

On Optimal Planning of Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring Schemes under Dependent Competing Risks

Rathin Das^a, Soumya Roy^{b,*}, Biswabrata Pradhan^a

^a*SQC and OR Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India*

^b*Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode, Kozhikode, Pin 673570, India*

Abstract

This work considers designing of reliability acceptance sampling plan (RASP) when the competing risk data are progressively interval-censored. The methodology uses the asymptotic results of the estimators of parameters of any lifetime distribution under progressive interval censored competing risk data. Therefore, we establish a simplified form of the Fisher information matrix and present the asymptotic properties of the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) under a set of regularity conditions. Next, we consider a special case to illustrate the proposed RASP. we assume that the lifetime of the item due to the individual cause follows Weibull distribution. Also, it is assumed that the components are dependent and the gamma frailty model describes the dependent structure between the components. Now, we obtain the optimal RASP in three different ways. First, We present the method for obtaining optimal sample size and acceptance limit using producer's and consumer's risks. Next, we determine the optimal RASP under C-optimal criteria without cost constraints and with cost constraints. Numerical example is performed for both independent and dependent cases. Also, Monte Carlo simulation study is conducted in order to show that the sampling plans meet the specified risks for finite sample size.

Keywords: Reliability, Acceptance sampling plan, Frailty model, Weibull Distribution, Asymtotic property

1. Introduction

In the present-day business world, characterized by intense competition, prioritizing the reliability of products is paramount for manufacturers [5]. Although reliability is an important consideration during the product development phase, achieving the targeted reliability levels throughout the post-production stages is equally critical. A standard approach to achieve this through life tests [18, pp. 2–3]. However, these tests are often performed under various censoring schemes, resulting in incomplete data sets [1]. Among

*Corresponding author

Email address: soumya@iimk.ac.in (Biswabrata Pradhan)

various censoring schemes, Type-I and Type-II schemes are perhaps the two most widely adopted schemes, primarily because of their inherent simplicity and ease of implementation. Hybrid censoring schemes, often viewed as a compromise between Type-I and Type-II schemes, have also received a lot of interest in the literature. However, these traditional schemes assume continuous inspection during the experiment, which may not be feasible due to insufficient resources. In view of this, interval censoring schemes are proposed in the literature, resulting in grouped failure data sets.

A major drawback of these interval censoring schemes is its inability to accommodate intermediate withdrawals of test units during the course of an experiment. However, such intermediate withdrawals may be unavoidable for various practical reasons. For example, consider the life test performed on 68 battery cells as discussed by Meeker and Escobar [18, p. 633]. Some battery cells are withdrawn from the ongoing experiment to assess the extent of physical degradation. To accommodate such intermediate withdrawals of the test units from the life test, Aggarwala [2] proposed the progressive Type-I interval censoring (henceforth, PIC-I) schemes.

In the existing literature, a considerable volume of work exists on statistical inference of various important lifetime models based on such PIC-I data sets. As mentioned above, Aggarwala [2] introduced PIC-I schemes and considered inference of exponential lifetime model based on PIC-I data sets. This was further extended for a number of lifetime models such as Weibull [20, 16], generalized exponential [9, 16], log-normal [22], Burr [7], inverse Weibull distribution [26], truncated Normal [17], and inverse Gaussian [25].

These works primarily focused on systems that have a single failure mode. However, as in the case of the battery cells data set mentioned above, a system often experiences multiple failure modes, causing it to failure when one of these competing failure modes occurs. These failure modes are commonly referred to as competing risks in the literature [23]. A significant number of work exists in the existing literature on statistical inference of lifetime data sets under various censoring schemes. See for example, Ahmadi et al. [3, 4], Azizi et al. [6] for statistical inference based on PIC-I data sets.

An important issue in this context is optimal planning of PIC-I schemes. Recently, this has drawn a lot of interest in the literature. Lin et al. [15] and Lin et al. [14] provided A - and D -optimal designs for log-normal and Weibull models, respectively. Roy and Pradhan [22] presented Bayesian D -optimal design for log-normal lifetime model. This was further extended to Bayesian c -optimal designs by Roy and Pradhan [23] for Weibull and log-normal lifetime models. Budhiraja and Pradhan [8] provided a cost function-based approach for deciding the optimal design parameters for PIC-I schemes. These works primarily focused on determining the optimal design parameters, such as optimal inspection times and the corresponding number

of test unit withdrawals from the experiment. However, a more pertinent question in this context may be the design of optimal reliability acceptance sampling plans (henceforth, RASPs). RASPs are essentially variations of variable Acceptance Sampling Plans (henceforth, ASPs), where we use the reliability of a product as a measurable quality characteristic of interest. Huang and Wu [11] presented a cost function-based approach for obtaining the RASPs for the exponential lifetime model. Wu and Huang [28] further extended their work in the competing risks set up, assuming that the latent failure time under a failure mode follows an exponential lifetime model.

In this article, we present RASPs under PIC-I schemes assuming the presence of independent and dependent competing risks. Unlike the existing works, we present a general framework for modeling the PIC-I data set under the competing risk setup. Subsequently, we obtain the Fisher information matrix and present the asymptotic properties of the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) under a set of regularity conditions. Subsequently, we consider a frailty-based dependent competing risks model, which provides an independent competing risks model as a special case. Subsequently, we present the optimal RASPs that provide the optimal sample size and lower acceptance limit under both independent and dependent competing risk setup. Subsequently, we introduce a generic cost function and develop an approach for obtaining the RASPs under a cost constraint. We then carry out a detailed numerical experiment to study the properties of the RASPs under a number of scenarios. We also perform a simulation exercise to study the finite sample properties of the optimal RASPs.

This article contributes to the existing literature in a number of ways. First, we present here a general model framework under a competing risks setup. This framework covers the important lifetime models as a special case. Second, we present a generic expression of the Fisher information matrix and also derive the asymptotic properties of the MLEs under a set of regularity conditions. Third, we present the RASPs in two different scenarios and highlight the importance of incorporating the dependence structure among the latent failure times in practice.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the general framework for modeling the PIC-I data set under competing risks setup.

2. General Framework

2.1. Model and Likelihood Function

Suppose, in a life test, a test unit fails as soon as one of the J competing failure modes occurs. Let X_j denote the potential failure time due to the j th cause of failure for $j = 1, \dots, J$. Let T denote the overall failure time of the test unit, and the index C denote the cause of failure. It is easy to understand

that $T = \min\{X_1, \dots, X_J\} = X_C$. Let $f_{X_j}(x | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j)$ and $F_{X_j}(x | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j)$ be the probability density function (henceforth, p.d.f.) and cumulative distribution function (henceforth, c.d.f.) of X_j , respectively, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ is the vector of parameters corresponding to the j th cause of failure. Also, denote the joint survivor function (henceforth, s.f.) of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_J)$ by $\bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s)$ is a vector of parameters.

In a competing risk setup, we collect data on C and T from a life-test. Typically, the joint distribution of C and T is specified in terms of the sub-distribution function $G(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = P(C = j, T \leq t)$ or equivalently, by the sub-survivor function $\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = P(C = j, T > t)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$. Also, let the p.d.f., c.d.f. and s.f. of T be given by $f_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $F_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\bar{F}_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, respectively. It is well known that the sub-density function corresponding to the observed pair $\{C = j, T = t\}$ is given by

$$g(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left[-\frac{\delta \bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\delta x_j} \right]_{t\mathbf{1}_J},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_J$ is a unit vector of J components and $[\dots]_{t\mathbf{1}_J}$ denotes that the enclosed partial derivative is to be computed at $t\mathbf{1}_J = (t, \dots, t)$.

Now suppose that n such identical test units having J competing failure modes are subjected to a life test under a M -point PIC-I scheme. Note that in a M -point PIC-I scheme, the units are monitored at the pre-decided inspection times $L_1 < L_2 < \dots < L_M$, where L_M is the pre-decided termination time of the experiment. Let N_i denote the number of units that are at risk of failure at the start of the i -th interval $(L_{i-1}, L_i]$ and D_{ij} be the number of failures occurring in this interval due to the j th cause of failure for $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$. Note that these failures are observed only at L_i . Furthermore, in a M point PIC-I scheme, R_i surviving items are removed from the life test at each intermediate time L_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M-1$. Subsequently, all remaining test units, say R_M , are removed from the life test at L_M . For convenience, let $\mathbf{D}_M = (D_{11}, \dots, D_{1J}, \dots, D_{M1}, \dots, D_{MJ})$ and $\mathbf{R}_M = (R_1, \dots, R_M)$ denote the number of failures and number of withdrawals for the M -point PIC-scheme, respectively.

It is easy to see that $N_1 = n$ and $N_i = N_{i-1} - \sum_{j=1}^J D_{i-1,j} - R_{i-1}$, for $i = 2, \dots, M$. Note that R_i s should not be greater than N_i s. Furthermore, R_i s are typically specified as the proportion of surviving units at L_i . Thus, for $i = 1, \dots, M-1$, $R_i = \lfloor p_i N_i \rfloor$, where p_i is the withdrawal proportion, with $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denoting the greatest integer less than or equal to x . It is needless to note that, $p_M = 1$. If $p_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, M-1$, then the PIC-I scheme reduces to a traditional interval censoring scheme. Thus, in order to conduct a life test under a PIC-I scheme, we must decide n , M , \mathbf{L}_M and \mathbf{p}_M , where $\mathbf{L}_M = (L_1, \dots, L_M)$ and $\mathbf{p}_M = (p_1, \dots, p_{M-1}, p_M = 1)$ represent the sequence of inspection times and corresponding withdrawal proportions for the M -point PIC scheme, respectively. For convenience, we denote these decision variables

by $\zeta = (n, M, \mathbf{L}_M, \mathbf{p}_M)$.

Let q_{ij} be the probability that a test unit fails in the i th interval due to the j th failure mode. It is easy to see that

$$q_{ij} = \frac{P(C = j, T \leq L_i) - P(C = j, T \leq L_{i-1})}{1 - P(T \leq L_{i-1})} = \frac{G(j, L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) - G(j, L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{\bar{G}(j, L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{G}(j, L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, let q_i represent the probability that a test unit fails in the i th interval. Then, we have

$$q_i = \frac{P(T \leq L_i) - P(T \leq L_{i-1})}{1 - P(T \leq L_{i-1})} = \frac{F_T(L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) - F_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{F}_T(L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}. \quad (2)$$

Note that $\sum_{j=1}^J q_{ij} = q_i$. Now, it is easy to see that

$$(D_{i1}, \dots, D_{iJ}) | \mathbf{D}_{i-1}, \mathbf{R}_{i-1} \sim \text{multinomial}(N_i, q_{i1}, \dots, q_{iJ}, 1 - q_i).$$

Furthermore, let us assume that

$$R_i | \mathbf{D}_i, \mathbf{R}_{i-1} \sim \text{binomial}\left(N_i - \sum_{j=1}^J D_{ij}, p_i\right).$$

Then, we can resursively obtain the expressions for $E[N_i]$, $E[D_{ij}]$ and $E[R_i]$, which are as follows:

$$E[N_i] = n \prod_{l=0}^{i-1} (1 - q_l)(1 - p_l) = n \left[\prod_{l=0}^{i-1} (1 - p_l) \right] \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (3)$$

$$E[D_{ij}] = n \left\{ \prod_{l=0}^{i-1} [(1 - q_l)(1 - p_l)] \right\} q_{ij} = n \left[\prod_{l=0}^{i-1} (1 - p_l) \right] [\bar{G}(j, L_{i-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{G}(j, L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

and

$$E[R_i] = n \left\{ \prod_{l=0}^{i-1} [(1 - q_l)(1 - p_l)] \right\} (1 - q_i)p_i = n \left[\prod_{l=0}^{i-1} (1 - p_l) \right] p_i \bar{F}_T(L_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (4)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, with $p_0 = 0$ and $q_0 = 0$ (see [28] for details). Note that $D_{i+} = \sum_{j=1}^J D_{ij}$ be the number of failures occurring in the time interval $(L_{i-1}, L_i]$ and $D = \sum_{i=1}^M D_{i+}$ be the total number of failure in the life test. Thus, we have

$$E[D] = \sum_{i=1}^M E[D_{i+}], \quad (5)$$

where

$$E[D_{i+}] = n \left\{ \prod_{l=0}^{i-1} [(1 - q_l)(1 - p_l)] \right\} q_i = n \left[\prod_{l=0}^{i-1} (1 - p_l) \right] [\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})].$$

We now briefly introduce the observed data from a M -point PIC-I scheme. Let n_i be the observed value of N_i , for $i = 1, \dots, M$. Furthermore, let δ_{ikj} represent an indicator function that takes value 1, if k surviving test unit fail in the i -th interval $(L_{i-1}, L_i]$ due to the j th failure mode, and 0, otherwise, for $k = 1, \dots, n_i$, and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$. Then, $\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ikj} = d_{ij}$, where d_{ij} is the observed value of D_{ij} . Let

$$\mathcal{D}_M = \{(d_{11}, d_{12}, \dots, d_{1J}, r_1), (d_{21}, d_{22}, \dots, d_{2J}, r_2), \dots, (d_{M1}, d_{M2}, \dots, d_{MJ}, r_M)\}$$

denote the observed data under the PIC-I scheme.

