

# On Equivalence of Likelihood-Based Confidence Bands for Fatigue-Life and Fatigue-Strength Distributions

Peng Liu <sup>\*</sup>    Yili Hong<sup>†</sup>    Luis A. Escobar<sup>‡</sup>    William Q. Meeker<sup>§</sup>

March 20, 2024

## Abstract

Fatigue data arise in many research and applied areas and there have been statistical methods developed to model and analyze such data. The distributions of fatigue life and fatigue strength are often of interest to engineers designing products that might fail due to fatigue from cyclic-stress loading. Based on a specified statistical model and the maximum likelihood method, the cumulative distribution function (cdf) and quantile function (qf) can be estimated for the fatigue-life and fatigue-strength distributions. Likelihood-based confidence bands then can be obtained for the cdf and qf. This paper provides equivalence results for confidence bands for fatigue-life and fatigue-strength models. These results are useful for data analysis and computing implementation. We show (a) the equivalence of the confidence bands for the fatigue-life cdf and the fatigue-life qf, (b) the equivalence of confidence bands for the fatigue-strength cdf and the fatigue-strength qf, and (c) the equivalence of confidence bands for the fatigue-life qf and the fatigue-strength qf. Then we illustrate the usefulness of those equivalence results with two examples using experimental fatigue data.

*Keywords:* Censored data; Failure-time regression; Likelihood ratio; Maximum likelihood; Nonlinear regression, Quantile function, S-N curves.

---

<sup>\*</sup>JMP Statistical Discovery LLC

<sup>†</sup>Department of Statistics, Virginia Tech

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Experimental Statistics, Louisiana State University

<sup>§</sup>Department of Statistics, Iowa State University

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Background . . . . .	3
1.2	Fatigue-Life and Fatigue-Strength Random Variables . . . . .	4
1.3	Related Literature and Contributions of This Work . . . . .	5
1.4	Overview . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Data, Model, and Statistical Inference with a Specified Fatigue-Life Model</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Data and Model . . . . .	7
2.2	Maximum Likelihood Estimation . . . . .	8
2.3	Likelihood-Ratio-Based Confidence Intervals . . . . .	8
2.3.1	Likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals for a single parameter . . . . .	9
2.3.2	Likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals for a scalar function of the parameters . . . . .	10
2.4	Likelihood-Ratio-Based Confidence Bands . . . . .	11
2.4.1	Likelihood confidence bands for fatigue-life qfs and cdfs when the fatigue-life model is specified . . . . .	11
2.4.2	Likelihood confidence bands for an induced fatigue-strength qf and an induced fatigue-strength cdf when the fatigue-life model is given . . . . .	12
<b>3</b>	<b>Equivalence Results when the Fatigue-Life Model is Specified</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	General Equivalence Result for Two Mutually Inverse Monotone Functions . . . . .	13
3.2	Equivalence Results for cdf and qf Bands . . . . .	16
3.3	Equivalence of Confidence Bands for the Fatigue-Life qf and the Induced Fatigue-Strength qf . . . . .	16
<b>4</b>	<b>Estimating Quantiles of the Fatigue-Strength Distribution for a New Spring</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Statistical Inference with a Specified Fatigue-Strength Model</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1	The Induced Fatigue-Life Model and Maximum Likelihood Estimation . . . . .	19
5.2	Likelihood Confidence Bands for the Specified Fatigue-Strength Distribution . . . . .	21
5.3	Likelihood Confidence Bands for the Induced Fatigue-Life Distribution . . . . .	21

5.4	Equivalence Results When Using a Specified Fatigue-Strength Model . . . .	22
<b>6</b>	<b>Estimating the Fatigue-Life and Fatigue-Strength Distributions of Nitinol Wire</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and Areas for Future Research</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>24</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Fatigue-life data from cyclic-stress experiments arise in many research and development areas. Fatigue-life experiments are usually conducted by allocating a sample of test specimens to different fixed levels of stress or strain amplitude (depending on material properties and the degree of loading some test are conducted by controlling strain and others are conducted by controlling stress or some stress-related variable like displacement). Units are run until failure (defined in some precise way such as crack initiation, specimen fracture, or noticeable delamination) or until a specified test-end time. Units that reach the end of the test without failing are right-censored (also known as runouts).

Traditional methods of modeling experimental fatigue data typically focused modeling to estimate the characteristics (such as quantiles and tail probabilities) of the fatigue-life distribution. Engineers, however, are often also interested in the quantiles or tail probabilities of the the fatigue-strength distribution. Based on a specified statistical model, the maximum likelihood (ML) method can be used to estimate the cumulative distribution function (cdf) and the quantile function (qf) for both the fatigue-life and fatigue-strength distributions. Then, likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals (LR confidence intervals) can be obtained for quantiles and cdf probabilities of these distributions.

In this paper, we prove three important equivalence results that are important in applications:

- The equivalence, for a given level of stress  $S_e$ , of LR confidence bands for the fatigue-life

cdf and qf.

- The equivalence, for a given level of cycles  $N_e$ , of LR confidence bands for the fatigue-strength cdf and fatigue-strength qf.
- The equivalence, for a given probability level  $p$ , of LR confidence bands for the fatigue-life qf and fatigue-strength qf.

These three equivalence results are not well-known, but are useful in data analysis and computing implementations, as demonstrated in our numerical examples.

## 1.2 Fatigue-Life and Fatigue-Strength Random Variables

This section briefly describes the relationship between the fatigue-life and fatigue-strength random variables. The distributions of these two closely-related random variables are often needed to quantify the reliability of a product or system component that can fail from fatigue. Technical details describing this relationship are given in [Meeker et al. \(2024\)](#) and summarized later in this paper.

Fatigue life  $N$  is the number of cycles when a unit fails from cyclic loading. The cdf for  $N$  depends on stress (or strain) amplitude,  $S$ . For some experiments, there may be other experimental variables (e.g., the stress ratio, testing temperature, and dwell time). In this paper we consider fatigue-life distributions that depend on stress amplitude. Extensions are possible (and straightforward), as described in the example in Section 4. The horizontal densities in Figure 1a are lognormal fatigue-life distributions and those in Figure 1b are Weibull fatigue-life distributions on the right. The Weibull and lognormal are the most frequently used probability distributions for fatigue-life. For the examples in Figure 1, the scale parameters of the distributions depend on the level of stress and the shape parameters do not.

