University of Victoria | Economics

Econometrics Working Paper EWP1703

ISSN 1485-6441

A Note on Improved Estimation for the Topp-Leone Distribution

David E. Giles
Department of Economics, University of Victoria
Victoria, B.C., Canada V8W 2Y2

August 2017

Summary

The Topp-Leone distribution is attractive for reliability studies as it has finite support and a bathtub-shaped hazard function. We compare some properties of the method of moments, maximum likelihood, and bias-adjusted maximum likelihood estimators of its shape parameter. The last of these estimators is very simple to apply and it dominates the method of moments estimator in terms of relative bias and mean squared error.

Keywords: J-shaped distribution; maximum likelihood; method of moments; unbiased estimation; mean squared error; bathtub hazard; finite support

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 62F10; 62N02; 62N05

Author Contact:
David E. Giles 58 Rock Lake Court, L'Amable, ON, Canada K0L 2L0; E-mail: dgiles@uvic.ca;
Voice: (613) 332-6833

1. Introduction

In this note we study the sampling properties of the maximum likelihood (ML) and method of moments (MOM) estimators of the shape parameter of an important distribution that has finite support – the Topp-Leone (T-L) distribution. The selection of distributions whose support is finite is relatively sparse. Obvious examples include the Beta and Uniform distributions, but there are also less well-known examples such as the doubly-truncated Weibull distribution (McEwan and Parresol, 1991), the distributions of Haupt and Schäbe (1992, 1997), and Schäbe (1994).

Nadarajah and Kotz (2003) "re-discovered" such a distribution, first proposed by Topp and Leone (1955), and this distribution has attracted recent attention – *e.g.*, Ghitany *et al*. (2005), Van Dorp and Kotz (2006), Zhoiu *et al*. (2006), Kotz and Seier (2007), Nadarajah (2009), and Genç (2012). As well as having finite support, the T-L distribution has a "J-shaped" density function and a hazard function that is "bathtub-shaped". The latter characteristic is especially important in reliability applications in a wide range of fields, as is discussed recently by Reed (2011).

For a given support, the shape parameter of the T-L distribution is easily estimated by ML or MOM. We show that both of these estimators are positively biased in finite samples. The ML estimator can be expressed in closed form, so it is especially simple to compute. It exhibits greater (relative) bias than the method of moments estimator, but smaller relative mean squared error. We derive the bias of the ML estimator to $O(n^{-1})$, and prove that the corresponding bias-corrected estimators based on the different approaches of Cox and Snell (1968) and Firth (1993) are identical for this problem. A simulation experiment illustrates that the bias-corrected ML estimator dominates the MOM estimator in terms of both (relative) bias and mean squared error.

2. The Topp-Leone distribution

The density function for the T-L distribution is:

$$f(x) = (2v/b)\,(x/b)^{(v-1)}\,(1-x/b)\,(2-x/b)^{(v-1)} \;\; ; \; 0 < x < b < \infty \; ; \;\; v > 0 \, . \qquad (1)$$

In contrast to the Beta distribution, for example, the T-L hazard function has a simple closed form, namely:

$$\lambda(x) = (2v/b)y(1-y^2)^{v-1}/[1-(1-y^2)^v] \, , \qquad (2)$$

where $y = 1 - (x/b)$.

Following Nadarajah and Kotz (2003, p.317) we will set b = 1, so that

$$f(x) = 2vx^{v-1}(1-x)(2-x)^{v-1} \;\; ; \quad 0 < x < 1 \; ; \quad v > 0 \, . \tag{3}$$

The J-shape of this density, and the bathtub shape of the hazard function (for *all* $v \in (0,1)$), are illustrated by Nadarajah and Kotz (2003, pp. 312-313).

Under independent sampling, with sample size n, the log-likelihood function is:

$$l = nlog(2) + \; nlog(v) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[(v-1)log(x_i) + log(1-x_i) + (v-1)log(2-x_i)] \quad . \tag{4}$$

Noting that

$$\partial l/\partial v = (n/v) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[log(x_i\,) + \log(2-x_i\,)] \, , \tag{5}$$

and

$$(\partial^2 l)/(\partial v^2\,) = -n/v^2 \, , \tag{6}$$

it follows trivially that the ML estimator for v can be expressed in closed-form as

$$\hat{v} = -n/\sum_{i=1}^{n}[1-(x_i-1)^2], \tag{7}$$

and so $\hat{v} > 0$.

Bayoud (2016, p.74) shows that this ML estimator coincides with the mean of the posterior density (which is gamma in form) in a Bayesian analysis of this problem with a non-informative prior. Accordingly, the ML estimator is also the Bayes estimator of v when the loss function is quadratic.

As the T-L density satisfies the usual regularity conditions, the ML estimator of v is weakly consistent and best asymptotically normal. However, its finite-sample properties are not readily deduced, given that the estimator is a highly non-linear function of the data.