Based on the observed data \mathcal{D}_M , the likelihood function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is given by

$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^M \prod_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\prod_{j=1}^J q_{ij}^{\delta_{ikj}} \right] (1 - q_i)^{1 - \delta_{ik+}},$$

where $\delta_{ik+} = \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj}$. The log-likelihood function, after ignoring the proportionality constant, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) &= \log L(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj} \log(q_{ij}) + (1 - \delta_{ik+}) \log(1 - q_i) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

2.2. Regularity Conditions and Fisher Information Matrix

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ denote the MLE of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Toward this end, we state the regularity conditions required to establish the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

Regularity Conditions

- I. T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n are independent and identically distributed (henceforth, i.i.d.) with common c.d.f. $F_T(\cdot | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and p.d.f. $f_T(\cdot | \boldsymbol{\theta})$.
- II. The number of causes of failure of a test unit is finite.
- III. $(T_1, C_1), (T_2, C_2), \dots, (T_n, C_n)$ are i.i.d. with common joint sub-survivor function $G(\cdot, \cdot | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and sub-density function $g(\cdot, \cdot | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- IV. The supports of f_T and g are independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

- V. The parameter space Θ contains an open set Θ_0 of which the true parameter θ^0 is an interior point.
- VI. For almost all t and for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, both $F_T(t | \theta)$ and $G(j, t | \theta)$ admit all third-order derivatives, $\frac{\partial^3 F_T(t | \theta)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w}$ and $\frac{\partial^3 G(j, t | \theta)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w}$, respectively, for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$ and $u, v, w = 1, 2, \dots, s$. In addition, all first, second, and third order derivatives of $F_T(t | \theta)$ and $G(j, t | \theta)$ with respect to the parameters are bounded for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$.
- VII. The log-inspection L_i s are fixed in such a way that

- (a) $0 < q_{ij} < 1$ and $0 < q_i < 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$.
- (b) $\nabla_{\theta} \mathbf{q}$ is a matrix of rank s , where $\nabla_{\theta} \mathbf{q} = \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right)_{s \times M}$ for $u = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$.

We now present the following results, which are required to obtain the Fisher information matrix.

Lemma 1. *The first derivative of the log-likelihood satisfies the following:*

$$E \left[\frac{\partial l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_u} \right] = 0, \text{ for } u = 1, \dots, s.$$

Proof. By differentiating (6) with respect to θ_u , we have

$$\frac{\partial l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_u} = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} U_{ik,u}, \quad (7)$$

where $U_{ik,u} = \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right)$ and $\delta_{ik+} = \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj}$. Then, we get

$$E \left[\frac{\partial l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_u} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^M E_{N_i} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_i} E[U_{ik,u} | N_i] \right].$$

It is sufficient to prove that $E[U_{ik,u} | N_i] = 0$. We know $E[\delta_{ikj}] = q_{ij}$ and $E[1 - \delta_{ik+}] = (1 - q_i)$. Thus, we have

$$E[U_{ik,u} | N_i] = \frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} - \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u}.$$

We know $\sum_{j=1}^J q_{ij} = q_i$. This implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} = \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u}.$$

Hence, $E[U_{ik,u} | N_i] = 0$. (Proved)

Lemma 2. *The second derivative of the log-likelihood function satisfies the following*

$$E \left[\frac{\partial^2 l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right] = E \left[\left(\frac{\partial l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial l(\theta | \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right], \text{ for } u, v = 1, \dots, s.$$

Proof. By differentiating (7) with respect to θ_v , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)^2} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} V_{ik,uv}, \text{ say,} \quad (9)$$

where $V_{ik,uv} = \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \right] - \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)^2} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]$.

Now, proceeding in the same manner as in Lemma 1, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^M E_{N_i} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_i} E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \right] = 0.$$

Therefore, taking the expectation of (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right] &= - \sum_{i=1}^M E_{N_i} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{E[\delta_{ikj}]}{q_{ij}^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(\frac{E[1 - \delta_{ik+}]}{(1 - q_i)^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using $E[\delta_{ikj}] = q_{ij}$ and $E[1 - \delta_{ik+}] = 1 - q_i$, we get

$$E \left[- \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \left(\frac{E[N_i]}{(1 - q_i)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]. \quad (10)$$

Note that

$$\left(\frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_v} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \sum_{i'=1}^M \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{i'}} U_{ik,u} U_{i'k',v},$$

where $U_{ik,u}$ and $U_{i'k',v}$ are as defined above. Now, suppose $i < i'$. Then, for given $n_{i'}$, n_i is fixed and hence $E[U_{ik,u} U_{i'k',v} \mid n_{i'}] = U_{ik,u} E[U_{i'k',v} \mid n_{i'}] = 0$. Similarly, when $i > i'$, $E[U_{ik,u} U_{i'k',v} \mid n_i] = U_{i'k',v} E[U_{ik,u} \mid n_i] = 0$. Also, when $i' = i$ and $k' \neq k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E[U_{ik,u} U_{i'k',v} \mid n_i] \\ &= E \left[\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ik'j'}}{q_{i'j'}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{i'j'}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) - \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik'+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\delta_{ik'j'}}{q_{ij'}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) - \sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ik'j'}}{q_{ij'}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik'+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik'+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since T_1, \dots, T_n are i.i.d., we have, for any fixed i ,

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj} \sum_{j'=1}^J \delta_{ik'j'} \right] &= E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj} \right] E \left[\sum_{j'=1}^J \delta_{ik'j'} \right], \\
E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj} (1 - \delta_{ik'+}) \right] &= E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{ikj} \right] E [1 - \delta_{ik'+}], \\
E \left[\sum_{j'=1}^J \delta_{ik'j'} (1 - \delta_{ik+}) \right] &= E \left[\sum_{j'=1}^J \delta_{ik'j'} \right] E [1 - \delta_{ik+}],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$E[(1 - \delta_{ik+})(1 - \delta_{ik'+})] = E[(1 - \delta_{ik+})] E[1 - \delta_{ik'+}].$$

Now, it is easy to see that $E[U_{ik,u}U_{ik',v} | n_i] = 0$. Lastly, when $i' = i$ and $k' = k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[U_{ik,u}U_{ik,v} | n_i] \\
&= E \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj'}}{q_{ij'}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) - \sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj'}}{q_{ij'}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij'}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})}{(1 - q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{(1 - \delta_{ik+})^2}{(1 - q_i)^2} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]. \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $P(\delta_{ikj}\delta_{ikj'} = 1) = 0$ for $j \neq j'$, and $P(\delta_{ikl}(1 - \delta_{ik+}) = 1) = 0$ for $l = 1, \dots, J$. Therefore, for $i = 1, \dots, M$, $k = 1, \dots, n_i$ and $j, j' = 1, \dots, J$, we get

$$E[\delta_{ikj}\delta_{ikj'} | n_i] = \begin{cases} E[\delta_{ikj}^2 | n_i] = E[\delta_{ikj} | n_i] = q_{ij} & j = j' \\ 0 & j \neq j' \end{cases},$$

$$E[\delta_{ikl}(1 - \delta_{ik+}) | n_i] = 0, \quad \text{for } l = j, j',$$

and

$$E[(1 - \delta_{ik+})^2 | n_i] = E[(1 - \delta_{ikj}) | n_i] = 1 - q_i.$$

Then, (11) can be written as

$$E[U_{ik,u}U_{ik,v} | n_i] = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{q_{ij}} \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{1}{(1-q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) = \sigma_{i,uv}^2 \text{ (say)}. \quad (12)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\left(\frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M E_{N_i} [U_{ik,u}U_{ik,v} | N_i] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \frac{E[N_i]}{(1-q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

(Proved)

Using Lemmas 1 and 2, we can easily obtain the Fisher information matrix.

Theorem 1. *The Fisher information matrix for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is given by*

$$I(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})^T + \frac{E[N_i]}{(1-q_i)} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)^T \right],$$

Proof. We know $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = E \left[-\frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_M, \boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} \right]$. Thus, using Lemma 2, we readily obtain the above expression. (Proved)

2.3. Asymptotic Properties of the MLEs

Here we present the asymptotic properties of the MLEs $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. We first present the following results, which are necessary in this context. For convenience, we use $F_T(t)$, $\bar{F}_T(t)$, $G(j, t)$, and $l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}_m, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ instead of $F_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\bar{F}_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $G(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $l(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, respectively.

Lemma 3. *Under the regularity conditions (I)-(VII) (as stated above), the first-, second-, and third-order derivatives of q_{ij} and q_i are bounded.*

Proof. We have

$$\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} = \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})} \left[\frac{\partial [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u} + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right], \quad (14)$$

for $u = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Now, let us define the following bounds:

$$\kappa = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0} \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_i)}, \quad (15)$$

$$A_u = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right| \quad (16)$$

and

$$B_u = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial G(j, L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right|, \quad (17)$$

for $u = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then, by using (15), (16) and (17), we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right| \leq \kappa[2B_u + A_u] = C_u, \quad \text{say.}$$

Thus, the first-order derivative of q_{ij} is bounded.

