

A NOTE ON BAYESIAN INFERENCE FOR THE BIVARIATE PSEUDO-EXPONENTIAL DATA

Banoth Veeranna¹

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India.

Abstract

In this present work, we discuss the Bayesian inference for the bivariate pseudo-exponential distribution. Initially, we assume independent gamma priors and then pseudo-gamma priors for the pseudo-exponential parameters. We are primarily interested in deriving the posterior means for each of priors assumed and also comparing each of the posterior means with the maximum likelihood estimators. Finally, all the Bayesian analyses are illustrated with a simulation study and also illustrated with real-life applications.

keywords: Posterior distributions, Confidence Intervals, Pseudo-Exponential, Gamma Priors, Exponential distribution, marginal and conditional distributions.

1 Introduction

Bivariate models that are conditionally specified frequently offer valuable, adaptable models with a range of dependence patterns. In such cases, consideration should be given to what are recognized as pseudo models, see [6]-[9]. In the present note we are interested in the Bayesian analysis of the bivariate pseudo-exponential which was primarily discussed in [1]. The bivariate pseudo-exponential models will have one exponential marginal and another conditional is also exponential. We start by going over the view on the bivariate pseudo-exponential model focusing on a few simplified sub-models. The Bayesian

¹veerusukya40@gmail.com

inference for such sub-models are explained in detail and each of the inferential aspects are illustrated with simulation study. Finally, we give a real life application of the presumed bivariate distribution. A similar phenomenon with Poisson structure is discussed in [3] and on the Bayesian with pseudo priors in [1].

2 The Bivariate Pseudo-Exponential Distributions

Let X and Y be a random variables with $X > 0$ and $Y > 0$ that could be used as a model for the lifespans of connected system components. The joint density is specified as a specific non-negative function on $(0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$ that integrates to 1. In contrast, [7] suggest using one marginal distribution (let's say X) and the family of conditional densities of the other variable (Y) given $X=x$, for every x , see [2], [6]. Therefore, the joint density of (X, Y) will have the following form, if $h(x)$ denotes the density of X for each x , and $g_x(y)$ indicates the conditional density of Y given that $X=x$, then

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = h(x)g_x(y)I(x > 0, y > 0). \quad (2.1)$$

In general, the pseudo-exponential distributions (inside the context of Filus and Filus) the equivalent to the case where h and g_x 's have exponential densities. As a result, the joint density of a bivariate pseudo-exponential distribution is one where

$$X \sim Exp(\theta_1), \quad (2.2)$$

and for each $x > 0$,

$$Y|X = x \sim Exp(\theta(x)), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\theta_1 > 0$ and $\theta(x) > 0 \forall x$. Except for measurability, there are no constraints on the structure of the function $\theta(x)$. The corresponding joint density is given by

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 x} \theta(x) e^{-\theta(x)y} I(x > 0, y > 0) \quad (2.4)$$

where the positive function $\theta(x)$ is quite arbitrary. Suppose, that $\theta(x) = \theta_2 + \theta_3 x$, then the corresponding joint p.d.f. is given by

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 x} (\theta_2 + \theta_3 x) e^{-(\theta_2 + \theta_3 x)y} I(x > 0, y > 0). \quad (2.5)$$

where $\theta_i > 0, i=1,2,3$.

2.1 Notes on priors for pseudo-exponential data

The joint density function for a bivariate pseudo-exponential distribution is of the form equation (2.5).

Consequently, the likelihood function for a sample of size n from this distribution is given by

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 | x, y) = \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (\theta_2 + \theta_3 x_i) \right) e^{-\theta_2 \sum_{i=1}^n y_i - \theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i} \quad (2.6)$$

Note that this likelihood factors as follows:

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 | x, y) = \left\{ \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \right\} \left\{ \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (\theta_2 + \theta_3 x_i) \right) e^{-\theta_2 \sum_{i=1}^n y_i - \theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i} \right\} \quad (2.7)$$

In the first factor only involves the parameter θ_1 , while the second factor involves the parameters θ_2 and θ_3 . We will call θ_1 the marginal parameter, and θ_2 and θ_3 will be called conditional parameters. This factorization will prove to be important in Bayesian inference for this model, as discuss below. Because of the factorization we will know that if a priori $\tilde{\theta}_1$ and $(\tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3)$ are independent, then they will be independent in posteriori also. Now, to the pseudo-exponential distribution defined in equation (2.5), it is simply assume a gamma prior for the marginal parameter $\tilde{\theta}_1$. i.e., a priori we assume that

$$\tilde{\theta}_1 \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \quad (2.8)$$

where $0 < \alpha_1 < \infty$ and $0 < \beta_1 < \infty$.

