

Reliability study of series and parallel systems of heterogeneous component lifetimes under proportional odds model

Pradip Kundu¹, Nil Kamal Hazra² and Asok K. Nanda^{1*}

¹ Department of Mathematics and Statistics, IISER Kolkata
Mohanpur 741246, India

² Department of Mathematical Statistics and Actuarial Science
University of the Free State, 339 Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate various stochastic orderings for series and parallel systems with independent and heterogeneous components having lifetimes following the proportional odds model. We also investigate comparisons between system with heterogeneous components and that with homogeneous components. This paper also studies relative ageing orders for two systems in the framework of components having lifetimes following the proportional odds model.

Keywords: Majorization, Schur-concave function, Schur-convex function, Stochastic order, Relative ageing.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: Primary: 90B25, 62N05; secondary: 60E15.

1 Introduction

There is an extensive literature on different stochastic orderings among order statistics where the observations come from different family of distributions. Some of these contributions are due to Balakrishnan and Zhao (2013), Bon and Păltănea (2006), Dykstra et al. (1997), Fang and Zhang (2012, 2015), Gupta et al. (2015), Khaledi and Kochar (2000), Khaledi et al. (2011), Kochar and Xu (2007a,b), Kundu et al. (2016), Li and Li (2016), Misra and Misra (2013), Pledger and Proschan (1971), Zhao and Balakrishnan (2011, 2012). A one-to-one correspondence between an order statistic and the lifetime of a k -out-of- n system is well known. A k -out-of- $n : G$ system (generally called k -out-of- n system) is a system consisting of n components which survives as long as at least k of the n components survive. Let $X_{k:n}$ be the k th

*Corresponding author, e-mail: asok.k.nanda@gmail.com

smallest order statistic corresponding to the random variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then the lifetime of a $(n - k + 1)$ -out-of- $n : G$ system corresponds to the order statistic $X_{k:n}$. So, $X_{n-k+1:n}$ represents lifetime of an k -out-of- $n : G$ system. In particular, $X_{1:n}$ and $X_{n:n}$ represent lifetimes of the series and the parallel systems, respectively.

The proportional odds (PO) model introduced by Bennet (1983) is a very important model in survival analysis context, mainly for its property of convergent hazard functions. The PO model, as discussed by Bennet (1983) and latter by Kirmani and Gupta (2001) guarantees that the ratio of hazard rates converges to unity as time tends to infinity. This is in contrast to the proportional hazards model where the ratio of the hazard rates remains constant with time. The convergent property of hazard functions makes the PO model reasonable in many practical applications as discussed by Bennet (1983), Kirmani and Gupta (2001) and Rossini and Tsiatis (1996). They also noticed that assumption of constant hazard ratio is unreasonable in many practical cases. For more applications of PO model one may refer to Collett (2004), Dinse and Lagakos (1983), Kirmani and Gupta (2001), Pettitt (1984).

Let X and Y be two random variables with distribution functions $F(\cdot)$, $G(\cdot)$, survival functions $\bar{F}(\cdot)$, $\bar{G}(\cdot)$, probability density functions $f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ and hazard rate functions $r_X(\cdot) = f(\cdot)/\bar{F}(\cdot)$, $r_Y(\cdot) = g(\cdot)/\bar{G}(\cdot)$ respectively. Let the odds functions of X and Y be defined respectively by $\theta_X(t) = \bar{F}(t)/F(t)$ and $\theta_Y(t) = \bar{G}(t)/G(t)$. The random variables X and Y are said to satisfy PO model with proportionality constant α if $\theta_Y(t) = \alpha\theta_X(t)$. It is observed that, in terms of survival functions, the PO model can be represented as

$$\bar{G}(t) = \frac{\alpha\bar{F}(t)}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\bar{F}(t)}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\bar{\alpha} = 1 - \alpha$. From the above representation we have

$$\frac{r_Y(t)}{r_X(t)} = \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\bar{F}(t)} = \frac{G(t)}{F(t)},$$

so that the hazard ratio is increasing (resp. decreasing) for $\alpha > 1$ (resp. $\alpha < 1$) and it converges to unity as t tends to ∞ . Also the model (1.1), with $0 < \alpha < \infty$, gives a method of introducing new parameter α to a family of distributions for obtaining more flexible new family of distributions as discussed by Marshall and Olkin (1997). The family of distributions so obtained is also known as Marshall-Olkin family of distributions or Marshall-Olkin extended distributions (for details see Marshall and Olkin (1997, 2007) and Cordeiro et al. (2014) among others).

Stochastic comparison of different systems with components following proportional hazard rates (PHR) model have been discussed by Pledger and Proschan (1971), Dykstra et al. (1997), Khaledi and Kochar (2000), Kochar and Xu (2007a,b), Li and Li (2016) among others. How-

ever, not much work have been done on stochastic comparison of systems with components following PO model. In this paper, we investigate stochastic comparisons of series and parallel systems with heterogeneous components having lifetimes following the PO model. We also obtain some stochastic comparison results between system with heterogeneous components and that with homogeneous ones. The comparisons are done with respect to the usual stochastic ordering, the hazard rate ordering, the reversed hazard rate ordering, the likelihood ratio ordering, and the relative ageing orderings.

Throughout the paper, by $a =^{sign} b$ we mean that a and b have the same sign and by $a =^{def} b$ we mean that b is defined as a . We also write $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}^+ = \{x : x > 0\}$.

2 Definitions and Preliminaries

Majorization is a preorder on vectors of real numbers. Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ denote a subset of the real line. Further let, for any vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x_{(1)} \leq x_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$ denote the increasing arrangement of the components of the vector \mathbf{x} . Below we give a couple of definitions to be used throughout the paper.

Definition 2.1 Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in I^n$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in I^n$ be any two vectors.