Now, differentiating with respect to θ_v , for $v = 1, 2, \dots, s$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} &= \frac{1}{[\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})]^2} \left[\frac{\partial [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u} + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})} \left[\frac{\partial^2 [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} + \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Under the regularity conditions, the second-order derivatives of $G(j, L_i)$ and $F_T(L_i)$ are assumed to be bounded. Therefore, we define

$$A_{uv} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial^2 F(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right| \quad (19)$$

and

$$B_{uv} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial^2 G(j, L_i)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right|, \quad (20)$$

for $u = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $v = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then, by using (15), (16), (17), (19) and (20) we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right| \leq \kappa^2[2B_u + A_u]A_v + \kappa[2B_{uv} + C_u A_u + A_{uv}] = C_{uv}, \quad \text{say.}$$

Differentiating Equation (18) with respect to θ_w , for $w = 1, 2, \dots, s$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial^3 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \\ &= \frac{2}{[\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})]^3} \left[\frac{\partial [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u} + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_w} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{[\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})]^2} \left[\frac{\partial [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u} + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{[\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})]^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2 [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_w} + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_w} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{[\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})]^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2 [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} + \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) + q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_w} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1})} \left[\frac{\partial^3 [G(j, L_i) - G(j, L_{i-1})]}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_w} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+q_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial^3 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 F_T(L_{i-1})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \Big].$$

Under the regularity conditions, it is assumed that the third-order derivatives of $G(j, L_i)$ and $F_T(L_i)$ are bounded. Therefore, we define

$$A_{uvw} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial^3 F(L_i)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right| \quad (21)$$

and

$$B_{uvw} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \left| \frac{\partial^3 G(j, L_i)}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right|, \quad (22)$$

for $u = 1, 2, \dots, s$, $v = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $w = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then, by using (15-22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial^3 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right| &\leq 2\kappa^3 [2B_u + A_u] A_v A_w + \kappa^2 [2B_u + C_u A_u] A_{vw} + \zeta^2 [2B_{uw} + A_{uw} + C_w A_u] A_v \\ &\quad + \kappa^2 [2B_{uv} + C_v A_u + A_{uv}] A_w + \kappa [3B_{uvw} + C_{vw} A_u + C_v A_{uw} + A_{uvw} + C_w A_{uv}] \\ &= C_{uvw}, \quad \text{say} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the third-order derivative of q_{ij} is bounded. We know that $q_i = \sum_{j=1}^J q_{ij}$. Therefore, we get $\left| \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right| \leq JC_u$, $\left| \frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right| \leq JC_{uv}$ and $\left| \frac{\partial^3 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right| \leq JC_{uvw}$. This shows that the first, second and third order derivatives of q_i are also bounded. (Proved)

Lemma 4. *Under the regularity conditions (I)-(VII) (as stated above), the ratio $\frac{N_i}{n}$ converges in probability to a finite number, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$.*

Proof. From (3), we have

$$E \left[\frac{N_i}{n} \right] = \left[\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (1 - p_j) \right] \bar{F}(L_{i-1}) = b_i \text{ (say).}$$

Note that $p_0 = 0$, $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, M-1$ and $p_M = 1$. Also, from the regularity conditions, we see that $\bar{F}(L_{i-1})$ is finite for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$. Thus, the expectation of N_i/n is a finite number. It is enough to show that the variance of N_i/n tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From Budhiraja and Pradhan [8], we have

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{N_i}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \prod_{\nu=1}^l (1 - p_\nu)(1 - q_\nu)(1 - p_l)q_l.$$

Thus, $\text{Var} \left(\frac{N_i}{n} \right) \rightarrow 0$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the proof. (Proved)

Theorem 2. *If the regularity conditions (I)-(VII) (as stated above) hold, then*

- (i) $I(\theta \mid \zeta)$ is finite for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$.
- (ii) $I(\theta \mid \zeta)$ is positive definite for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$.

Proof. **Proof of part (i):** Using (13), we have

$$I_{uv}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} + \frac{E[N_i]}{(1-q_i)} \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right],$$

for $u, v = 1, 2, \dots, s$.

Note that for fixed n , $E[N_i] < n$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$. Since $0 < q_{ij} < 1$, $0 < \frac{1}{q_{ij}} < \infty$, $\forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0$. Also, since $0 < q_i < 1$, $0 < \frac{1}{q_i} < \infty$, $\forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0$. From Lemma 3, we also have that the first-order derivatives of q_{ij} and q_i are bounded, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$. Thus, $I_{uv}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta}) < \infty$. Hence, the proof.

Proof of part (ii): By definition of $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta})$, it is a symmetric matrix. For any vector $a(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we get

$$a(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta}) a(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \{a(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})\}^2 + \frac{E[N_i]}{(1-q_i)} \{a(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)\}^2 \right]. \quad (23)$$

Since $0 < q_i < 1$, $0 < q_{ij} < 1$ and $E[N_i] > 0$, then from the equation (23), we can say that $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is non-negative definite matrix. We know prove that it is positive definite matrix. We use the method of contradiction for this purpose. Let consider there exist a vector $a'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ such that

$$a'(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta}) a'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_i]}{q_{ij}} \{a'(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})\}^2 + \frac{E[N_i]}{(1-q_i)} \{a'(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)\}^2 \right]. \quad (24)$$

Now the equation 24 holds if $a'(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij}) = 0$ and $a'(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i) = 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$.

However, this implies that $\nabla \mathbf{q}$ is a rank-deficient matrix, which contradicts the regularity conditions V(b).

Hence $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is a positive definite matrix for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. (Proved)

Lemma 5. *Suppose that the regularity conditions (I)-(VII) (as stated above) hold. Let Θ_0 be an open subset in the parameter space Θ containing the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$. Then, all third derivatives $\frac{\partial^3 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w}$ exist. Furthermore, there exists a bound $K_{uvw}(\mathcal{D}_M)$ such that $\left| \frac{\partial^3 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right| \leq K_{uvw}(\mathcal{D}_M)$, with $E[K_{uvw}] = nk_{uvw}$, where k_{uvw} is finite, for $u, v, w = 1, 2, \dots, s$.*

Proof. Differentiating both sides of (8) with respect to θ_w , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^3 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^3 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) - \frac{(1-\delta_{ik+})}{(1-q_i)} \left(\frac{\partial^3 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}^2} \right) \left[\left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_w} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{(1-\delta_{ik+})}{(1-q_i)^2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_w} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\delta_{ikj}}{q_{ij}^3} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_w} \right) - \frac{(n_i - \delta_{ik+})}{(1-q_i)^3} \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_w} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now define

$$\gamma_1 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \left(\frac{1}{q_{ij}} \right)$$

and

$$\gamma_2 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_i} \right).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial^3 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v \partial \theta_w} \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^M n_i [(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) J C_{uvw} + (\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2) J^2 (C_{uv} C_w + C_{vw} C_u + C_{uw} C_v) \\ &\quad + 2(\gamma_1^3 J + \gamma_2^3 J^3) C_u C_v C_w] = \sum_{i=1}^M n_i b_{uvw}, \text{ say.} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sum_{i=1}^M n_i b_{uvw} = K_{uvw}$. Now $E[K_{uvw}] = nk_{uvw}$, where $k_{uvw} = b_{uvw} \sum_{i=1}^M b_i$. It is easy to see that $k_{uvw} < \infty$. Hence, the proof. (Proved)

Theorem 3. *If the regularity conditions (I)-(VII) (as stated above) hold, then*

(I) $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is consistent for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

(II) $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is asymptotically normal with mean $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ and variance-covariance matrix $[I(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0 | \boldsymbol{\zeta})]^{-1}$.

Proof. **Proof of Part (I):** It is enough to prove the following results [13, Theorem 5.1, page 463]:

(a) $\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) $\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} \xrightarrow{P} -I_{uv}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \sum_{i=1}^M b_i \sigma_{i,uv}^2$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

From (7), we get the following.

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} = \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \left[\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} U_{ik,u} \right].$$

For given n_i , $U_{ik,u}$ s are i.i.d. and $E[U_{ik,u} | n_i] = 0$, for $k = 1, \dots, n_i$. Now, by the Weak Law of Large Numbers (WLLN), for given n_i , $\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} U_{ik,u} / n_i \xrightarrow{P} 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now, by Lemma 3, it follows that $\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Similarly, from (8), we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u \partial \theta_v} = \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \left[\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} V_{ik,u} \right].$$

For given n_i , $V_{ik,u}$ s are i.i.d. and $E[V_{ik,u} | n_i] = - \left[\frac{1}{q_{ij}} \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]$, for $k = 1, \dots, n_i$. Now, by the WLLN, for a given n_i , $\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} V_{ik,u} / n_i \xrightarrow{P} - \left[\frac{1}{q_{ij}} \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_v} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_v} \right) \right]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now, by Lemma 4, we get the desired result.

Proof of Part (II): Consider the following Taylor's Series expansion of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$:

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) + \sum_{w=1}^s (\widehat{\theta}_w - \theta_w^0) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^2)|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ is a point on line segment connecting $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$. Since $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = 0$, the above expression can be written as

$$\left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w=1}^s (\widehat{\theta}_w - \theta_w^0) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^2)|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \right\} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)$$

By Lemma 5 and the consistency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, we have $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{w=1}^s (\widehat{\theta}_w - \theta_w^0) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^2)|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Then, we get

$$-\frac{1}{n} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w=1}^s (\widehat{\theta}_w - \theta_w^0) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^2)|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \xrightarrow{P} I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0 | \boldsymbol{\zeta}). \quad (25)$$

Next, we find the limiting distribution of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)$. From equation (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^M \sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \left\{ \sqrt{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{U_{ik,1}}{n_i} \right\}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \left\{ \sqrt{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{U_{ik,s}}{n_i} \right\} \right)^T \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^M \sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \mathbf{w}_i \right)^T, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{w}_i = (\sqrt{n_i} \bar{U}_{i,1}, \dots, \sqrt{n_i} \bar{U}_{i,s})$ is a vector with $\bar{U}_{i,u} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{U_{ik,u}}{n_i}$, for $u = 1, \dots, s$. Consider the vector $\mathbf{V}_{ik} = (U_{ik,1}, \dots, U_{ik,s})$. From Lemma 1, we get $E[U_{ik,u} | n_i] = 0$ and from equation (12), we get that for given n_j , the covariance matrix of \mathbf{V}_{ik} is \sum_i , where the uv th element of $\sum_i = \text{Cov}(U_{ik,u}, U_{ik,v}) = \sigma_{i,uv}^2$, for $u, v = 1, \dots, s$. Then, by central limit theorem, for given n_j , $\mathbf{w}_i \sim^a N_s(\mathbf{0}, \sum_i)$. Now $\sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \mathbf{w}_i \sim^a N(\mathbf{0}, \frac{n_i}{n} \sum_i)$. Also, $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{w}_{ju}, \mathbf{w}_{j'v}) = 0$, for $j' \neq j = 1, \dots, s$. Hence $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_s$ are uncorrelated. This implies $\sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \mathbf{w}_s$ are uncorrelated. Therefore, $\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n}} \mathbf{w}_i \right)^T \sim^a N_s \left(\mathbf{0}, \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \sum_i \right)$. The (uv) th element of $\sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \sum_i$ is given by $\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \sum_i \right)_{uv} = \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \sigma_{i,uv}$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^M \frac{n_i}{n} \sigma_{i,uv} \xrightarrow{P} \sum_{i=1}^M b_i \sigma_{i,uv} = I_{uv}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \sim^a N_s(\mathbf{0}, I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)). \quad (26)$$

By using (25) and (26), we have $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \sim^a N_s(\mathbf{0}, [I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)]^{-1})$. Hence $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is asymptotically normal with mean $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ and variance-covariance matrix $[I(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)]^{-1}$, where $I(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0) = nI^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^0)$. (Proved)

3. Frailty Model

In this section, we consider a special case of the generic model presented in the previous section. We assume that X_j , the latent failure time due to j th failure mode, follows a Weibull model, having the p.d.f.

$$f_{X_j}(x | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) = \left(\frac{\gamma_j}{\eta_j}\right) \left(\frac{x}{\eta_j}\right)^{\gamma_j-1} \exp\left[-\left(\frac{x}{\eta_j}\right)^{\gamma_j}\right], \quad x > 0,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j = (\eta_j, \gamma_j)$, with $\eta_j (> 0)$ and $\gamma_j (> 0)$ being the scale and shape parameters, respectively, for $j = 1, \dots, J$. As in Roy and Mukhopadhyay [21], we further assume $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_J = \gamma$, where γ is the common shape parameter. Now the survival function of X_j is given by

$$\bar{F}_{X_j}(x | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{x}{\eta_j}\right)^\gamma\right] = \exp(-\Lambda_j(x)),$$

where $\Lambda_j(\cdot)$ is the cumulative hazard function corresponding to the j -th failure mode.

We assume that $\Lambda_1(x), \dots, \Lambda_J(x)$ share common random frailty Z , where Z follows a Gamma distribution with mean 1 and variance ν [10, pp. 42-45]. Then the unconditional joint s.f. of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_J)$ is given by

$$\bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (1 + \nu\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}, \quad (27)$$

where $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^J \Lambda_j(x_j) = \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{x_j}{\eta_j}\right)^\gamma$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \sigma, \nu)$. Then, the sub-density function $g(j, t)$ is given by,

$$g(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left(\frac{\gamma}{\eta_j}\right) \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j}\right)^{\gamma-1} \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j}\right)^\gamma\right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}-1}.$$

Furthermore, the joint survivor function corresponding to the observed pair $\{C = j, T = t\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \int_t^\infty g_j(s) ds \\ &= \int_t^\infty \left(\frac{\gamma}{\eta_j}\right) \left(\frac{s}{\eta_j}\right)^{\gamma-1} \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{s}{\eta_j}\right)^\gamma\right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}-1} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}}\right)^\gamma} \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j}\right)^\gamma\right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The following theorem shows that the resulting model is identifiable from the observed competing risks data on (C, T) .

