

Remarks on Bayesian Control Charts

Amir Ahmadi-Javid^{†*} and Mohsen Ebadi[†]

[†] Department of Industrial Engineering, Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author; email address: ahmadi_javid@aut.ac.ir

arXiv: December 7, 2017

Abstract. There is a considerable amount of ongoing research on the use of Bayesian control charts for detecting a shift from a good quality distribution to a bad quality distribution in univariate and multivariate processes. Monitoring continuous-time multivariate processes by using Bayesian control charts is studied in Makis (2008) [Makis, V. (2008). Multivariate Bayesian control chart. *Operations Research*, 56(2), 487-496, DOI: [10.1287/opre.1070.0495](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1070.0495)]. Makis (2008) and some other authors widely claimed that Bayesian control charts were economically optimal, compared to non-Bayesian control charts. This paper first shows that the Bayesian control charts considered by Makis (2008) are not always better than non-Bayesian control charts. Secondly, it demonstrates that the algorithm presented in Makis (2008) to determine the optimal control limits of Bayesian control charts fails to find the true optimal values.

Keywords: Bayesian control charts, Shewhart-type control charts, Economic design, Simulation-based optimization

1. Introduction

Bayesian control charts, originated by Girshick and Rubin (1952), are not new in the literature, and their economic design has received increasing attention over the last two decades (see Nikolaidis and Tagaras (2017), and references therein).

Girshick and Rubin (1952) discussed the optimality of Bayesian charts for the first time. They considered only a special case of a *discrete-time* production system that produces at discrete instants of time, and where 100% inspection is carried out (inspection costs are ignored). For this special setting, they studied the optimum quality control policy which specifies when to terminate production and put the machine in the repair shop in order to minimize the long-run expected average cost. They explicitly determined the following optimal policy (Tagaras, 1994):

"Stop and repair at time t if and only if the posterior probability at time t that the process is in the bad state exceeds a control limit p ."

Note that their proposed policy was initially presented in a different form. To see the equivalence to the above form, the readers are referred to the proof of Lemma 1 in page 116 of Girshick and Rubin (1952).

Table 1 A list of misleading statements regarding the optimality of Bayesian charts

Paper	Journal	Statements
Calabrese (1995)	<i>Management Science</i>	" Taylor (1965, 1967) has shown that non-Bayesian techniques are not optimal ..." (page 637, line 16)
		"A Bayes statistic together with a simple control limit policy is shown to be an economically optimal method of process control" (page 638, line 9)
Makis (2008)	<i>Operations Research</i>	"It is well known that these traditional, non-Bayesian process control techniques are not optimal "(Abstract: page 795, line 4)
		"Under standard operating and cost assumptions, [in this paper] it is proved that a [Bayesian] control limit policy is optimal , and an algorithm is presented to find the optimal control limit and the minimum average cost."(Abstract: page 487, line 8)
Makis (2009)	<i>European Journal of Operational Research</i>	" Taylor (1965, 1967) has shown that non-Bayesian techniques are not optimal ..." (page 488, line 4)
		"It is well known that this traditional non-Bayesian approach to a control chart design is not optimal" (Abstract: page 487, line 3)
Wang, & Lee (2015)	<i>Operations Research</i>	" Taylor (1965, 1967) has shown that non-Bayesian techniques are not optimal..." (page 796, line 9)
		" Calabrese (1995) proved that, when the sampling interval and the sample size are both fixed, the [Bayesian] control-limit policy is optimal for finite-horizon problems. Makis (2008, 2009) , assuming a binary state space, showed that the control-limit policy is optimal for multivariate control charts in the finite and infinite-horizon cases" (page 1, line 46).

Unfortunately, by generalizing the particular optimality result obtained by Girshick and Rubin (1952), Makis (2008) and some other authors made misleading statements that imply the optimality of Bayesian control charts and the non-optimality of non-Bayesian control charts in general settings. In Table 1, a few of these statements are collected. This table provides a chain of citations starting from 1995.

