## UNIVERSITY<sup>OF</sup> BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

### A posterior probability base sequential binormal test method for verification of success ratio P Liu, Qi; An, Min

DOI:

10.1260/1708-5284.8.4.313

Document Version Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Liu, Q & An, M 2011, 'A posterior probability base sequential binormal test method for verification of success ratio P', *World Journal of Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 313-324. https://doi.org/10.1260/1708-5284.8.4.313

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

#### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

#### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

A posterior probability based sequential binomial test method for verification of success ratio p

by

Q. Liu and M. An

reprinted from

# WORLD JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING



VOLUME 8 NUMBER 4 2011

**MULTI-SCIENCE PUBLISHING COMPANY LTD.** 



World Journal of Engineering 8(4) (2011) 313-324

#### World Journal of

Engineering

### A posterior probability based sequential binomial test method for verification of success ratio *p*

Q. Liu<sup>1</sup> and M. An<sup>2,\*</sup>

 <sup>1</sup>School of Information Systems and Management, National University of Defence Technology, Changsha, P. R. China, 410073
 <sup>2</sup>School of Civil Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK \*E-mail: M.An@bham.ac.uk

(Received 2 August 2011; accepted 8 September 2011)

#### Abstract

Testing the lifetimes of components or products by means of the verification of probability of success ratio *p* on which to base a statistical probability of the binomial distribution is often a costly and difficult undertaking. Sometimes tests cannot reach at a desirable target, particularly, in the reliability assurance tests. A Bayesian sequential binomial test model (BSBTM) is proposed for obtaining the composite hypothesis of *p*, which posterior criteria are taken into consideration. In order to get robust decision criteria and closed continuation-sampling regions, a modified Bayesian sequential binomial test model (MBSBTM) is also developed. By using BSBTM and MBSBTM, the upper and lower boundaries of a continuation-sampling region can be determined and the decision criteria can be made. A simulation method of calculating the average sample number (ASN) by using MBSBTM is also presented in this paper. Two case examples are used to demonstrate the proposed BSBTM and MBSBTM methodologies. The results indicate that by using MBSBTM sample numbers can be decided effectively and efficiently in the reliability tests.

Key words: Bayesian, BSBTM, MBSBTM, Sequential test, Posterior probability

#### **1. Introduction**

The purpose of the verification of probability of success p in the lifetime tests, especially in the assurance tests of binomial distributed components or products, is to determine the sample numbers to satisfy the consumer's requirements of the quality of products before assembly and manufacture. Many of sampling test methods, such as fixed-sample tests (Desu and Raghavarao, 1990; Hines and Montgomery, 2003) and sequential probability ratio tests (SPRT) (Ghosh, 1970; Kapur and

Lamberson, 1977; Wetherill and Glazebrook, 1986) are comparatively mature methods and usually depend on a hypothesis testing of p. However, in many circumstances, the application of these methods may not give satisfactory results in determining average sample number (ASN) due to the unknown parameters in the prior information before actual tests. Therefore, it is essential to develop new methods to predict the numbers of samples and to verify the probability of success p in an acceptable way under various environments

where such mature methods cannot be effectively or efficiently applied. Bayesian method has been proved to be an effective and efficient method in reliability assurance tests (Hamada et al., 2008; Koch, 2007). Incorporating Bayesian method into SPRT method (Guo et al., 2008) proposed a method of sequential posterior odd test (SPOT) for sequential tests, which acquires not only reliable results, but also makes fully use of prior information in order to reduce the required ASN. By comparing fixed-sample test method (Desu and Raghavarao, 1990; Hines and Montgomery, 2003) with SPOT (Guo et al., 2008; Ghosh, 1970), the ASN of SPOT in a sequential test is smaller than a fixed-sample test for the given risks  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  of the producer and consumer, respectively.  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are defined as (Lefebvre, 2006; Dekking, 2005)

$$\alpha = P(\text{Error of Type I})$$

$$= P(\text{Reject } H_0 | H_0 \text{ is true})$$
(1)

$$\beta = P(\text{Error of Type II})$$
  
= P(Accept H<sub>0</sub>|H<sub>0</sub> is false) (2)

where  $H_0$  is null hypothesis of parametric test. A Type I error occurs when  $H_0$  is rejected due to an incorrect decision made by the producer, while Type II error occurs when  $H_0$  is not rejected due to an incorrect decision made by the consumer.

However, because a Bayesian assurance test is a sequential test, a decision usually needs to be made at a time on whether to continue testing or stop testing when a sampling has been completed. Current methods only address the determination of the posterior risks  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , but these methods do not provide clear decision criteria based on actual testing conditions and situations. For example, Jiang et al., (2009) introduced a Bayesian SPRT method in the design and planning of tests. On the basis of the posterior risks  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  it just simply states that if  $P(H_0 \mid x)$  is far larger than  $P(H_1 \mid x)$ , then accept  $H_0$ , and if  $P(H_0 \mid x)$  is far smaller than  $P(H_1 \mid x)$ , then accept  $H_1$ . By using a lognormal distribution, Guo et al., (2008) proposed a censored SPOT method for the verification of the mean time to repair (MTTR). In this method, for a simple hypothesis (*i.e.*  $H_0$ :  $p = p_0$  vs  $H_1$ :  $p = p_1$ ), it is easy to calculate the posterior risks and design a sequential sampling plan, as well as to determine the acceptance region, rejection region and continuation region. But for a composite hypothesis (*i.e.*  $H_0$ :  $p \ge$  $p_0$  vs.  $H_1: p < p_1$ , where  $p_1 \le p_0$ ), this method may

