perform better than the MLEs and UMVUEs. For all the methods, when $m$ and $n$ increase, the average biases and MSEs decrease. The Bayesian interval (with conjugate priors), $(L_3, U_3)$ has the shortest average length for all values of $R$ and $(m, n)$. The average lengths of all intervals decrease as $m$, $n$ increase. The interval $(L_2, U_2)$ has the largest average probability coverage which is approximately the anticipated 95%. The interval $(L_3, U_3)$ has the smallest average probability coverage and it is far from 0.95. The average probability coverage of $(L_1, U_1)$ is approximately 0.95 for large $m$, $n$.

For the second case, we have assumed that the common scale parameter $\lambda$ of the folded Crammer distribution is unknown. From the sample, we compute the estimate of $\lambda$ using the iterative algorithm (3.5.6). Once we estimate $\lambda$, we obtain the MLE of $R$ using (3.5.7). We report the average biases and mean squared errors (MSEs) in Table 3.6, and report 95% confidence intervals based on the delta, Boot-p and Boot-t methods in Table 3.7 using 1000 bootstrap replications in both cases. The performance of the MLEs are quite satisfactory in terms of biases and MSEs. It is observed that when $m$, $n$ increase, the MSEs decrease. It verifies the consistency property of the MLE of $R$. The confidence intervals based on the delta method work quite well, as it offers much narrower intervals, unless the sample size is very small, say (15, 15). For very small samples, the Boot-t confidence intervals perform well.

We do not have any prior information on $R$, therefore, we prefer to use the non-informative prior to compute different Bayes estimates. Since the non-informative prior, i.e. $a_1 = a_2 = b_1 = b_2 = 0$ provides prior distributions which are not proper, we adopt the suggestion of Congdon (2001, p.20) and Kundu and Gupta (2005), i.e.
choose \( a_1 = a_2 = b_1 = b_2 = 0.0001 \), which are almost like Jeffreys prior, but they are proper. Under the same prior distributions, we compute the Bayes estimate of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) and have approximate the Bayes estimates of \( R \) under the squared error loss function. To generate random observations from the posterior distributions of \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \lambda \), we use the Metropolis-Hastings method. The algorithms of Gibbs sampling is described in section 3.6. The burn in sample in each case is taken 5000. The results are reported in Table 3.8. It is observed that as expected when \( m, n \) increase then the average biases and the MSEs decrease.

The calculations for general case will be in similar way as have been done in second case with some modifications. That is why we omit this portion here.

3.9 Concluding Remark

In this article, we have discussed inference problem of \( R = P(X < Y) \) for exponentiated family of distributions. This family is obtained by adding a parameter to the exponent of a distribution function (called a baseline distribution function) to make resulting distribution richer and more flexible for modeling data. We have considered the cases when the baseline distribution is known or unknown through parameter(s). At first we look into inference of \( R \) in more general set up under any known baseline distribution not necessarily restricted to the location-scale family. Based on the simulation results, we recommend to use the MLE for \( R \) from the frequentist view point. From the Bayesian view point, the Bayes estimate of \( R \) is also recommended with conjugate priors. The confidence interval \((L_2, U_2)\) based on the exact distribution of the MLE is recommended for its largest average probability coverage, even though the credible interval \((L_3, U_3)\) has the shortest average length. When the baseline distribution is unknown through parameter(s), in particular for the folded Crammer distribution, it is observed that the MLE works quite well. The confidence intervals based on the delta method is recommended to use. For very small samples, the Boot-t confidence intervals perform well and it is recommended to use.