Makis (2008) in the abstract of his paper explicitly claimed that he proved the optimality of a Bayesian control chart. However, he, and similarly Calabrese (1995) and Makis (2009), did not provide any proof and only cited the two papers Taylor (1965, 1967), where their statements have exactly the same wording. Let us now examine these Taylor's papers to make sure that they do not extend the optimality of Bayesian charts to more general settings, and that they only readdress the results obtained by Girshick and Rubin (1952).

Taylor (1965) studied a general control problem, called a sequential replacement process, which deals with a dynamic system that is observed periodically and classified into one of a number of possible states; and after each observation, one of possible decisions is made. A sequential replacement process is a control process with an additional special action, called replacement, which instantaneously returns the system to some initial state. The paper first proves the existence of an optimal stationary non-randomized rule, and then presents a method to determine the optimal policy under two popular effectiveness measures: the expected total discounted cost and the long-run expected average cost. The paper also shows that the optimal rule proposed by Girshick and Rubin (1952) for "100% inspection" case can be covered by their results. On the other hand, using a counterexample, the paper shows the non-optimality of the other rule that Girshick and Rubin (1952) claimed to be optimal for the "non-100% inspection" case. Taylor (1967) discussed no optimality result and only proposed a method to approximately determine the optimal control limit p of the rule proposed by Girshick and Rubin (1952) for "100% inspection" case whenever the bad state slightly deviates from the good state. Hence, Taylor (1965, 1967) did not provide any new optimality or non-optimality results for Bayesian or non-Bayesian charts in other settings.

This note assesses Makis (2008) and shows that his claim on the optimality of his proposed Bayesian chart is not correct. Examining a set of 36 benchmark instances, it is shown that Shewhart-type control charts, which are the most basic non-Bayesian control charts, repeatedly perform better than the proposed Bayesian charts in both univariate and multivariate cases. The note also indicates that the algorithm presented by Makis (2008) to find optimal control limits works incorrectly and cannot compute the true (or near) optimal solutions. Simulation-based optimization is used to provide these observations.

The remainder of this note is organized as follows: Section 2 shows that one cannot generalize the Girshick-Rubin optimality result to the setting considered by Makis (2008). Section 3 reveals that the solution algorithm proposed by Makis (2008) to determine optimal control limits fails to find the actual optimal solutions. Section 4 provides our conclusions.

2. Bayesian control charts are not optimal

Let us first explain our quality control problem. Consider a continuous-time production process that continuously produces a product at a constant rate. This process is characterized by two quality states: *in-control*, denoted by 0, and *out-of-control*, denoted by 1. The process starts at the in-control state, and the occurrence time of an assignable (hidden) cause follows the exponential distribution with parameter λ , representing the process failure rate. After the occurrence of each assignable cause, the process makes an unobservable transition from state 0 to state 1, and will stay at state 1 until the out-of-control state is detected and a repair action is made.

Assignable causes are detected using statistical control policies, called *quality control charts*, which are typically feed-back control policies. In a static setting, a sample of size n is collected every h units of time from the observation process. Then, at each sampling epoch a statistic (formed based on the current sample, and possibly the samples taken at the previous sampling epochs) is plotted on a control chart; and if it exceeds the control limits, an alarm occurs and the process is stopped for the inspection to check whether the process is in control or out of control. If the chart correctly signals, the signal is called a *true* alarm and a repair action is needed. Otherwise, the signal is called a *false*

alarm, and the process will continue without any action. The process stops during searches and repairs.

A *quality control cycle* is defined as the time period between the starting times of any two successive in-control periods. At the beginning of each cycle, the control chart is exactly initialized as at the beginning of the first cycle. This assumption makes the sequence of cycles a renewal stochastic process.