The random variable  $X$ , fatigue-strength, is the *level of stress* at which a unit would fail at a given number of cycles,  $N_e$ . The vertical densities in Figure 1a are lognormal fatigue-strength distributions and those in Figure 1b are Weibull fatigue-strength distributions. Fatigue strength cannot be observed directly because the stress levels in the test,  $S$ , are




Figure 1: Plot showing fatigue-life and fatigue-strength lognormal distributions (a); Plot showing fatigue-life and fatigue-strength Weibull distributions (b).

specified experimental levels and the failure time (the number of cycles,  $N$ ) is random. However, the fatigue-strength distribution can be estimated from fatigue-life data.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the fatigue-life and fatigue-strength models share the same quantile lines. The relationships between the models can also be expressed in a precise manner, as they are in Meeker et al. (2024, Sections 2 and 3). A summary of those results is presented in Sections 2.4.2 and 5.1.

Traditionally, fatigue-life data are analyzed by specifying a model for the fatigue-life random variable  $N$ , resulting in an induced model for the fatigue-strength  $X$ . Another approach is to specify the fatigue-strength model, resulting in an induced model for fatigue-life. These approaches are equivalent only if the  $S$ - $N$  relationship is a straight line (as it is in Figure 1) when plotted on log-log scales. There are important advantages of latter approach when the  $S$ - $N$  relationship is nonlinear. These advantages are described in Meeker et al. (2024, Section 3.2.1). We discuss the this new approach in Section 5 and illustrate its use in the corresponding example in Section 6.

### 1.3 Related Literature and Contributions of This Work

For a single distribution, Hong et al. (2008) showed that pointwise likelihood-ratio-based confidence interval bands for a cdf are exactly the same as pointwise likelihood-ratio-based

confidence interval bands for the corresponding qf. [Meeker et al. \(2024\)](#) provide a comprehensive review of the traditional modeling approach for fatigue-life data and present a novel alternative modeling approach using modern statistical methods for modeling fatigue life as a function of applied cyclic stress amplitude. Their results can be used to estimate both a fatigue-life distribution at a given level of stress and a fatigue-strength distribution at a given level of cycles. The contribution of this paper is to extend the results in [Hong et al. \(2008\)](#) to linear or nonlinear regression models that connect fatigue-life models and fatigue-strength models and to show how existing software for estimating fatigue-life models can be used to obtain confidence intervals for fatigue-strength quantities of interest. We prove three important equivalence results and show how they provide insights that are useful for data analysis and computing implementation.

## 1.4 Overview

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the data and model and shows how to obtain pointwise LR confidence intervals and confidence bands for a *specified* fatigue-life model and for the corresponding *induced* fatigue-strength model. Section 3 shows, for a specified fatigue-life model, the equivalence of confidence bands for (a) the fatigue-life cdf and fatigue-life qf (b) the fatigue-strength cdf and fatigue-strength qf, and (c) the fatigue-strength qf and fatigue-life qf. Section 5 describes similar results for the important situation when the fatigue-strength model is specified and the fatigue-life model is induced. Numerical examples illustrating the usefulness of our results for the two different modeling approaches are given in Sections 4 and 6, respectively. Section 7 contains some conclusions and areas for future research.

## 2 Data, Model, and Statistical Inference with a Specified Fatigue-Life Model

### 2.1 Data and Model

This section introduces notation and the traditional statistical model for describing the fatigue-life data. The  $S$ - $N$  data (stress/strain and number of cycles to failure), often with right censoring, are denoted by  $(S_i, N_i, \delta_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Here  $S_i$  is the level of applied stress (or strain) amplitude (which, for simplicity of expression, we refer to as “stress”),  $N_i$  is the observed cycles to failure or number of cycles at the end of the test for a right-censored observation (called a runout in the fatigue literature), and  $\delta_i$  is the failure indicator, where

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } N_i \text{ is a failure time} \\ 0 & \text{if } N_i \text{ is a runout time.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $N$  be the number of cycles to failure and let  $S$  be the applied stress amplitude. The fatigue-life model can be written as

$$\log(N) = \log[g(S; \boldsymbol{\beta})] + \sigma_N \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where  $g(S; \boldsymbol{\beta})$  is a positive monotonically decreasing (often nonlinear) function of stress  $S$  with regression parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . The random error term is  $\sigma_N \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon$  has a location-scale distribution with  $\mu = 0$  and  $\sigma = 1$  and  $\sigma_N$  is a shape parameter for the log-location-scale distribution describing the variability in  $N$ . Then  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}', \sigma_N)'$  is a vector containing the unknown regression-model parameters. The lognormal and Weibull distributions are the most commonly used distributions for fatigue life and both are members of the log-location-scale family of distributions, as described in [Meeker et al. \(2022, Chapter 4\)](#).

To simplify the presentation in this section we will suppose that  $\log[g(S; \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  has neither a vertical nor a horizontal asymptote. When such asymptotes exist, the results are similar but require some technical adjustments (described in Section 2.4 of [Meeker et al., 2024](#)).

Let  $F_N(t; S, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  denote the fatigue-life cdf and let  $f_N(t; S, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = dF_N(t; S, \boldsymbol{\theta})/dt$  denote the corresponding fatigue-life pdf. Then for any given stress level  $S_e$ , fatigue life  $N$  has a

log-location-scale distribution with cdf

$$F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \Pr(N \leq t; S_e) = \Phi\left(\frac{\log(t) - \log[g(S_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})]}{\sigma_N}\right), \quad t > 0, S_e > 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $g(S_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})$  is a scale parameter and  $\sigma_N$  is a shape parameter of the distribution of  $N$ . For any given stress level  $S_e$ , the fatigue-life  $p$  quantile is

$$t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp[\log[g(S_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})] + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N], \quad 0 < p < 1, S_e > 0. \quad (3)$$

To simplify the presentation, we will often omit the dependency on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and write  $t_p(S_e)$ . When we refer to  $t_p(S_e)$  as a ‘‘quantile function’’ (qf) it could be (for fixed  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ )  $t_p(S_e)$  as a function of  $p$  for fixed  $S_e$  or  $t_p(S_e)$  as a function of  $S_e$  for fixed  $p$ . The exact meaning will be clear from the context of the use. We will use similar notation and terminology for a fatigue-strength qf.