Therefore, the priori density for $\tilde{\theta}_1$ is of the form

$$f_{\tilde{\theta}_1}(\theta_1) = \frac{\beta_1^{\alpha_1} \theta_1^{\alpha_1-1} e^{-\beta_1 \theta_1}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)}; \quad 0 < \theta_1 < \infty.$$

The choice of a priori joint density of $(\tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3)$ that will be independent of $\tilde{\theta}_1$ is not so obvious. It is clear whether it is possible to choose such a prior that will be "Conjugate" with the second factor in equation (2.7). The joint posterior of $(\tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3)$ will need to be dealt with numerically.

3 Independent priors

Consider an a priori joint density in which all three parameters are independent, and each has a gamma distribution. Thus we have

$$f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3}(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{\beta_i^{\alpha_i} \theta_i^{\alpha_i-1} e^{-\beta_i \theta_i}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \quad (3.1)$$

where $0 < \theta_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i < \infty$, for $i=1,2,3$.

The kernel of the posterior which is the product of the kernel of the factored likelihood (2.7) and the kernel of the prior (3.1) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
& ker(f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3 | \underline{X}, \underline{Y}}(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 | \underline{x}, \underline{y})) \\
&= \left\{ \theta_1^{\alpha_1 + n - 1} e^{-\theta_1(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)} \right\} \\
&* \left\{ \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (\theta_2 + \theta_3 x_i) \right) \theta_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} \theta_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} e^{-\theta_2(\beta_2 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. * e^{-\theta_3(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

From the first factor in equation (3.2) we recognise that a posteriori $\tilde{\theta}_1$ has a gamma distribution, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\theta}_1 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1 + n, \beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i) \tag{3.3}$$

The second factor is the kernel of the posterior density of $(\tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3)$. It will need to be dealt with numerically.

3.1 Sub-Model-I($\theta_2 = \theta_3$):

We first focus on the the sub-model of equation (5) obtained by equating θ_2 and θ_3 . The model is given by

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 x} \theta_3 (1 + x) e^{-\theta_3(1+x)y} I(x > 0, y > 0). \tag{3.4}$$

The likelihood function for a sample of size n from this distribution is

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x_i) \right) e^{-\theta_3(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}$$

The likelihood factors as follows:

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \left\{ \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \right\} \left\{ \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x_i) \right) e^{-\theta_3 (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

For such a conjugate joint prior density for two parameters in the model, we can take one with independent gamma marginals. Thus

$$f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_3}(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \frac{\beta_1^{\alpha_1} \theta_1^{\alpha_1-1} e^{-\beta_1 \theta_1}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \cdot \frac{\beta_3^{\alpha_3} \theta_3^{\alpha_3-1} e^{-\beta_3 \theta_3}}{\Gamma(\alpha_3)} \quad (3.6)$$

The kernel of the posterior density, which is the product of the kernel of the likelihood factors (3.5) and the kernel of the joint prior (3.6) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} Ker(f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_3 | \underline{X}, \underline{Y}}(\theta_1, \theta_3 | \underline{x}, \underline{y})) &= \left\{ \theta_1^{\alpha_1+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 (\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)} \right\} \\ &* \left\{ \theta_3^{\alpha_3+n-1} e^{-\theta_3 (\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

A posteriori the two parameters have independent gamma distributions. Thus

$$\tilde{\theta}_1 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1 + n, \beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i), \quad (3.8)$$

and, independently,

$$\tilde{\theta}_3 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_3 + n, \beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i). \quad (3.9)$$

The squared error loss estimates of the parameters (the posterior means) are thus,

$$\hat{\theta}_1^{(B)} = \frac{\alpha_1 + n}{\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_3^{(B)} = \frac{\alpha_3 + n}{\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}$$

If we choose to an improper prior with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = \beta_1 = \beta_3 = 0$, then the resulting Bayes estimates coincide with the corresponding maximum likelihood estimates(M.L.E's).




Figure 1: Density plot of independent gamma prior with hyper-parameter values are $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 2: Density plot of posterior (independent gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.

A Predictive Model for sub-model I

Remember that our data \mathbf{X} follow the distribution $f(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$ for a fixed value of θ . However, since the actual value of θ is unknown, we should take an average of all potential values in order to understand the distribution of \mathbf{X} .

Now, $\underline{\mathbf{X}} \sim Exponential(\theta_1)$, and $\theta_1 \sim Gamma(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ then the Posterior distribution of $\tilde{\theta}_1|\underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1 + n, \beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$.