not give a satisfactory sequential sampling plan. Furthermore, for a sequential sampling test with binomial distributions, the fixed-sample test method introduced by Hamada et al., (2008) can only make a test plan for given posterior risks  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . However, for composite hypothesis of failure rates (*i.e.*  $H_0$  :  $\theta \le \theta_0$ , where  $\theta$  is failure rate and  $\theta_0$  is a critical value for the failure rate that the producer claims to meet to satisfy the consumer's requirements of quality of products), Barnett (Barnett, 1972; Hoff, 2009) proposed a Bayesian sequential life test model that considers posterior probability, but the engineering requirement of the verification of success ratio does not take into consideration. Therefore, the existing methods have at least the following problems.

- The existing models only take the posterior risks of Types I and II errors (Ghosh, 1970; Kapur and Lamberson, 1977; Koch, 2007) into account, but do not consider the posterior probability of  $H_0$  or  $H_1$ . Therefore, the results of hypothesis test may not satisfy the 'small probability event principle' (Li and Li, 2008).
- For a composite hypothesis of success ratio, *p*, the existing models cannot be applied to make an effective test plan before testing (Li and Li, 2008).

This paper presents a Bayesian sequential binomial test model (BSBTM) and a modified **Bayesian** sequential binomial test model (MBSBTM), which the posterior probability with composite hypothesis of *p* is taken into consideration. By using BSBTM and MBSBTM, the upper and lower boundaries of continuation-sampling region can be determined so that the sequential sampling plan and decision criteria can be made effectively and efficiently. Two case examples are used to demonstrate the applications of BSBTM and MBSBTM.

#### 2. The assumptions of a sequential test

#### 2.1. The assumptions of parametric tests

In the reliability assurance tests of binomial distributed components or products, the consumer is interested in whether or not the success ratio p satisfies a given requirement  $p_0$ , which is equivalent to test the following statistical hypothesis

$$H_0: p \ge p_0 \text{ and } : H_1: p < p_0$$
 (3)

Supposing the prior distribution of p is  $\pi(p)$ . If it is a conjugate distribution (prior distributions that take the same functional form as the posterior distribution are called conjugate prior distributions (Hamada *et al.*, 2008), the prior distribution will be a Beta distribution B(a, b), where a and b are hyperparameters, *i.e. a* is the pseudo-success-number and b is the pseudo-failure-number in the prior reliability test. The probability density function (PDF) of B(a, b) is defined as

$$f(p \mid a, b) = \frac{p^{a-1}(1-p)^{b-1}}{\int_0^1 p^{a-1}(1-p)^{b-1} dp}$$
(4)

Let *n* denote the actual sample number and *s* denote the successful sample number in a sequential test, where  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and  $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ . The posterior distribution of *p* will be  $\pi$  (*p* | (*n*, *s*)), which can be obtained by Bayesian formula (5) (Desu and Raghavarao, 1990)

$$\pi(p \mid (n,s)) = \frac{\pi(p)L(p \mid (n,s))}{\int_0^1 \pi(p)L(p \mid (n,s))dp}$$
(5)

where  $L(p \mid (n,s)) = p^s (1-p)^{n-s}$  is likelihood function.

Particularly, when the prior distribution is a Beta distribution, B(a, b), the posterior distribution will be B(a + s, b + n - s) (Ghosh *et al.*, 2006; Hoff, 2009). For example, assume the prior distribution is B(500, 50) and actual and successful sample numbers are (160, 150). The posterior distribution will be B(650, 60). If actual and successful sample numbers are (160, 160), then posterior distribution will be B(660, 60). The prior and posterior distributions are shown in Figure 1.

#### 2.2. The process of a sequential sampling test

As described earlier in this paper, because the sample number and total operating time in the



Fig. 1. Prior and posterior distributions.



Fig. 2. Sequential sampling process of binomial distributed components or products.

sequential sampling test cannot be pre-assigned, a decision of carrying on next testing or not should be made just after each sampling completed rather than at the end of all samples being tested in order to obtain reliable results and reducing testing time and resources (Kin *et al.*, 1997).

Let *n* and *s* denote current actual and successful sample numbers, and  $s_U$  and  $s_L$  denote upper and lower boundary of continuation-sampling regions, respectively. The steps of a sequential sampling test for the hypothesis test of *p* are as follows:

*Step 1*: Divide the sample space into three mutually exclusive regions: rejection region, acceptance region and continuation region according to the given prior distribution.

Step 2: Calculate  $s_U$  and  $s_L$  of continuation region based on the given actual sample number *n* as shown in Figure 2.

Step 3: Verify the value of n,  $s_U$  and  $s_L$ .

- If  $s_U \le s \le n$ , then stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
- If  $0 \le s \le s_L$ , then stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .
- If the testing result is 'success', then let s = s + 1 and , if  $s_L < s < s_U$ , then let n = n+1, select another sample to test (continue sampling), repeat *Step 3*.