The MOM estimator of v is obtained by solving the moment equation, $E(X) = \bar{X}$, for v. From Nadarajah and Kotz (2003; p.315), when b = 1, $E(X) = 1 - 4^v\big(\Gamma(1+v)\big)^2/\Gamma(2+2v)$, so the MOM estimator ($\hat{v}_{MOM}$) is obtained as the solution to the nonlinear equation,

$$\Gamma(2+2v)(\bar{X}-1)+4^{v}(\Gamma(1+v))^{2}=0\ . \tag{8}$$

Although the MOM estimator is also weakly consistent for v, by construction, its finite-sample properties have not been explored previously. While the function of v in (8) is non-trivial, straightforward numerical evaluations show that it has a unique (positive) root for all $0 < \bar{X} < 1$.

By construction, $\hat{v} > 0$ and $\hat{v}_{MOM} > 0$, but it is possible for these estimators to yield estimates that exceed unity, especially for very small n. For such estimates the density function is not J-shaped, and the corresponding hazard function no longer has a bathtub shape.

3. Bias-adjusted estimators

One would anticipate the ML and MOM estimators of v may each be biased in finite samples. If so, this could be of concern when the T-L distribution is applied to reliability problems. Here, we investigate this issue, and consider bias-correction strategies for the ML estimator.

Cox and Snell (1968) provided a framework for estimating the bias, to $O(n^{-1})$ for ML estimators of the parameters of "regular" densities. Then, subtracting the estimated bias from the original ML estimator produces a bias-corrected estimator that is unbiased to $O(n^{-2})$. This type of "corrective" bias adjustment has been applied successfully in many contexts. Recent examples include Cordeiro and Klein (1994), Lemonte *et al*. (2007), Lemonte (2011), Giles *et al*. (2013), Schwartz *et al*. (2013), Xiao and Giles (2014), Schwartz and Giles (2016), and Giles *et al*. (2016).

In general terms, suppose that the parameter vector, θ, is of dimension p. Defining

$$k_{ij} = E(\partial^2 l / \partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j) \quad ; \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{9}$$

$$k_{ijl} = E(\partial^3 l / \partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j \partial\theta_l) \quad ; \quad i, j, l = 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{10}$$

$$k_{ij,l} = E[(\partial^2 l / \partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j)(\partial l / \partial\theta_l)] \quad ; \quad i, j, l = 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{11}$$

Cox and Snell (1968) showed that the bias of the sth element of the ML estimator of θ ($\hat{\theta}$) is:

$$Bias(\hat{\theta}_s) = \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{p} k^{si} k^{jl}[0.5k_{ijl} + k_{ij,l}] + O(n^{-2})\,; \qquad s = 1, 2, \ldots, p, \tag{12}$$

where k^{ij} is the $(i,j)^{\text{th}}$ element of the inverse of the information matrix, $K = \{-k_{ij}\}$.

Cordeiro and Klein (1994) note that this bias expression can be re-written as:

$$Bias(\hat{\theta}_s) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} k^{si} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} [k_{ij}^{(l)} - 0.5k_{ijl}]k^{jl} + O(n^{-2}) ; \qquad s = 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{13}$$

where

$$k_{ij}^{(l)} = \partial k_{ij} / \partial \theta_l \qquad ; \qquad i, j, l = 1, 2, \ldots, p. \tag{14}$$

The computational advantage of (13) over (12) is that it avoids computing expectations of products (see (11). Then, defining $a_{ij}^{(l)} = k_{ij}^{(l)} - (k_{ijl} / 2)$, for $i, j, l = 1, 2, \ldots, p$; and constructing the matrices:

$$A^{(l)} = \{a_{ij}^{(l)}\} ; \quad i, j, l = 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{15}$$

$$A = [A^{(1)} \mid A^{(2)} \mid \ldots\ldots \mid A^{(p)}], \tag{16}$$

Cordeiro and Klein (1994) show that the expression for the $O(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\theta}$ can be re-written as:

$$Bias(\hat{\theta}) = K^{-1} A \, vec(K^{-1}) + O(n^{-2}) . \tag{17}$$

Here, $K = \{-k_{ij}\}$, is the (expected) Fisher information matrix. Then, a "bias-corrected" ML estimator for θ can then be constructed as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{CS} = \hat{\theta} - \hat{K}^{-1} \hat{A} \, vec(\hat{K}^{-1}) , \tag{18}$$

where $\hat{K} = (K)|_{\hat{\theta}}$ and $\hat{A} = (A)|_{\hat{\theta}}$.