(i) The vector \mathbf{x} is said to majorize the vector \mathbf{y} (written as $\mathbf{x} \succeq^m \mathbf{y}$) if (cf. Marshall et al., 2011)

$$\sum_{i=1}^j x_{(i)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^j y_{(i)}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n x_{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^n y_{(i)}.$$

(ii) The vector \mathbf{x} is said to weakly supermajorize the vector \mathbf{y} (written as $\mathbf{x} \succeq^w \mathbf{y}$) if (cf. Marshall et al., 2011)

$$\sum_{i=1}^j x_{(i)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^j y_{(i)}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

(iii) The vector \mathbf{x} is said to weakly submajorize the vector \mathbf{y} (written as $\mathbf{x} \succeq_w \mathbf{y}$) if (cf. Marshall et al., 2011)

$$\sum_{i=j}^n x_{(i)} \geq \sum_{i=j}^n y_{(i)}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

(iv) The vector \mathbf{x} is said to be p -larger than the vector \mathbf{y} (written as $\mathbf{x} \succeq^p \mathbf{y}$) if (cf. Bon and Păltănea,

1999)

$$\prod_{i=1}^j x_{(i)} \leq \prod_{i=1}^j y_{(i)}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

(v) The vector \mathbf{x} is said to reciprocally majorize the vector \mathbf{y} (written as $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{rm}{\succ} \mathbf{y}$) if (cf. Zhao and Balakrishnan, 2009)

$$\sum_{i=1}^j \frac{1}{x_{(i)}} \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \frac{1}{y_{(i)}}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

It can be seen that

$$\mathbf{x} \stackrel{m}{\succ} \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{x} \stackrel{w}{\succ} \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{x} \stackrel{p}{\succ} \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{x} \stackrel{rm}{\succ} \mathbf{y}.$$

Remark 2.1 Definition 3.1(i) can equivalently be written as

$$\mathbf{x} \stackrel{m}{\succ} \mathbf{y} \text{ if } \sum_{i=1}^j x_{[i]} \geq \sum_{i=1}^j y_{[i]}, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n x_{[i]} = \sum_{i=1}^n y_{[i]},$$

where $x_{[1]} \geq x_{[2]} \geq \dots \geq x_{[n]}$ is a decreasing arrangement of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n .

Definition 2.2 A function $\phi : I^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be Schur-convex (resp. Schur-concave) on I^n if

$$\mathbf{x} \stackrel{m}{\succ} \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \phi(\mathbf{y}).$$

Below we give some definitions of stochastic orders. The details of usual stochastic order, failure rate order, reversed hazard rate order and likelihood ratio orders may be obtained in Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007), whereas the relative ageing ordering with respect to hazard rate is given in Sengupta and Deshpande (1994), and Rezaei et al. (2015) discuss the relative ageing ordering with respect to reversed hazard rate.

Definition 2.3 Let X and Y be two absolutely continuous random variables with cumulative distribution functions $F(\cdot)$, $G(\cdot)$, survival functions $\bar{F}(\cdot)$, $\bar{G}(\cdot)$, probability density functions $f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$, hazard rate functions $r_1(\cdot)$, $r_2(\cdot)$, and the reversed failure (hazard) rate functions $\tilde{r}_1(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{r}_2(\cdot)$, respectively. Then

1. X is said to be smaller than Y in the

- (i) usual stochastic order (denoted as $X \leq_{st} Y$) if $\bar{F}(t) \leq \bar{G}(t)$ for all t ;
- (ii) failure (hazard) rate order (denoted as $X \leq_{hr} Y$) if $\bar{G}(t)/\bar{F}(t)$ is increasing in $t \geq 0$, or equivalently if $r_1(t) \geq r_2(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$;

- (iii) reversed failure (hazard) rate order (denoted as $X \leq_{rhr} Y$) if $G(t)/F(t)$ is increasing in $t > 0$, or equivalently if $\tilde{r}_1(t) \leq \tilde{r}_2(t)$ for all $t > 0$;
- (iv) likelihood ratio order (denoted as $X \leq_{lr} Y$) if $f(x)/g(x)$ decreases in x over the union of the supports of X and Y .

2. X is said to age faster than Y in terms of the

- (i) hazard rate (denoted as $X \lesssim_{hr} Y$), if $r_1(t)/r_2(t)$ is increasing in $t > 0$;
- (ii) reversed hazard rate, denoted as $X \lesssim_{rhr} Y$, if $\tilde{r}_2(t)/\tilde{r}_1(t)$ is increasing in $t > 0$. □

The following notation is used throughout the paper.

- (i) $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n\}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{D}_+ = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n > 0\}$.
- (iii) $\mathcal{E} = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n\}$.
- (iv) $\mathcal{E}_+ = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 < x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n\}$.

Before we start, we mention below, for completeness, a few lemmas to be used in sequel. The first four lemmas are due to Marshall et al. (2011). Below we take $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ and $\varphi_{(k)}(\mathbf{z}) = \partial\varphi(\mathbf{z})/\partial z_k$, the partial derivative of φ with respect to its k th argument.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, continuously differentiable on the interior of \mathcal{D} . Then, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\mathbf{x} \succeq^m \mathbf{y} \implies \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \varphi(\mathbf{y})$$

if, and only if,

$$\varphi_{(k)}(\mathbf{z}) \text{ is decreasing (resp. increasing) in } k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, continuously differentiable on the interior of \mathcal{E} . Then, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$\mathbf{x} \succeq^m \mathbf{y} \implies \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \varphi(\mathbf{y})$$

if, and only if,

$$\varphi_{(k)}(\mathbf{z}) \text{ is increasing (resp. decreasing) in } k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 2.3 *Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open interval and let $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuously differentiable. Necessary and sufficient conditions for φ to be Schur-convex (resp. Schur-concave) on I^n are*

φ is symmetric on I^n , and for all $i \neq j$

$$(z_i - z_j) (\varphi_{(i)}(\mathbf{z}) - \varphi_{(j)}(\mathbf{z})) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{z} \in I^n.$$

Lemma 2.4 Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Further, let $\varphi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Then, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in S$,

$$\mathbf{x} \succeq_w \mathbf{y} \implies \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \varphi(\mathbf{y})$$

if, and only if, φ is both increasing (resp. decreasing) and Schur-convex (resp. Schur-concave) on S . Similarly,

$$\mathbf{x} \succeq^w \mathbf{y} \implies \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \varphi(\mathbf{y})$$

if, and only if, φ is both decreasing (resp. increasing) and Schur-convex (resp. Schur-concave) on S .

The following lemma is taken from Khaledi and Kochar (2002) and Kundu et al. (2016).