For example, assume n = 50,  $s_L = 34$  and  $s_U = 45$ . If s = 40, according to the above decision criteria, 34 < s < 45, more tests need to be conducted.

### 3. Proposed Bayesian sequential binomial test model (BSBTM)

#### 3.1. Fundamentals of BSBTM

On the basis of the assumptions described in section 2.1, when (n,s) have been gained, the posterior distribution  $\pi$  ( $p \mid (n,s)$ ) can be obtained by using Bayesian formula (5) (Koch, 2007). According to reliability test hypothesis (3), the posterior probability of  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  can be calculated by

$$P(H_0 | (n,s)) = P(p \ge p_0 | (n,s))$$
$$= \int_{p_0}^1 \pi(p | (n,s)) dp \tag{6}$$

$$P(H_{1}|(n,s)) = P(p < p_{0}|(n,s))$$
  
=  $\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p|(n,s)) dp$  (7)

Considering the 'small event probability principle' (Hoff, 2009) in a hypothesis test, the decisions can be made as follows:

- (1) If  $P(H_0 | (n, s))$  is sufficiently small, for example  $P(H_0 | (n, s)) < 0.005$ , then  $H_0$  has to be rejected. If  $H_0$  is rejected, according to the definition of  $\alpha$  (1), Type I error may occur. Therefore, the risk  $\alpha$  of the producer can be defined as a sufficiently small number. In this case, the decision criterion will be: if  $P(H_0 | (n, s)) < \alpha$  or  $P(H_1 | (n, s))$  $\geq 1-\alpha$ , then reject  $H_0$ , and the probability of Type I error is smaller than  $\alpha$  as shown in Figure 3(a).
- (2) If  $P(H_1|(n, s))$  is sufficiently small, for example  $P(H_1|(n, s)) < 0.05$ , then  $H_1$  has to be rejected, in other words,  $H_0$  can be accepted. According to the definition of  $\beta(2)$ , if  $H_0$  is accepted, Type II error may occur. Therefore, the risk  $\beta$  of the consumer can be defined as a sufficiently small number. In this case, the decision criterion will be: if  $P(H_1|(n, s)) < \beta$  or  $P(H_0|(n, s)) \ge 1 - \beta$ , then accept  $H_0$ , and the probability of Type II error is smaller than  $\beta$  as shown in Figure 3(b).

In any cases, because  $P(H_1 | (n, s))$  is a strictly monotone decreasing function of *s* while  $P(H_0 | (n, s)) = 1-P(H_1 | (n, s))$  is a



Fig. 3. Posterior probability of  $H_0$  and  $H_1$ .

strictly monotone increasing function of *s* (see Appendix), if  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ , then the given (n, s) does not meet the above criteria 1) and 2). But, *s* in anyway satisfies either

$$\beta \le P(H_1 \mid (n,s)) < 1 - \alpha \tag{8}$$

or

$$\alpha \le P(H_0 \mid (n,s)) < 1 - \beta \tag{9}$$

Therefore, for any given (n, s) that does not meet the above criteria 1) and 2), the following criterion needs to be applied.

(3) If posterior probability of  $H_1$  satisfies Inequality (8) or posterior probability of  $H_0$ satisfies Inequality (9), then continue sampling.

#### 3.2. Solution of BSBTM

Supposing the prior distribution of p is the Beta distribution B(a, b) and actual tests are (n, s), then the posterior distribution of p is B(a + s, b + n - s). In this case, if  $H_0$  is rejected, then the posterior probability of  $H_1$  satisfies

$$P(H_1 | (n,s)) = \int_0^{p_0} f(p | a+s, b+n-s) dp \ge 1-\alpha$$
(10)

for a given n, G(s) can be defined as

$$G(s) = \int_0^{p_0} f(p \mid a + s, b + n - s) dp$$
(11)

Obviously, for given a, b and, n, G(s) is a strictly monotone decreasing function of s (see Appendix). In this case, the values of G(s) will be more and more small with increasing s, the results will be either

- (1) Let  $s_L$  denotes the maximum successful sample number *s* that satisfies Inequality (10), then  $s_L$  is the lower boundary of continuation region for a given *n* as shown in Figure 2.
- (2) For a given *n*, any *s* (s = 0, 1, 2, ..., n) does not satisfy Inequality (10), let  $s_L = -1$  by means of more tests needed for the verification of *p*. In this circumstance,

$$s_L = \max\{-1, \max\{s \mid G(s) \ge 1 - \alpha\}, s = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$$
  
(12)

However, if  $H_0$  is accepted, then the posterior probability of  $H_1$  must satisfy

$$P(H_1 | (n,s)) = \int_0^{p_0} f(p | a + s, b + n - s) dp < \beta$$
(13)

Similarly, for a given s (s = 0, 1, 2, ..., n), the values of G(s) will be more and more small with increasing s, the results will be either

- (1) Let  $s_U$  denotes the minimum successful sample number *s* that satisfies Inequality (13). Therefore,  $s_U$  is the upper boundary of continuation region for a given *n* as shown in Figure 2.
- (2) For a given *n*, any *s* ( $s = 0, 1, 2 \dots, n$ ) does not satisfy Inequality (13), let  $s_U = n + 1$  by means of more tests needed for the verification of *p*. In this circumstance,

$$s_U = \min \{n + 1, \min\{s \mid G(s) < \beta\}, s = 1, 2, ..., n\}$$
(14)

Considering inequalities (10) and (13), for a given n, the following decision criteria can be obtained

- If  $s_U \le s \le n$ , then stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
- If  $0 \le s \le s_L$ , then stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .
- If  $s_L < s < s_U$ , then select another sample and continue testing.