Theorem 4. *Suppose the joint s.f. of the latent failure times X_1, \dots, X_J be given by $\bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot)$ as in (27). Then the sub-survival function $\bar{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(j, t)$ is identifiable based on the observed data on C and T , for all j and*

t .

Proof. It is enough to show that

$$\frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})/dt}{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})/dt} = 1$$

is true if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$, for all j and t , where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \gamma, \nu)$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\eta_1^*, \eta_2^*, \gamma^*, \nu^*)$.

Note that

$$\frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{dt} \bigg/ \frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{dt} = \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma^*} \right) \left(\frac{(\eta_j^*)^{\gamma^*}}{\eta_j^\gamma} \right) t^{\gamma - \gamma^*} \times \frac{\left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu} - 1}}{\left[1 + \nu^* \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j^*} \right)^{\gamma^*} \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu^*} - 1}}.$$

We know

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu} - 1} = 1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{dt} \bigg/ \frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{dt} &= \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma^*} \right) \left(\frac{(\eta_j^*)^{\gamma^*}}{\eta_j^\gamma} \right) t^{\gamma - \gamma^*} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \gamma > \gamma^* \\ \infty & \text{if } \gamma < \gamma^* \\ \left(\frac{\eta_j^*}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma & \text{if } \gamma = \gamma^* \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{dt} \bigg/ \frac{d\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{dt} = 1,$$

if and only if $\gamma = \gamma^*$ and $\eta_j = \eta_j^*$, for $j = 1, \dots, J$.

Now, we assume that $\eta_j = \eta_j^*$ and $\gamma = \gamma^*$, for $j = 1, \dots, J$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{dG(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{dt} \bigg/ \frac{dG(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{dt} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu} - 1}}{\left[1 + \nu^* \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu^*} - 1}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \nu < \nu^* \\ \infty & \text{if } \nu > \nu^* \\ \frac{\nu^{-\frac{1}{\nu}-1}}{\nu^{*-\frac{1}{\nu^*}-1}} & \text{if } \nu = \nu^* \end{cases} .$$

This shows that when $\gamma = \gamma^*$ and $\eta_j = \eta_j^*$, for $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{dG(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{dt} \bigg/ \frac{dG(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{dt} = 1,$$

iff $\nu = \nu^*$. Hence, the proof is done. (Proved)

Towards this end, we obtain the s.f. of lifetime T . It is easy to see that the s.f. of T is given by

$$\bar{F}_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = P(T > t) = P(X_1 > t, \dots, X_J > t) = \bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(t\mathbf{1}) = \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}. \quad (29)$$

It can be easily proved that $\bar{F}_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is an increasing function of ν , for given t , η_j s and γ . Interestingly, as $\nu \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\bar{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{t}) = \exp(-\Delta) = \exp \left[- \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t_j}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right],$$

which is essentially the joint s.f. of X_1, \dots, X_J under the assumption of independence among the potential causes of failure [21]. Thus, the independent competing risks model can be obtained as a special case of the shared gamma frailty model presented here. Accordingly, the sub-survivor function and the s.f. are given by

$$\bar{G}(j, t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma} \exp \left[- \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right] \quad (30)$$

and

$$\bar{F}_T(t | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp \left[- \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right], \quad (31)$$

respectively.

4. Development of Sampling Plans

Suppose n test units, randomly selected from a lot, are put on a life test under a m -point PIC-I scheme to decide the acceptability of the lot. In practice, the decision to accept or reject such a lot is often based on the product's reliability at some pre-decided time point mutually agreed upon by the producer and consumer. Thus, a lot is accepted if the reliability of the system $\bar{F}_T(t)$ at some specified time point t_0 is greater than π_0 and it is rejected if it is lower than π_1 [12]. Obviously, $\pi_0 \geq \pi_1$. The appropriate values of π_0 and π_1 are

decided based on an agreement between the producer and the consumer. It is easy to see that the above decision rule is equivalent to testing the following set of simple hypotheses:

$$H_0 : \bar{F}_T(t_0) = \pi_0 \text{ vs } H_A : \bar{F}_T(t_0) = \pi_1. \quad (32)$$

In practice, $\bar{F}(t_0)$ needs to be estimated. Let $\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0)$ be the MLE of $\bar{F}_T(t_0)$. The lot is accepted if $\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) > \pi_c$ and rejected if $\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) \leq \pi_c$, where π_c is an appropriately chosen cutoff value. In traditional reliability sampling plans, we need to decide n and π_c .

Let α and β be the producer's risk and consumer's risk, respectively. We have

$$P\left(\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) > \pi_c \mid H_0\right) = 1 - \alpha \quad (33)$$

and

$$P\left(\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) > \pi_c \mid H_A\right) = \beta. \quad (34)$$

Now, from Theorem 3, we get that $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ follows asymptotically normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and variance-covariance $I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\zeta})^{-1}$, where $I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = I(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\zeta})/n$. Using the Delta method, we get $\sqrt{n}[\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) - \bar{F}_T(t_0)]$ follows asymptotically normal distribution with mean 0 and variance S^2 , where $S^2 = \mathbf{C}'_T[I^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\zeta})]^{-1}\mathbf{C}_T$ and $\mathbf{C}_T = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\bar{F}_T(t_0)$ [18, pp. 619-620]. Hence

$$Z = \frac{\sqrt{n}[\widehat{\bar{F}}_T(t_0) - \bar{F}_T(t_0)]}{S}$$

is asymptotically normal with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. Now, as Theorem 1 suggests, we need to compute $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})$ and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)$ to obtain $I(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. From (1) and (2), we have

$$\log(q_{ij}) = \log(\bar{G}(j, L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{G}(j, L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \log(\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}))$$

and

$$\log(1 - q_i) = \log(\bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \log(\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})),$$

for $j = 1, \dots, J$ and $i = 1, \dots, M$. Now, for the dependent competing risks model in (28) and (29) and the independent competing risks model in (30) and (31), we have

$$\log(q_{ij}) = \log(\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log(\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})),$$

where $\psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \left(\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma \right)$. Thus, we get

$$\frac{1}{q_{ij}} \left(\frac{\partial q_{ij}}{\partial \theta_u} \right) = \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) \right] - \left(\frac{\partial \psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{1}{1 - q_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_u} \right) = \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right) - \frac{1}{\bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(L_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_u} \right),$$

for $u = 1, \dots, s$.

Thus, it is straightforward to obtain S^2 , since we readily have

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \eta_j} = \frac{\gamma}{\eta_j} \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}-1} \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma,$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \gamma} = - \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \log \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right),$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \nu} = \left[1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right]^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \left[\frac{1}{\nu^2} \log \left(1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right) - \frac{1}{\nu} \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma}{1 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma} \right) \right]$$

for the dependent competing risks model in (28) and (29). Similarly, for the independent competing risks model in (30) and (31), we have

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \eta_j} = \frac{\gamma}{\eta_j} \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right),$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \bar{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \gamma} = - \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \right) \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right)^\gamma \log \left(\frac{t}{\eta_j} \right).$$

Furthermore, we also note that

$$\frac{\partial \psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \eta_j} = \frac{\left(\frac{\gamma}{\eta_j} \right) \sum_{j' \neq j} \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma},$$

$$\frac{\partial \psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \eta_{j'}} = - \frac{\left(\frac{\gamma}{\eta_{j'}} \right) \sum_{j' \neq j} \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}} \right)^\gamma}, \text{ for } j' \neq j,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \psi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \gamma} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^j \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}}\right)^\gamma \log\left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}}\right)}{\sum_{j'=1}^J \left(\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_{j'}}\right)^\gamma}.$$

Towards this end, let us denote by S_0 and S_1 the values of S , under H_0 and H_A , respectively. Then, from (33) and (34), we have

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}[\pi_c - \pi_0]}{S_0}\right) = \alpha$$

and

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}[\pi_c - \pi_1]}{S_1}\right) = 1 - \beta.$$

Solving these two equations, we get

$$\pi_c = \frac{\pi_0 S_1 z_\beta - \pi_1 S_0 z_{1-\alpha}}{S_1 z_\beta - S_0 z_{1-\alpha}}, \quad (35)$$

where z_δ is such that $P(Z > z_\delta) = \delta$. Moreover, using the above expression of π_c , we get n as follows:

$$n = \left[\frac{S_1 z_\beta - S_0 z_{1-\alpha}}{\pi_0 - \pi_1} \right]^2. \quad (36)$$

For convenience, we reproduce the entire process of finding n and π_c in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Detemination of n and π_c

- 1: Fix α and β , the producer's risk and consumer's risk, respectively.
 - 2: Fix t_0 .
 - 3: Fix π_0 and π_1 , the acceptable reliability limit and rejectable reliability limit, respectively.
 - 4: Compute S_0 and S_1 , the standard deviations of $\widehat{F}(t_0|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ under H_0 and H_A , respectively.
 - 5: Compute the acceptance limit π_c using (35).
 - 6: Calculate the value of n using (36).
 - 7: The required sample size is taken as $\lfloor n \rfloor$.
-

5. Optimal PIC-I Schemes

In the previous section, we presented the method for obtaining the optimal n and π_c , for given α , β , π_0 and π_1 . In practice, however, it is essential to suitably determine the timing of inspections and the proportions of withdrawals to efficiently conduct life tests under PIC-I schemes. In general, the current literature presents two primary approaches to resolve this issue. The first approach deals with achieving the estimation precision of some important system reliability characteristics and presents the optimal design parameters considering a suitably constructed design criterion that aligns with this goal. This approach typically ignores the cost constraints that are ubiquitous in the context of life tests. Thus, the second approach proposes a

cost-based objective function and determines the optimal design parameters by minimizing such a function. In this context, it is also important to highlight that there are a select number of studies that integrate both these approaches. However, such work is largely absent in the context of PIC-I schemes and, more importantly, in the presence of competing causes of failure. Towards this end, we present the first approach in §5.1 and subsequently deal with the combined approach in §5.2.

5.1. Optimal RASP without Cost Constraints

Since our main focus is on reliability-based sampling plans in this article, we consider a design criterion that focuses on precise estimation of $\widehat{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This, in turn, would be helpful in accurately deciding the lot acceptance criteria presented in the previous section. In particular, we consider a design criterion that aims to minimize the variance of $\widehat{F}_T(t|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ at a specific time point t_0 . Thus, our design criterion is given by

$$\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = S^2/n, \tag{37}$$

where S^2 is as in the previous section. This design criterion is more commonly known as the c -optimality criterion in the literature. It is easy to see that $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ depends on the unknown true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Thus, in order to compute it, a suitable set of guess values for the parameters is typically used. Note that such guess values are often available in practice from similar life tests performed in the past.

To compute optimal $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, say $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^*$, we minimize $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ with respect to n , M , \mathbf{L}_M and \mathbf{p}_M . Toward this end, as is standard in the existing literature, we assume that inspections are equispaced, i.e., for $i = 1, \dots, M$, $L_i - L_{i-1} = h$, where h is the common time gap between two successive inspections. Furthermore, we also assume that $p_1 = \dots = p_{M-1} = p$, where p is the common proportion of withdrawals at each L_i . Note that such PIC-I schemes are particularly popular among reliability engineers mainly due to the straightforwardness they offer in practical applications. Thus, we have four decision variables in this context, resulting in $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (n, M, h, p)$. However, as the following theorem shows, the complexity of the optimization problem reduces further due to the following monotonicity properties of $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$.

Theorem 5. *The design criterion $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$, given by (37), satisfies the following monotonicity properties:*

- (I) *For fixed (M, h, p) , $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is decreasing in n .*
- (II) *For fixed (n, h, p) , $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is decreasing in M .*
- (III) *For fixed (n, M, h) , $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is increasing in p .*

Proof. **Proof of part (i):** We note that $\phi(\zeta) = S^2/n$, where S^2 is independent of n . Then, it is obvious that $\phi(\zeta)$ is decreasing in n , for fixed (M, h, p) .