In our problem, $p = 1$, $K = (n/v^2)$, $(\partial^3 l)/(\partial v^3) = k_{111} = k_{11}^{(1)} = (2n/v^3)$, and $A = a_{11}^{(1)} = (n/v^3)$. So, from (16), $Bias(\hat{v}) = (v/n) + O(n^{-2})$, and the Cox-Snell bias-corrected estimator is

$$\hat{v}_{CS} = \hat{v} - (\hat{v}/n) = (n-1)\hat{v}/n , \tag{19}$$

where $\hat{v}$ is defined in (7). This result is confirmed by Mazucheli *et al*. (2017; p.6), using the R package 'mle.tools' (Mazucheli, 2017).

Firth (1993) suggested an alternative "preventive" approach to bias correction that involves adjusting the score vector before solving the likelihood equation(s) for the ML estimator. In the present context and notation, Firth's estimator requires that we solve the equation

$$U^* = (\partial l / \partial v) - A vec(K^{-1}) = 0. \tag{20}$$

Using (4), and the expressions for K and A, we immediately obtain the solution:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_F &= (1-n)/\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n}[\log(x_i)+\log(2-x_i)] \ . \\ &= (1-n)/\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n}[1-(x_i-1)^2] = \hat{v}_{CS}\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

So, for this particular estimation problem, the Cox-Snell and Firth bias-corrected ML estimators are identical. Moreover, $\hat{v}_{CS}$ is also a Bayes estimator. Bayoud (2016) shows that under a non-informative prior the posterior for v is a gamma distribution with a shape parameter of n, and a scale parameter of $-1/lnT$, where $T = \prod_{i=1}^{n}[x_i(2-x_i)]$. If $lnT \geq -1$, the mode of this distribution is $(1-n)/lnT = \hat{v}_{CS}$. This is the Bayes estimator of v if we have a "zero-one" loss function.

4. Simulation results

The (percentage) biases and mean squared errors of the ML, bias-adjusted ML, and MOM estimators of v have been investigated in a small simulation experiment. This experiment was conducted using the R software environment (R Core Development Team, 2016). The MOM estimator was obtained by solving equation (8) using the *uniroot* function in R. The Monte Carlo simulation involved 25,000 replications, and the T-L random variates were generated by inverting the distribution function. That is, $x = 1-\sqrt{1-\sqrt[v]{u}}$, where u is drawn from a U(0,1) distribution (Nadarajah and Kotz, 2003, p.317). The results appear in Table 1. There, for example, if $\hat{v}_{(i)}$ is the MLE of v obtained from the ith replication of the experiment, then the percentage bias is $\%Bias(\hat{v}) = 100[(1/25000)\sum_{i=1}^{25000}\hat{v}_{(i)} - v]/v$, and $\%MSE(\hat{v}) = 100[(1/25000)\sum_{i=1}^{25000}(\hat{v}_{(i)} - v)^2]/v^2$, *etc.*

It transpires that the percentage biases and MSEs of the ML and bias-corrected ML estimators of v are invariant to the value of v itself. In contrast, the relative bias and relative MSE of the MOM estimator of v depend on the value of that parameter. We see in Table 1 that the MOM estimator exhibits less relative bias, but much greater percentage MSE than does the ML estimator of v. However, the simple Cox-Snell/Firth bias correction is extremely effective. The positive relative bias of the adjusted ML estimator is much less than that of the MOM estimator of v (typically by an order of magnitude); and in addition, bias-correcting the ML estimator also reduces the %MSE of that estimator slightly. In summary, the easy-to-apply bias-corrected ML estimator is recommended, even for very small sample sizes.

5. Conclusions

Recently, there has been renewed interest in the Topp-Leone distribution, especially in relation to reliability studies, where its finite support and bathtub-shaped hazard function are appealing. For a fixed support, method of moments estimation of the distribution's shape parameter is straightforward enough, but the maximum likelihood estimator is trivial to compute. Correcting the latter estimator for its bias to $O(n^{-1})$ is also straightforward. This bias-corrected estimator is attractive because it has smaller percentage bias and mean squared error than the method of moments estimator in samples of the size likely to be encountered in practice. It also has a natural Bayesian interpretation.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to Ryan Godwin, Helen Feng, and Joseph Schwartz for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this work.