Therefore the Posterior Predictive distribution is:

$$f(X_N|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \int_0^\infty f(X_N|\theta_1)f(\tilde{\theta}_1|\underline{X}, \underline{Y})d\theta_1$$

(Since X_N is independent of the sample data \mathbf{X} .)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_0^\infty (\theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 X_N}) \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1+n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \theta_1^{\alpha_1+n-1} e^{-(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)\theta_1} \right) d\theta_1 \\ &= \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1+n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \right) \int_0^\infty \theta_1^{\alpha_1+n+1} e^{-(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N)\theta_1} d\theta_1 \\ &= \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1+n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n + 1)}{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N)^{\alpha_1+n+1}} \right) \\ f(X_N|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) &= \frac{(\alpha_1 + n)(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{(\alpha_1+n)}}{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N)^{(\alpha_1+n+1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This is the posterior predictive distribution for a new data point X_N . Now, which is follows a Pareto distribution of the second kind, with mean $\frac{\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{\alpha_1 + n - 1}$ and variance is $\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2(\alpha_1 + n)}{(\alpha_1 + n - 1)^2(\alpha_1 + n - 2)}$.

Similarly, $\underline{Y}|\underline{X} \sim Exponential(\theta_3(1 + x))$, and $\theta_3 \sim Gamma(\alpha_3, \beta_3)$. Then the Posterior distribution $\tilde{\theta}_3|\underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim Gamma(\alpha_3 + n, \beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)$. Therefore the Posterior Predictive distribution is:

$$f(X_N|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \int_0^\infty f(X_N|\theta_3)f(\tilde{\theta}_3|\underline{X}, \underline{Y})d\theta_3$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (\theta_3 e^{-\theta_3 X_N}) \left\{ \frac{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^{\alpha_3 + n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_3 + n)} \right. \\ \left. \theta_3^{\alpha_3 + n - 1} e^{-(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i) \theta_3} \right\} d\theta_3$$

therefore

$$f(X_N | \underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \frac{(\alpha_3 + n)(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^{(\alpha_3 + n)}}{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i + X_N)^{(\alpha_3 + n + 1)}}.$$

It follows a Pareto distribution of the second kind, with mean $\frac{\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\alpha_3 + n}$ and variance is $\frac{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^2 (\alpha_3 + n)}{(\alpha_3 + n - 1)^2 (\alpha_3 + n - 2)}$.

3.2 Sub-Model-II($\theta_2 = 0$):

Consider the sub-model-II obtained by setting $\theta_2 = 0$. The model is thus of the form

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 x} \theta_3 x e^{-\theta_3 x y} I(x > 0, y > 0). \quad (3.10)$$

The likelihood function for a sample of size n from this distribution is

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right) e^{-\theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}$$

The likelihood factors as follows:

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \left\{ \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \right\} \left\{ \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right) e^{-\theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i} \right\} \quad (3.11)$$

If we use a prior with independent gamma marginals such as

$$f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_3}(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \frac{\beta_1^{\alpha_1} \theta_1^{\alpha_1 - 1} e^{-\beta_1 \theta_1}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \cdot \frac{\beta_3^{\alpha_3} \theta_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} e^{-\beta_3 \theta_3}}{\Gamma(\alpha_3)} \quad (3.12)$$

The kernel of the posterior density, which is the product of the kernel of the likelihood factors (3.11) and the kernel of the joint prior (3.12) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Ker(f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_3 | \underline{X}, \underline{Y}}(\theta_1, \theta_3 | \underline{x}, \underline{y})) &= \left\{ \theta_1^{\alpha_1 + n - 1} e^{-\theta_1(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)} \right\} \\ &* \left\{ \theta_3^{\alpha_3 + n - 1} e^{-\theta_3(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

A posteriori the two parameters have independent gamma distributions. Thus

$$\tilde{\theta}_1 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1 + n, \beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i), \quad (3.14)$$

and, independently,

$$\tilde{\theta}_3 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_3 + n, \beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i). \quad (3.15)$$

The squared error loss estimates of the parameters (the posterior means) are thus,

$$\hat{\theta}_1^{(B)} = \frac{\alpha_1 + n}{\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_3^{(B)} = \frac{\alpha_3 + n}{\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}$$

If we choose to an improper prior with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = \beta_1 = \beta_3 = 0$, then the resulting Bayes estimates coincide with the corresponding maximum likelihood estimates(M.L.E's).

3.2.1 A Predictive Model for sub-model II:

Remember that our data \mathbf{X} follow the distribution $f(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$ for a fixed value of θ . However, since the actual value of θ is unknown, we should take an average of all potential values in order to understand the distribution of \mathbf{X} .