Table 3.1: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of estimates of $R$ when baseline distributions are completely known and $m = n = 15$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha, \beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 0.4</td>
<td>0.1176471</td>
<td>0.1241110</td>
<td>0.0064639</td>
<td>0.0018093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1186844</td>
<td>0.1186844</td>
<td>0.0010373</td>
<td>0.0016983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1266500</td>
<td>0.1266500</td>
<td>0.0090028</td>
<td>0.0018782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8, 0.4</td>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>0.3400351</td>
<td>0.0067017</td>
<td>0.0054612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3351727</td>
<td>0.3351727</td>
<td>0.0018393</td>
<td>0.0056811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3421717</td>
<td>0.3421717</td>
<td>0.0088383</td>
<td>0.0053780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5028957</td>
<td>0.0028957</td>
<td>0.0081285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5030025</td>
<td>0.5030025</td>
<td>0.0030025</td>
<td>0.0086792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5028498</td>
<td>0.5028498</td>
<td>0.0028498</td>
<td>0.0078948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 0.8</td>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.6612367</td>
<td>-0.0054299</td>
<td>0.0069237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6660255</td>
<td>0.6660255</td>
<td>-0.0006411</td>
<td>0.0072197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6591277</td>
<td>0.6591277</td>
<td>-0.0075389</td>
<td>0.0068062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 3</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.8775772</td>
<td>-0.0047756</td>
<td>0.0015257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8829957</td>
<td>0.8829957</td>
<td>0.0006427</td>
<td>0.0014362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8750404</td>
<td>0.8750404</td>
<td>-0.0073125</td>
<td>0.0015850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of estimates of $R$ when baseline distributions are completely known and $m = 20, n = 25$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$, $\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 0.4</td>
<td>0.1176471</td>
<td>0.1216647</td>
<td>0.0040176</td>
<td>0.0010981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1185643</td>
<td>0.1185643</td>
<td>0.0009172</td>
<td>0.0010577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1231408</td>
<td>0.1231408</td>
<td>0.0054937</td>
<td>0.0011230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8, 0.4</td>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>0.3385388</td>
<td>0.0052054</td>
<td>0.0042621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3363988</td>
<td>0.3363988</td>
<td>0.0030655</td>
<td>0.0043901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3394884</td>
<td>0.3394884</td>
<td>0.0061550</td>
<td>0.0042503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4941221</td>
<td>-0.0058779</td>
<td>0.0056908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4952429</td>
<td>0.4952429</td>
<td>-0.0047570</td>
<td>0.0059368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4935758</td>
<td>0.4935758</td>
<td>-0.0064241</td>
<td>0.0055822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 0.8</td>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.6612858</td>
<td>-0.0053809</td>
<td>0.0045092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6656551</td>
<td>0.6656551</td>
<td>-0.0010115</td>
<td>0.0046101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6592534</td>
<td>0.6592534</td>
<td>-0.0074132</td>
<td>0.0044756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 3</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.8786907</td>
<td>-0.0036622</td>
<td>0.0010396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8828578</td>
<td>0.8828578</td>
<td>0.0005048</td>
<td>0.0009864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.876689</td>
<td>0.876689</td>
<td>-0.0056638</td>
<td>0.0010768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of estimates of $R$ when baseline distributions are completely known and $m = n = 25$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$, $\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 0.4</td>
<td>0.1176471</td>
<td>0.1206998</td>
<td>0.0030527</td>
<td>0.0008488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1174729</td>
<td>-0.0001741</td>
<td>0.0008160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1222521</td>
<td>0.0046050</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0008715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8, 0.4</td>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>0.3352984</td>
<td>0.0019650</td>
<td>0.0037183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3323512</td>
<td>-0.0009821</td>
<td>0.0038204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3366616</td>
<td>0.0033282</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0036765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4983102</td>
<td>-0.0016897</td>
<td>0.0049426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4982778</td>
<td>-0.0017221</td>
<td>0.0051422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4983251</td>
<td>-0.0016749</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0048524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 0.8</td>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.661385</td>
<td>-0.0052816</td>
<td>0.0037909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.664281</td>
<td>-0.0023856</td>
<td>0.0038718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6600459</td>
<td>-0.0066207</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0037586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 3</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.879125</td>
<td>-0.0032279</td>
<td>0.0009735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.882344</td>
<td>-8.9956 × 10^{-6}</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0009370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8775767</td>
