



## Nonparametric Test for UBACT Class of Life Distribution Based on U-Statistic

S. E. Abu-Youssef<sup>a</sup> and B. I. Mohammed<sup>a\*</sup>

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Al- Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt


M. E. Bakr<sup>b1</sup>

Egyptian General Authority for Meteorology, Ministry of Civil Aviation, Cairo, Egypt

### Abstract.

Based on U-statistic, testing exponentially versus used better than aged in convex tail ordering (UBACT) class of life distribution is introduced for complete and censored data. Convergence of the proposed statistic to the normal distribution is proved. Selected critical values are tabulated for sample sizes 5(5)80 for complete data, and (61)(10)(201) for censored data. The Pitman asymptotic relative efficiency of the proposed tests to the other classes is studied. A numerical examples in medical science demonstrates practical application of the proposed test.

**Key Words:** UBAC class of life distribution; U-Statistic; hypothesis testing; asymptotic normality; efficiency.



# Council for Innovative Research

Peer Review Research Publishing System

Journal: JOURNAL OF ADVANCES IN MATHEMATICS

Vol .11, No.2

[www.cirjam.com](http://www.cirjam.com) , [editorjam@gmail.com](mailto:editorjam@gmail.com)



## INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  be a non-negative continuous random variable representing equipment life with distribution function  $F$  and survival function  $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$ ; such that  $F(0-) = 0$ , given a unit which has survived up to time  $t$ ; with distribution function  $F_t(x)$  and survival function

$$\bar{F}_t(x) = \frac{\bar{F}(x+t)}{\bar{F}(t)}, \quad x, t > 0,$$

and assume that  $X$  has a finite mean

$$u = E(X) = \int_0^{\infty} \bar{F}(u) du.$$

Some properties concerning the asymptotic behavior of  $Xt$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  will be used.

### Definition 1.1

If  $X$  is non-negative random variable, its distribution function  $F(x)$  is said to be finitely and positively smooth if a number  $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$  exists and,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{F}(x+t)}{\bar{F}(t)} = e^{-\gamma x}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\gamma$  is called the asymptotic decay coefficient of  $X$ . See Bhattacharjee (1982).

### Definition 1.2

The distribution function  $F$  is said to be Used better than aged (UBA) if it is finitely and positively smooth and satisfies

$$\bar{F}(x+t) \geq \bar{F}(t)e^{-\gamma x}. \quad (1.2)$$

### Definition 1.3

The distribution function  $F$  is said to be used better than aged in convex ordering (UBAC) if it is finitely and positively smooth and satisfies,

$$v(x+t) \geq \gamma^{-1} \bar{F}(t) e^{-\gamma x}, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$v(x+t) = \int_{x+t}^{\infty} F(z) dz.$$

### Definition 1.4

The distribution  $F(x)$  is called used better than aged in convex tail ordering (UBACT) if,

$$\Gamma(x+t) \geq \gamma^{-2} \bar{F}(t) e^{-\gamma x} \text{ for } t \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where,

$$\Gamma(x+t) = \int_{x+t}^{\infty} V(u) du.$$

The equality in (1.2) is achieved when  $F(x)$  has an exponential distribution with mean  $\mu$  equal to the coefficient of asymptotic decay  $\gamma$ , where the exponential distribution is the only one which has the no aging property.

We can see the details for these definitions in Abu-Youssef and Bakr (2014). Its dual class is used worse than used in convex tail order, denoted by UWACT, which is defined by reversing the above inequality. Then, it is clear that

$$\text{IHR} \subset \text{DMRL} \subset \text{UBA} \subset \text{UBAC} \subset \text{UBACT}.$$

See Willmot and Cai (2000).

Well known classes of life distributions include increasing failure rate (IFR), increasing failure rate in average (IFRA), new better than used (NBU), decreasing mean residual life (DMRL) and new better than used in expectation (NBUE). For definitions and properties of these criteria we refer Deshpande et al (1986), Barlow and Proschan (1981), Bryson and Siddique (1969).

Testing exponentially against the classes of life distribution has seen a good deal of attention. For testing against IHR, we refer to Barlow and Proschan (1981) and Ahmad (1994), among others. While testing against DMRL see Ahmad (1992), testing against UBA see Ahmad (2004) and tasting against UBAC see Abu-Youssef (2009), and Mohie El-Din et.al (2013). Finally tasting against UBACT see Abu-Youssef and Bakr (2014).