Figure 3: Density plot of posterior (independent gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample size 30 of the sub-model-II.

Now, $\underline{\mathbf{X}} \sim Exponential(\theta_1)$, and $\theta_1 \sim Gamma(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ then the Posterior distribution of $\tilde{\theta}_1 | \underline{\mathbf{X}} = \underline{x}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}} = \underline{y} \sim \Gamma(\alpha_1 + n, \beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$.

Therefore the Posterior Predictive distribution is:

$$f(X_N | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) = \int_0^{\infty} f(X_N | \theta_1) f(\tilde{\theta}_1 | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) d\theta_1$$

(Since X_N is independent of the sample data $\underline{\mathbf{X}}$.)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_0^{\infty} (\theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 X_N}) \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1 + n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \theta_1^{\alpha_1 + n - 1} e^{-(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i) \theta_1} \right) d\theta_1 \\ &= \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1 + n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \right) \int_0^{\infty} \theta_1^{\alpha_1 + n + 1} e^{-(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N) \theta_1} d\theta_1 \\ &= \left(\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{\alpha_1 + n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n)} \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + n + 1)}{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N)^{\alpha_1 + n + 1}} \right) \\ f(X_N | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) &= \frac{(\alpha_1 + n)(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^{(\alpha_1 + n)}}{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + X_N)^{(\alpha_1 + n + 1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This is the posterior predictive distribution for a new data point X_N . Now, which is follows a Pareto distribution of the second kind, with mean $\frac{\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{\alpha_1 + n - 1}$ and variance is

$$\frac{(\beta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2 (\alpha_1 + n)}{(\alpha_1 + n - 1)^2 (\alpha_1 + n - 2)}.$$

Similarly, $\underline{\mathbf{Y}} | \underline{\mathbf{X}} \sim Exponential(\theta_3 x)$, and $\theta_3 \sim Gamma(\alpha_3, \beta_3)$. Then the Posterior dis-

tribution $\tilde{\theta}_3|\underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y} \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_3 + n, \beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)$. Therefore the Posterior Predictive distribution is:

$$\begin{aligned} f(X_N|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) &= \int_0^\infty f(X_N|\theta_3) f(\tilde{\theta}_3|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) d\theta_3 \\ &= \int_0^\infty (\theta_3 e^{-\theta_3 X_N}) \left(\frac{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^{\alpha_3+n}}{\Gamma(\alpha_3 + n)} \theta_3^{\alpha_3+n-1} e^{-(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i) \theta_3} \right) d\theta_3 \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$f(X_N|\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \frac{(\alpha_3 + n)(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^{(\alpha_3+n)}}{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i + X_N)^{(\alpha_3+n+1)}}.$$

It follows a Pareto distribution of the second kind, with mean $\frac{\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\alpha_3 + n}$ and variance is $\frac{(\beta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^2 (\alpha_3 + n)}{(\alpha_3 + n - 1)^2 (\alpha_3 + n - 2)}$.

4 Pseudo-Gamma priors

In the following sections we will be discussing bivariate pseudo-gamma priors and their applications in more details for each of the sub-model I & II.

4.1 Sub-Model I ($\theta_2 = \theta_3$):

Consider the sub-model, specified in equation (3.4), the likelihood function for a sample of size n from this distribution is given by

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x_i) \right) e^{-\theta_3 (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \quad (4.1)$$

This time we will consider a joint prior that is of the bivariate pseudo-gamma form. For it we assume that θ_3 has a $\Gamma(\tau_1, \psi_1)$ density, i.e.,

$$f(\theta_3) \propto \theta_3^{\tau_1-1} e^{-\theta_3 \psi_1} I(\theta_3 > 0), \quad 0 < \tau_1, \psi_1 < \infty.$$

and then for each value of θ_3 , the conditional density θ_1 given θ_3 is assumed to be of the gamma form with an intensity parameter that is a linear function of θ_3 . Thus

$$f(\theta_1|\theta_3) \propto (\psi_2 + \psi_3\theta_3)^{\tau_2}\theta_1^{\tau_2-1}e^{-(\psi_2+\psi_3\theta_3)\theta_1}I(\theta_1 > 0).$$

where $0 < \tau_2, \psi_3 < \infty$ and $0 \leq \psi_2 < \infty$.