Proof of part (ii): Let $\zeta_1 = (n, M, h, p)$ and $\zeta_2 = (n, M + 1, h, p)$. Then, it is enough to show that $\phi(\zeta_2) \leq \phi(\zeta_1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_{M+1}]}{q_{(M+1)j}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{(M+1)j}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{(M+1)j})^T + \frac{E[N_{M+1}]}{(1 - q_{M+1})} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{(M+1)}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{(M+1)})^T. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for any $\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T [I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1)] \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{E[N_{M+1}]}{q_{(M+1)j}} [\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} q_{(M+1)j}]^2 + \frac{E[N_{M+1}]}{(1 - q_{M+1})} [\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} q_{(M+1)}]^2 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1)$ is a non-negative definite matrix. This implies that $I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) - I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2)$ is also non-negative definite matrix. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T [I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) - I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2)] \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0 \\ & \implies \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2) \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0 \\ & \implies \phi(\zeta_2) \leq \phi(\zeta_1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of part (iii): Let $\zeta_1 = (n, M, h, p_1)$ and $\zeta_2 = (n, M, h, p_2)$, where $p_1 < p_2$. Then it is enough to prove that $\phi(\zeta_1) \leq \phi(\zeta_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{(E[N_i^1] - E[N_i^2])}{q_{ij}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})^T + \frac{(E[N_i^1] - E[N_i^2])}{(1 - q_i)} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)^T \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $E[N_i^k] = n(1 - p_k)^{i-1} \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $k = 1, 2$. Now, for any $\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T [I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_1) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \zeta_2)] \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{(E[N_i^1] - E[N_i^2])}{q_{ij}} [\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_{ij})]^2 + \frac{(E[N_i^1] - E[N_i^2])}{(1 - q_i)} [\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(q_i)]^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} E[N_i^1] - E[N_i^2] &= n(1 - p_1)^{i-1} \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - n(1 - p_2)^{i-1} \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= n \bar{F}_T(L_{i-1}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) [(1 - p_1)^{i-1} - (1 - p_2)^{i-1}] \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $I(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_1) - I(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_2)$ is a non-negative definite matrix. This implies that $I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_2) - I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_1)$ is also non-negative definite matrix. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T [I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_2) - I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_1)] \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0 \\ \implies &\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_2) \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\zeta}_1) \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0 \\ \implies &\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1) \leq \phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_2) \end{aligned}$$

(Proved)

Theorem 5 suggests that $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ attains its optimum value for the decision variables n , M and p at their respective boundaries. Thus, we must fix them apriori and determine the optimal value of h , say h^* , by minimizing $\phi(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ or equivalently, S^2 . Subsequently, we determine π_c and n using (35) and (36), respectively. For convenience, we summarize this entire process in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Determination of Optimal Decision Variables

- 1: Fix α and β , the producer's risk and consumer's risk, respectively.
 - 2: Fix t_0 .
 - 3: Fix π_0 and π_1 , the acceptable reliability limit and rejectable reliability limit, respectively.
 - 4: Fix M and p .
 - 5: Obtain h^* , the optimal value of h , by minimizing S^2 . \triangleright The expression for S^2 is provided in Section 4.
 - 6: Compute the acceptance limit π_c from (35) using h^* .
 - 7: Calculate the value of n from (36) using h^* .
 - 8: The required sample size is taken as $\lfloor n \rfloor$.
-

Note that the optimization problem involved in Step 5 in Algorithm 2 is rather simple and can be easily solved using any standard optimization module (e.g., *optim()* function in *R*).

5.2. Optimum RASP with cost constraints

Reliability experiments are often conducted under strict budgetary limitations; the approach presented in the previous subsection overlooks these budgetary constraints. To resolve this issue, we now incorporate the budgetary constraints into the optimization problem presented above and provide an enhanced solution that aligns with real-world budgetary constraints.

Let $TC(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ denote the total cost of running a life test under a PIC-I scheme. Note that the total cost depends on the following costs as follows:

- (i) **Sample Cost:** This is the cost of n test units that are subjected to a life test under a PIC-I scheme. Let C_S be the cost of each test unit. Then, the total cost of the sample is given by nC_S .
- (ii) **Operation Cost:** This involves the cost of running a life test, including the cost of utilities and the salary of the operators. Let τ denote the duration of the life test. Furthermore, let C_τ be the operating cost per unit of time. Then the resulting total operating cost is $C_\tau E[\tau]$, where $E[\tau]$ is the expected duration of the PIC-I scheme and is given by

$$E[\tau] = \sum_{m=1}^M L_m \mathcal{P}_m,$$

where \mathcal{P}_m is the probability that the life test terminates at L_m and is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_m = P_m - P_{m-1},$$

with

$$P_m = \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^m \prod_{l_2=0}^{l_1-1} (1 - p_{l_2})(1 - q_{l_2}) \{q_{l_1} + (1 - p_{l_1})q_{l_1}\} \right]^n,$$

for $m = 1, \dots, M - 1$. Note that $P_0 = 0$ and $P_M = 1$.

- (iii) **Failure Cost:** This refers to the expenses incurred from the failure of a test unit during a life test experiment, encompassing the costs associated with identifying the failure mode, performing a rework, scrapping the defective unit, and any additional procedures necessary to understand the failure. Let C_D be the cost associated with a failed test unit. So, the resulting total cost is given by $C_D E[D]$, where $E[D]$ is given by (5).
- (iv) **Inspection Cost:** This cost involves the cost of conducting intermittent inspections during the course of the life test under a PIC-I scheme. Let I denote the number of inspections completed in a M -point PIC-I scheme. Furthermore, let C_I be the cost per inspection in such a life test. Then, the total inspection cost is given by $C_I E[I]$, where $E[I]$ is expected number of inspections and is given by

$$E[I] = \sum_{m=1}^M m \mathcal{P}_m.$$

Thus, the total cost corresponding to a life test under a PIC-I scheme is given by

$$TC(\zeta) = nC_S + C_\tau E[\tau] + C_D E[D] + C_I E[I].$$

Let C_B be the available budget for conducting the life test. Then, for given (α, β) , the decision problem to find the optimal $\zeta = (n, M, h, p)$ is given by

$$\text{minimize } \phi(\zeta) \tag{38}$$

subject to

$$TC(\zeta) \leq C_B \tag{39}$$

$$n = \left[\frac{S_1 z_\beta - S_0 z_{1-\alpha}}{\pi_0 - \pi_1} \right]^2 \tag{40}$$

$$M \geq s, n \in \mathbb{N}, M \in \mathbb{N}, h > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq p < 1.$$

It is obvious that (39) represents the cost constraint, as discussed above. Note that the equality constraint 40 is derived in Section 4. Furthermore, as the Regularity Condition VII(b) suggests, M must be greater than s , the number of parameters in the model. Toward this end, we note that $s = 4$ for the dependent model given by (28) and (29). Similarly, for the independent model given by 30) and (31), $s = 3$.

In Theorem 5, it is seen that for fixed (n, h, p) , $\phi(\zeta)$ is decreasing in M . Also, it is clearly seen that $TC(\zeta)$ is increasing in M . Therefore the optimal solution of M is that the highest value of M for that $TC(\zeta) < C_b$. Using this fact we propose the Algorithm 3.

From (40), it is easy to see that n depends on M, h and p . We reduce the complexity of the decision problem by substituting (40) both in (38) and (39). Thus, the optimization problem involves only the decision variables M, h , and p . Toward this end, we use Algorithm 3 to compute the optimal decision variables.

6. Numerical Experiment

In this section, we conduct a detailed numerical study to evaluate the properties of the optimal sampling plans presented in Sections 4 and 5. Furthermore, we consider the battery failure data set introduced in Section 1 after recalibrating it in the units of thousand ampere-hours to determine the necessary background details.

The battery failure data set includes four causes of failure and provides the number of failures attributed to each cause at each inspection point, along with the corresponding number of withdrawals. The limited number of observed failures for each cause leads us to group Causes "1" and "3" together as the first cause of

Algorithm 3 Determination of Optimal Decision Variables under Cost Constraints

- 1: Fix α and β , the producer's risk and consumer's risk, respectively.
 - 2: Fix t_0 .
 - 3: Fix π_0 and π_1 , the acceptable reliability limit and rejectable reliability limit, respectively.
 - 4: Fix an upper bound for M , say M_0 .
 - 5: $M \leftarrow s$. $\triangleright s$ is the the lower bound for M
 - 6: **while** $M < M_0$ **do**
 - 7: Obtain the solution $(h^*(M), p^*(M))$ that minimizes $\phi(\zeta)$ subject to cost constraint given by (39).
 - 8: Compute n using (40).
 - 9: Set $n^*(M) = \lfloor n \rfloor$. $\triangleright n^*(M)$ is the optimal value of n for a given M .
 - 10: Compute $\phi(\zeta)$, for $\zeta = (n^*(M), M, h^*(M), p^*(M))$.
 - 11: $M \leftarrow M + 1$.
 - 12: Obtain M^* such that $\triangleright M^*$ is the optimal value of M .
- $$\phi(n^*(M^*), h^*(M^*), p^*(M^*), M^*) = \min_{s \leq M \leq M_0} \phi(n^*(M), h^*(M), p^*(M), M).$$
- 13: Set $n^* \equiv n^*(M^*)$, $h^* \equiv h^*(M^*)$ and $p^* \equiv p^*(M^*)$.
 - 14: Compute the acceptance limit π_c from (35) using $\zeta^* = (n^*, M^*, h^*, p^*)$.
-

failure. Similarly, Causes "2" and "4" are considered as the second cause of failure. Therefore, we have $J = 2$ for the subsequent analysis. We further use the independent competing risks model presented in (30) and (31) and obtain the MLEs $\hat{\eta}_1 = 1.291$, $\hat{\eta}_2 = 1.339$ and $\hat{\gamma} = 1.644$ by maximizing the log-likelihood function $l(\theta \mid \mathcal{D}_M, \zeta)$ given by (6).

As Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 suggest, we further need to compute S_0 and S_1 , the values of S under H_0 and H_A as specified in (32). However, this would require the specification of the unknown model parameters. Toward this end, we adopt the approach of Wu et al. [27]. We note that the reliability function $\bar{F}_T(t_0 \mid \theta)$ in (31) is an increasing function of η_j for each $j = 1, \dots, J$. Thus, the hypotheses in (32) can be equivalently stated as follows:

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_A : \boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_1,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{01}, \dots, \eta_{0J})$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 = (\eta_{11}, \dots, \eta_{1J})$. A lot is accepted when $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is greater than $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ and it is rejected when $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is less than $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$. Obviously, $\eta_{0j} \geq \eta_{1j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, J$. For the subsequent analysis, we consider $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{01}, \eta_{02}) = (1.291, 1.339)$, which are the MLEs of η_1 and η_2 . To decide $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$, we further define the discrimination ratio d_j as $d_j = \eta_{0j} / \eta_{1j}$ and set it to a suitable set of values as detailed in the subsequent sub-sections. Throughout the analysis, we have used $\gamma = 1.644$, which is the MLE of γ . Furthermore, we consider $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.05, 0.1)$. Also, the specific time point of interest t_0 is fixed at 0.5.

The rest of this section is organized as follows. In §6.1, we provide optimal sampling plans following the methodology presented in Section 4. Subsequently, we consider the methodology presented in Section 5 and provide the c -optimal design parameters along with the optimal sample size and acceptance limit in §6.2

without the cost constraints and in 6.2 with cost constraints.