## 2.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimation

The log-likelihood function for the fatigue  $S$ - $N$  data is

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{\delta_i \log[f_N(N_i; S_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})] + (1 - \delta_i) \log[1 - F_N(N_i; S_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})]\}. \quad (4)$$

The ML estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is the value of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  that maximizes (4). Standard optimization algorithms can be used to maximize  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ .

For our goal of fatigue-life experiments, we are interested in estimators of quantiles and probabilities of the fatigue-life and/or fatigue-strength distributions. Based on the invariance property of maximum likelihood estimators, the maximum likelihood estimators of  $t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ ,  $F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ ,  $x_p(N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , and  $F_X(x; N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  are respectively  $t_p(S_e, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ ,  $F_N(t; S_e, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ ,  $x_p(N_e, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ , and  $F_X(x; N_e, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ . In the next section, we describe the procedure to calculate likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals (LR intervals) for these quantities, which are all scalar functions of parameters.

## 2.3 Likelihood-Ratio-Based Confidence Intervals

This section describes procedures to calculate LR confidence intervals for a scalar function of parameters. The first procedure is based on the profile relative likelihood function which



provides a useful visualization of likelihood inference for a scalar function of the model parameters. The second procedure provides the same intervals but has important computational and technical advantages that we use in establishing the main results of this paper.

### 2.3.1 Likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals for a single parameter

The procedure for computing LR intervals for a scalar parameter is well-known. For example, to calculate an interval for  $\theta_i$ , element  $i$  of the full parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , construct a profile relative likelihood function for  $\theta_i$  which is

$$R(\theta_i) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \setminus \{\theta_i\}} \left[ \frac{\exp[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]}{\exp[\mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]} \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \setminus \{\theta_i\}$  denotes the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  with  $\theta_i$  excluded (i.e., the nuisance parameters). The profile relative likelihood function is described and illustrated in Meeker et al. (2022, Section 8.2). An approximate  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  LR confidence interval is defined by the set of all values of  $\theta_i$  where  $R(\theta_i)$  exceeds  $\exp[-(1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2]$ , where  $\chi_{(p;1)}^2$  is the  $p$  quantile of a chi-square distribution with 1 degree of freedom. That this is so can be seen by noting that these values of  $\theta_i$  are the values that would not be rejected by a likelihood-ratio test.

The endpoints of the LR confidence interval can be written as  $[\underline{\theta}_i, \tilde{\theta}_i]$  and can be defined more formally as

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\theta}_i &= \min \{ \theta_i \mid R(\theta_i) \geq \exp(-(1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2) \} \\ \tilde{\theta}_i &= \max \{ \theta_i \mid R(\theta_i) \geq \exp(-(1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the notation  $\{e \mid \mathbb{C}\}$  is the set for which every element  $e$  satisfies the condition  $\mathbb{C}$ . A numerical implementation of this approach requires finding the roots of the profile relative likelihood function. In this paper we assume that the likelihood is concave. This will be so if the statistical model is identifiable and there is a sufficient amount of data. Under this condition, the relative likelihood  $R(\theta_i)$  is unimodal and any interval generated by the procedure will be closed. Meanwhile, the roots  $\underline{\theta}_i$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_i$ , where  $R(\theta_i)$  intersects  $\exp(-(1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2)$  may not exist, in which case the corresponding confidence interval endpoint is on or approaching the boundary of the parameter space. That, however, does not affect subsequent results.

### 2.3.2 Likelihood-ratio-based confidence intervals for a scalar function of the parameters

To find an LR confidence interval for a scalar function  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  of the parameters, the same procedure can be used after a reparameterization where  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  replaces any one of the elements of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . This can be done because of the invariance properties of likelihood inference. Such reparameterizations are described and illustrated [Meeker et al. \(2022, Section 8.2.4\)](#) and are easy to implement if it is easy to compute  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and its inverse. When there is no closed form for the inverse (a frequently occurring situation), numerical inversion can be used but that requires much more computing effort.

When pedagogy is less important, there are computational and technical reasons to use the log-likelihood (instead of the relative likelihood) directly to find LR intervals. Using the log-likelihood directly, the same interval endpoints in (6) can be obtained from:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\theta}_i &= \min \{ \theta_i \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \} \\ \tilde{\theta}_i &= \max \{ \theta_i \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \},\end{aligned}$$

where  $k = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - (1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2$ . This approach recognizes that to define the interval, it is only necessary to find the interval endpoints and suggests a completely different formulation. The operation of maximizing out the nuisance parameters is replaced by the constraint  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k$  because all candidate interval endpoints have to be on a particular log-likelihood level curve. The indicated minimization and maximization are done subject to that constraint. More importantly, this constrained optimization approach greatly simplifies the procedure for finding LR confidence intervals for functions of the parameters because reparameterization is not needed. That is the LR confidence interval  $[\underline{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \tilde{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$  for  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  can be obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \min \{ \xi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \} \\ \tilde{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \max \{ \xi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \}.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Standard optimization algorithms (e.g., the Lagrange multiplier method) can be used to do the needed constrained optimization. [Doganaksoy \(2021\)](#) uses this approach, to compute LR confidence intervals in several applications where reparameterization would be difficult. His presentation contains details of the needed optimization algorithms.

Similar to (6), in this paper we assume that the part of  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  subject to the constraint  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k$  is continuous. This will be so if  $\xi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a continuous function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Meanwhile, the endpoints  $\underline{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\tilde{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  subject to the constraint  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k$  may not exist, in which case the corresponding confidence interval endpoint is on or approaching the boundary of the parameter space. That, however, does not affect subsequent results.