The main object in this paper is to deal with the problem of testing  $H_0: F$  is exponential against  $H_1: F$  is the largest class of life distribution UBACT. The paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we give a test statistic based on U-statistic for complete data. Selected critical values are tabulated for sample sizes 5(5)80 is investigated in section 3. The Pitman asymptotic efficiency for common alternatives is obtained in section 4. In section 5 we propose a test statistic based on U-statistic for censored data. Finally, A numerical examples in medical science is demonstrated practical application for complete and censored data in section 6.

## 2 TESTING FOR COMPLETE DATA

The test presented on a sample  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  from a population with distribution  $F(x)$ . We wish to test the null hypothesis,

$$H_0 : \bar{F} \text{ is exponential distribution with mean } 0, \text{ against,}$$

$$H_1 : \bar{F} \text{ is UBACT, and not exponential distribution.}$$

Let the measure of departure from  $H_0$  in favor of  $H_1$  is

$$\delta_{ut} = E[\Gamma(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{t}) - \gamma^{-2}\bar{F}(t)e^{-\gamma x}],$$

Which gives

$$\delta_{ut} = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty (\Gamma(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \bar{F} e^{-\gamma x}) dF(x) dF(t), \tag{2.1}$$

Remark that under  $H_0: \delta_{ut} = 0$ , while under  $H_1: \delta_{ut} \geq 0$ . Then to estimate  $\delta_{ut}$  by  $\hat{\delta}_{ut}$ , let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be a random sample from  $F$  and let

$$\hat{\Gamma}_n(x) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{m=1}^n (X_m - x - t)^2 I(X_m > x + t)$$
 is the empirical distribution of  $\Gamma(x)$ ,

$$d\hat{F}_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}$$
 is the empirical distribution of  $dF(x)$ , Then,

$$\hat{\delta}_{ut_n} = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty (\hat{\Gamma}_n(x + t) - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \bar{F}_n e^{-\gamma x}) d\hat{F}_n(x) d\hat{F}_n(t),$$

i.e,

$$\hat{\delta}_{ut} = \frac{1}{2n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n (X_k^2 + X_i^2 + X_j^2 + 2X_j X_i - 2X_k X_i - 2X_k X_j) I(X_k > X_i + X_j) - \frac{e^{-\gamma X_i}}{\gamma^2} \tag{2.2}$$

where,

$$I(y > t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y > t \\ 0 & \text{if, o. w.,} \end{cases}$$

let us rewrite (2.2) as the following,

$$\hat{\delta}_{ut} = \frac{1}{2n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \phi(X_i, X_j, X_k)$$

where,

$$\phi(X_i, X_j, X_k) = [(X_k - X_i - X_j)^2 I(X_k > X_i + X_j) - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} e^{-\gamma X_i}].$$

To make the test scale invariant, we take,

$$\hat{\Delta}_{ut} = \hat{\delta}_{ut} / \bar{x}^2, \tag{2.3}$$

Set

$$\phi(X_1, X_2, X_3) = [(X_3 - X_1 - X_2)^2 I(X_3 > X_1 + X_2) - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} e^{-\gamma X_1}]$$

Then  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  in (2.3) is equivalent to the U-statistic.

### Theorem 2.1

i) When  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\sqrt{n}(\Delta_{ut} - \hat{\Delta}_{ut})$  is convergence asymptotically normal distribution with mean 0 and variance,



$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 = \text{var} & \left( \int_0^\infty \int_{X+u}^\infty (v - X - u)^2 f(v) f(u) dv du - e^{-X} \right. \\ & + \int_0^\infty \int_{\substack{X+u \\ X-X-u}}^\infty (v - u - X)^2 f(v) f(u) dv du - \int_0^\infty e^{-u} f(u) du \\ & \left. + \int_0^\infty \int_0^{X-u} (X - v - u)^2 f(v) f(u) dv du - \int_0^\infty e^{-v} f(v) dv \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

ii) Under  $H_0$ :  $\Delta_{ut_n} = 0$ , and  $\sigma^2 = \frac{104}{27}$ .

iii) If  $F(x)$  is continuous UBACT, then the test is consistent.

**Proof**

(i) and (ii) follow from the standard theory of U-statistics cf. Lee (1990) by direct calculation. To prove part (iii), let  $D(x, t) = \Gamma(x + t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{F} e^{-\gamma x}$ . Since  $F(x)$  UBACT, then  $D(x, t) > 0$  for at least one value of  $x, t$  call  $x_0, t_0$ . Set

$(x_1, t_1) = \text{Inf}\{(x, t): x \geq x_0, t \geq t_0, \bar{F}(x) = \bar{F}(x_0)\}$ , thus,

$$D(x_1, t_1) = \Gamma(x_1 + t_1) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{F}(t_1) e^{-\gamma x_1} > \Gamma(x_0 + t_0) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{F}(t_0) e^{-\gamma x_0} = D(x_0, t_0),$$

and  $F(x_1 + \delta) - F(x_1) > 0$ .