Lemma 2.5 Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Then,

$$\mathbf{x} \succeq^p \mathbf{y} \implies \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\text{resp. } \leq) \varphi(\mathbf{y})$$

if, and only if, the following two conditions hold:

- (i) $\varphi(e^{a_1}, \dots, e^{a_n})$ is Schur-convex (resp. Schur-concave) in (a_1, \dots, a_n) ,
- (ii) $\varphi(e^{a_1}, \dots, e^{a_n})$ is decreasing (resp. increasing) in each a_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

where $a_i = \ln x_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Following lemma is adapted from Bon and Păltănea (2006) (See also Gupta et al., 2015).

Lemma 2.6 Let $\phi : (0, \infty)^n \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a symmetrical and continuously differentiable mapping. If, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in (0, \infty)^n$ with $x_p = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i$ and $x_q = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i$, we have

$$(x_p - x_q) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq p} x_i} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_p} - \frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq q} x_i} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_q} \right) < (>) 0,$$

for $x_p \neq x_q$, then

$$\phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \leq (\geq) \phi(x, x, \dots, x),$$

where $x = \sqrt[n]{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n}$.

3 Series systems with component lifetimes following PO model

In this section we compare the lifetimes of two series systems, each of heterogeneous components having lifetimes following the proportional odds (PO) model, with respect to some stochastic

orders. We also compare lifetimes of two series systems, one comprising of heterogeneous components and another comprising of homogeneous components.

Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following PO model, denoted as $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$, where \bar{F} is the baseline survival function, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n)$ with $\lambda_i > 0$ and $\mu_i > 0$, for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We have the survival functions of $X_{1:n}$ and $Y_{1:n}$, respectively, as

$$\bar{F}_{X_{1:n}}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \bar{F}_{X_i}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i \bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x)},$$

and

$$\bar{F}_{Y_{1:n}}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \bar{F}_{Y_i}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i \bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\mu}_i \bar{F}(x)},$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_i = 1 - \lambda_i$ and $\bar{\mu}_i = 1 - \mu_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

The hazard rate functions of $X_{1:n}$ and $Y_{1:n}$ are, respectively, obtained as

$$r_{X_{1:n}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_{X_i}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x)},$$

and

$$r_{Y_{1:n}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_{Y_i}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r(x)}{1 - \bar{\mu}_i \bar{F}(x)}.$$

If $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda \mathbf{1})$, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, $\lambda > 0$, then the survival function and the hazard rate function of $X_{1:n}$ are, respectively,

$$\bar{F}_{X_{1:n}}(x) = \frac{\lambda^n \bar{F}^n(x)}{(1 - \bar{\lambda} \bar{F}(x))^n},$$

and

$$r_{X_{1:n}}(x) = \frac{nr(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda} \bar{F}(x)}.$$

The following theorem compares the lifetimes of two series systems formed out of n heterogeneous components following PO model.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose the lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} \stackrel{p}{\succeq} \boldsymbol{\mu} \text{ implies } X_{1:n} \leq_{st} Y_{1:n}.$$

Proof: Write $a_i = \ln \lambda_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{F}_{X_{1:n}}(x) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{a_i} \bar{F}(x)}{1 - (1 - e^{a_i}) \bar{F}(x)} \\ &= \phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n}), \text{ (say).}\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n})$ is symmetric with respect to $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial a_i} = \frac{1 - \bar{F}(x)}{1 - (1 - e^{a_i}) \bar{F}(x)} \phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n}),$$

so that $\phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n})$ is increasing in each a_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Now, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}(a_i - a_j) \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial a_i} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial a_j} \right) &= \frac{(a_i - a_j)(e^{a_j} - e^{a_i}) \bar{F}(x)(1 - \bar{F}(x))}{(1 - (1 - e^{a_i}) \bar{F}(x))(1 - (1 - e^{a_j}) \bar{F}(x))} \phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n}) \\ &\leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

So, from Lemma 2.3, $\phi(e^{a_1}, e^{a_2}, \dots, e^{a_n})$ is Schur-concave in $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, from Lemma 2.5, we have $\phi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \leq \phi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n)$ whenever $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \succeq^p \boldsymbol{\mu}$. \square

Corollary 3.1 *Suppose that the lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda \mathbf{1})$. Then, $X_{1:n} \leq_{st} Y_{1:n}$ if $\lambda \geq \sqrt[n]{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_n}$.* \square

The following counterexample shows that the condition of p -larger order given in the above theorem cannot be replaced by reciprocal majorization order.

Counterexample 3.1 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ be two sets of independent random variables, such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_i)$ and $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, where the baseline survival function is given by $\bar{F}(x) = e^{-2x}$. Take $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = (2.2, 3, 5)$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (2.8, 3.2, 3.3)$ so that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \succeq^{rm} (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$ but $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \not\prec^p (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$. It is observed that for $x = 0.2$, $\bar{F}_{X_{1:3}}(x) = 0.63929$ and $\bar{F}_{Y_{1:3}}(x) = 0.641646$. Again for $x = 0.8$, $\bar{F}_{X_{1:3}}(x) = 0.0861549$ and $\bar{F}_{Y_{1:3}}(x) = 0.084394$. So $X_{1:3} \not\leq_{st} Y_{1:3}$.*

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose that the lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} \succeq^w \boldsymbol{\mu} \text{ implies } X_{1:n} \leq_{hr} Y_{1:n}.$$

Proof: We have

$$r_{X_{1:n}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r(x)}{1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x)},$$

which is symmetric with respect to $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now,

$$\frac{\partial r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{\partial \lambda_i} = -\frac{r(x)\bar{F}(x)}{(1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x))^2},$$

so that $r_{X_{1:n}}(x)$ is decreasing in each λ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \left(\frac{\partial r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{\partial \lambda_i} - \frac{\partial r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{\partial \lambda_j} \right) &= (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) r(x) \bar{F}(x) \left[\frac{1}{(1 - \lambda_j \bar{F}(x))^2} - \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x))^2} \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{sign}}{=} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) [(1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x))^2 - (1 - \lambda_j \bar{F}(x))^2] \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, from Lemma 2.3, it follows that $r_{X_{1:n}}(x)$ is Schur-convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, by Lemma 2.4, we have $r_{X_{1:n}}(x) \geq r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)$ whenever $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \succeq^w \boldsymbol{\mu}$. Hence the theorem follows. \square

Corollary 3.2 *Suppose lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_1)$. Then, $X_{1:n} \leq_{hr} Y_{1:n}$ if $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$.* \square

The following counterexample shows that the condition of weakly supermojorization order given in the above theorem cannot be replaced by p -larger order.