## 2.4 Likelihood-Ratio-Based Confidence Bands

Sets of pointwise confidence intervals are generally computed and displayed in statistical software along with point estimates of qfs and cdfs. We call these sets of intervals “pointwise confidence bands.” Often Wald-based intervals are used to compute the pointwise confidence bands in these applications because they require less computational effort. LR bands, however, have desirable technical properties (e.g., coverage probabilities that are closer to the nominal confidence level and the equivalence results given in this paper); such LR bands are defined in this section.

### 2.4.1 Likelihood confidence bands for fatigue-life qfs and cdfs when the fatigue-life model is specified

For any given stress level  $S_e$ , the  $p$  quantile of  $N$  is  $t_p(S_e) = \exp[\log[g(S_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})] + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N]$ , which is a function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , as in (3). An LR  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  confidence interval for the fatigue-life cdf  $t_p(S_e)$  for given  $S_e$  and value of  $p$  using (7) is  $[\underline{t}_p(S_e), \tilde{t}_p(S_e)]$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{t}_p(S_e) &= \min \{t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{t}_p(S_e) &= \max \{t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\},\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

$k = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - (1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2$ , and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}', \hat{\sigma}_N)'$ . Again, standard optimization algorithms can be used to do the needed optimization. Note that when used for a given value of  $S_e$  and range of values of  $p$ , (8) provides a set of pointwise confidence intervals for the fatigue-life qf  $t_p(S_e)$  which we refer to as a “pointwise confidence band” for the qf.

Similarly, an LR  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  confidence interval for the fatigue-life cdf  $F_N(t; S_e)$ , a function

of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , at given stress level  $S_e$  and time  $t$  is  $[ \underline{F}_N(t; S_e), \quad \tilde{F}_N(t; S_e) ]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{F}_N(t; S_e) &= \min \{ F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \} \\ \tilde{F}_N(t; S_e) &= \max \{ F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Again, when used over a given range of  $t$  values (9) provides a pointwise confidence band for  $F_N(t; S_e)$ , the fatigue-life cdf at stress level  $S_e$  for that range of  $t$  values.

#### 2.4.2 Likelihood confidence bands for an induced fatigue-strength qf and an induced fatigue-strength cdf when the fatigue-life model is given

As described in Section 1.2, fatigue strength is an unobservable random variable  $X$  defined as the level of stress where failure would occur at  $N_e$ , a given number of cycles. As shown in Meeker et al. (2024, Section 2.4.1), to obtain the fatigue-strength cdf at  $N_e$ , start with (1) and replace  $N$  by  $N_e$  and  $S_e$  by  $X$  giving

$$\log(N_e) = \log[g(X; \boldsymbol{\beta})] + \sigma_N \epsilon.$$

Thus the random variable driven by  $\sigma_N \epsilon$  is switched from  $N$  at the given value of  $S_e$  to  $X$  at given value of  $N_e$ . Then solving for the fatigue-strength random variable  $X$  gives

$$X = g^{-1}[\exp(\log(N_e) - \sigma_N \epsilon); \boldsymbol{\beta}].$$

The cdf of fatigue strength  $X$  is

$$\begin{aligned} F_X(x; N_e) &= \Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(\log[g(X; \boldsymbol{\beta})] \geq \log[g(x; \boldsymbol{\beta})]) \\ &= \Pr(\log(N_e) - \sigma_N \epsilon \geq \log[g(x; \boldsymbol{\beta})]) \\ &= \Pr \left[ \epsilon \leq \frac{\log(N_e) - \log[g(x; \boldsymbol{\beta})]}{\sigma_N} \right] \\ &= \Phi \left[ \frac{\log(N_e) - \log[g(x; \boldsymbol{\beta})]}{\sigma_N} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This cdf is *not* a log-location-scale distribution unless, for fixed  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ,  $\log[g(x; \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  is a linear function of  $\log(x)$ .

The qf for  $X$  is  $x_p(N_e) = g^{-1}[\exp[\log(N_e) - \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N]; \boldsymbol{\beta}]$ . Then, using (7), for given values of cycles  $N_e$  and  $p$ , the  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  LR confidence interval for  $x_p(N_e)$ , a function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , is

$[\underline{x}_p(N_e), \tilde{x}_p(N_e)]$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{x}_p(N_e) &= \min \{x_p(N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{x}_p(N_e) &= \max \{x_p(N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

Note that (10) also provides pointwise confidence bands for  $x_p(N_e)$ , the fatigue-strength qf at  $N_e$  cycles for a given range of values of  $p$ .

Similarly, the LR confidence interval for fatigue-strength cdf  $F_X(x; N_e)$ , a function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , for a given value  $N_e$  cycles at a given  $x$  is  $[\underline{F}_X(x; N_e), \tilde{F}_X(x; N_e)]$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{F}_X(x; N_e) &= \min \{F_X(x; N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{F}_X(x; N_e) &= \max \{F_X(x; N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}.\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Thus, (11) provides pointwise confidence bands for  $F_X(x; N_e)$ , the fatigue-strength cdf for a given range of  $x$  values.

### 3 Equivalence Results when the Fatigue-Life Model is Specified

This section shows the important equivalence results for LR confidence bands. Note that for confidence bands computed in other ways (e.g., the simpler and widely used Wald method), the results will be approximate.

#### 3.1 General Equivalence Result for Two Mutually Inverse Monotone Functions

This section presents a general result that can then be used to easily establish the particular results that are important in practical applications.

**Result 1.** The pointwise LR confidence bands for two strictly monotone (increasing or decreasing) functions that are inverses of each other are equivalent.

To show the result, we first extend (7) as follows

$$\left\{ \left[ \underline{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \tilde{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\} \equiv \{ \xi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \},\tag{12}$$




Figure 2: Plot showing LR confidence bands for  $\xi(w)$  as a collection of individual confidence intervals of  $\xi(w)$  at individual  $w$  (a); Plot showing a transposed LR confidence bands for  $\xi^{-1}(v)$  as a collection of individual confidence intervals of  $\xi^{-1}(v)$  at individual  $v$  (b).

which states the equivalence of two sets. The set on the left contains a single interval. The set on the right contains an infinite number of individual points. The sets are equivalent in the sense that the interval in the set on the left encloses all points in the set on the right.