Table 1: Percentage biases [and MSEs]

n	$\%Bias(\hat{v})$ [$\%MSE(\hat{v})$]	$\%Bias(\hat{v}_{CS})$ [$\%MSE(\hat{v}_{CS})$]	$\%Bias(\hat{v}_{MOM})$ [$\%MSE(\hat{v}_{MOM})$]			
			v			
			0.2	**0.4**	**0.6**	**0.8**
10	11.168	0.052	6.353	6.682	6.953	7.174
	[16.648]	[12.475]	[48.141]	[31.126]	[25.657]	[23.030]
25	4.018	-0.143	2.209	2.319	2.415	2.494
	[4.850]	[4.321]	[16.802]	[10.616]	[8.600]	[7.619]
50	1.915	-0.122	1.022	1.079	1.127	1.168
	[2.192]	[2.070]	[8.116]	[5.090]	[4.101]	[3.618]
75	1.299	-0.050	0.593	0.679	0.728	0.763
	[1.416]	[1.362]	[5.316]	[3.329]	[2.679]	[2.361]
100	0.973	-0.036	0.423	0.483	0.523	0.551
	[1.052]	[1.022]	[3.998]	[2.497]	[2.008]	[1.768]
250	0.399	-0.022	0.219	0.228	0.237	0.245
	[0.405]	[0.400]	[1.580]	[0.985]	[0.790]	[0.694]
500	0.177	-0.022	0.073	0.076	0.082	0.087
	[0.202]	[0.201]	[0.795]	[0.494]	[0.396]	[0.348]
1000	0.089	-0.011	0.032	0.033	0.033	0.035
	[0.100]	[0.100]	[0.395]	[0.247]	[0.198]	[0.174]

References

Bayoud, H. A., 2016. Admissible minimax estimators for the shape parameter of Topp-Leone distribution. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 45, 71-82.

Cordeiro, G. M. and R. Klein, 1994. Bias correction in ARMA models. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 19, 169-176.

Cox, D. R. and E. J. Snell, 1968. A general definition of residuals. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B*, 30, 248-275.

Firth, D., 1993. Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika*, 80, 27-38.

Genç, A. I., 2012. Moments of order statistics of Topp-Leone distribution. *Statistical Papers*, 53, 117-131.

Ghitany, M. E., S. Kotz, and M. Xie, 2005. On some reliability measures and their stochastic orderings for the Topp-Leone distribution. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 32, 715-722.

Giles, D. E., H. Feng and R. T. Godwin, 2013. On the bias of the maximum likelihood estimator for the two-parameter Lomax distribution. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 42, 1934-1950.

Giles, D. E., H. Feng and R.T. Godwin, 2016. Bias-corrected maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of the generalized Pareto distribution. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 45, 2465-2483

Haupt, E. and H. Schäbe, 1992. A new model for a lifetime distribution with bathtub shaped failure rate. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 32, 633–639.

Haupt, E. and H. Schäbe, 1997. The TTT transformation and a new bathtub distribution model. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 60, 229–240.

Kotz, S. and E. Seier, 2007. Kurtosis of the Topp-Leone distributions. *InterStat*, July, #001.

Lemonte, A. J., 2011. Improved point estimation for the Kumaraswamy distribution. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 81, 1971–1982.

Lemonte, A. J., F. Cribari-Neto, and K. L. Vasconcellos, 2007. Improved statistical inference for the two parameter Birnbaum-Saunders distribution. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 51, 4656–4681.

Mazucheli, J, 2017. Package 'mle.tools': Expected/observed Fisher information and bias- corrected maximum likelihood estimate(s). R package version 1.0.0.

Mazucheli, J., A. F. B. Menezes, and S. Nadarajah, 2017. mle.tools: An R package for maximum likelihood bias correction, mimeo.

McEwen, R.P. and B. R. Parresol, 1991. Moment expressions and summary statistics for the complete and truncated Weibull distribution. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 20, 1361–1372.

Nadarajah, S., 2009. Bathtub-shaped failure rate functions. *Quality and Quantity*, 43, 855-863.

Nadarajah, S. and S. Kotz, 2003. Moments of some J-shaped distributions. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 30, 311-317.

R Development Core Team, 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Reed, W. J., 2011. A flexible parametric survival model which allows a bathtub shaped hazard rate function. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 38, 1665-1680.

Schäbe, H., 1994. Constructing lifetime distributions with bathtub shaped failure rate from DFR distributions. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 34, 1501–1508.

Schwartz, J. and D. E. Giles, 2016. Bias-reduced maximum likelihood estimation for the zero-inflated Poisson distribution. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 45,465-478.

Schwartz, J., R. T. Godwin and D. E. Giles, 2013. Improved maximum likelihood estimation of the shape parameter in the Nakagami distribution. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 83, 434-445.

Topp, C. W. and F. C. Leone, 1955. A family of J-shaped frequency functions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 50, 209-219.

Van Dorp, J. R. and S. Kotz, 2006. Modeling income distributions using elevated distributions on a bounded domain. In R. H. Pleguezuelo, J. C. Céspedes and J. M. Velasco (eds.), *Distribution Models Theory*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1-25.

Xiao, L. and D. E. Giles, 2014. Bias reduction for the maximum likelihood estimator of the generalized Rayleigh family of distributions. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 43, 1778-1792.

Zhou, M., D. W. Yang, Y. Wang, and S. Nadarajah, 2006. Some J-shaped distributions: Sums, products and ratios. RAMS '06. Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium, 175- 181.