Since  $x_1$  and  $t_1$  are points of increasing of  $F$ , thus  $\Delta_{ut} > 0$ .

**Remark:**

The statistic  $T_n$  is consistent for the parameter  $g(\theta)$  if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p[|T_n - g(\theta)|] = 0, \varepsilon > 0.$$

i.e.,

$$T_n - g(\theta) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This complete the proof.


**MONTE CARLO NULL DISTRIBUTION CRITICAL POINTS**

In practice, simulated percentiles for small samples are commonly used by applied statisticians and reliability analyst. We have simulated the upper percentile points for 95%, 98%, 99%. Table 1 gives these percentile points of statistic  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  in (2.3) and the calculations are based on 10000 simulated samples of sizes  $n = 5(5)80$ . The percentiles values change slowly as  $n$  increase.

**Table 1.**Critical values of  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$

n	95%	98%	99%
5	1.345	1.672	1.891
10	0.855	1.084	1.239
15	0.623	0.810	0.937
20	0.492	0.655	0.764
25	0.401	0.546	0.644
30	0.334	0.466	0.556
35	0.284	0.406	0.489
40	0.242	0.357	0.435
45	0.209	0.318	0.391
50	0.180	0.283	0.352
55	0.148	0.246	0.312
60	0.132	0.226	0.289
65	0.105	0.195	0.256
70	0.087	0.173	0.232
75	0.071	0.155	0.211
80	0.062	0.143	0.198

It is clear from Table 1 that, the percentiles values decreases slowly as the sample size increases where is shown in Figure 1.



**Figure 1.**The Relation between sample size and critical values of  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$



### ASYMPTOTIC RELATIVE EFFICIENCY (ARE)

Since the above test statistic  $\Delta_{utn} = \frac{\delta_{ut}}{x^2}$  is new and no other tests are known for these class UBACT. We may compare this to those of the other classes classes. Here we choose the  $\delta_2$  presented by Ahmad (2004) for (UBAE) class of life distribution and  $\hat{\Delta}_k$  presented Mohie El-Din et al (2014) for (UBAC) class of life distribution. The comparisons are achieved by using Pitman asymptotic relative efficiency (PARE), which is defined as follows:

Let  $T_{1n}$  and  $T_{2n}$  be two statistics for testing  $H_0 : F_{\theta_x} \in \{F_x\}, \theta_n = \theta + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$  with C an arbitrary constant, then PARE of  $T_{1n}$  relative to  $T_{2n}$  is defined by

$$e(T_{1n}, T_{2n}) = \frac{\mu_1(\theta_0)}{\sigma_1(\theta_0)} / \frac{\mu_2(\theta_0)}{\sigma_2(\theta_0)} \tag{4.1}$$

where  $\mu_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} E(T_{in})_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0}$  and  $\sigma_i^2(\theta_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} var(T_{in}), i = 1, 2.$

Two of the most commonly used alternatives (cf. Hollander and Proschan (1972)) they are:

(i) Linear failure rate family

$$\bar{F}_1(x) = e^{-x - \frac{x^2}{2}\theta}, \quad x, \theta \geq 0 \tag{4.2}$$

(ii) Makeham family:

$$\bar{F}_2(x) = e^{-x - \theta(x + e^{-x} - 1)}, \quad x, \theta \geq 0 \tag{4.3}$$

Note that  $H_0$  (the exponential distribution) is attained at  $\theta = 0$  in (i) and (ii). The Pitman's asymptotic efficiency (PAE) of  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  is equal to

$$eff_F = \frac{|\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Delta|_{\theta = \theta_0}}{\sigma_0} \tag{4.4}$$

Direct calculations of PAE of  $\delta_2$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_k$  are summarized in table (2), the efficiencies in table (2) shows clearly our U-statistic  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  perform well for  $F_1$  and  $F_2$

**Table 2.** PAE of  $\delta_2$  &  $\hat{\Delta}_{UK}$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_k$

Distribution	$\delta_2$	$\hat{\Delta}_{UK}$	$\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$
$F_1$ Linear failure rate	0.630	0.565	0.748
$F_2$ Makeham	0.385	0.245	0.248

In Table 3, we give PARE.s of  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  with respect to  $\delta_2$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_{UK}$  whose PAE are mentioned in Table 2

**Table 3.** PARE of  $\hat{\Delta}_K$  with respect to  $\delta_2$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_{UK}$

Distribution	$eff_i(\hat{\Delta}_{ut}, \delta_2)$	$eff_i(\hat{\Delta}_{ut}, \hat{\Delta}_{UK})$
$F_1$ Linear failure rate	1.2	1.3
$F_2$ Makeham	0.7	1.01

It is clear from Table 3 that the statistic  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}$  perform well for  $\bar{F}_1$  and  $\bar{F}_2$  and it is more efficient than both  $\delta_2$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_{UK}$  for all cases mentioned above. Hence our test, which deals the much larger UBAC is better and also simpler.