Next, suppose we have a strictly monotone function  $v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , whose inverse function is  $w = \xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . By being strictly monotone, we ensure that for any  $w$  there is one and only one corresponding  $v$ , and vice versa. The  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  pointwise LR confidence bands for  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , using (12), can be defined in two equivalent ways

$$B_{\xi(w)} = \left\{ \left[ \underline{\xi}(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \tilde{\xi}(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \mid \forall w \in \mathbb{D}_w, \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\} \quad (13)$$

$$\equiv \left\{ (w, v) \mid \forall w \in \mathbb{D}_w, \forall v \in \mathbb{D}_v, v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\mathbb{D}_w$  denotes the domain of  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  (and the range of  $\xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ ). Also,  $\mathbb{D}_v$  denotes the domain of  $\xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  (and the range of  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ ). The first definition (13) is a set of confidence intervals for the function  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  for  $w$  spanning the domain of the function, illustrated by Figure 2a. There are an infinite number of intervals in this set. According to (12), each single interval set  $\left\{ \left[ \underline{\xi}(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \tilde{\xi}(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \mid w \in \mathbb{D}_w, \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\}$  for a given  $w$  can be expressed

equivalently as a set of points  $\{v \mid w \in \mathbb{D}_w, v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}$  for the same  $w$ . By collecting the equivalent sets of points for all  $w$ , the second definition (14) expresses the set of intervals equivalently as a set of points  $(w, v)$  that are constrained by the functional relationship  $v = \xi_w(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k$ .

For the inverse function, the  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  pointwise LR confidence bands for  $\xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , using (12), can be defined in two equivalent ways as well:

$$B_{\xi^{-1}(v)} = \left\{ \left[ \widetilde{\xi}^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \widetilde{\xi}^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \mid \forall v \in \mathbb{D}_v, \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\} \quad (15)$$

$$\equiv \{ (v, w) \mid \forall w \in \mathbb{D}_w, \forall v \in \mathbb{D}_v, w = \xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \} \quad (16)$$

$$= \{ (v, w) \mid \forall w \in \mathbb{D}_w, \forall v \in \mathbb{D}_v, v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \}. \quad (17)$$

The first definition (15) is a set of individual confidence intervals for function  $\xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  for  $v$  spanning the domain of the function, illustrated by Figure 2b. There are an infinite number of intervals in this set. The intervals in Figure 2b have been transposed to illustrate the inverse relationship. The second definition (16) expresses the set of intervals equivalently as a set of all points  $(v, w)$  that are constrained by the functional relationship  $w = \xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k$ . The sets (15) and (16) are equivalent because of the similar reason for the equivalence between (13) and (14). The sets (16) and (17) are equal because we just replace the condition  $w = \xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  with the equivalent condition  $v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ .

By comparing the sets (14) and (17), we have  $\forall (v, w) \in B_{\xi(w)}$ ,  $(w, v) \in B_{\xi^{-1}(v)}$ , and vice versa. In other words, the transpose of  $B_{\xi(w)}$  is identical to  $B_{\xi^{-1}(v)}$ , and vice versa. Thus the transposed pointwise confidence bands for  $v = \xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  are exactly the same as the pointwise confidence bands for  $w = \xi^{-1}(v, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ .

It is interesting to note that the result holds even if the function has horizontal or vertical asymptotes, as long as the function is strictly monotone. For example, suppose  $\xi(w, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  is the center curve in Figure 2a, which is the maximum likelihood estimate of  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Suppose the function  $\xi(w, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  has a vertical asymptote at  $w_0$  on the right side. Then  $\xi(w, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  is undefined on  $[w_0, \infty)$ . The most important question, however, is whether the likelihood based pointwise confidence intervals of  $\xi(w, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  are defined on  $[w_0, \infty)$ . Without the loss of generality, we just need to check whether the interval for  $\xi(w_0, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is defined, which is, according to (13),  $\left\{ \left[ \widetilde{\xi}(w_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \widetilde{\xi}(w_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \right\}$ , or equivalently, according to (14),  $\{ (w_0, v) \mid \forall v \in \mathbb{D}_v, v = \xi(w_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k \}$ . Whether the length of the interval is zero, or

whether the set of points is empty, those situations do not affect the above result, which depends only on the conditions of how the sets are constructed.

This concludes the demonstration that the pointwise LR confidence bands are equivalent for two monotone functions that are inverse to each other. With this general result, we can immediately obtain the next two results.

### 3.2 Equivalence Results for cdf and qf Bands

The following result extends a similar result in [Hong et al. \(2008\)](#) to the linear and nonlinear regression models used here.

**Result 2.** The LR confidence bands for the specified fatigue-life cdf in (9) and the corresponding fatigue-life qf in (8) are equivalent.

The result holds as an application of Result 1 because the fatigue-life cdf and the fatigue-life quantiles are inverse functions of each other. This result shows that if one uses the LR procedures, it makes no difference whether one computes pointwise confidence bands for  $F_N(t; S_e)$  or  $t_p(S_e)$ —the bands will be the same.

The following shows that the equivalence result extends to the induced fatigue-strength model.

**Result 3.** The LR confidence bands for the induced fatigue-strength cdf in (10) and the corresponding qf in (11) are equivalent.

The result holds as an application of Result 1 because the induced fatigue-strength cdf and the corresponding fatigue-strength quantiles are inverse functions of each other. This result shows that if one uses the LR procedures, it makes no difference whether one computes pointwise confidence bands for  $x_p(N_e)$  or  $F_X(x; N_e)$ —the bands will be the same.