Counterexample 3.2 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ are two sets of independent random variables, such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_i)$ and $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, where the baseline survival function is given by $\bar{F}(x) = e^{-1.2x}$. Take $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = (2, 3, 5)$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (2.8, 3.2, 3.4)$ so that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \succeq^p (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$ but $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \not\succeq^w (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$. It is observed that, for $x = 0.2$, $r_{X_{1:3}}(x) = 1.2297$ and $r_{Y_{1:3}}(x) = 1.1687$. Again, for $x = 1.8$, $r_{X_{1:3}}(x) = 2.3935$ and $r_{Y_{1:3}}(x) = 2.4089$. So $X_{1:3} \not\leq_{hr} Y_{1:3}$.* \square

In case of multiple-outlier model, below we study the relative ageing of two series systems with heterogeneous components in terms of the hazard rate.

Theorem 3.3 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model with $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_2)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_2)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then*

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \succeq^m \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\mu_2, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_2)}_{n_2} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:n},$$

provided $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{E}_+, (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{E}_+, n_1 \geq n_2\}$ or $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{D}_+, (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{D}_+, n_1 \leq n_2\}$.

Proof: We denote

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) : \lambda_i = \lambda_1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n_1 \text{ and } \lambda_j = \lambda_2, \text{ for } n_1 + 1 \leq j \leq n\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n) : \mu_i = \mu_1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n_1 \text{ and } \mu_j = \mu_2, \text{ for } n_1 + 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

We have to show that, under the given majorization order,

$$\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\lambda_i F(x)}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\bar{\mu}_i F(x)}} \quad (3.1)$$

is decreasing in $x > 0$ for $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{B}$, which can be shown to be equivalent to

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i}{(1-\lambda_i F(x))^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\lambda_i F(x)}} \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mu}_i}{(1-\bar{\mu}_i F(x))^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\bar{\mu}_i F(x)}}.$$

Now to show the above inequality, it suffices to show that, for $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\phi(\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_n) =_{def} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i}{(1-\lambda_i F(x))^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\lambda_i F(x)}}$$

is Schur-convex in $(\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_n) \in \mathcal{A}$. Writing $u(x) = 1/(1-x)$ and $v(x) = x/(1-x)$, we have

$$\phi(\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_n) = \frac{1}{\bar{F}(x)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n u(\bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))v(\bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))}{\sum_{i=1}^n u(\bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq n_1$,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \bar{\lambda}_i} = \frac{n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))v'(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))[n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))u'(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))[v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))]}{(n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x)))^2},$$

and, for $n_1 + 1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \bar{\lambda}_j} = \frac{n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))v'(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))[n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))u'(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))[v(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))]}{(n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x)))^2}.$$

Now, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n_1$ or $n_1 + 1 \leq i, j \leq n$, we have $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_i} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_j} = 0$. Again, for $1 \leq i \leq n_1$ and $n_1 + 1 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_i} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_j} &=_{sign} [n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))][n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))v'(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))v'(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))] \\ &\quad + n_1 n_2 [v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))][u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))u'(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))u'(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))]. \end{aligned}$$

As $v(x)$ and $u(x)v'(x)$ are both increasing and nonnegative in x , we have, for $n_1 \geq$ (resp. \leq) n_2

and $\bar{\lambda}_1 \geq$ (resp. \leq) $\bar{\lambda}_2$,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \bar{\lambda}_i} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \bar{\lambda}_j} \geq \text{(resp. } \leq) 0.$$

So, from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\underbrace{(\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\lambda}_2, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{m}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\bar{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\bar{\mu}_2, \bar{\mu}_2, \dots, \bar{\mu}_2)}_{n_2} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \succ_{hr} Y_{1:n}.$$

Then the result follows from the fact that $\underbrace{(\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\lambda}_2, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{m}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\bar{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\bar{\mu}_2, \bar{\mu}_2, \dots, \bar{\mu}_2)}_{n_2}$

is equivalent to $\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{m}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\mu_2, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_2)}_{n_2}$, which follows from Remark 2.1.

Corollary 3.3 *Let, for $i = 1, 2$, the two independent random variables X_i and Y_i follow PO model with parameters λ_i and μ_i , respectively. Then*

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \stackrel{m}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \mu_2) \Rightarrow X_{1:2} \succ_{hr} Y_{1:2}.$$

Below we give another set of sufficient conditions for Theorem 3.3 to hold.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model with $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_2)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_2)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then*

$$\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \leq \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \succ_{hr} Y_{1:n}.$$

Proof: We have to show that

$$\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)} = \frac{\frac{n_1}{1-\lambda_1 \bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2}{1-\lambda_2 \bar{F}(x)}}{\frac{n_1}{1-\mu_1 \bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2}{1-\mu_2 \bar{F}(x)}} \text{ is decreasing in } x > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Writing $u(x) = 1/(1-x)$ and $v(x) = x/(1-x)$, (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & n_1^2 u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x)) \\ & [v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\mu}_2 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_2 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))] \\ & + n_2^2 u(\bar{\mu}_2 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_2 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_2 \bar{F}(x))] \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

As both $u(x)$ and $v(x)$ are increasing in x , so the above inequality holds if the condition $\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \leq \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ holds. \square

A result on relative ageing is given next in terms of weakly majorization order.

Theorem 3.5 Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model with $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \succ_{hr} Y_{1:n}.$$

Proof: We have to show that

$$\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)} = \frac{\frac{n_1}{1-\lambda_1 \bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2}{1-\eta \bar{F}(x)}}{\frac{n_1}{1-\mu_1 \bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2}{1-\eta \bar{F}(x)}} = \gamma(x), \text{ say,} \quad (3.3)$$

is decreasing in $x > 0$. As earlier, let us take $u(x) = 1/(1-x)$ and $v(x) = x/(1-x)$, which are increasing in x . Now differentiating $\gamma(x)$ with respect to x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma'(x) &= \text{sign} \quad n_1^2 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x)) \\ &\quad [v(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))] + n_1 n_2 u(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x)) u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x))] \\ &= \psi(x), \text{ say.} \end{aligned}$$

Now the condition $\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2}$ is equivalent to the fact that $\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1$ or $\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \eta$ or $\eta \leq \lambda_1 \leq \mu_1$.