6.1. Determination of n and π_c

As evident from Section 4, we must specify M , \mathbf{L}_M and \mathbf{p}_M first to obtain the optimal sample size n and the acceptance limit π_c . For convenience, we consider the equispaced PIC-I schemes with uniform withdrawal proportions introduced in Section 5. In particular, we consider three options for the number of inspections M (i.e., 4, 6, and 8). In each case, we further select three choices for both the common inspection time interval h (i.e., 0.2, 0.3, and 0.4) and the common withdrawal proportion p (i.e., 0.0, 0.2, 0.3). Moreover, we consider the same discrimination ratio for both causes and choose two possible values for the common discrimination ratio d (i.e., 1.5 and 1.8). We then obtain the optimal values of π_c and n both for the independent and dependent competing risks model presented in Section 3. For the dependent competing risks model, we further consider two different levels of dependence considering two different choices for ν (i.e., 0.5 and 1). Table 1 provides the resulting optimal values of π_c and n in each case. For convenience, we represent the independent competing risks model using $\nu = 0$ in Table 1.

It is interesting to note that as ν increases, both π_c and n increase irrespective to the choices of M , h , p , and d . Furthermore, the resulting optimal π_c and n are higher for the dependent competing risks model compared to the independent competing risks model. This is perhaps due to the fact that the system s.f. increases with ν . For given ν , h , M , the optimal π_c is rather insensitive to the choice of withdrawal proportion p . However, the optimal n increases with p both for the dependent and independent competing risks model. Furthermore, the effect of M on π_c and n seems to be insignificant, particularly for higher d . As expected, both π_c and n decrease as d increases.

As is standard in the existing literature, we now present the Operating Characteristic (OC) curves in Figure 1 for both the independent and dependent competing risks models for $M=6$, $h = 0.3$, and $p = 0.2$. Note that the OC curve demonstrates the likelihood of accepting a lot against the proportion of defective items in the lot. As expected, the lot acceptance probability decreases as the proportion of defective items goes up. Moreover, for a fixed proportion of defective items, the acceptance probability is lower for the dependent competing risks model for both $d = 1.5$ and $d = 1.8$. This reconfirms the importance of incorporating the dependence among the potential risks while modeling competing risks data. We also note that the OC curves become flatter as d increases, suggesting that the lot acceptance probability increases with d for a given proportion of defective items.

Table 1: Determination of π_c and n for different values of M , p , d , h and ν

	ν	h	$d = 1.5$						$d = 1.8$					
			$M = 4$		$M = 6$		$M = 8$		$M = 4$		$M = 6$		$M = 8$	
			π_c	n	π_c	n	π_c	n	π_c	n	π_c	n	π_c	n
$p = 0$	0	0.2	0.547	32	0.546	31	0.547	31	0.482	13	0.481	13	0.481	13
		0.3	0.546	33	0.547	33	0.547	33	0.481	14	0.482	13	0.482	13
		0.4	0.548	36	0.548	36	0.548	36	0.483	15	0.484	15	0.484	15
	0.5	0.2	0.593	57	0.594	51	0.594	49	0.544	25	0.546	23	0.547	22
		0.3	0.594	53	0.594	50	0.594	49	0.547	24	0.547	22	0.547	22
		0.4	0.593	53	0.594	53	0.593	53	0.546	24	0.545	23	0.545	23
	1	0.2	0.627	76	0.628	70	0.629	67	0.587	34	0.589	32	0.590	30
		0.3	0.629	72	0.628	68	0.628	67	0.590	33	0.590	31	0.590	30
		0.4	0.628	71	0.628	70	0.628	70	0.589	32	0.588	32	0.588	32
$p = 0.2$	0	0.2	0.548	38	0.547	37	0.547	37	0.484	16	0.484	15	0.484	15
		0.3	0.547	36	0.547	36	0.547	36	0.482	15	0.482	15	0.482	15
		0.4	0.547	37	0.547	37	0.547	37	0.482	15	0.483	15	0.483	15
	0.5	0.2	0.593	71	0.594	66	0.595	63	0.544	31	0.546	29	0.547	28
		0.3	0.595	60	0.595	56	0.595	55	0.548	27	0.549	25	0.549	25
		0.4	0.594	56	0.594	55	0.594	54	0.547	25	0.546	24	0.546	24
	1	0.2	0.627	93	0.628	88	0.628	86	0.587	42	0.589	40	0.589	39
		0.3	0.629	82	0.629	77	0.629	75	0.590	38	0.591	35	0.591	35
		0.4	0.628	75	0.628	73	0.628	73	0.589	34	0.589	33	0.589	33
$p = 0.3$	0	0.2	0.548	44	0.548	42	0.548	42	0.486	18	0.486	17	0.486	17
		0.3	0.547	37	0.547	37	0.547	37	0.483	15	0.483	15	0.483	15
		0.4	0.547	38	0.547	38	0.547	38	0.482	16	0.483	15	0.483	15
	0.5	0.2	0.593	82	0.594	77	0.595	74	0.544	36	0.546	34	0.547	33
		0.3	0.595	66	0.595	61	0.595	60	0.549	29	0.549	27	0.550	27
		0.4	0.594	57	0.594	56	0.594	56	0.548	26	0.547	25	0.547	25
	1	0.2	0.627	107	0.628	102	0.628	100	0.587	48	0.588	46	0.589	45
		0.3	0.629	89	0.629	83	0.629	82	0.591	41	0.591	38	0.591	38
		0.4	0.628	77	0.628	75	0.628	75	0.590	35	0.590	34	0.589	34




Figure 1: OC curve when $h = 0.3$ $M = 6$ and $p = 0.2$

6.2. Determination of Optimal h , π_c and n

We now consider the determination h , n and π_c using the c -optimality design criterion presented in Section 5. As Algorithm 2 suggests, we first fix M and p at the three possible values presented above and obtain the optimal h by minimizing $\phi(\zeta)$. Table 2 reports the resulting optimal interval duration. Note that the optimal inspection interval h is independent of the discrimination ratio d . However, as (35) and (36) suggest, both π_c and n depend on the discrimination ratio d . Thus, Table 2 reports π_c and n for both $d = 1.5$ and $d = 1.8$. Furthermore, Table 2 also provides the optimal value of S^2 .

It is evident that the optimal inspection interval h gets larger as ν increases, irrespective of the choices

Table 2: Optimal time length and determination of n and π for different values of ν , d and p

p	ν	$M = 4$				$M = 6$				$M = 8$			
		h	S^2	n	π	h	S^2	n	π	h	S^2	n	π
0	0	0.197	0.1649	32	0.547	0.143	0.1601	31	0.547	0.112	0.1579	30	0.547
				13	0.482			12	0.482			12	0.482
	0.5	0.332	0.1789	53	0.594	0.265	0.1695	50	0.594	0.226	0.1650	49	0.594
				23	0.547			22	0.547			21	0.547
	1	0.348	0.1767	71	0.628	0.284	0.1683	68	0.629	0.246	0.1643	66	0.629
				32	0.590			31	0.590			30	0.590
0.2	0	0.272	0.1857	36	0.547	0.282	0.1854	36	0.547	0.284	0.1850	36	0.547
				15	0.482			15	0.482			15	0.482
	0.5	0.384	0.1896	56	0.594	0.351	0.1852	55	0.594	0.338	0.1839	54	0.594
				25	0.547			24	0.548			24	0.548
	1	0.40	0.1857	75	0.620	0.371	0.1819	73	0.628	0.36	0.1806	73	0.628
				34	0.589			33	0.590			33	0.590
0.3	0	0.317	0.1931	37	0.547	0.325	0.1927	37	0.547	0.325	0.1926	37	0.5470
				15	0.483			15	0.483			15	0.483
	0.5	0.407	0.1945	57	0.594	0.385	0.1910	56	0.594	0.378	0.1901	56	0.594
				25	0.547			25	0.548			25	0.548
	1	0.421	0.1892	76	0.628	0.402	0.1866	75	0.628	0.396	0.1865	75	0.628
				35	0.589			34	0.589			34	0.590

of p and M . Thus, as the level of dependence among the potential causes of failure goes up, the successive inspections will be more infrequent. Furthermore, as the withdrawal proportion p increases, the optimal interval h becomes longer irrespective of the choices ν and M . Thus, the successive inspections in a PIC-I scheme are expected to be less frequent in comparison to a traditional interval censoring scheme. Furthermore, as the number of inspections M increases, the inspection intervals are slightly wider. As observed in the first case, the sample size n increases as the level of dependence gets stronger. This is also true for π_c . Furthermore, as expected, the sample size n decreases significantly as the discrimination ratio d increases. We also note that the value of the design criterion increases as the withdrawal proportion p increases, whereas it goes down as M increases. Note that this is consistent with Theorem 5.

6.3. Optimal RASP

In this subsection, we consider the cost constraints and obtain the optimal decision variables n , h , and π_c using Algorithm 3. For the purpose of illustration, we assume $C_s = 0.1$, $C_\tau = 5$, $c_d = 0.025$, and $C_m = 10$, where each of these cost components is as in §5.2. Furthermore, we consider six possible values of the available budget C_B , i.e., 55, 65, 85, and 95, primarily to check the sensitivity of the design parameters with respect to available budgetary allocation. Tables 4 and 5 present the optimal values of n , M , h , π_c under various scenarios for the common discrimination ratio $d = 1.5$ and $d = 1.8$, respectively. Tables 4 and 5 further report the expected number of failures $E[D^*]$, expected duration of life test experiment $E[\tau^*]$ and expected number of inspections $E[I^*]$ and the optimal value of the design criterion $\phi(\zeta^*)$.

We observe that the required sample size and acceptance limit increase as the level of dependence gets stronger for both $d = 1.5$ and $d = 1.8$. This is true irrespective of the size of the available budget and the withdrawal proportion p . Also, the inspections are expected to be more infrequent as the level of dependence goes up in each case. However, the optimal number of inspections is typically insensitive to the level of dependence at a fixed budget and withdrawal proportion. However, for a given level of dependence, as the available budget increases, the number of inspections M goes up marginally. This is true for every withdrawal proportion. Interestingly, the sample size is rather insensitive to the available budget for a given level of dependence. However, the inspection interval is expected to be shorter as the available budget increases. As expected, the sample size requirement significantly drops as the discrimination ratio goes up. Furthermore, the acceptance limit also goes down with the increase in the discrimination ratio.

It is also interesting to note that the expected number of failures increases as the level of dependence becomes stronger. This holds for every available budget and withdrawal proportion. Furthermore, the experiment duration is expected to get longer as the level of dependence increases. However, the expected number of inspections is rather insensitive to the level of dependence.

For comparing the effect of C_b , we consider the value of $\phi(\zeta^*)$ at $C_b = 75$ taken as V_1 and the value of $\phi(\zeta)$ at other value of C_b taken as V_2 . Now we calculate the percentage of relative variance change at C_b over $C_b = 75$, which is measured by RVC and provided by

$$RVC = 100 \times \frac{(V_1 - V_2)}{V_1} \%$$

Table 3: Optimal sampling parameters different value of C_b when $d = 1.5$

d	p	ν	$\zeta^* = (n^*, M^*, h^*)$	π	$E[D^*]$	$E[\tau^*]$	$E[I^*]$	$\phi(\zeta^*)$
1.5	0	0	(31, 6, 0.142)	0.547	19.372	0.852	6.00	0.1601
		0.5	(50, 6, 0.265)	0.594	41.079	1.590	6.000	0.1695
		1	(69, 5, 0.311)	0.628	50.026	1.555	5.000	0.1716
	0.2	0	(36, 8, 0.283)	0.547	23.350	1.748	6.177	0.1850
		0.5	(55, 5, 0.363)	0.594	34.978	1.812	4.993	0.1867
		1	(74, 5, 0.382)	0.628	43.540	1.910	5.000	0.1833
	0.3	0	(37, 6, 0.324)	0.547	21.309	1.625	5.014	0.1927
		0.5	(56, 6, 0.384)	0.594	32.132	2.155	5.611	0.1912
		1	(75, 5, 0.408)	0.628	39.870	2.037	4.992	0.1878
1.8	0	0	(12, 6, 0.142)	0.482	7.499	0.852	6.000	0.1601
		0.5	(22, 6, 0.265)	0.547	18.075	1.589	5.998	0.1695
		1	(31, 6, 0.284)	0.590	23.373	1.704	6.000	0.1683
	0.2	0	(15, 7, 0.283)	0.482	9.691	1.493	5.277	0.1851
		0.5	(24, 7, 0.342)	0.548	15.349	2.088	6.106	0.1845
		1	(33, 6, 0.371)	0.590	19.622	2.189	5.901	0.1819
	0.3	0	(15, 6, 0.324)	0.483	8.639	1.404	4.334	0.1927
		0.5	(25, 8, 0.377)	0.548	14.298	2.034	5.394	0.1905
		1	(34, 6, 0.401)	0.590	18.134	2.233	5.570	0.1870

7. Numerical Illustration

7.1. Illustrative Example

In this section, we demonstrate the proposed methodology using a failure data set provided by Mendenhall and Hader [19]. The data set provides failure times corresponding to the ARC-1 VHF communication transmitter-receivers and involves two failure modes (i.e., confirmed and unconfirmed failures). For convenience, we recalibrate the data set by converting the failure times to thousands of hours.