**TESTING FOR CENSORED DATA**

In this section, a test statistic is proposed to test

$H_0$  ( $\bar{F}$  is exponential distribution with mean  $\mu$ ) versus

$H_1$  ( $\bar{F}$  is UBACT and not exponential distribution); with randomly right-censored data.

Such a censored data is usually the only information available in a life-testing model or in a clinical study where patients may be lost (censored) before the completion of a study. This experimental situation can formally be modeled as follows:

Suppose  $n$  objects are put on test, and  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  denote their true life time. We assume that  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) according to a continuous life distribution  $F$ .

Let  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n$  be (i.i.d.) according to a continuous life distribution  $G$  and assume that  $X$ 's and  $Y$ 's are independent. In the randomly right-censored model, we observe the pairs  $(Z_i, \delta_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $Z_i = \min(X_i, Y_i)$  and

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Z_i = X_i \text{ (i th observation is uncensored)} \\ 0 & \text{if } Z_i = Y_i \text{ (i th observation is censored).} \end{cases}$$

Let  $Z_{(0)} < Z_{(1)} < \dots < Z_{(n)}$  denoted the ordered of  $Z$ 's and  $\delta_i$  is the  $\delta$  corresponding to  $Z_{(i)}$ , respectively. Using the Kaplan and Meier estimator in the case of censored data

$(Z_i, \delta_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ , then the proposed test statistic in (2.3) can be written using right censored data as

$$\delta_K^c = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(x) [\hat{F}_n(x+t) - \bar{F}_n(t)e^{-\gamma Z_{(j)}}] \left[ \prod_{p=1}^{i-2} C_i^{\delta_i} - \prod_{p=1}^{i-1} C_i^{\delta_i} \right] \left[ \prod_{q=1}^{j-2} C_i^{\delta_i} - \prod_{q=1}^{j-1} C_i^{\delta_i} \right] \quad (5.1)$$

Where


$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_n(x+t) &= \int_x^\infty \int_z^\infty \bar{F}_n(u+t) du dt = \int_x^\infty \int_{z+t}^\infty \bar{F}_n(u) du dt & (5.2) \\ &= \int_x^\infty \left[ \hat{\mu} - \sum_{k=1}^l \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} C_m^{\delta_m} (Z_k - Z_{k-1}) \right] \\ & \quad l = i+j \quad \text{if } Z_i + Z_j < Z_n \\ & \quad l = n \quad \text{if } Z_i + Z_j > Z_n \\ \hat{\mu} &= \sum_{j=1}^l \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} C_k^{\delta_k} (Z_{(j)} - Z_{(j-1)}), \\ dF_n(Z_i) &= \prod_{q=1}^{j-2} C_i^{\delta_i} - \prod_{q=1}^{j-1} C_i^{\delta_i}, \\ \hat{f}(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^l \delta_k K(X - Z_{(k)}) \\ \bar{F}_n(t) &= \prod_{m < t} C_m^{\delta_m}, \\ C_m &= \frac{n-m}{n-m+1}, \quad t \in [0, Z_{(m)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Table 4 shows the critical values percentiles  $\hat{\delta}_{\alpha t}^c$  for sample size  $n = (61)(10)(201)$  and Figure 2 shows the relation between the sample size and critical values in the case of censored data.