Case I: Let $\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1$. Then $\psi(x) \leq 0$.

Case II: Let $\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \eta$. Then we have $u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) \geq u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) \geq u(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x))$ and $v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) \geq v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) \geq v(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x))$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &\leq n_1 u(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x)) [v(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{F}(x))] [n_1 u(\bar{\mu}_1 \bar{F}(x)) + n_2 u(\bar{\eta} \bar{F}(x))] \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case III: $\eta \leq \lambda_1 \leq \mu_1$. Then the proof follows in the same line as that of Case II.

Hence the theorem follows. \square

Corollary 3.4 Let X_1 and X_2 be independent following PO model with parameters λ_1 and η respectively, and let Y_1 and Y_2 be independent following PO model with parameters μ_1 and η respectively. Then

$$(\lambda_1, \eta) \stackrel{w}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \eta) \Rightarrow X_{1:2} \succ_{hr} Y_{1:2}.$$

The following lemma, required to prove the next theorem, has been borrowed from Kundu et al. (2016).

Lemma 3.1 *If $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \lambda_2$ or $\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \lambda_2$, and $n_1\lambda_1 + n_2\lambda_2 = n_1\mu_1 + n_2\mu_2$, then*

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{m}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\mu_2, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_2)}_{n_2}.$$

The following theorem shows that under certain restriction on the model parameters the condition of majorization order in Theorem 3.3 can be replaced by the weak supermajorization order.

Theorem 3.6 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model with $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_2)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_2)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then, for $\{\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \lambda_2 \text{ and } n_1 \geq n_2\}$ or $\{\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \lambda_2 \text{ and } n_1 \leq n_2\}$*

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\mu_2, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_2)}_{n_2} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:n}.$$

Proof: Suppose that the first set of conditions holds. The weak supermajorization order gives that $\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1$ and $n_1\lambda_1 + r\lambda_2 \leq n_1\mu_1 + r\mu_2$, for $r = 1, 2, \dots, n_2$. If $n_1\lambda_1 + n_2\lambda_2 = n_1\mu_1 + n_2\mu_2$ holds then, under the given condition, the result follows from Theorem 3.3. Suppose that $n_1\lambda_1 + n_2\lambda_2 < n_1\mu_1 + n_2\mu_2$. Then there exists an η satisfying $\lambda_1 < \eta \leq \mu_1$ such that $n_1\eta + n_2\lambda_2 = n_1\mu_1 + n_2\mu_2$. Let $X_{1:n}^*$ be the lifetime of a series system formed by n components having lifetimes $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$, where $X_i^* \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$ and $X_j^* \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_2)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then, from Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, we have $X_{1:n}^* \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:n}$, when $n_1 \geq n_2$. Again $\lambda_1 < \eta \leq \lambda_2$ and

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2}.$$

So, from Theorem 3.5, it follows that $X_{1:n} \succeq_{hr} X_{1:n}^*$. Hence $X_{1:n} \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:n}$. The proof for the second set of conditions can be done in a similar way. \square

Corollary 3.5 *Let X_1 and X_2 be independent following PO model with parameters λ_1 and λ_2 respectively, and let Y_1 and Y_2 be independent following PO model with parameters μ_1 and μ_2 respectively. Then*

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \stackrel{w}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \mu_2) \Rightarrow X_{1:2} \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:2},$$

where $\{\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \lambda_2\}$ or $\{\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \lambda_2\}$. \square

The following theorem shows that, under certain condition, a series system with homogeneous components ages faster than that with heterogeneous ones in terms of the hazard rate.

Theorem 3.7 Suppose lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda \mathbf{1})$. Then, $X_{1:n} \succeq_{hr} Y_{1:n}$ if $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$.

Proof: We have

$$\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)} = \frac{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)}.$$

Now, differentiating the above expression with respect to x , we have, for $x > 0$,

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)} \right) = \frac{f(x)(1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x))}{n} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i}{(1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x))^2} \right],$$

so that $\frac{r_{X_{1:n}}(x)}{r_{Y_{1:n}}(x)}$ is decreasing if

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)} \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)}{(1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x))^2}.$$

From Cebyšev's inequality (cf. Mitrinović et al., 1993, p. 240), the above inequality holds if

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)} \right)$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{\bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $\phi(x) = x/(1 - x)$, which is increasing and convex in x . Now (3.4) holds if

$$\phi(\bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)),$$

i.e. if

$$\phi(\bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)) \leq \phi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\lambda}_i\bar{F}(x)\right),$$

which follows from the fact that ϕ is convex. Now the theorem holds because ϕ is increasing. \square

In case of multiple-outlier model, below we study the likelihood ratio ordering between two series systems with heterogeneous components. The result under majorization order follows from Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, whereas the result under weak supermajorization order follows from Theorems 3.2 and 3.6.

Theorem 3.8 Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_2)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_2)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 +$

$2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then

$$\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{n_2} \stackrel{m}{\succeq} \text{(resp. } \stackrel{w}{\succeq}) \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1} \underbrace{(\mu_2, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_2)}_{n_2} \Rightarrow X_{1:n} \leq_{lr} Y_{1:n},$$

provided $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{E}_+, (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{E}_+, n_1 \geq n_2\}$ or $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{D}_+, (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathcal{D}_+, n_1 \leq n_2\}$ [resp. $\{\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \lambda_2$ and $n_1 \geq n_2\}$ or $\{\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \lambda_2$ and $n_1 \leq n_2\}$] holds. \square

The following theorem gives a condition under which a series system with homogeneous components and that with heterogeneous ones are ordered in terms of the likelihood ratio order. The proof follows from Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.2.