Let random vector \mathbf{X} represent q observable quality characteristics. When the process is in control, this vector follows a multivariate normal distribution $N_q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. In the out-of-control situation, the mean vector shifts from $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ to $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$. The measurable function $C(\theta, t)$ designates the instantaneous cost of the production process under control policy θ at time t . This includes the in-control and out-of-control quality costs, the cost of false alarms, the cost of searching an assignable cause after a true alarm, the cost of process correction after detecting the assignable cause; and the fixed and variable costs of sampling. The objective is to find the best control policy that minimizes the long-run expected average cost given by

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} f(\theta) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E \left(\frac{\int_0^T C(\theta, t) dt}{T} \right) \quad (1)$$

where Θ is the class of admissible control policies θ for which the above limit finitely exists. From the renewal nature of the induced process of quality control cycles, the following identity holds:

$$f(\theta) = \frac{E(CC(\theta))}{E(CT(\theta))} \quad (2)$$

where $CC(\theta)$ and $CT(\theta)$ are random variables denoting the cost and time of a typical quality control cycle, respectively.

As stated in the previous section, Makis (2008) claimed that the optimal control policy in (1) could be found in the subclass of Bayesian control charts he proposed. This section shows that this characterization is not correct by presenting many examples for which some Shewhart-type control

charts outperform all the proposed Bayesian control charts. To continue our discussion, let us formally define these control charts.

Table 2. Notation used in formula (3)

μ_0	Mean vector of process when it is in control	T_S	Expected time to sample and chart one item
μ_1	Mean vector of process when it is out of control	C_0	Quality cost per time unit when the process is in control
Σ	Covariance matrix of process	C_1	Quality cost per time unit when the process is out of control
λ	Process failure rate	C_F	Cost per false alarm which includes the costs of searching and testing for the cause
h	Sampling interval	C_{LR}	Cost for locating and repairing the assignable cause when one exists
n	Sample size	a	Fixed cost of sampling
T_{LR}	Expected time to locate and repair the assignable cause	b	Variable cost of sampling

The most basic static control charts in the univariate and mutivarite cases are Shewhart-type control charts, which are called \bar{X} and T^2 charts, respectively. Let $\mathbf{X}_j = (X_{j1}, \dots, X_{jq})'$ be the j th observation vector in a sample of size n collected at a sampling epoch and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ be the sample mean of random vectors $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$. Then, for a T^2 chart the criterion to stop the process is as follows:

$$T^2 := n(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mu_0)' \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mu_0) > \text{UCL}^2$$

where UCL is a preset control limit, $\text{UCL} > 0$. For $q = 1$ and random variables X_1, \dots, X_n , this criterion is equivalent to

$$\left| \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \right| > \text{UCL},$$

which shows the equivalence of \bar{X} and T^2 charts in the univariate case. From this equivalence, in what follows, only T^2 charts are considered.

For the T^2 chart with control limit UCL, Type-I and Type-II error probabilities are calculated by

$$\alpha = \Pr\{T^2 > \text{UCL} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0\}, \beta = 1 - \Pr\{T^2 > \text{UCL} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_1\}.$$

These values can be easily computed since T^2 follows the chi-square distribution with q degrees of freedom when the process is in control, and otherwise follows the non-central chi-square distribution with q degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\gamma = n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)$, whose density function is given by

$$h(x) = e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{\gamma}{2})^i}{i!} g_{q+2i}(x)$$

where $g_k(x)$ is the density function of the central chi-square distribution with k degrees of freedom.

Using the formula proposed by Lorenzen and Vance (1986), the objective function can be explicitly obtained for T^2 charts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta) = & \left\{ \frac{C_0}{\lambda} + C_1 \left[-\tau + nT_S + h \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) \right] + C_F s \alpha + C_{LR} \right. \\ & \left. + \left[\frac{a + bn}{h} \right] \left[\frac{1}{\lambda} - \tau + nT_S + h \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) \right] \right\} \div \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda} - \tau + nT_S + h \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) + T_{LR} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where s and τ are auxiliary parameters computed by

$$s = \frac{e^{-\lambda h}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda h})}, \tau = \frac{1 - (1 + \lambda h)e^{-\lambda h}}{\lambda(1 - e^{-\lambda h})},$$

and the other notation is defined in Table 1. Using the above formula one can accurately find the optimal control limit UCL by direct search with desired precision in a reasonable time.