The joint prior is thus of the form

$$f(\theta_1, \theta_3) \propto (\psi_2 + \psi_3\theta_3)^{\tau_2}\theta_1^{\tau_2-1}e^{-(\psi_2+\psi_3\theta_3)\theta_1}\theta_3^{\tau_1-1}e^{-\theta_3\psi_1}I(\theta_1 > 0, \theta_3 > 0). \quad (4.2)$$

Consider the simpler prior in which we assume that $\psi_2 = 0$. This prior density will be of the form

$$f_p(\theta_1, \theta_3) \propto \theta_1^{\tau_2-1}e^{-\theta_1\theta_3\psi_3}\theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1}e^{-\psi_1\theta_3}I(\theta_1 > 0, \theta_3 > 0). \quad (4.3)$$

The corresponding posterior density to a sample of size n from sub-model I will be

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta_1, \theta_3|\underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y}) &\propto (\theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i})(\theta_3^n e^{-\theta_3(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}) \\ &\quad * (\theta_1^{\tau_2-1} e^{-\theta_1 \theta_3 \psi_3} \theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1} e^{-\psi_1 \theta_3}) \\ &\propto \theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1} e^{-\theta_3(\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} \\ &\quad * e^{-\theta_1 \theta_3 \psi_3} \\ &\propto (\theta_3^{\tau_1+n-1} e^{-\theta_3(\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}) \\ &\quad * (\theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \psi_3 \theta_3)}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

The marginal posterior distributions of θ_1 and θ_3 are

$$f_{\theta_1}^p(\theta_1) \propto [\theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}] \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\tau_1 + n)}{(\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i + \theta_1 \psi_3)^{(\tau_1+n)}}, \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$f_{\theta_1}^p(\theta_1) \propto [\theta_3^{\tau_1+n-1} e^{-\theta_3(\psi_1+\sum_{i=1}^n y_i+\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}] \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\tau_2+n)}{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \theta_3 \psi_3)^{(\tau_2+n)}}. \quad (4.6)$$

For the plots of such prior and posterior densities, see Figures 4, 5, 6 (for priors) and Figures 7, 8, 9 (for posteriors).




Figure 4: Density plot of pseudo-gamma prior with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 1$ (small), $\psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 5: Density plot of pseudo-gamma prior with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 0$ (simple), $\psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 6: Density plot of pseudo-gamma prior with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 7(\text{large}), \psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 7: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 1(\text{small}), \psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 8: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 0(\text{simple}), \psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.




Figure 9: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 7(\text{large}), \psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the sub-model-I.

4.2 Sub-Model-II ($\theta_2 = 0$)

Consider the sub-model obtained by setting $\theta_2 = 0$. The model is thus of the form

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_1 x} \theta_3 x e^{-\theta_3 xy} I(x > 0, y > 0).$$

The likelihood function for a sample of size n from this distribution is given by

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right) e^{-\theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}$$

the kernel of the likelihood function is given by

$$L(\theta_1, \theta_3) \propto \theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^n e^{-\theta_3 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i} \quad (4.7)$$

Consider the simpler joint pseudo-gamma prior in which we assume that $\psi_2 = 0$. This joint prior density will be

$$f_p(\theta_1, \theta_3) \propto \theta_1^{\tau_1-1} e^{-\theta_1 \theta_3 \psi_3} \theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1} e^{-\psi_1 \theta_3} I(\theta_1 > 0, \theta_3 > 0). \quad (4.8)$$

The posterior density will be

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\theta_1, \theta_3 | \underline{X} = \underline{x}, \underline{Y} = \underline{y}) &\propto (\theta_1^n e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}) (\theta_3^n e^{-\theta_3 (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}) \\
&* (\theta_1^{\tau_2-1} e^{-\theta_1 \theta_3 \psi_3} \theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1} e^{-\psi_1 \theta_3}) \\
&\propto \theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \theta_3^{\tau_1+\tau_2-1} \\
&* e^{-\theta_3 (\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)} e^{-\theta_1 \theta_3 \psi_3} \\
&\propto (\theta_3^{\tau_1+n-1} e^{-\theta_3 (\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}) \\
&* (\theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \psi_3 \theta_3)})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

The marginal posterior distributions of θ_1 and θ_3 are

$$f_{\theta_1}^p(\theta_1) \propto [\theta_1^{\tau_2+n-1} e^{-\theta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}] \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\tau_1 + n)}{(\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i + \theta_1 \psi_3)^{(\tau_1+n)}}, \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$f_{\theta_3}^p(\theta_3) \propto [\theta_3^{\tau_1+n-1} e^{-\theta_3 (\psi_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}] \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\tau_2 + n)}{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \theta_3 \psi_3)^{(\tau_2+n)}}. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that the mean and variance of the marginals need to be dealt with numerically.