<td>-0.0047762</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0009977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of estimates of $R$ when baseline distributions are completely known and $m = n = 50$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$, $\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 0.4</td>
<td>0.1176471</td>
<td>0.1205489</td>
<td>0.0029018</td>
<td>0.0004714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1189402</td>
<td>0.0012931</td>
<td>0.0004581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1213379</td>
<td>0.0036908</td>
<td>0.0004798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8, 0.4</td>
<td>0.33333333</td>
<td>0.3361455</td>
<td>0.0028121</td>
<td>0.0019635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3346827</td>
<td>0.0013493</td>
<td>0.0019840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3368485</td>
<td>0.0035151</td>
<td>0.0019551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.500021</td>
<td>2.0961 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.0025857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5000206</td>
<td>2.0567 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.0026374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5000211</td>
<td>2.1138 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.0025612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 0.8</td>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.6650935</td>
<td>-0.0015731</td>
<td>0.0019151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6665655</td>
<td>-0.0001011</td>
<td>0.0019387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.664386</td>
<td>-0.0022806</td>
<td>0.0019052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4, 3</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.881857</td>
<td>-0.0004959</td>
<td>0.0004406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8834483</td>
<td>0.0010953</td>
<td>0.0004352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8810763</td>
<td>-0.0012766</td>
<td>0.0004451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: Average length of the intervals and coverage probability, $1-\gamma = 0.95$ when baseline distributions are completely known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$m = 15$, $n = 15$</th>
<th>$m = 20$, $n = 25$</th>
<th>$m = 25$, $n = 25$</th>
<th>$m = 50$, $n = 50$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. length</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>Avg. length</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1176471</td>
<td>0.1530690</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.1243955</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1610088</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.1107205</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1088123</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.0749692</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>0.3134595</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.2583699</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3114038</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.2401906</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2170539</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.16703</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3462040</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.2873023</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3402838</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.2808955</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2385059</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.1969246</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.3107594</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.2581351</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.308911</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.2712599</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2152449</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.1901887</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.1516271</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.1241446</td>
<td>0.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1596477</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.1494543</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.107836</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.1028255</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each cell first, second and third row represent for $A = (L_1, U_1)$, $B = (L_2, U_2)$ and $C = (L_3, U_3)$. 
Table 3.6: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of estimates of $R$ when baseline distribution is unknown through parameter $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$, $n$</th>
<th>$\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>$MSE$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, 15</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.110523</td>
<td>-0.007123</td>
<td>0.002425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.328390</td>
<td>-0.004943</td>
<td>0.007279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.501738</td>
<td>0.001738</td>
<td>0.009832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.66667</td>
<td>0.676385</td>
<td>0.009718</td>
<td>0.008039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.891497</td>
<td>0.009144</td>
<td>0.002609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 25</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.113055</td>
<td>-0.004591</td>
<td>0.001633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.328322</td>
<td>-0.0050107</td>
<td>0.004883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.497996</td>
<td>-0.0020038</td>
<td>0.006136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.66667</td>
<td>0.667912</td>
<td>0.001245</td>
<td>0.005218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.881997</td>
<td>0.004846</td>
<td>0.001874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 25</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.112801</td>
<td>-0.004845</td>
<td>0.001438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.327344</td>
<td>-0.005988</td>
<td>0.004682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.496659</td>
<td>-0.0033405</td>
<td>0.005591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.66667</td>
<td>0.668385</td>
<td>0.001718</td>
<td>0.004698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.886460</td>
<td>0.004107</td>