**Table 4.**Critical values of  $\hat{\Delta}_K^c$

n	95%	98%	99%
61	3.894	3.988	4.050
71	1.990	2.077	2.135
81	1.313	1.394	1.448
91	0.983	1.059	1.110
101	0.792	0.864	0.913
11	0.670	0.739	0.786
121	0.586	0.652	0.697
131	0.524	0.588	0.631
141	0.478	0.539	0.580
151	0.441	0.500	0.540
161	0.411	0.468	0.507
171	0.387	0.442	0.480
181	0.366	0.420	0.456
191	0.348	0.401	0.436
201	0.333	0.384	0.419

It is clear from Table 1 that, the percentiles values decreases slowly as the sample size increases where is shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2.**The relation between sample size and critical values





## Applications

### 1. Applications for complete data

#### Example 1

The following data represent 39 liver cancers patients taken from El Minia Cancer Center Ministry of Health Egypt (Attia (2004)). The ordered life times (in days) are:

10	14	14	14	14	14	15	17	18	20	20	20	20
20	23	23	24	26	30	30	31	40	49	51	52	60
61	67	71	74	75	87	96	105	107	107	107	116	150

It is found that the test statistics for the set data by using equation (2.3) is  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut} = 1.71113 * 10^7$ , which is greater than the crossposting critical value of the table (1) is (0.242). Then we accept  $H_1$  which states that the set of data have UBACT property under significant level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

#### Example 2.

In an experiment at Florida state university to study the effect of methylmercury poisoning on the life lengths of fish goldfish were subjected to various dosages of methyl mercury (Kochar (1985)). At one dosage level the ordered times to death in week are:

6	6.143	7.286	8.714	9.429	9.857	10.143	11.571	11.714	11.714
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

It is found that the test statistics for the set data by using equation (2.3) is  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut} = 0.648704$ , which is smaller than the crossposting critical value of the table (3) (0.855). Then we accept  $H_0$  which states that the set of data do not have UBACT property under significant level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

### 2. Applications for censored data

#### Example 3

On the basis of right-censored data for lung cancer patients from Pena (2002). These data consists of 86 survival times (in month) with 22 right censored. The whole life times

##### i) Non-censored data

0.99	1.28	1.77	1.97	2.17	2.63	2.66	2.76	2.79	2.86
2.99	3.06	3.15	3.45	3.71	3.75	3.81	4.11	4.27	4.34
4.40	4.63	4.73	4.93	4.93	5.03	5.16	5.17	5.49	5.68
5.72	5.85	5.98	8.15	8.62	8.48	8.61	9.46	9.53	10.05
10.15	10.94	10.94	11.24	11.63	12.26	12.65	12.78	13.18	13.47
13.96	14.88	15.05	15.31	16.13	16.46	17.45	17.61	18.20	18.37
19.06	20.70	22.54	23.36						

##### ii) Censored data

11.04	13.53	14.23	14.65	14.91	15.47	15.47	17.05
17.28	17.88	17.97	18.83	19.55	19.55	19.75	19.78
19.95	20.04	20.24	20.73	21.55	21.98		

It is found that the test statistics for the set of data  $\hat{\Delta}_{ut}^c = 0.682989$ . Then we accept  $H_0$  which states that the set of data do not have UBACT property under significant level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .



## REFERENCES

1. Abu-Youssef, S.E. (2009). Nonparametric Test for Used Better Than Aged in Convex Ordering Class (UBAC) of Life Distributions with Hypothesis Testing, *Intentional Journal of Reliability and Applications*, **10**, 81-88.
2. Abu-Youssef, S. E. and Bakr, M.E. (2014). Some properties of UBACT class of lifedistribution, *Journal of Advanced Research in Applied Mathematics*, **6**, 1-9.
3. Abu-Youssef, S. E. and Bakr, M.E. (2014). A goodness of fit approach to class of lifedistribution with unknown age, *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 30-35
4. Abu-Youssef, S. E., B. I. Mohammed and Bakr, M.E. (2014). Nonparametric test for unknown age class of life distributions, *International Journal of Reliability and Applications*, 99-110.
5. Ahmed, I.A. (2004). Some Properties of Classes of Life Distributions with Unknown Age, *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 333-342.
6. Barlow, R. E. and Doksum, K. A. Isoomic (1972). Tests for Covex Ordering, *Proceeding of 6<sup>th</sup> Berkeley Symposium*, 93-323.
7. Barlow, R. E. and Proschan, F. (1981). *Statistical Theory of Reliability and Life Testing Probability Models*, To Begin With, Silver-Spring, MD.
8. Deshpand, J.V., Kocher, S.C. and Singh, H. (1986). Aspects of Positive aging, *Journal of Applied Probability*, 1472-1483.
9. Kanjo, A. J. (1993). Testing for new is better than used, *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 311-321.
10. Kochar, S.C. (1985). Testing exponentiality against monotone failure rate average, *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 381-392.
11. Mohie El-Din, M.M., Abu-Youssef, S.E. and Hassan, M.KH. (2014). On testing of unknown age classes of life distributions, submitted.
12. Willmot, G.E. and Cai, J. (2000). On Classes of Lifetime Distributions with unknown age, *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*. 473-484.