Figure 10: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 1$ (small), $\psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the SM-II.




Figure 11: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 0$ (*simple*), $\psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the SM-II.




Figure 12: Density plot of posterior (pseudo-gamma prior) with hyper-parameter values are $\tau_1 = 2, \tau_2 = 4, \psi_1 = 2, \psi_2 = 7$ (*large*), $\psi_3 = 3$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 5$ with sample of size 30 of the SM-II.

5 Simulation study

Due to the general marginal and conditional composition of exponential distributions, simulation can be performed in two steps: first, simulate x from $\text{exponential}(\theta_1)$ and then y from $\text{exponential}(\theta_2 + \theta_3 x)$. However, even with independent gamma priors, inference for the posterior distribution is difficult for the full model. We must rely on a numerical algorithm to compute marginal distributions and their moments. In this paper, we will use the Hit-And-Run Metropolis (HARM) algorithm to simulate posterior distributions from observations for all priors (improper, independent, and pseudo) and for full and its sub-models. For the (HARM) algorithm implementation and comparison with Gibbs and

Metropolis sampling, see [5]. We refer to [10] for current Bayesian simulation algorithms using R software.

We have simulated 10,000 data sets using the HARM algorithm with thinning at 10th sample from the posterior distributions of θ 's with varying sample sizes of $n = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200, 500$: Mean and posteriori 95% confidence intervals are mentioned in Table 1 and 2 are computed from 10000 iterations of the preceding procedure.




Figure 13: Posterior density plot of θ_1 (independent gamma, improper and pseudo-gamma priors) with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 3, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_2 = 1, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_2 = 1, \theta_3 = 3$ with sample of size($n=10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 500$).




Figure 14: Posterior density plot of θ_2 (independent gamma, improper and pseudo-gamma priors) with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 3, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_2 = 1, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_2 = 1, \theta_3 = 3$ with sample of size($n=10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 500$).




Figure 15: Posterior density plot of θ_3 (independent gamma, improper and pseudo-gamma priors) with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 3, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_2 = 1, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_2 = 1, \theta_3 = 3$ with sample of size ($n=10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 500$).




Figure 16: Posterior density plot of θ_1 with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 3$ of sub-model-I.




Figure 17: Posterior density plot of θ_3 with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 3$ of sub-model-I.




Figure 18: Posterior density plot of θ_1 with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 3$ of sub-model-II.




Figure 19: Posterior density plot of θ_3 with hyper-parameters $\alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_3 = 4, \beta_1 = 2, \beta_3 = 5$ and parameter values $\theta_1 = 2, \theta_3 = 3$ of sub-model-II.

Table 1: Simulation (Sub-model I)

Sample size (n), parameters (\mathbf{P}), posterior mean by independent gamma prior (IGP(1)), posterior mean by improper prior (ImP(2)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 1$ (PGP1(3)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 0$ (PGP2(4)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 7$ (PGP3(5)), 95% confidence interval of IGP(1) (CI(1)), 95% confidence interval of ImP(2) (CI(2)), 95% confidence interval of PGP1(3) (CI(3)), 95% confidence interval of PGP2(4) (CI(4)), 95% confidence interval of PGP3(5) (CI(5))

n	\mathbf{P}	SIP ₁	SIP ₂	SIP ₃	SIP ₄	SIP ₅	CISIP ₁	CISIP ₂	CISIP ₃	CISIP ₄	CISIP ₅
20	θ_1	1.483	1.624	0.998	1.071	0.815	(0.924 2.141)	(1.015 2.371)	(0.504 1.550)	(0.608 1.608)	(0.516 1.172)
	θ_3	2.304	3.306	2.239	2.075	1.984	(1.350 3.291)	(2.028 4.965)	(1.257 9.249)	(1.258 2.935)	(1.259 2.936)
30	θ_1	1.729	1.953	1.242	1.287	1.016	(1.152 2.365)	(1.257 2.648)	(0.836 1.707)	(0.853 1.769)	(0.702 1.401)
	θ_3	2.184	3.159	1.895	1.884	1.929	(1.486 3.041)	(2.011 4.498)	(1.282 2.643)	(1.283 2.616)	(1.319 2.625)
50	θ_1	2.294	2.450	1.677	1.746	1.404	(1.723 2.926)	(1.813 3.127)	(1.240 2.179)	(1.273 2.261)	(0.984 1.808)
	θ_3	2.488	3.091	2.121	2.030	2.309	(1.845 3.193)	(2.248 4.013)	(1.517 2.765)	(1.482 2.621)	(1.547 2.868)
100	θ_1	2.465	2.918	1.986	2.032	1.782	(2.033 2.981)	(2.129 3.265)	(1.625 2.399)	(1.648 2.479)	(1.449 2.128)
	θ_3	2.830	3.175	2.422	2.417	2.450	(2.278 3.435)	(2.565 3.811)	(1.970 2.892)	(1.971 2.942)	(1.961 2.973)
200	θ_1	2.039	2.066	1.823	1.845	1.801	(1.765 2.324)	(1.776 2.362)	(1.582 2.088)	(1.588 2.132)	(1.503 2.020)
	θ_3	2.850	3.028	2.650	2.813	2.663	(2.474 3.258)	(2.625 3.425)	(2.281 3.010)	(2.303 3.180)	(2.279 3.051)
500	θ_1	1.912	1.944	1.828	2.245	1.781	(1.747 2.096)	(1.761 2.085)	(1.673 1.996)	(1.669 2.042)	(1.639 1.934)
	θ_3	3.026	3.104	2.944	2.906	2.934	(2.776 3.262)	(2.829 3.384)	(2.676 3.206)	(2.614 3.190)	(2.669 3.204)