### 3.3 Equivalence of Confidence Bands for the Fatigue-Life qf and the Induced Fatigue-Strength qf

Consider the need to find a safe level of stress  $S_e$  such that  $t_p(S_e) = N_e$ . If computed using the LR method, this  $S_e$  value is equivalent to the lower confidence bound  $x_p(N_e)$  of



the fatigue-strength distribution. More generally, if pointwise LR confidence intervals for  $t_p(S_e) = N_e$  are used to obtain bands of such  $S_e$  values for a range of  $N_e$  values, they will be equivalent to the confidence bands for  $x_p(N_e)$  in (10) over the same range of  $N_e$ . We have the following result.

**Result 4.** For a fixed  $p$ , the  $p$  qf curve for the fatigue-life distribution as a function of  $S_e$  is the same as the  $p$  qf curve for the fatigue-strength distribution as a function of  $N_e$ . In addition, for fixed  $p$ , the confidence bands for the fatigue-life qf in (8) over a range of  $S_e$  and the induced fatigue-strength qf in (10) over a range of  $N_e$  are equivalent.

We first show that the  $p$  qf curve for the fatigue-life distribution is the same as the  $p$  qf curve for the fatigue-strength distribution. For a fixed  $p$  and  $S_e$ , a point on the qf for the fatigue-life distribution is  $(S_e, \exp[\mu_\beta + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N])$ , where  $\mu_\beta = \log[g(S_e; \beta)]$ . This point is also on the  $p$  qf for the fatigue-strength distribution for a fixed  $N_e = \exp(\mu_\beta + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N)$ . The qf for  $X$  is

$$\begin{aligned} x_p(N_e) &= g^{-1}[\exp(\log(N_e) - \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N); \beta] \\ &= g^{-1}[\exp(\log[\exp(\mu_\beta + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N)] - \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N); \beta] \\ &= g^{-1}[\exp(\mu_\beta); \beta] = S_e, \end{aligned}$$

which is the same point as  $(S_e, \exp(\mu_\beta + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_N))$ . Thus the two qf curves are equivalent.

Because the two qf curves are equivalent, the two different quantiles functions are inverses of each other. Then, as an application of Result 1, the confidence bands for the fatigue-life qf in (8) and the induced fatigue-strength qf in (10) are then equivalent.

## 4 Estimating Quantiles of the Fatigue-Strength Distribution for a New Spring

A large experiment was conducted to estimate the fatigue-life distribution of a newly designed nib spring to be used in a vehicle. In a full-factorial experiment, nine springs were tested at each combination of two levels of a manufacturing-processing temperature (500 and 1,000 degrees F), two manufacturing methods (Old and New), and three levels of Stroke (50,




Figure 3: Fatigue-life cdf estimates at 500,000 cycles as a function of Stroke (a); Fatigue-life 0.10 quantile estimates as a function of Stroke (b); the dashed lines are pointwise 90% confidence bands.

60, and 70 mils), for a total of 108 springs. Each spring was tested until failure or 5,000 thousand cycles (whichever came first). Stroke, proportional to stress, was the displacement used in the cyclic stressing of the springs and served as an accelerating variable. That is, the engineers were interested in the reliability of the springs at lower levels of Stroke that would be encountered in actual vehicle operation. There were 73 observed failure times and 35 runouts by the end of the test. The data were presented and previously analyzed in [Meeker et al. \(2003\)](#) and [Meeker et al. \(2022, Chapter 19\)](#). Details of the ML estimation will not be repeated here.

Although the question was not explicitly addressed in these references, the engineers who requested the data analysis wanted to know the level of Stroke such that the spring would survive 500,000 thousand cycles (500 million cycles) with only a 0.10 probability of failing. In other words, the engineers wanted a lower confidence bound on the 0.10 quantile of the fatigue-strength distribution.

Figure 3a is a plot of the ML estimates of the fatigue-life failure probabilities and corresponding pointwise LR two-sided 90% confidence bands, as a function of Stroke for the New manufacturing method and 600 degrees F temperature. Using [Result 2](#) and [Result 3](#) in [Section 3.2](#), [Figure 3a](#) shows that the LR one-sided lower 95% confidence bound for the desired 0.10 quantile of the fatigue-strength distribution at 500,000 cycles can be ob-

tained from the value of Stroke that results in a one-sided *upper* 95% confidence bound  $\tilde{F}_N(500,000; \text{Stroke}) = 0.10$ . The figure (note where the dotted lines cross) shows that this value is  $\underline{x}_{0.10}(500,000) = 17.99$  mils.

Figure 3b shows the ML estimates and LR two-sided 90% confidence intervals for the fatigue-life 0.10 quantile as a function of Stroke. This plot illustrates an alternative way to obtain the desired lower confidence bound on the 0.10 quantile of the fatigue-strength distribution by using Result 4 in Section 3.3. In particular, one finds the level of Stroke that has a *lower* confidence bound for the fatigue-life quantile equal to  $\underline{t}_{0.10}(\text{Stroke}) = 500,000$  cycles (where the dotted lines cross), again giving  $\underline{x}_{0.10}(500,000) = 17.99$  mils.

Plots like those in Figure 3 can be obtained from commonly available statistical software (e.g., JMP, Minitab, or SAS) for fitting lifetime regression models (although Wald-based intervals are usually provided, at least as a default). This example, using our results, shows how existing inferential methods for fatigue-life probabilities and quantiles can be used to make inferences on fatigue-strength quantiles and probabilities.

## 5 Statistical Inference with a Specified Fatigue-Strength Model

In contrast to the traditional fatigue-life modeling methods described in Section 2 (that are currently widely available in statistical software), this section describes the alternative approach where the fatigue-strength model is specified and the fatigue-life model is induced (and these methods have not been available in widely available statistical software).

### 5.1 The Induced Fatigue-Life Model and Maximum Likelihood Estimation

This section briefly reviews the approach described in Meeker et al. (2024, Section 3.2) in which one specifies a fatigue-strength model which induces a fatigue-life model that is fit to the fatigue-life data. An important advantage of this approach is that, as pointed out by Weibull (1956) (and also mentioned in Bastenaire et al., 1961), the shape/spread of fatigue-strength distributions tend not to depend on  $N_e$ , the given number of cycles. This is in

contrast to the shape/spread of fatigue-life distributions that often do depend on  $S_e$ , the given level of stress or strain (especially in high-cycle fatigue applications). [Meeker et al. \(2024, Section 3.2.1\)](#) provides further discussion about this point.