Theorem 3.9 *Suppose lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{1})$. Then, $X_{1:n} \leq_{lr} Y_{1:n}$ if $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$.*

4 Parallel systems with component lifetimes following PO model

In this section we compare lifetimes of two parallel systems of heterogeneous components having lifetimes following the PO model with respect to some stochastic orders. We also compare lifetimes of two parallel systems, one comprising of heterogeneous components and another of homogeneous components.

Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following PO model. Let $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$, where \bar{F} is the baseline survival function, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n)$, $\lambda_i > 0$ and $\mu_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We have the survival functions of $X_{n:n}$ and $Y_{n:n}$, respectively, as

$$\bar{F}_{X_{n:n}}(x) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \bar{F}_{X_i}(x)) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1 - \bar{F}(x)}{1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x)} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\bar{F}_{Y_{n:n}}(x) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \bar{F}_{Y_i}(x)) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1 - \bar{F}(x)}{1 - \mu_i \bar{F}(x)} \right).$$

Also the reversed hazard rate functions of $X_{n:n}$ and $Y_{n:n}$ are obtained, respectively, as

$$\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{r}_{X_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i \tilde{r}(x)}{1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x)}, \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\tilde{r}_{Y_{n:n}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{r}_{Y_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i \tilde{r}(x)}{1 - \mu_i \bar{F}(x)}.$$

If $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{1})$, $\lambda > 0$, then the survival function and the reversed hazard rate function of

$X_{n:n}$ are, respectively, given by

$$\bar{F}_{X_{n:n}}(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{1 - \bar{F}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)} \right)^n,$$

and

$$\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x) = \frac{n\lambda\tilde{r}(x)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{F}(x)}.$$

The following theorem compares the lifetimes of two parallel systems formed out of n heterogeneous components following PO model.

Theorem 4.1 *Suppose that lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \boldsymbol{\mu} \text{ implies } X_{n:n} \leq_{rhr} Y_{n:n}.$$

Proof: Differentiating (4.2) with respect to λ_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}}{\partial \lambda_i} &= \frac{\tilde{r}(x)(1 - \bar{F}(x))}{(1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))^2} \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)$ is increasing in each λ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Also $\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)$ is symmetric with respect to $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}}{\partial \lambda_i} - \frac{\partial \tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}}{\partial \lambda_j} \right) &= (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \tilde{r}(x)(1 - \bar{F}(x)) \left[\frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))^2} - \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{F}(x))^2} \right] \\ &\stackrel{sign}{=} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \left((1 - \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{F}(x))^2 - (1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{F}(x))^2 \right) \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, from Lemma 2.3, it follows that $\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)$ is Schur-concave in $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, from Lemma 2.4, we have $\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x) \leq \tilde{r}_{Y_{n:n}}(x)$ whenever $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \boldsymbol{\mu}$. \square

Corollary 4.1 *Suppose lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda \mathbf{1})$. Then, $X_{n:n} \leq_{rhr} Y_{n:n}$ if $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$. \square*

The following counterexample shows that even under usual stochastic order, the condition of weakly supermojorization order given in the above theorem cannot be replaced by p -larger order.

Counterexample 4.1 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ be two sets of independent random variables, such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_i)$ and $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, where the baseline survival function is given by $\bar{F}(x) = e^{-1.8x}$, $x > 0$. Take $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = (2, 3, 5)$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (2.6, 3.2, 3.7)$ so that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \stackrel{p}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$ but $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \not\stackrel{w}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$. It is*

observed that, for $x = 1.5$, $\bar{F}_{X_{3:3}}(x) = 0.471629$ and $\bar{F}_{Y_{3:3}}(x) = 0.459619$. So $X_{3:3} \not\leq_{st} Y_{3:3}$. Now take $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = (2.5, 3, 5)$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (3, 3.8, 4.4)$ so that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \stackrel{p}{\succeq} (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$. It is observed that, for $x = 1.2$, $\bar{F}_{X_{3:3}}(x) = 0.67176$ and $\bar{F}_{Y_{3:3}}(x) = 0.69449$. So $X_{3:3} \not\leq_{st} Y_{3:3}$. \square

Theorem 4.2 Suppose that lifetime vectors $X \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $Y \sim PO(\bar{F}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}1)$. Then, $X_{n:n} \geq_{st} Y_{n:n}$ if $\lambda = \sqrt[n]{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_n}$.

Proof: Write

$$\bar{F}_{X_{n:n}}(x) = \phi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

Then we have

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_i} = \bar{F}(x)[1 - \bar{F}_{X_{n:n}}(x)] \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_i \bar{F}(x)}.$$

Let $\lambda_p = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i$ and $\lambda_q = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq p} \lambda_i} \right) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_p} - \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq q} \lambda_i} \right) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_q} &= \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq p} \lambda_i} \right) \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_p \bar{F}(x)} - \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq q} \lambda_i} \right) \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_q \bar{F}(x)} \\ &= \text{sign} \left[\frac{\lambda_p}{1 - \lambda_p \bar{F}(x)} - \frac{\lambda_q}{1 - \lambda_q \bar{F}(x)} \right] \\ &= \text{sign} (\lambda_p - \lambda_q)(1 - \bar{F}(x)) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $(\lambda_p - \lambda_q) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq p} \lambda_i} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_p} - \frac{1}{\prod_{i \neq q} \lambda_i} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda_q} \right) > 0$. Thus, from Lemma 2.6, we have, for $\lambda = \sqrt[n]{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_n}$, $\phi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \geq \phi(\lambda, \lambda, \dots, \lambda)$, i.e. $X_{n:n} \geq_{st} Y_{n:n}$. \square

Following counterexample shows that even in case of multiple-outlier model, under the majorization order, two parallel systems of heterogeneous components may not be ordered with respect to relative ageing in terms of reversed hazard rate.

Counterexample 4.2 Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_6)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_6)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, 2)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, 3)$, for $i = 1, 2$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, 6)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, 5.5)$, for $j = 3, 4, 5, 6$, where the baseline survival function is given by $\bar{F}(x) = e^{-2x}$. Clearly, $(2, 2, 6, 6, 6, 6) \stackrel{m}{\succeq} (3, 3, 5.5, 5.5, 5.5, 5.5)$. However, it is observed from Figure 1(a) that $\tilde{r}_{Y_{6:6}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{6:6}}(x)$ is nonmonotone.