Now, we fit both independent and dependent competing risk models for this data set. As discussed in Section 3, these models assume that the shape parameters are equal. However, as is standard in the existing literature, we also consider independent and dependent competing risk models with unequal shape parameters. Subsequently, we obtain the MLEs and the corresponding standard errors (SEs) of the model parameters by maximizing the logarithmic likelihood function in (6).

Table 6 reports the MLEs and the corresponding standard errors (SEs) of the model parameters for both independent and dependent competing risk models with equal and unequal shape parameters. Furthermore, we also report the log-likelihood value, Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) in Table 6. Looking at the AIC and BIC values, it is obvious that both the dependent competing risks models outperform the independent competing risks models. However, it is not possible to pick a clear winner between the dependent competing risk models. As suggested in the literature in such contexts (see, for example, Yang [29]), the BIC is typically considered for model selection. Thus, it seems

Table 4: Optimal sampling parameters different value of C_b when $d = 1.5$

p	C_b	ν	$\zeta^* = (n^*, M^*, h^*)$	π	$E[D]$	$E[\tau^*]$	$E[I^*]$	$\phi(\zeta^*)$	RVC
0	55	0	(32, 4, 0.196)	0.547	18.394	0.784	4.000	0.1650	-3.061%
		0.5	(53, 4, 0.332)	0.594	39.973	1.328	4.000	0.1789	-5.546%
		1	(71, 4, 0.330)	0.628	47.443	1.320	4.00	0.1770	-3.147%
	65	0	(31, 5, 0.165)	0.547	18.769	0.825	5.000	0.1619	-1.124%
		0.5	(51, 5, 0.293)	0.594	40.417	1.465	5.00	0.1732	-2.183%
		1	(71, 4, 0.348)	0.628	48.797	1.392	4.00	0.1766	-2.914%
	85	0	(30, 7, 0.125)	0.547	19.230	0.875	7.000	0.1588	0.812%
		0.5	(50, 6, 0.265)	0.594	41.079	1.590	6.000	0.1695	0.0000%
		1	(68, 6, 0.284)	0.629	51.270	1.704	6.000	0.1683	1.923%
	95	0	(30, 7, 0.125)	0.547	19.230	0.875	7.000	0.1588	0.812%
		0.5	(49, 7, 0.243)	0.594	41.332	1.701	7.00	0.1669	1.534%
		1	(67, 7, 0.263)	0.629	52.045	1.841	7.00	0.1661	3.205%
0.2	55	0	(36, 4, 0.272)	0.547	20.095	1.088	4.00	0.1857	-0.378%
		0.5	(56, 4, 0.384)	0.594	35.120	1.536	4	0.1896	-1.553%
		1	(85, 4, 0.277)	0.629	38.166	1.108	4.00	0.2087	-13.857%
	65	0	(36, 5, 0.274)	0.547	21.833	1.362	4.970	0.1857	-0.378%
		0.5	(56, 4, 0.384)	0.594	35.120	1.536	4	0.1896	-1.553%
		1	(75, 4, 0.400)	0.628	43.207	1.60	4.00	0.1853	-1.091%
	85	0	(36, 8, 0.283)	0.547	23.350	1.748	6.177	0.1850	0.0000%
		0.5	(55, 6, 0.350)	0.594	35.138	2.075	5.930	0.1852	0.803%
		1	(73, 6, 0.371)	0.628	43.406	2.224	5.996	0.1819	0.764%
	95	0	(36, 8, 0.283)	0.547	23.350	1.748	6.177	0.1850	0.000%
		0.5	(54, 8, 0.337)	0.594	34.526	2.465	7.314	0.1839	1.500%
		1	(73, 7, 0.364)	0.628	43.638	2.536	6.966	0.1810	1.255%
0.3	55	0	(37, 4, 0.316)	0.547	19.940	1.259	3.985	0.1931	-0.208%
		0.5	(57, 4, 0.406)	0.594	32.571	1.623	3.997	0.1942	-1.569%
		1	(111, 4, 0.178)	0.627	27.896	0.712	4.00	0.2847	-51.597%
	65	0	(37, 6, 0.324)	0.547	21.309	1.625	5.014	0.1927	0.0000%
		0.5	(57, 4, 0.406)	0.594	32.571	1.623	3.997	0.1942	-1.569%
		1	(76, 4, 0.420)	0.628	39.972	1.680	4.00	0.1897	-1.012%
	85	0	(37, 6, 0.324)	0.547	21.309	1.625	5.014	0.1927	0.0000%
		0.5	(56, 9, 0.376)	0.594	32.014	2.417	6.429	0.1904	0.418%
		1	(75, 6, 0.401)	0.628	40.001	2.372	5.916	0.1869	0.479%
	95	0	(36, 8, 0.283)	0.547	23.350	1.748	6.177	0.1849	4.048%
		0.5	(56, 9, 0.376)	0.594	32.014	2.417	6.429	0.1904	0.418%
		1	(75, 7, 0.397)	0.6280	40.037	2.650	6.675	0.1865	0.692%

that the dependent model with equal shape parameters is sufficient to model this data set. For the purpose of illustration, we also consider the independent competing risks model with equal shape parameters, primarily for comparative purposes.

We now follow a similar approach to that discussed in the previous section to obtain S_0 and S_1 , which are required to obtain the optimal sampling plans. In particular, we consider the specific time point of interest t_0 to be 0.15 and use the same discrimination ratio $d = 1.5$ for both causes. Subsequently, we determine the optimal inspection interval by minimizing the c -optimality criterion, given by (37), for PIC-I schemes with

Table 5: Optimal sampling parameters different value of C_b when $d = 1.8$

p	C_b	ν	$\zeta^* = (n^*, M^*, h^*)$	π	$E[D^*]$	$E[\tau^*]$	$E[I^*]$	$\phi(\zeta^*)$	RVC
0	55	0	(13, 4, 0.196)	0.482	7.473	0.784	4.00	0.1650	-3.060%
		0.5	(23, 4, 0.332)	0.547	17.347	1.328	4.000	0.1789	-5.546%
		1	(32, 4, 0.3480)	0.590	21.993	1.392	4.00	0.1766	-4.932
	65	0	(13, 5, 0.165)	0.482	7.871	0.825	5.00	0.1619	-1.124%
		0.5	(23, 5, 0.293)	0.5470	18.2270	1.4650	5.0000	0.1732	-2.182%
		1	(32, 5, 0.311)	0.590	23.200	1.555	5.000	0.1716	-1.961%
	85	0	(12, 7, 0.125)	0.482	7.692	0.875	6.999	0.1588	0.812%
		0.5	(22, 7, 0.243)	0.547	18.557	1.699	6.994	0.1669	1.534%
		1	(31, 7, 0.263)	0.590	24.080	1.841	7.000	0.1661	1.307%
	95	0	(12, 8, 0.112)	0.482	7.864	0.896	7.999	0.1571	1.874%
		0.5	(21, 8, 0.225)	0.547	18.069	1.796	7.982	0.1649	2.714%
		1	(30, 8, 0.246)	0.590	23.857	1.968	8.00	0.1643	2.377%
0.2	55	0	(15, 4, 0.272)	0.482	8.373	1.079	3.968	0.1857	-0.3241%
		0.5	(25, 4, 0.384)	0.547	15.679	1.531	3.986	0.1896	-0.0153%
		1	(34, 4, 0.400)	0.589	19.587	1.600	3.999	0.1833	-0.770%
	65	0	(15, 7, 0.283)	0.482	9.691	1.493	5.277	0.1851	0.000%
		0.5	(24, 5, 0.363)	0.548	15.263	1.769	4.874	0.1867	-1.192%
		1	(34, 5, 0.382)	0.590	20.005	1.904	4.984	0.1819	-0.00%
	85	0	(15, 7, 0.283)	0.482	9.691	1.493	5.277	0.1851	0.000%
		0.5	(24, 10, 0.332)	0.548	15.327	2.267	6.829	0.1834	0.596%
		1	(33, 7, 0.364)	0.590	19.727	2.439	6.701	0.1811	0.440%
	95	0	(15, 7, 0.283)	0.482	9.691	1.493	5.277	0.1851	0.000%
		0.5	(24, 10, 0.332)	0.548	15.327	2.267	6.829	0.1834	0.596%
		1	(33, 8, 0.359)	0.590	19.768	2.641	7.356	0.1806	0.715%
0.3	55	0	(15, 6, 0.324)	0.483	8.639	1.404	4.334	0.1927	0.000%
		0.5	(25, 4, 0.406)	0.547	14.286	1.592	3.920	0.1942	-1.942%
		1	(35, 4, 0.420)	0.589	18.408	1.675	3.988	0.1897	-1.444%
	65	0	(15, 6, 0.324)	0.483	8.639	1.404	4.334	0.1927	0.000%
		0.5	(25, 6, 0.384)	0.548	14.345	1.932	5.031	0.1912	-0.367%
		1	(34, 5, 0.408)	0.589	18.074	1.990	4.876	0.1878	-0.428%
	85	0	(15, 6, 0.324)	0.483	8.639	1.404	4.334	0.1927	0.000%
		0.5	(25, 8, 0.377)	0.548	14.298	2.034	5.394	0.1905	0.000%
		1	(34, 10, 0.393)	0.590	18.158	2.623	6.673	0.1860	0.535%
	95	0	(15, 6, 0.324)	0.483	8.639	1.404	4.334	0.1927	0.000%
		0.5	(25, 8, 0.377)	0.548	14.298	2.034	5.394	0.1905	0.000%
		1	(34, 10, 0.393)	0.590	18.158	2.623	6.673	0.1860	0.535%

4, 6, and 8 inspection points. We further consider two cases—no intermediate withdrawal (i.e., $p = 0$) and 20% withdrawal of surviving units (i.e., $p = 0.2$). We report the optimal inspection interval (h), sample size (n), and acceptance limit (π_c) in Table 7 for both independent and dependent competing risk models. It is interesting to note that the inspection interval (h) is relatively shorter for the independent model, suggesting that more frequent inspections are necessary for the independent model. Furthermore, the acceptance limit is slightly on the higher side for the independent model compared to its dependent counterpart. Also, the required sample size (n) increases for both models as the withdrawal proportion increases.