According to Formulas (12) and (14), obviously, when  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ , for any possible sample number *n*,  $s_L \neq s_U$ , the continuation region always exists as shown in Figure 2.

#### 3.3. Censored BSBTM

As discussed in section 3.2, when  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ , for a given *n*, if  $s_L < s < s_U$ , then more sampling tests need to be conducted continuously. However, in many cases, there are only *N* censored samples in hand. Therefore, when n = N, the sequential test, however, must be terminated and a decision has to be made. In this case, the following decision criteria can be applied:

- (1) Control  $\beta$  to protect the consumer's benefit. If  $n \le N-1$ , the decision criteria are as same as described in section 3.2. If n = N, the decision criteria are
  - If s<sub>U</sub> ≤ s ≤ N, stop testing and accept H<sub>0</sub>.
    If s < s<sub>U</sub>, stop testing and reject H<sub>0</sub>.
- (2) Control  $\alpha$  to protect the producer's benefit. If  $n \le N-1$ , the decision criteria are as same as described in section 3.2. If n = N, the decision criteria are
  - If  $0 \le s \le s_L$ , stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .
  - If  $s > s_L$ , the stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .

- (3) Compromise  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The decision criteria are: if  $n \le N 1$ , the decision criteria are same as described in section 3.2; if n = N, let  $s_M = (s_L + s_U)/2$ , the decision criteria are
  - If  $s \ge s_M$ , stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
  - If  $s < s_M$ , stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .

#### 3.4. Numerical example 1

Considering the verification test of an engine starter, the prior distribution of p derived from previous test is B (500, 50) and  $\alpha = \beta = 0.05$ . Reliability requirement is  $p_0 = 0.9$ . Assume 1000 engine starters, i.e. N = 1000 available for reliability tests. For a given n (n = 1, 2, ..., N = 1000),  $s_L$  and  $s_U$  can be calculated by Formulas (12) and (14), i.e.  $s_L = 54$  and  $s_U = 79$ , respectively. When n = 80, for a given s (s = 1, 2, ..., 80), G(s) can be derived by Formula (11), *i.e.* 

$$G(s) = \int_0^{p_0} f(p \mid a+s, b+n-s) dp$$
$$= \int_0^{0.9} B(500+54, 50+80-54) dp$$
$$= 0.9501$$

Similarly,

$$G(55) = 0.9357, \dots, G(79) = 0.0463,$$
  
 $G(80) = 0.0340$ 

The results of G(s) are shown in Figure 4. Figure 5 shows the sample space. When  $n \le 84$ , the values of  $s_L$  and  $s_U$  are given in Table 1.

According to the decision criteria described in section 3.2, when n = 80, and  $s_L = 54 s_U = 79$ , the decisions can be made as

- If  $s \le 54$ , then stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .
- If  $s \ge 79$ , then stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
- If 54 < s < 79, then continue testing until to a given sample number N or  $s \ge s_U$  or  $s \le s_L$ , and make decisions as described in section 3.3.

As discussed in section 3.2, when  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ , for a given *n*, there will not be a theoretical censored sample number *N*. This is true as discussed in the above case example as shown in Figure 5. However, when *n* reaches at the proposed censored sample number *N*, *i.e.* n = N, the sequential test must be terminated and a decision has to be made as described in section 3.3. In other words, even if





Fig. 5. Sequential tests of binomial distributed products of BSBTM.

Table 1. Values of  $S_L$  and  $S_U$  of BSBTM

п	$S_L$	$S_U$	n	$S_L$	$S_U$									
0	-1	1	17	-1	18	34	13	35	51	28	52	68	43	68
1	-1	2	18	-1	19	35	13	36	52	29	53	69	44	69
2	-1	3	19	-1	20	36	14	37	53	29	54	70	45	70
3	-1	4	20	0	21	37	15	38	54	30	55	71	45	71
4	-1	5	21	1	22	38	16	39	55	31	56	72	46	72
5	-1	6	22	2	23	39	17	40	56	32	57	73	47	73
6	-1	7	23	3	24	40	18	41	57	33	58	74	48	74
7	-1	8	24	4	25	41	19	42	58	34	59	75	49	75
8	-1	9	25	5	26	42	20	43	59	35	60	76	50	76
9	-1	10	26	5	27	43	21	44	60	36	61	77	51	77
10	-1	11	27	6	28	44	21	45	61	37	62	78	52	77
11	-1	12	28	7	29	45	22	46	62	37	63	79	53	78
12	-1	13	29	8	30	46	23	47	63	38	64	<u>80</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>79</u>
13	-1	14	30	9	31	47	24	48	64	39	65	81	54	80
14	-1	15	31	10	32	48	25	49	65	40	66	82	55	81
15	-1	16	32	11	33	49	26	50	66	41	66	83	56	82
16	-1	17	33	12	34	50	27	51	67	42	67	84	57	83
													1	1

the sequential test is carried out continuously, no final result can be received unless a certain censored sample number N is set up to stop testing. Therefore, in order to get a theoretical censored sample number N, a modified BSBTM is needed.