Table 2: Simulation (Sub-model II)

Sample size (n), parameters (P), posterior mean by independent gamma prior (IGP(1)), posterior mean by improper prior (ImP(2)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 1$ (PGP1(3)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 0$ (PGP2(4)), posterior mean by pseudo-gamma prior for $\psi_2 = 7$ (PGP3(5)), 95% confidence interval of IGP(1) (CI(1)), 95% confidence interval of ImP(2) (CI(2)), 95% confidence interval of PGP1(3) (CI(3)), 95% confidence interval of PGP2(4) (CI(4)), 95% confidence interval of PGP3(5) (CI(5))

n	P	SIP ₁	SIP ₂	SIP ₃	SIP ₄	SIP ₅	CISIP ₁	CISIP ₂	CISIP ₃	CISIP ₄	CISIP ₅
20	θ_1	1.473	1.643	0.792	0.822	0.629	(0.900 2.177)	(1.040 2.394)	(0.481 1.192)	(0.469 1.321)	(0.383 0.913)
	θ_3	3.744	11.814	3.344	3.417	3.739	(2.297 5.415)	(7.516 16.266)	(2.065 4.996)	(2.045 5.184)	(2.227 5.714)
30	θ_1	1.757	1.909	0.969	1.001	1.103	(1.222 2.399)	(1.268 2.617)	(0.633 1.399)	(0.667 1.444)	(0.540 1.400)
	θ_3	4.207	9.799	3.679	3.565	4.066	(2.954 5.829)	(6.403 14.006)	(2.452 5.282)	(2.430 4.943)	(2.538 6.711)
50	θ_1	1.824	1.821	0.988	1.011	0.860	(1.295 2.251)	(1.337 2.247)	(0.718 1.295)	(0.738 1.329)	(0.644 1.070)
	θ_3	6.041	12.405	5.126	5.070	5.388	(4.452 7.781)	(9.154 14.984)	(3.653 6.581)	(3.689 6.629)	(4.063 7.842)
100	θ_1	2.057	2.285	1.316	1.351	1.210	(1.680 2.481)	(1.711 2.646)	(1.052 1.604)	(1.087 1.649)	(0.982 1.478)
	θ_3	7.628	11.732	6.154	6.064	6.306	(6.319 9.046)	(9.091 14.179)	(4.912 7.569)	(4.872 7.438)	(4.984 7.669)
200	θ_1	1.983	2.005	1.466	1.482	1.398	(1.709 2.265)	(1.730 2.290)	(1.271 1.694)	(1.276 1.690)	(1.208 1.592)
	θ_3	8.995	11.257	7.583	7.565	7.661	(7.880 10.261)	(9.636 12.890)	(6.516 8.689)	(6.486 8.579)	(6.631 8.792)
500	θ_1	2.212	2.048	1.731	1.732	1.694	(1.866 2.270)	(1.876 2.211)	(1.589 1.880)	(1.558 1.894)	(1.543 1.848)
	θ_3	10.185	11.098	9.047	9.253	9.083	(9.129 11.412)	(10.163 12.109)	(8.268 9.915)	(8.177 10.141)	(8.301 10.008)

6 Applications:

One example from the social sciences where an inverse dependence relationship is expected is infant mortality and GDP. Both of these indicators are roughly exponentially distributed for countries and regions all over the world. The C.I.A. generates estimates of values based on massive databases of global affairs information. In 2022, 225 countries and regions will provide data on infant mortality as deaths per 1000 live births (Y) and per capita GDP in thousands of dollars (X).