<td>0.001508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 50</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.117314</td>
<td>-0.000332</td>
<td>0.000762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.330085</td>
<td>-0.003248</td>
<td>0.002126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.499085</td>
<td>-0.000406</td>
<td>0.002577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.66667</td>
<td>0.665511</td>
<td>-0.001155</td>
<td>0.002120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.886149</td>
<td>0.003796</td>
<td>0.000766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7: Confidence Intervals of $R$ when baseline distribution is unknown through parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$, $n$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$CI_d$</th>
<th>$CI_{boot-p}$</th>
<th>$CI_{boot-t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, 15</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>(0.033603, 0.187443)</td>
<td>(0.028184, 0.197734)</td>
<td>(0.082433, 0.193374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>(0.172729, 0.484051)</td>
<td>(0.117986, 0.444176)</td>
<td>(0.259907, 0.407828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.329508, 0.673968)</td>
<td>(0.293958, 0.687201)</td>
<td>(0.349942, 0.580655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>(0.524033, 0.828736)</td>
<td>(0.458024, 0.815290)</td>
<td>(0.445414, 0.834927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>(0.822886, 0.960108)</td>
<td>(0.665628, 0.934786)</td>
<td>(0.736418, 0.938587)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 25</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>(0.058805, 0.167305)</td>
<td>(0.027543, 0.143901)</td>
<td>(0.074772, 0.324875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>(0.213413, 0.443231)</td>
<td>(0.174119, 0.444362)</td>
<td>(0.189632, 0.616123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.369590, 0.626402)</td>
<td>(0.382204, 0.682432)</td>
<td>(0.196976, 0.789454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>(0.552942, 0.782882)</td>
<td>(0.588276, 0.857327)</td>
<td>(0.394075, 0.752330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>(0.834471, 0.939928)</td>
<td>(0.820402, 0.962061)</td>
<td>(0.837312, 0.947217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 25</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>(0.051065, 0.174537)</td>
<td>(0.060964, 0.238650)</td>
<td>(0.024918, 0.565707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>(0.205569, 0.449119)</td>
<td>(0.215327, 0.491937)</td>
<td>(0.156457, 0.559833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.360983, 0.632335)</td>
<td>(0.369239, 0.657253)</td>
<td>(0.294208, 0.618601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>(0.547042, 0.787928)</td>
<td>(0.619468, 0.861645)</td>
<td>(0.554524, 0.936866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>(0.834471, 0.939928)</td>
<td>(0.820402, 0.962061)</td>
<td>(0.837312, 0.947217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 50</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>(0.071726, 0.162902)</td>
<td>(0.038928, 0.118739)</td>
<td>(0.068552, 0.279955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>(0.242745, 0.417425)</td>
<td>(0.246952, 0.428971)</td>
<td>(0.280111, 0.459289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.402536, 0.596650)</td>
<td>(0.404521, 0.610471)</td>
<td>(0.464106, 0.671751)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>(0.578313, 0.752709)</td>
<td>(0.597613, 0.784652)</td>
<td>(0.544028, 0.780716)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>(0.846121, 0.926178)</td>
<td>(0.762388, 0.896096)</td>
<td>(0.604966, 0.998084)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8: Biases and Mean Squared Errors of Bayes estimates of $R$ when baseline distribution is unknown through parameter $\alpha, \beta, \lambda$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m, n$</th>
<th>$\alpha, \beta, \lambda$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\hat{R}$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, 15</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.107534</td>
<td>-0.010113</td>
<td>0.001164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.303510</td>
<td>-0.029823</td>
<td>0.006342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.498338</td>
<td>-0.001661</td>
<td>0.007842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>0.641738</td>
<td>-0.024927</td>
<td>0.008540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.775178</td>
<td>-0.107174</td>
<td>0.015074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 25</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.147594</td>
<td>0.029947</td>
<td>0.002248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.233583</td>
<td>-0.099749</td>
<td>0.013007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.498658</td>
<td>-0.001341</td>
<td>0.006335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>0.642149</td>
<td>-0.024516</td>
<td>0.005845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.892355</td>
<td>0.010024</td>
<td>0.000832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 25</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.040825</td>
<td>-0.076821</td>
<td>0.006040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.355480</td>
<td>0.022147</td>
<td>0.005181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.516483</td>
<td>0.016483</td>
<td>0.005083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>0.525415</td>
<td>-0.014125</td>
<td>0.024947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.776394</td>
<td>0.105959</td>
<td>0.013335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 50</td>
<td>3, 0.4, 0.5</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>0.064869</td>
<td>-0.052777</td>
<td>0.002915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8, 0.4, 1.5</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.357916</td>
<td>0.024582</td>
<td>0.002537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.480819</td>
<td>-0.019180</td>
<td>0.002637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 0.8, 3</td>
<td>0.666667</td>
<td>0.630305</td>
<td>-0.036361</td>
<td>0.003143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4, 3, 2</td>
<td>0.882353</td>
<td>0.860816</td>
<td>-0.021536</td>
<td>0.000987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>