# 4. Modified Bayesian sequential binomial test model (MBSBTM)

#### 4.1. Fundamentals of MBSBTM

As discussed in section 3.4, a modified BSBTM is needed to solve the problem of no final result in the sequential test to be obtained when  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ . Considering the 'small probability event principle'

(Li and Li, 2008), the following assumptions are applied.

(1) If  $H_0$  is accepted, then for a given (n, s), the posterior probability of  $P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s))$  may be near 1, i.e.  $P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s)) \approx 1$ . In other words,  $P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s)) = 1 - P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s)) \approx 0$ . If  $P(p < p_0 | (n, s))$  is a sufficiently small value, the producer must be sure that the consumer fully accepts the null hypothesis  $H_0$ . As described in section 3.1, when  $P(p < p_0 | (n, s)) < \beta$ , then stop testing and accept  $H_0$ . In this case, the probability of Type II error is smaller than  $\beta$ .

Assume  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a small value (it should be noted that the aim of introduction of  $\varepsilon$  is to

protect the consumer's benefit). From the viewpoint of consumers, it would be interested in p having a maximum value of probability. Consider  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon \mid (n, s))$  has a sufficiently large value, e.g.  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon \mid (n, \epsilon))$ s))  $\approx 1$ . Because  $P(p \ge p_0 \mid (n, s)) > P(p \ge p_0)$  $+\varepsilon | (n, s)$ , if  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s)) \approx 1$ , then  $P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s)) \approx 1$ . In this case, the consumer may be happy to fully accept  $H_0$ . For example, when  $\alpha = 0.05$ ,  $p_0 = 0.9$ , the prior distribution is B(500, 50) and the result of actual and successful sample numbers are (80, 54), the posterior probability of  $H_0$  is  $P(p \ge 0.9 \mid (80, 79)) = 0.9537$ . On the basis of decision criteria of BSBTM as described in section 3.1,  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. But by adding a small value of  $\varepsilon = 0.025$  into  $p_0$ , the posterior probability will be  $P(p \ge 0.9 +$ 0.025 | (80, 79) = 0.3018. As can be seen that the posterior probability decreases significantly. Therefore, the following decision criterion is introduced.

(2) If  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s))$  is a sufficiently small value, for example,  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s)) < 0.05$ , then the consumer can reject null hypothesis  $H_0$ . As described in section 3.1, in this case, if  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s)) < \alpha$ , then stop testing and reject  $H_0$ . The probability of Type I error is bigger than  $\alpha$  because  $P(p \ge p_0 | (n, s)) > P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s))$ .  $\varepsilon$  can be assigned to an agreed value by both consumer and producer, *e.g.*  $\varepsilon < 1 - p_0$  based on the particular cases.

On the basis of the above two assumptions, the decision in the sequential test can be naturally as

(3) If  $P(p < p_0 | (n, s)) \ge \beta$  and  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (n, s))$   $\ge \alpha$ , then continue testing. In this case, the continuation region will be the region in which for any (n, s), the posterior probability of psatisfies  $P(p_0 .$ For a given prior distribution <math>B(a, b) and

actual sample number (n, s), the variance of p is defined

$$Var(p \mid a+s, b+n-s) = \frac{(a+s)(b+n-s)}{(a+b+n)^2(a+b+n+1)}$$
(15)

With *n* increasing, the variances will be gradually reduced and the PDF of  $\pi$  (*p* | (*n*, *s*)) will

be more and more close. Therefore, a maximum sample number *N* must exist. When n = N,  $s = s_0$ ,  $P(p < p_0 | (N, s_0)) \le \beta$  and  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon | (N, s_0)) \ge \alpha$ . Let  $s_L = s_U = s_0$ , then sample testing must be stopped and the decision of accepting or rejecting  $H_0$  must be made.

#### 4.2. Solution of MBSBTM

When the prior distribution of *p* is *B* (*a*, *b*),  $P(p < p_0 | (n, s)) < \beta$  will be

$$\int_{0}^{p_{0}} f\left(p \mid a+s, b+n-s\right) dp < \beta \tag{16}$$

It should be noted that Inequality (16) is same as Inequality (13). Similarly, for any given n,  $s_U$  can be calculated by Formula (14).

When  $P(p \ge p_0 + \varepsilon \mid (n, s)) < \alpha$ , it becomes

$$1 - \int_0^{p_0 + \varepsilon} f(p \mid a + s, b + n - s) dp < \alpha$$
 (17)

or

$$\int_{0}^{p_{0}+\varepsilon} f(p \mid a+s, b+n-s) dp \ge 1-\alpha \qquad (18)$$

As can be seen that Inequality (18) is similar to Inequality (10). The only difference is that the upper limit of integral is changed from  $p_0$  to  $p_0 + \varepsilon$ . The calculation of  $s_L$  is similar to BSBTM. But the lower boundary of  $s_L$  of MBSBTM may be greater than that of BSBTM (when  $\varepsilon > 0$ ) or equal to that of BSBTM (when  $\varepsilon = 0$ ). Obviously, when  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the curve of lower boundary  $s_L$  will intersect wherever upper boundary  $s_U$  at point A as shown in Figure 7. Therefore, the continuation-sampling region will be closed and a sequential test procedure will lead fairly rapid to a terminal decision.