Remark 4.1 Taking the random variables as in Counterexample 4.2, we see from Figure 1(b) that $f_{Y_{6:6}}(x)/f_{X_{6:6}}(x)$ is also nonmonotone. This gives that, in case of multiple-outlier model, under the majorization order, two parallel systems with heterogeneous components may not be ordered with respect to likelihood ratio order.




Figure 1: (a) Curve $\tilde{r}_{Y_{6:6}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{6:6}}(x)$ (b) Curve $f_{Y_{6:6}}(x)/f_{X_{6:6}}(x)$ for $x > 0$.




Figure 2: (a) Curve $\tilde{r}_{Y_{4:4}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{4:4}}(x)$ (b) Curve $\tilde{r}_{Y_{4:4}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{4:4}}(x)$ for $x > 0$.

Following counterexample shows that, a parallel system of heterogeneous components may not be comparable with that of homogeneous components with respect to relative ageing in terms of reversed hazard rate, irrespective of the condition in Corollary 4.1.

Counterexample 4.3 Let $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda)$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where the baseline survival function is given by $\bar{F}(x) = e^{-(x/\beta)^k}$, $\beta, k > 0$. It is observed from Figure 2(a) that for $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = 3$, $\lambda_3 = 4$, $\lambda_4 = 5$, $\lambda = 3.6$, $\beta = 0.8$, and $k = 2$ $\tilde{r}_{Y_{4:4}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{4:4}}(x)$ is nonmonotone. Again for $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = 3$, $\lambda_3 = 4$, $\lambda_4 = 5$, $\lambda = 3.4$, $\beta = 3$ and $k = 2$ $\tilde{r}_{Y_{4:4}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{4:4}}(x)$ is also nonmonotone as seen from Figure 2(b). \square

In case of multiple-outlier model, following theorem gives a condition under which $X_{n:n}$ ages faster than $Y_{n:n}$ in terms of the reversed hazard rate.

Theorem 4.3 Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then

$$\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1 \Rightarrow X_{n:n} \lesssim_{hr} Y_{n:n}.$$

Proof: We have to show that

$$\frac{\tilde{r}_{Y_{n:n}}(x)}{\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)} = \frac{\frac{n_1\mu_1}{1-\bar{\mu}_1\bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2\eta}{1-\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x)}}{\frac{n_1\lambda_1}{1-\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{F}(x)} + \frac{n_2\eta}{1-\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x)}} = \gamma(x), \text{ say,} \quad (4.3)$$

is increasing in $x > 0$. Let us write $u(x) = 1/(1-x)$ and $v(x) = x/(1-x)$, both of which are increasing in x . Now differentiating $\gamma(x)$ with respect to x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma'(x) &=^{sign} n_1^2\lambda_1\mu_1u(\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{F}(x))u(\bar{\mu}_1\bar{F}(x))[v(\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\mu}_1\bar{F}(x))] + n_1n_2\eta\mu_1u(\bar{\mu}_1\bar{F}(x))u(\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x)) \\ &\quad [v(\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\mu}_1\bar{F}(x))] + n_1n_2\eta\lambda_1u(\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{F}(x))u(\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x))[v(\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{F}(x)) - v(\bar{\eta}\bar{F}(x))] \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

if $\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1$. Hence the theorem follows.

Corollary 4.2 *Let X_1 and X_2 be independent following PO model with parameters λ_1 and η respectively, and let Y_1 and Y_2 be independent following PO model with parameters μ_1 and η respectively. Then*

$$\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1 \Rightarrow X_{2:2} \lesssim_{rhr} Y_{2:2}.$$

The following counterexample shows that Theorem 4.3 does not hold under the condition $\lambda_1 \leq \mu_1 \leq \eta$.

Counterexample 4.4 *Let X_1 and X_2 follow PO model with parameters λ_1 and η respectively, and Y_1 and Y_2 follow PO model with parameters μ_1 and η respectively, where the baseline distribution is exponential with parameter $\lambda = 2$. Now for $\lambda_1 = 0.2$, $\mu_1 = 0.4$ and $\eta = 0.9$, $\tilde{r}_{Y_{2:2}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{2:2}}(x)$ is nonmonotone as seen from Figure 3.*

Theorem 4.4 *Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ be two sets of independent random variables, each following the multiple-outlier PO model such that $X_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \lambda_1)$, $Y_i \sim PO(\bar{F}, \mu_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $X_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, $Y_j \sim PO(\bar{F}, \eta)$, for $j = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2 (= n)$. Then*

$$\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1 \Rightarrow X_{n:n} \leq_{lr} Y_{n:n}.$$

Proof: We have to show that

$$\frac{f_{Y_{n:n}}(x)}{f_{X_{n:n}}(x)} = \frac{F_{Y_{n:n}}(x) \tilde{r}_{Y_{n:n}}(x)}{F_{X_{n:n}}(x) \tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)} \quad (4.4)$$

is increasing in $x > 0$. We have $\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1$, which implies $\underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2} \stackrel{w}{\succeq} \underbrace{(\mu_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)}_{n_1}, \underbrace{(\eta, \eta, \dots, \eta)}_{n_2}$. So, from Theorem 4.1, under the given condition, $F_{Y_{n:n}}(x)/F_{X_{n:n}}(x)$ is




Figure 3: Curve $\tilde{r}_{Y_{2:2}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{4:4}}(x)$ for $x > 0$.

increasing in $x > 0$. Again Theorem 4.3 gives that under the given condition, $\tilde{r}_{Y_{n:n}}(x)/\tilde{r}_{X_{n:n}}(x)$ is increasing in $x > 0$. Hence the theorem follows.