Carefully note that, despite the claim of Lorenzen and Vance (1986), the formula (3) cannot be adjusted by using ARLs (Average Run Lengths) for memory-type control charts, such as EWMA and Bayesian charts whose statistics at different sampling epochs may be dependent (Ahmadi-Javid & Ebadi, 2017). Even if the adjusted formula suggested by Lorenzen and Vance (1986) was correct, the ARLs should be estimated by simulation.

Bayes' theorem implies that the posterior probability Π_{mh} at sampling epoch mh can be recursively expressed by

$$\Pi_{mh} = \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda h}(1 - \Pi_{(m-1)h})}{1 - e^{-\lambda h}(1 - \Pi_{(m-1)h})(1 - e^{(nd^2 + Z_m)/2})}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

where $\Pi_0 = 0$, d is the Mahalanobis distance (M-distance) between the vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$, defined as

$$d := \sqrt{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)},$$

and $Z_m = 2 \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_j - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)$ is a statistic, whose distribution follows $N(0, 4nd^2)$ and $N(-2nd^2, 4nd^2)$ when the process is in control and out of control, respectively (Makis, 2008). The criterion to stop the process by a Bayesian chart at time epoch mh is

$$\Pi_{mh} > p$$

where p is a preset control limit, $0 < p < 1$.

The formula (3) cannot be adjusted to compute the objective function in (1) for Bayesian charts as they are memory-type. Therefore, here we use a simulation model implemented in MATLAB to accurately estimate objective (1) for Bayesian control charts (the simulation model is available online at the link <https://www.dropbox.com/s/36ngqre7m2dbk8i/SimulationCodeBayesian.m?dl=0>). Using this simulation model, the objective function in (1) can be approximated by

$$f(\theta) \approx \hat{f}_N(\theta) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N cc_i(\theta)}{\sum_{i=1}^N ct_i(\theta)} \quad (4)$$

where $cc_i(\theta)$ and $ct_i(\theta)$ denote the observed cost and time of the i th simulated cycle, respectively; and where N is the number of simulated cycles. From the strong law of large numbers and the identity given in (2), the statistic $\hat{f}_N(\theta)$ almost surely converges to $f(\theta)$ when both $\text{var}(CC(\theta))$ and $\text{var}(CT(\theta))$ are finite, which is the case for control charts θ considered in this note. Hence, for sufficiently large N , the estimated value has any desired accuracy. We will discuss the validity of the

simulation model and the accuracy level of its resulting values after presenting our numerical study below.

The simulation model enables us to determine the optimal control limit p by direct search. Recall that we cannot use the method proposed by Makis (2008) because we will show that this method works incorrectly in the next section.

Table 3. Data of 36 benchmark instances in the univariate and multivariate cases

Instance	a	b	C_F	C_{LR}	C_0	C_1	T_S	T_{LR}	λ	d
$U_1 M_1$	0.5	0.1	50	25	100	250	0.05	2	0.01	0.5
$U_2 M_2$	0.5	0.1	50	25	200	500	0.5	20	0.05	0.5
$U_3 M_3$	0.5	0.1	500	250	100	250	0.5	20	0.01	2
$U_4 M_4$	0.5	0.1	500	250	200	500	0.05	2	0.05	2
$U_5 M_5$	0.5	1	50	25	100	250	0.5	2	0.05	2
$U_6 M_6$	0.5	1	50	25	200	500	0.05	20	0.01	2
$U_7 M_7$	0.5	1	500	250	100	250	0.05	20	0.05	0.5
$U_8 M_8$	0.5	1	500	250	200	500	0.5	2	0.01	0.5
$U_9 M_9$	5	0.1	50	25	100	250	0.05	20	0.05	2
$U_{10} M_{10}$	5	0.1	50	25	200	500	0.5	2	0.01	2
$U_{11} M_{11}$	5	0.1	500	250	100	250	0.5	2	0.05	0.5
$U_{12} M_{12}$	5	0.1	500	250	200	500	0.05	20	0.01	0.5
$U_{13} M_{13}$	5	1	50	25	100	250	0.5	20	0.01	0.5
$U_{14} M_{14}$	5	1	50	25	200	500	0.05	2	0.05	0.5
$U_{15} M_{15}$	5	1	500	250	100	250	0.05	2	0.01	2
$U_{16} M_{16}$	5	1	500	250	200	500	0.5	20	0.05	2
$U_{17} M_{17}$	0.5	0.1	50	25	10	100	0.05	4	0.01	0.5
$U_{18} M_{18}$	0.5	0.1	50	25	10	100	0.05	4	0.01	2