Fig. 6. Results of G(s) and  $G_{\mathcal{E}}(s)$ , when n = 838.



Fig. 7. Sequential test of binomial distributed products of MBSBTM.

In MBSBTM,  $G_{\varepsilon}(s)$  is defined as

$$G_{\varepsilon}(s) = \int_{0}^{p_{0}+\varepsilon} f(p \mid a+s, b+n-s) dp \qquad (19)$$

which is similar to Formula (12),  $s_L$  can be calculated by

$$S_L = \max \{-1, \max\{s \mid G_{\varepsilon}(s) \ge 1 - \alpha\}, s = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$$
(20)

For  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, s_L$  and  $s_U$  can be calculated by Formulas (20) and (14). The censored sample number *N* can be obtained

$$N = \min \{ n \mid s_L = s_U, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots n \}$$
(21)

Once  $s_L$ ,  $s_U$  and N are obtained, the decision criteria of sequential tests can be determined.

- If  $s_U \le s \le n$ , then stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
- If  $0 \le s \le s_L$ , then stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .

• If  $s_L \le s \le s_U$ , then continue testing until to a maximum sample number N or  $s \ge s_U$  or  $s \le s_L$ .

#### 4.3. Numerical example 2

Using the data associated with Example 1 as described in Section 3.4, supposing  $\varepsilon = 0.025$  and  $n = 1, 2, \dots, s_U$  and  $s_L$  can be calculated by Formulas (14) and (20). By using Formula (21) a maximum censored sample number N can be determined. Figure 6 shows the results of G(s) and  $G_{\varepsilon}(s)$  when n = 838 and s = 700 to 838. As can be seen from Figure 6, when s = 767, both curves of G(s) and  $G_{\varepsilon}(s)$  satisfy Formulas (14) and (20). Therefore, the censored sample number N = 838 when  $s_L = s_U = 767$ .

Figure 7 shows the sample space. When  $n \le 84$ , the values of  $s_L$  and  $s_U$  are listed in Table 2. Comparing Tables 2 with 1, it can be seen that  $s_L$  of some same n in Table 2 are greater than those in Table 1. For example, when n = 51,  $s_L = 44$  of MBSBTM in Table 2 is greater than  $s_L = 28$  of BSBTM in Table 1.

Therefore, the decision criteria are

- (1) When n < 838
  - If  $s_U \leq s \leq n$ , stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
  - If  $0 \le s \le s_L$ , stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .
  - If  $s_L < s < s_U$ , continue testing.
- (2) When n = 838
  - If s > 767, stop testing and accept  $H_0$ .
  - If  $s \leq 767$ , stop testing and reject  $H_0$ .

Table 2.

Numerical	values	of $S_L$	and $S_U$	of MBSBTM
-----------	--------	----------	-----------	-----------

-	a	a	1	i a		1	- a		1	ä		1	I a	- a
n	$S_L$	$S_U$												
0	-1	1	17	13	18	34	29	35	51	44	52	68	60	68
1	-1	2	18	14	19	35	30	36	52	45	53	69	61	69
2	-1	3	19	15	20	36	30	37	53	46	54	70	62	70
3	0	4	20	16	21	37	31	38	54	47	55	71	62	71
4	1	5	21	17	22	38	32	39	55	48	56	72	63	72
5	2	6	22	18	23	39	33	40	56	49	57	73	64	73
6	3	7	23	19	24	40	34	41	57	50	58	74	65	74
7	4	8	24	19	25	41	35	42	58	51	59	75	66	75
8	5	9	25	20	26	42	36	43	59	51	60	76	67	76
9	6	10	26	21	27	43	37	44	60	52	61	77	68	77
10	7	11	27	22	28	44	38	45	61	53	62	78	69	77
11	8	12	28	23	29	45	39	46	62	54	63	79	70	78
12	8	13	29	24	30	46	40	47	63	55	64	80	71	79
13	9	14	30	25	31	47	40	48	64	56	65	81	72	80
14	10	15	31	26	32	48	41	49	65	57	66	82	73	81
15	11	16	32	27	33	49	42	50	66	58	66	83	73	82
16	12	17	33	28	34	50	43	51	67	59	67	84	74	83

It should be noted that the prior distribution of p should be feasible and accurate. The more accurate the prior distribution is, the more correction the deduction of p will be. Therefore, the prior information may need to be collected as much as possible. These include historical data analysis, failure analysis, concept mapping, and domain human expert experience and engineering knowledge analysis. However, if the rejection or acceptance conclusions are obtained by adopting the prior distribution, the decision needs to be made whether the actual sequential test is needed or not. For example, if  $p_0 = 0.90$ ,  $\alpha = \beta = 0.05$  and prior distribution is B (645,55), then

$$\int_{0}^{p_0} f(p \mid 645, 55) dp = 0.0231 < 0.05$$

On the basis of the Assumption 1) of BSBTM as described in section 3.1, the decision of accepting  $H_0$  can be made, and no actual test is needed. However, if the prior distribution is B(615, 55), then

$$\int_{0}^{p_0} f(p \mid 615, 85) dp = 0.9644 > 1 - 0.05$$

In this case, the decision of rejecting  $H_0$  can be made based on the Assumption 2) of BSBMT as described in section 3.1, and no actual test is needed.