Table 6: MLEs (SEs) and Goodness-of-fit for Different Models

	Model			
	Independent		Dependent	
	Equal	Unequal	Equal	Unequal
η_1	0.439 (0.026)	0.436 (0.025)	0.303 (0.039)	0.299 (0.037)
η_2	0.822 (0.076)	0.894 (0.107)	0.497 (0.086)	0.514 (0.096)
γ_1	1.135 (0.052)	1.194 (0.066)	1.436 (0.130)	1.529 (0.145)
γ_2	-	1.029 (0.083)	-	1.311 (0.142)
ν	-	-	0.616 (0.237)	0.646 (0.240)
log-likelihood	-138.404	-137.214	-134.124	-132.571
AIC	282.807	282.428	276.248	275.142
BIC	294.539	298.071	291.891	294.696

We further consider the budgetary constraints and obtain the optimal RASPs as discussed in §5.2. For

Table 7: Optimal time length and determination of n and π for different values of ν , d and p

p	Types	$M = 4$				$M = 6$				$M = 8$			
		h	S^2	n	π	h	S^2	n	π	h	S^2	n	π
0	Independent	0.064	0.1750	72	0.563	0.048	0.1690	69	0.563	0.039	0.1659	68	0.5630
	Dependent	0.107	0.2016	71	0.538	0.089	0.1918	68	0.538	0.078	0.1875	66	0.538
0.2	Independent	0.083	0.1914	78	0.563	0.078	0.1914	78	0.563	0.077	0.1906	78	0.563
	Dependent	0.121	0.2116	74	0.538	0.112	0.2070	73	0.538	0.109	0.2052	72	0.5384
0.3	Independent	0.091	0.1982	81	0.563	0.090	0.1979	81	0.5630	0.090	0.1979	81	0.563
	Dependent	0.126	0.2158	75	0.538	0.121	0.2124	74	0.538	0.119	0.2115	74	0.538

the purpose of illustration, we assume the cost components $C_s = 0.1$, $C_d = 0.025$, $c_t = 5$, $C_I = 10$. In addition, we consider the available budget as $C_b = 65$. Table 8 reports the resulting optimal sample size (n), number of inspections (M), inspection interval (h) along with the acceptance limit (π_c). Furthermore, 8 also provides the expected number of failures ($E[D^*]$), the expected duration of the experiment ($E[\tau^*]$), the expected number of inspections ($E[I^*]$) and the optimal value of the design criterion ($\phi(\zeta^*)$). As observed in the previous case, the acceptance limit is slightly on the higher side for the independent model compared to its dependent counterpart. Also, the inspection interval is slightly longer for the dependent model. Although there is hardly any impact on the number of inspections, the required sample size is slightly on the lower side for the dependent model as the withdrawal proportion increases. Interestingly, the expected number of failures is on the higher side for the dependent model. Moreover, the expected duration seems to be on the higher side for the dependent model.

Toward this end, we briefly demonstrate the process of making a decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of a lot with a simulated data set. We consider the optimal RASP (73, 5, 0.115) along with $p = 0.2$ for the purpose of illustration. Under this plan, the manufacturer conducts a life test with a sample size of 73.

Table 8: Optimal RASPs under Budgetary Constraints

p	Types	$\zeta^* = (n^*, M^*, h^*)$	π	$E[D^*]$	$E[\tau^*]$	$E[I^*]$	$\phi(\zeta^*)$
0	Independent	(70, 5, 0.054)	0.563	40.337	0.270	5.000	0.1713
	Dependent	(69, 5, 0.096)	0.538	55.867	0.480	5.000	0.1961
0.2	Independent	(78, 5, 0.079)	0.563	41.432	0.395	5.000	0.1907
	Dependent	(73, 5, 0.115)	0.538	48.605	0.575	4.998	0.2084
0.3	Independent	(81, 5, 0.091)	0.563	40.640	0.455	4.998	0.1979
	Dependent	(75, 5, 0.122)	0.538	45.649	0.606	4.967	0.2136

A total of 5 inspections is conducted at an interval of 0.115 time units. Furthermore, 20% of the surviving units are withdrawn at each intermediate inspection, with all remaining serving items being removed from the experiment at the 5-th inspection. Based on the observed data set, a decision is taken regarding the acceptance or rejection of the lot using the estimated system reliability function. Thus, a lot in this case is accepted if $\widehat{R}_{\hat{\theta}}(0.15) > 0.538$. Using the MLEs presented above, we simulate a data set following the algorithm provided by Roy and Pradhan [24]. The simulated data set is presented in Table 9. For this data set, we obtain the MLEs of the model parameters and system s.f., which are as follows:

$$\widehat{\eta}_1 = 0.292, \widehat{\eta}_2 = 0.374, \widehat{\gamma} = 1.779, \widehat{\nu} = 0.668, \widehat{F}_T(0.15) = 0.648.$$

Since the estimated system reliability is above the acceptance limit of 0.538, we accept the lot.

Table 9: Progressive Type-I interval censored generated sample

i	Time interval	d_{i1}	d_{i2}	r_i
1	(0, 0.115]	11	7	11
2	(0.115, 0.230]	10	8	5
3	(0.230, 0.345]	6	4	2
4	(0.345, 0.460]	1	0	1
5	(0.460, 0.575]	3	1	3

7.2. Simulation Evaluation

In this sub-section, we evaluate the finite sample behavior of the optimal RASPs through a simulation study. For brevity, we consider the optimal RASPs under budgetary constraints for subsequent analysis.

For each optimal PIC-I scheme, we simulate 5000 data sets following the algorithm provided by Roy and Pradhan [24]. In each case, we consider the MLEs reported in the previous subsection as the true values (TVs) of the model parameters. For each data set, we obtain the MLEs of the relevant parameters by maximizing the log-likelihood function given by (6). Using these MLEs, we then obtain the MLE of the system s.f. $F_T(t|\theta)$, given by (29) and (31). Fig. 2b shows the histograms of the resulting MLEs of $\widehat{F}_T(t|\theta)$ for independent and dependent models. It is obvious that both histograms are symmetric in nature, which

is in line with our observation in Theorem 3.

We further obtain the average estimate of the system s.f. and the corresponding root mean square deviation (RMSD) over 500 simulation runs. Table 10 reports the average estimate of the system s.f. and the corresponding RMSD. We also compute the estimate of the standardized variance S^2 in each case using the MLEs of model parameters. Table 10 also provides the average estimate of standardized variance S^2 and the corresponding RMSD. Furthermore, we check whether the lot is accepted or rejected in each case using the decision rule presented in Section 4 and obtain the estimates of the producer's risk (α) and the consumer's risk (β), as given by (33) and (34), respectively. Table 10 reports the estimated producer's risk ($\hat{\alpha}$) and the consumer's risk ($\hat{\beta}$). It is easy to note that the average estimates of the system s.f. are close to their TVs in each case. Furthermore, the precision in reliability estimates is hardly affected as the withdrawal proportion increases. A similar observation can also be drawn for S^2 . We also note that the estimates of the producer's and consumer's risk are reasonably close to their respective specified values.




Figure 2: Histograms of $\hat{F}_T(t|\theta)$ for Independent and Dependent Models

Table 10: Average Estimates and RMSDs of $F_T(t|\theta)$ and S^2 along with Estimates of Producer's and Consumer's Risks

Types	TV of RF	p	ζ	Avg. SF	RMSD of SF	Avg. S^2	$\hat{\alpha}$	$\hat{\beta}$
Independent	0.644	0	(70, 5, 0.054)	0.639	0.054	0.208	0.066	0.128
		0.2	(78, 5, 0.079)	0.638	0.054	0.227	0.068	0.127
Dependent	0.626	0	(69, 5, 0.096)	0.621	0.057	0.168	0.071	0.111
		0.2	(73, 5, 0.115)	0.622	0.058	0.245	0.073	0.120

8. Conclusion

In this work, we have developed a method of obtaining optimum RASP under progressive interval censoring for competing risk data. In this study, we considered the failure time for individual causes Weibull

distributed. However, the proposed methodology can be extended to any lifetime distribution. Also, in this work, a gamma frailty model is used to study the dependency case between the components. However, other models, for example, the copula model can be used to study the dependency among the components. In this work, the parameter values of the lifetime distribution are assumed to be fixed and known to obtain optimum sampling plans. Sometimes, in practice, there may be uncertainty about the parameter values which can be modeled through a probability distribution. In such situations, a Bayesian approach may be considered to obtain Bayesian reliability acceptance sampling plans.

References

1. (2019). A new approach to measure systemic risk: A bivariate copula model for dependent censored data. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 279(3):1053–1064.
2. Aggarwala, R. (2001). Progressive Interval Censoring: Some Mathematical Results with Application to Inference. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 30:1921–1935.
3. Ahmadi, K., Yousefzadeh, F., and Rezaei, M. (2016). Analysis of progressively type-I interval censored competing risks data for a class of an exponential distribution. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 86:3629–3652.
4. Ahmadi, K., Yousefzadeh, F., and Rezaei, M. (2017). Progressively Type-I interval censored competing risks data for the proportional hazards family. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 46:5924–5950.
5. Aven, T., Rios Insua, D., Soyer, R., Zhu, X., and Zio, E. (2024). Fifty years of reliability in operations research. *European Journal of Operational Research*.
6. Azizi, F., Haghghi, F., and Gilani, N. T. (2020). Statistical inference for competing risks model under progressive interval censored Weibull data. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 49:1931–1944.
7. Belaghi, R. A., Noori Asl, M., and Singh, S. (2017). On estimating the parameters of the Burr XII model under progressive type-I interval censoring. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 87:3132–3151.
8. Budhiraja, S. and Pradhan, B. (2017). Computing Optimum Design Parameters of a Progressive Type-I Interval Censored Life Test from a Cost Model. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 33:494–506.
9. Chen, D. G. and Lio, Y. L. (2010). Parameter Estimations for Generalized Exponential Distribution under Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 54:1581–1591.
10. Crowder, M. (2001). *Classical Competing Risks*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
11. Huang, S.-R. and Wu, S.-J. (2008). Reliability Sampling Plans Under Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring Using Cost Functions. *Reliability, IEEE Transactions on*, 57:445–451.
12. Lam, Y. (1990). An Optimal Single Variable Sampling Plan with Censoring. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series D: The Statistician*, 39:53–66.
13. Lehmann, E. L. and Casella, G. (2003). *Statistical Inference: Theory and Practice*. Springer.
14. Lin, C., Balakrishnan, N., and Wu, S. J. S. (2011). Planning Life Tests Based on Progressively Type-I Grouped Censored Data from the Weibull Distribution. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 40:574–595.
15. Lin, C., Wu, S. J. S., and Balakrishnan, N. (2009). Planning Life Tests with Progressively Type-I Interval Censored Data from the Lognormal Distribution. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139:54 – 61.
16. Lin, Y. and Lio, Y. L. (2012). Bayesian Inference under Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 39:1811–1824.
17. Lodhi, C. and Tripathi, Y. M. (2020). Inference on a progressive type I interval-censored truncated normal distribution. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 47:1402–1422.
18. Meeker, W. Q. and Escobar, L. A. (1998). *Statistical Methods for Reliability Data*. New York: Wiley.
19. Mendenhall, W. and Hader, R. (1958). Estimation of parameters of mixed exponentially distributed failure time distributions from censored life test data. *Biometrika*, 45(3-4):504–520.
20. Ng, H. K. T. and Wang, Z. (2009). Statistical Estimation for the Parameters of Weibull Distribution based on Progressively Type-I Interval Censored Sample. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 79:145–159.
21. Roy, S. and Mukhopadhyay, C. (2014). Bayesian Accelerated Life Testing under Competing Weibull Causes of Failure. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 43:2429–2451.
22. Roy, S. and Pradhan, B. (2017). Bayesian Optimum Life Testing Plans under Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring Scheme. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 33:2727–2737.
23. Roy, S. and Pradhan, B. (2019). Bayesian C-optimal Life Testing Plans under Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring Scheme. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 70:299–314.
24. Roy, S. and Pradhan, B. (2023). Inference for log-location-scale family of distributions under competing risks with progressive type-i interval censored data. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 77:208–232.
25. Roy, S., Pradhan, B., and Purakayastha, A. (2022). On inference and design under progressive type-I interval censoring scheme for inverse Gaussian lifetime model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 39:1937–1962.

26. Singh, S. and Tripathi, Y. M. (2018). Estimating the parameters of an inverse Weibull distribution under progressive type-I interval censoring. *Statistical Papers*, 59:21–56.
27. Wu, S.-J., Hsu, C.-C., and Huang, S.-R. (2020). Optimal designs and reliability sampling plans for one-shot devices with cost considerations. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 197:106795.
28. Wu, S. J. and Huang, S. R. (2014). Planning Progressive Type-I Interval Censoring Life Tests With Competing Risks. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, 63:511–522.
29. Yang, Y. (2005). Can the strengths of AIC and BIC be shared? A conflict between model identification and regression estimation. *Biometrika*, 92:937–950.