Figure 20: Posterior density plots for full-model




Figure 21: Histograms for the bivariate data of the per Capita GDP and Infant Mortality rate data set for sub-model-I & II

Table 3: per Capita GDP and Infant Mortality rate dataset (full-model)

n	P	IGP(1)	ImP(2)	PGP1(3)	CI(1)	CI(2)	CI(3)
225	θ_1	0.209	0.113	0.112	(0.041 0.056)	(0.031 0.170)	(0.040 0.321)
	θ_2	0.026	0.032	2.234	(0.011 0.056)	(0.007 0.033)	(0.009 35.763)
	θ_3	0.004	0.098	0.022	(0.002 0.005)	(0.003 0.005)	(0.001 0.016)

Table 4: per Capita GDP and Infant Mortality rate dataset (sub-model-I)

n	P	IGP(1)	ImP(2)	PGP1(3)	CI(1)	CI(2)	CI(3)
225	θ_1	0.04103	0.04739	0.05478	(0.04906, 0.04113)	(0.04729, 0.04773)	(0.05410, 0.05768)
	θ_3	0.00468	0.00451	0.00420	(0.00447, 0.00498)	(0.00441, 0.00490)	(0.00400, 0.00464)

Table 5: per Capita GDP and Infant Mortality rate dataset (sub-model-II)

n	P	IGP(1)	ImP(2)	PGP1(3)	CI(1)	CI(2)	CI(3)
225	θ_1	0.04131	0.05280	0.04991	(0.04125, 0.04142)	(0.04013, 0.06238)	(0.04768, 0.05091)
	θ_3	0.00506	0.00484	0.00508	(0.00484, 0.00536)	(0.00395, 0.00588)	(0.00481, 0.00550)

7 Conclusion

[1] have argued that the pseudo-exponential distribution should be the primary option when modeling bivariate data. The pseudo-exponential provides for both classical and Bayesian analysis as well as simple simulation due to its clear construction in [4]. However, only a tiny number of bivariate priors in the literature can account for dependence between the parameters when there is outside information indicating it. We introduced the pseudo-gamma priors in Section 4 and suggested as a possible option for Bayesian inference with prior dependence. Finally recommend that Bayesian analysis with dependent prior for the bivariate pseudo-exponential with a pseudo-gamma priors.

8 Acknowledgement(s)

I thank Ministry of Tribal Affairs-National Fellowship Scheme For Higher Education of ST Students(NFST) for providing me Junior Research Fellowship (JRF) and Senior Research Fellowship (SRF) (award no: 201819-NFST-TEL-00347). Also thanks to Institution of Eminence(IoE) project, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad (UoH-IoE-RC2-21-013).

References

- [1] Arnold, B.C., Arvanitis, M.A.(2019) *On bivariate pseudo-exponential distributions*, Journal of Applied Statistics:Taylor & Francis.
- [2] Arnold, B.C., Castillo, E., Sarabia, J.M. (1999) *Conditional Specification of statistical Models*, Springer, New York.
- [3] Arnold, B.C., Manjunath, B.G.(2021) *Statistical inference for distributions with one Poisson conditional*, Journal of Applied Statistics, 48:2306-2325.
- [4] Arnold, B.C., Veeranna, B., Manjunath, B.G., Shobha, B.(2022) *Bayesian inference for Pseudo-Poisson data*, Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation.
- [5] Chen, M.H.(1993) *Performance of the Gibbs, Hit-and-Run, and Metropolis Samplers*, Journal of Comput. and Graph. Statistics. 2(3):251-272.
- [6] Filus, J.K., Filus, L.Z.(2006) *On some new classes of multivariate probability distributions*, Pakistan Journal of Statistics. 22:21-42.
- [7] Filus, J.K., Filus, L.Z.(2007) *On new multivariate probability distributions and stochastic processes with system reliability and maintenance applications*, Methodol. Comput. Appl. Probab. 9:425-446.

- [8] Filus, J. K., Filus, L. Z. and Arnold, B.C.(2009) *Families of multivariate distributions involving "Triangular" transformations*, Communication in Statistics-Theory and Methods, 39:107-116.
- [9] Filus, J.K., Filus, L.Z.(2013) *A method for multivariate probability distributions construction via parameter dependence*, comm. Statistics: Theory Methods, 42:716-721.
- [10] Hall, B., (2021). LaplacesDemon: An R Package for Bayesian Inference, <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/LaplacesDemon/index.html>.