#### 4.4. Simulation of average sample number (ASN)

The MBSBTM introduces a small positive value  $\varepsilon$  to be assigned, the maximum censored sample number *N* can be obtained by Formula (21). In fact, *N* will be the maximum sample numbers for the binomial sequential test.

As discussed earlier in this paper, in practice, a Bayesian sequential test could be stopped at a time where *s* satisfies the decision criteria. Therefore, the actual sample number *n* is often smaller than or equal to the maximum sample number *N* in hand, i.e.  $n \le N$ . In order to make an effective and efficient testing plan, it would be useful if the expected sample number of a sequential test, i.e. the average sample number (ASN), can be predicted in advance.

The ASN can be obtained by adopting a simulation method which involves the following steps:

Step 1: For given B(a, b),  $\varepsilon$  and N, calculate  $s_L$  and  $s_U$  (n = 0, 1, 2, ..., N). The sample space can be obtained as shown in Figure 7.

Step 2: Establish simulation criterion by assigning the absolute precision  $\varepsilon_A$ , for example,  $\varepsilon_A = 0.0001$ .



Fig. 8. Simulation process of ASN calculation.

Step 3: Let i = 1, where *i* denotes the *i*<sup>th</sup> binomial sequential test.

Step 4: Let sum: = 0, where sum denotes the total sample number of the previous  $i^{\text{th}}$  test.

Step 5: Let  $ASN_0$ : = 0.

*Step 6*: The *i*<sup>th</sup> simulation process

- Step 6.1: Let  $n_i := 0$  and  $s_i := 0$ , where  $n_i$  is the actual successful sample number in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  test and  $n_i \le N$ .
- Step 6.2: If  $s_i \ge s_U$  and  $s_i \le s_L$ , then stop simulation and go to Step 7, otherwise, let  $n_i := n_i + 1$ .
- Step 6.3: Calculate the random number  $p_{ni}$  based on the prior distribution B(a,b).
- Step 6.4: Let  $p_{n_i}$  be the probability of success ratio of the  $n_i$ <sup>th</sup> test.
- Step 6.5: Calculate the random number *t* based on the binomial distribution  $b(1, p_{ni})$  and let  $s_i := s_i + t$ , where *t* denotes the result of the  $n_i$ <sup>th</sup> test (t = 0 - test failure and t = 1 - test success).
- *Sept 6.6*: Go to Step 6.2.

Step 7: Let sum: = sum +  $n_i$ .

Step 8: Calculate the  $ASN_i$ .

Step 9: If  $|ASN_i - ASN_{i-1}| < \varepsilon_A$ , then stop simulation process, let ASN: =  $ASN_i$  and go to Step 11.

Step 10: If  $|ASN_i - ASN_{i-1}| \ge \varepsilon_A$ , then let i: = i + 1 and go to Step 6.

Step 11: End

A Matlab programme for the simulation has been developed following the steps as described above. Using the data associated with case Examples 1 and 2 as described in Sections 3.4 and 4.3, the ASN are calculated. In this case,  $\varepsilon_A = 0.0001$ . When i = 11886, the simulation is terminated and ASN = 126.0612. Figure 8 shows the simulation process.

#### **5.** Conclusion

Testing the lifetimes of components or products by means of the verification of probability of success ratio on which to base a statistical probability of the binomial distribution is often a costly and difficult undertaking. The current methods such as SPRT and SPOT are comparatively mature methods and usually depend on a hypothesis testing of p resulting in poor performance with increasing costs and time delay in the sequential reliability tests, even cannot reach at a desirable target. Therefore, it is essential to develop new methods to predict the sample numbers and to verify of success ratio *p* in an acceptable way under various environments where such mature methods cannot be effectively or efficiently applied. This paper presents the BSBTM and MBSBTM methodologies for verification of probability of success ratio and prediction of ASN for binomial distributed components or products in the sequential tests. This paper also presents two case examples to demonstrate the proposed methods. Comparing with those traditional methods, the advantages of the proposed methods can be summarized (1) for a given prior distribution, B(a, b), the proposed methods take the posterior probability (or  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) into consideration, which enables a good testing plan can be made before the implementation of tests. By using such a testing plan, the testing process can be monitored and sequential test decision can be made effectively and efficiently, (2) by using MBSBTM, the average simple number (ASN) can be predicted in advance before the test implementation, (3) the proposed BSBTM and MBSBMT are more convenient to incorporate into a computer programmes such as Matlab, and (4) the introduction of  $\varepsilon$  based on the 'small probability event principle' enables decision being made to perform a sequential test of the underlying actual testing environment so that more reliable result can be obtained.

#### Acknowledgement

The work described herein is part of a research project on reliability analysis funded by National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 70971133). Their support is gratefully acknowledged.