Recall (from [Section 1.2](#)) that fatigue strength is defined to be the level of stress amplitude that will cause a unit to fail at a given number of cycles  $N_e$ . This random variable is not observable but its distribution can be estimated by using appropriate  $S$ - $N$  data. Let  $X$  be the fatigue strength and let  $N_e$  be the given number of cycles to failure. A model for fatigue-strength can be written as

$$\log(X) = \log[h(N_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})] + \sigma_X \epsilon, \quad (18)$$

where  $h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})$  is a positive monotonically decreasing function of  $t$  for a fixed regression parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . This model implies that for fixed values of  $N_e$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ,  $X$  has a log-locations-scale distribution with a scale parameter  $h(N_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ . The random error term is  $\sigma_X \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon$  has a location-scale distribution with  $\mu = 0$  and  $\sigma = 1$  and  $\sigma_X$  is a shape parameter for the log-location-scale distribution describing the variability in fatigue strength  $X$ .

As in [Section 2](#), to simplify the presentation in this section we will also suppose that  $\log[h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  has neither a vertical nor a horizontal asymptote. When such asymptotes exist, the results are similar but require some technical adjustments (described in [Section 3.2](#) of [Meeker et al., 2024](#)).

Omitting the details of the derivation (which are given in [Section 3.2.3](#) of [Meeker et al., 2024](#)), after specifying a model for fatigue strength  $X$ , one can obtain, for a given level of applied stress amplitude  $S_e$ , the cdf for the fatigue-life random variable  $N$  as

$$F_N(t; S_e) = \Pr(N \leq t) = \Phi \left[ \frac{\log(S_e) - \log[h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})]}{\sigma_X} \right], \quad t > 0, S_e > 0. \quad (19)$$

This cdf is *not* a log-location-scale distribution unless, for fixed  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ,  $\log[h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  is a linear function of  $\log(t)$ .

Because  $N$  is observable, the cdf in [\(19\)](#) along with the corresponding pdf  $f_N(t; S_e) = dF_N(t; S_e)/dt$  can be used to define the likelihood for the available fatigue-life data and to obtain ML estimates of the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}', \sigma_X)'$ , as described in [Section 2.2](#). [Sections 5.2](#) and [5.3](#) show how to compute LR confidence intervals/bands, for cdfs and qfs for the fatigue-strength distributions and induced fatigue-life distributions, respectively.

## 5.2 Likelihood Confidence Bands for the Specified Fatigue-Strength Distribution

Let  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_N)$  be the log-likelihood function, and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_N$  be the ML estimates. For any given number of cycles  $N_e$ , (18) implies that  $X$  has a log-location-scale distribution with log-location parameter  $\mu(X_e) = \log[h(N_e; \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  and shape parameter  $\sigma_X$ . The logarithm of the  $p$  quantile of  $X$  is  $\log[x_p(N_e)] = \mu(N_e) + \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_X$ .

The  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  LR confidence bands for the fatigue-strength qf  $x_p(N_e)$  for given  $N_e$  over a range of values of  $p$  using (7) are  $[\underline{x}_p(N_e), \tilde{x}_p(N_e)]$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{x}_p(N_e) &= \min \{x_p(N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{x}_p(N_e) &= \max \{x_p(N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\},\end{aligned}$$

$k = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - (1/2)\chi_{(1-\alpha;1)}^2$ , and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\sigma}_N)$ . Similarly, LR confidence bands for the fatigue-strength cdf  $F_X(x; N_e)$  for a given  $N_e$  and over a range of  $x$  values are  $[\underline{F}_X(x; N_e), \tilde{F}_X(x; N_e)]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{F}_X(x; N_e) &= \min \{F_X(x; N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{F}_X(x; N_e) &= \max \{F_X(x; N_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}.\end{aligned}$$

## 5.3 Likelihood Confidence Bands for the Induced Fatigue-Life Distribution

The fatigue-life random variable  $N$  is  $N = h^{-1}[\exp(\log(S_e) - \sigma_X \epsilon); \boldsymbol{\beta}]$ . The cdf of fatigue life  $N$  is

$$\begin{aligned}F_N(t; S_e) &= \Pr(N \leq t) = \Pr(\log[h(N; \boldsymbol{\beta})] \geq \log[h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})]) \\ &= \Phi \left[ \frac{\log(S_e) - \log[h(t; \boldsymbol{\beta})]}{\sigma_X} \right].\end{aligned}$$

The qf for  $N$  is  $t_p(S_e) = h^{-1}[\exp(\log(S_e) - \Phi^{-1}(p)\sigma_X); \boldsymbol{\beta}]$ .

LR confidence bands for the fatigue-life qf at a given stress level  $S_e$  and over a range of values of  $p$  are  $t_p(S_e)$  using (7) is  $[\underline{t}_p(S_e), \tilde{t}_p(S_e)]$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{t}_p(S_e) &= \min \{t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{t}_p(S_e) &= \max \{t_p(S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, LR confidence bands for the fatigue-life cdf  $F_N(t; S_e)$  for a given level of stress  $S_e$  over a range of  $t$  values are

$$[ \underline{F}_N(t; S_e), \quad \tilde{F}_N(t; S_e) ]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{F}_N(t; S_e) &= \min\{F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\} \\ \tilde{F}_N(t; S_e) &= \max\{F_N(t; S_e, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k\}. \end{aligned}$$

## 5.4 Equivalence Results When Using a Specified Fatigue-Strength Model

There are similar equivalence results for the specify-the-fatigue-strength-model approach that parallel the results given in Section 3. This section states these explicitly. Proofs are omitted because they are similar to those in Section 3. In particular, when the fatigue-strength model is specified and the fatigue-life model is induced according to the approach described in Section 5.1, we have the following results:

**Result 4** For any given value of number of cycles  $N_e$ , the pointwise LR confidence bands for the fatigue-strength cdf and the corresponding fatigue-strength qf are equivalent.