Corollary 4.3 *Let X_1 and X_2 be independent following PO model with parameters λ_1 and η respectively, and let Y_1 and Y_2 be independent following PO model with parameters μ_1 and η respectively. Then*

$$\lambda_1 \leq \eta \leq \mu_1 \Rightarrow X_{2:2} \leq_{lr} Y_{2:2}.$$

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied stochastic comparison of series and parallel systems formed from independent heterogeneous components having lifetimes following the PO model. Most of the results are obtained using different concepts of majorization. We have also compared a system formed of heterogeneous components with another system of homogeneous components. We have derived conditions under which two series systems with heterogeneous components are ordered with respect to different stochastic orders; in case of multiple-outlier model, they are compared with respect to likelihood ratio order and relative ageing in terms of hazard rate. We have also derived conditions under which a series system with heterogeneous components and that with homogeneous components are ordered with respect to the above mentioned stochastic orderings. In case of parallel system, we have obtained conditions under which two parallel systems with heterogeneous components are ordered with respect to usual stochastic order and reversed hazard rate order. The comparison is also made in case of a parallel system

with heterogeneous components and that with homogeneous components. However, unlike series system, with suitable counterexamples we have showed that even in case of multiple-outlier model, under majorization order, two parallel systems with heterogeneous components may not be comparable with respect to likelihood ratio order and relative ageing in terms of reversed hazard rate, although, under more restricted conditions, we are able to compare the parallel systems with respect to those stochastic orderings.

Acknowledgements:

Pradip Kundu sincerely acknowledges the support received from the IISER Kolkata to carry out this research work. The support received from the University of the Free State, South Africa is gratefully acknowledged by Nil Kamal Hazra. The financial support from NBHM, Govt. of India (vide Ref. No. 2/48(25)/2014/NBHM(R.P.)/R&D II/1393 dt. Feb. 3, 2015) is duly acknowledged by Asok K. Nanda.

References

- Balakrishnan, N., Zhao, P. (2013). Hazard rate comparison of parallel systems with heterogeneous gamma components, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 113, 153-160.
- Bennett, S. (1983). Analysis of survival data by the proportional odds model, *Statistics in Medicine* 2, 273-277.
- Bon, J.L., Păltănea, E. (1999). Ordering properties of convolutions of exponential random variables, *Lifetime Data Analysis* 5, 185-192.
- Bon, J.L., Păltănea, E. (2006). Comparisons of order statistics in a random sequence to the same statistics with i.i.d. variables, *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* 10, 1-10.
- Collett, D. (2004). *Modelling survival data in medical research*, 2nd edition, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Cordeiro, G.M., Lemonte, A.J., Ortega, E.M.M. (2014). The Marshall-Olkin family of distributions: mathematical properties and new models, *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice* 8(2), 343-366.
- Dinse, G.E., Lagakos, S.W. (1983). Regression analysis of tumour prevalence data, *Applied Statistics* 32(3), 236-248.
- Dykstra, R., Kochar, S.C., Rojo, J. (1997). Stochastic comparisons of parallel systems of heterogeneous exponential components, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 65, 203-211.

- Fang, L., Zhang, X. (2012). New results on stochastic comparison of order statistics from heterogeneous Weibull populations, *Journal of Korean Statistical Society* 41, 13-16.
- Fang, L., Zhang, X. (2015). Stochastic comparison of parallel system with exponentiated Weibull components, *Statistics & Probability Letters* 97, 25-31.
- Gupta, N., Patra, L.K., Kumar, S. (2015). Stochastic comparisons in systems with Frèchet distributed components, *Operations Research Letters* 43, 612-615.
- Khaledi, B., Kochar, S.C. (2000). Some new results on stochastic comparisons of parallel systems, *Journal of Applied Probability* 37, 283-291.
- Khaledi, B., Kochar, S.C. (2002). Dispersive ordering among linear combinations of uniform random variables, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 100, 13-21.
- Khaledi, B., Farsinezhad, S., Kochar, S.C. (2011). Stochastic comparisons of order statistics in the scale models, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 141, 276-286.
- Kirmani, S.N.U.A., Gupta, R.C. (2001). On the proportional odds model in survival analysis, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 53(2), 203-216.
- Kochar, S.C., Xu, M. (2007a). Stochastic comparisons of parallel systems when components have proportional hazard rates, *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 21, 597-609.
- Kochar, S.C., Xu, M. (2007b). Some recent results on stochastic comparisons and dependence among order statistics in the case of PHR model, *Journal of Iranian Statistical Society* 6, 125-140.
- Kundu, A., Chowdhury, S., Nanda, A.K., Hazra, N.K. (2016). Some results on majorization and their applications, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 301, 161-177.
- Li, C., Li, X. (2016). Relative ageing of series and parallel systems with statistically independent and heterogeneous component lifetimes, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 65(2), 1014-1021.
- Marshall, A.W., Olkin, I. (1997). A new method of adding a parameter to a family of distributions with applications to the exponential and Weibull families, *Biometrika* 84, 641-652.
- Marshall, A.W., Olkin, I. (2007). *Life Distributions*, Springer, New York.
- Marshall, A.W., Olkin, I., Arnold, B.C. (2011). *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*, Springer, New York.

- Misra, N., Misra, A.K. (2013). On comparison of reversed hazard rates of two parallel systems comprising of independent gamma components, *Statistics & Probability Letters* 83, 1567-1570.
- Mitrinović, D.S., Pečarić, J.E., Fink, A.M. (1993). *Classical and New Inequalities in Analysis*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Pettitt, A.N. (1984). Proportional odds models for survival data and estimates using ranks, *Applied Statistics* 33(2), 169-175.
- Pledger, P., Proschan, F. (1971). Comparisons of order statistics and of spacings from heterogeneous distributions, in: J.S. Rustagi (Ed.), *Optimizing Methods in Statistics*, Academic Press, New York, 89-113.
- Rezaei, M., Gholizadeh, B., Izadkhah, S. (2015). On relative reversed hazard rate order, *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* 44, 300-308.
- Rossini, A.J., Tsiatis, A.A. (1996). A Semiparametric proportional odds regression model for the analysis of current status data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91(434), 713-721.
- Sengupta, D., Deshpande, J.V. (1994). Some results on the relative ageing of two life distributions, *Journal of Applied Probability* 31, 991-1003.
- Shaked, M., Shanthikumar, J.G. (2007). *Stochastic Orders*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Zhao, P., Balakrishnan, N. (2009). Mean residual life order of convolutions of heterogeneous exponential random variables, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 100, 1792-1801.
- Zhao, P., Balakrishnan, N. (2011). New results on comparisons of parallel systems with heterogeneous gamma components, *Statistics & Probability Letters* 81, 36-44.
- Zhao, P., Balakrishnan, N. (2012). Stochastic comparison of largest order statistics from multiple-outlier exponential models, *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 26, 159-182.