#### References

- Barnett V. D., 1972. Bayesian sequential life test. *Technometrics* **14(2)**, 453–468.
- Dekking F.M., Kraaikamp C., Lopuhaa H.P. and Meester L.E., 2005. A modern introduction to probability and statistics: Understanding why and how. Springer, London.

- Desu M.M. and Raghavarao D., 1990. Sample size methodology. Academic Press, Boston.
- Ghosh B.K., 1970. Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses. Reading (Mass). Addison-Wesley, London.
- Ghosh J.K., Delampady M. and Samanta T., 2006. An introduction to Bayesian analysis: Theory and methods. Springer, New York.
- Guo B., Jing P. and Xing Y.Y., 2008. A censored sequential posterior odd test (SPOT) method for verification of the mean time to repair. *Reliability*, *IEEE Transactions* **57**(**2**), 243–247.
- Hamada M.S., Wilson A.G., Reese C.S. and Martz H.F., 2008. Bayesian reliability. Springer Science and Business Media, New York.
- Hines W.W. and Montgomery D.C., 2003. Probability and statistics in engineering and management science. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.
- Hoff P.D., 2009. A first course in Bayesian statistical methods. Springer, New York.
- Jiang G., Li C. and Liu B., 2009. Test design of operational applicability for torpedo based on Bayes SPRT method. *Torpedo Technology* **17**, 77–80.
- Kapur K.C. and Lamberson L.R., 1977. Reliability in engineering design. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- Kin C.C., Seraidaridia C.I. and Tortorella M., 1997. Sequential sampling plans for early-life reliability assessment. Proceedings of Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium, 131–135, London.
- Koch K.R., 2007. Introduction to Bayesian statistics., Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- Lefebvre M., 2006. Applied probability and statistics. Springer, New York.
- Li X.R. and Li X.B., 2008. Common fallacies in applying hypothesis testing. Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Information Fusion, 1–8, New York.
- Wetherill G.B. and Glazebrook K.D., 1986. Sequential methods in statistics. Chapman and Hall, London, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.

#### ACRONYM

### BSBTMBayesian sequential binomial test modelMBSBTMModified Bayesian sequential binomial

- test model
- ASN Average sample number

SPRT	Sequential probability ratio test
SPOT	Sequential posterior odd test
PDF	Probability density function

#### **NOTATION**

- B(a, b) Beta distribution (a and b are known)
- $\alpha$  Risk of producer (probability of Type I error)
- $\beta$  Risk of consumer (probability of Type II error)
- *n* Sample size, *i.e.* current actual test number or field test number
- *s* Current successful sample number
- *s*<sub>L</sub> Lower boundary of continuation sampling region

- $s_U$  Upper boundary of continuation sampling region
- *N* Maximum actual sample number
- *p* Success ratio
- $p_0$  Given system reliability requirement
- $H_0$  Null hypothesis in hypothesis test, *i.e.* hypothesis of  $p \ge p_0$
- $H_1$  Alternative hypothesis in hypothesis test, *i.e.* hypothesis of  $p < p_0$
- $\varepsilon$  A small positive value

$$f(p \mid a, b)$$
 PDF of p, and a, b are known parameters

- $P(H_0|x)$  Posterior probability of  $H_0$ , *i.e.*  $P(p \ge p_0|x)$ , where x is the actual test result
- $P(H_1|x)$  Posterior probability of  $H_1$ , *i.e.*  $P(p < p_0|x)$

#### Appendix

$$G(s) = P(H_1 | (n, s)) = P(p < p_0 | (n, s))$$

For given *a*, *b* and *n*, G(s) is a strictly monotone decreasing function of *s*, where s = 0, 1, 2, ..., n. Proof

Let  $g(s) = p^{s+1} (1-p)^{n-s-1}$ , according to Bayesian Formula (5)

$$G(s) = \frac{\int_0^{p_0} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp}{\int_0^1 \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp}, \quad G(s+1) = \frac{\int_0^{p_0} \pi(p)g(s)dp}{\int_0^1 \pi(p)g(s)dp}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{G(s)}{G(s+1)} &= \frac{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp}{\int_{0}^{1} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp} \end{aligned}$$
$$= \frac{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \left(\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp + \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp\right)}{\left(\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp + \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp\right) \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp} \end{aligned}$$
$$= \frac{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp + \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{p_{0}}^{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp}{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp}$$

Because  $\frac{1-p}{p} = \frac{1}{p} - 1$  is a strictly monotone decreasing function of p, when  $0 < p_0 < 1$ 

(22)

$$\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp > \frac{1-p_{0}}{p_{0}} \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp$$
$$\int_{p_{0}}^{1} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp < \frac{1-p_{0}}{p_{0}} \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp$$

Therefore

$$\frac{G(s)}{G(s+1)} > \frac{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp + \frac{1-p_{0}}{p_{0}} \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp}{\int_{0}^{p_{0}} \frac{1-p}{p} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp + \frac{1-p_{0}}{p_{0}} \int_{p_{0}}^{1} \pi(p)g(s)dp \int_{0}^{p_{0}} \pi(p)g(s)dp} = 1$$

For any s(s = 0, 1, 2, ..., n), G(s) > G(s + 1), G(s) is therefore a strictly monotone decreasing function of *s*.

324