**Result 5** For any given level of stress  $S_e$ , pointwise LR confidence bands for the induced fatigue-life cdf and the induced fatigue-life qf are equivalent.

**Result 6** For a fixed  $p$ , confidence bands for the fatigue-strength qf for a range of number of cycles  $N_e$  described in Section 5.2 and the induced fatigue-life qf for a range of stress  $S_e$  described in Section 5.3 are equivalent.

## 6 Estimating the Fatigue-Life and Fatigue-Strength Distributions of Nitinol Wire

An experiment was conducted to study the fatigue life of nitinol wire. Nitinol is a superelastic alloy that is used, for example, in medical devices such as stents and artificial heart valves.

Fatigue-life failure probability estimates (a)



Fatigue-strength quantile estimates (b)




Figure 4: Fraction failing as a function of percent strain for time 600 million cycles (a); Strength quantile as a function of percent strain for time 600 million cycles (b); the dashed lines are pointwise 90% confidence bands.

The data for this example were previously analyzed in [Falk \(2019\)](#) and [Meeker et al. \(2024\)](#) and are a subset of a larger data set analyzed in [Weaver et al. \(2023\)](#). The test consisted of 66 wire specimens allocated across 10 levels of Percent Strain. The specimens were subjected to rotary bend fatigue tests under strain control until failure or until one billion cycles, whichever came first. By the end of the test, there were 46 failures and 20 runouts. The purpose of the test was to estimate small quantiles of the fatigue-strength distribution at 600 million cycles. Details of the estimation results presented in the cited papers will not be repeated here.

Figure 4a is a plot of the ML estimates of the fatigue-life failure probabilities and corresponding bands of pointwise LR two-sided 90% confidence intervals, as a function of Percent Strain, for a fixed value of  $N_e = 600$  million cycles. Plotting an ML estimate of  $F_N(t; S_e)$  (and the corresponding confidence bands) versus  $S_e$  in this way (for fixed  $t = 600$  million cycles) is also an ML estimate (and corresponding confidence bands) for the fatigue-strength cdf.

To obtain a lower confidence bound on the 0.01 quantile of the nitinol fatigue-strength distribution at 600 million cycles, we can use Result 4 in Section 5.4. In particular, the needed blower bound can be obtained from the value of Percent Strain that results in an one-sided upper 95% confidence bound on the fatigue-life failure probability at 600 million

cycles that is equal to 0.01 (i.e.,  $\tilde{F}_N(600; \text{Percent Strain}) = 0.01$ ). Figure 4a shows this value (note where the dotted lines cross) to be  $\underline{x}_{0.01}(600) = 0.3793$  Percent Strain. Similar to the nib spring example in Section 4, such fatigue-life inferences can be obtained from commonly available statistical software and then used to make fatigue-strength inferences.

Figure 4b focuses directly on the needed inference, providing the ML estimate and 2-sided pointwise 90% confidence bands for the quantile function of the fatigue-strength distribution. The figure shows (note where the dotted lines cross) that the one-sided lower 95% confidence bound for the 0.01 quantile is again 0.3793 Percent Strain (i.e.,  $\underline{x}_{0.01}(600) = 0.3793$ ).

## 7 Conclusions and Areas for Future Research

In this paper, we showed the equivalence of different sets of confidence bands when those bands are based on inverting likelihood ratio tests. These results are useful for making inferences on fatigue-strength distributions by using readily available software for estimation of fatigue-life distributions. The results will also be useful for those who want to develop statistical software to estimate fatigue-strength distributions.

When the confidence bands are based on the more commonly used Wald method, the results are only approximate, with the approximation improving with larger sample sizes. The intuition for this is that Wald confidence intervals are based on a quadratic approximation to the profile likelihood function that determines LR confidence intervals, as described in Meeker and Escobar (1995). It would be interesting to study the adequacy of this approximation to help practitioners decide when it is appropriate to use Wald-based intervals.

## References

- Bastenaire, F., M. Bastien, and G. Pomey (1961). Statistical analysis of fatigue test results and its application to new series of data. *Acta Technica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 35-36*, 7–26. [19](#)
- Doganaksoy, N. (2021). A simplified formulation of likelihood ratio confidence intervals using a novel property. *Technometrics 63*, 127–135. [10](#)



- Falk, W. (2019). A statistically rigorous fatigue strength analysis approach applied to medical devices. In *Fourth Symposium on Fatigue and Fracture of Metallic Medical Materials and Devices*. ASTM International. 23
- Hong, Y., W. Q. Meeker, and L. A. Escobar (2008). The relationship between confidence intervals for failure probabilities and life time quantiles. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 57, 260–266. 5, 6, 16
- Meeker, W. Q. and L. A. Escobar (1995). Teaching about approximate confidence regions based on maximum likelihood estimation. *The American Statistician* 49, 48–53. 24
- Meeker, W. Q., L. A. Escobar, and F. G. Pascual (2022). *Statistical Methods for Reliability Data* (Second ed.). Wiley. 7, 9, 10, 18
- Meeker, W. Q., L. A. Escobar, F. G. Pascual, Y. Hong, P. Liu, W. M. Falk, and B. Ananthasayanam (2024). Modern statistical models and methods for estimating fatigue-life and fatigue-strength distributions from experimental data. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.04550v1>. Accessed: 18 March 2024. 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 19, 20, 23
- Meeker, W. Q., L. A. Escobar, and S. Zayac (2003). Use of sensitivity analysis to assess the effect of model uncertainty in analyzing accelerated life test data. In W. R. Blischke and D. N. P. Murthy (Eds.), *Case Studies in Reliability and Maintenance*, Chapter 6, pp. 135–162. Wiley. 18
- Weaver, J., G. Sena, K. Aycock, A. Roiko, W. Falk, S. Sivan, and B. Berg (2023). Rotary bend fatigue of nitinol to one billion cycles. *Shape Memory and Superelasticity* 9, 50–73. 23
- Weibull, W. (1956). Scatter of fatigue life and fatigue strength in aircraft structural materials and parts. In A. Freudenthal (Ed.), *Fatigue in Aircraft Structures*, pp. 126–145. Academic Press. 19