We now present a numerical study to show that Shewhart-type control charts can outperform Bayesian control charts proposed by Makis (2008). Table 3 entails the details of 18 process scenarios taken from the literature to create 36 instances in both univariate and multivariate cases. Instances $U_1|M_1$ to $U_{16}|M_{16}$ are adapted from 16 process scenarios considered by Molnau et al. (2001), while instances $U_{17}|M_{17}$ and $U_{18}|M_{18}$ are adapted from two process scenarios used in some old papers such as Montgomery et al. (1995). Similarly as in Makis (2008), in all instances, the sampling parameters

are set as $h = 1.5, n = 1$. In the univariate case, for instances U_1 to U_{18} the in-control mean and standard deviation are set as $\mu_0 = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$. In the multivariate case, for instances M_1 to M_{18} based on Makis (2008) we set $q = 2$ with the following in-control mean vector and covariance matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = (0,0)', \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The column " d " represents the values of mean shifts $|\mu_0 - \mu_1|$ in the univariate case, and the M-distance value in the multivariate case.

To expedite the direct-search optimization procedure, the upper control limit p was allowed to be integer multiples of 0.01 between 0 and 1, and the UCL of \bar{X} or T^2 charts was also considered to be integer multiples of 0.1 between 0 and 10. To compute objective function in (1) for the \bar{X} or T^2 charts the formula (3) was used, while for Bayesian charts, the simulation model and the formula (4) were used.

All runs were performed on a PC with Intel Core(TM)2 Quad CPU (Q8400), 2.66 GHz and 4 GB RAM. The average time to perform 100,000 simulation runs for 100 values of p is about 34,884 seconds. Run times can be significantly decreased if the simulation model is implemented using more efficient programming languages, such as C and Fortran, which may be a less user-friendly option compared to using MATLAB. Our study also shows that run times have an inverse relationship with the magnitudes of the parameters d and λ .

Table 4 compares the optimal \bar{X} and univariate Bayesian control charts. From this table, it can be seen that for nine instances $U_1, U_2, U_7, U_8, U_{11}, U_{12}, U_{13}, U_{14}, U_{17}$ the optimal \bar{X} chart economically outperforms the optimal Bayesian chart. Table 5 also compares the optimal T^2 and multivariate Bayesian control charts. This table similarly shows that for seven instances $M_1, M_7, M_8, M_{12}, M_{13}, M_{14}, M_{17}$ the optimal T^2 chart has a smaller cost than the optimal Bayesian control chart. One can see that for all of these 16 instances, the shift values are the small one, $d = 0.5$. This indicates that memory-type control charts such as Bayesian charts do not necessarily perform better in detecting small shifts.

In Table 4, the optimal Bayesian policy is determined based on different numbers of simulated cycles N , varying from 10,000 to 1,000,000. One can see that for $N \geq 100,000$ the optimal control limits remain unchanged and the absolute differences between estimated cost values for $N = 100,000$ and $N = 1,000,000$ is less than 0.17. Hence, $N = 100,000$ is sufficiently large to have accurate estimated results. As a result, the values reported in Table 5 were obtained only for $N = 100,000$.

To validate the correctness of our simulation model, as well as to double-check the accuracy level for $N = 100,000$, Tables 4 and 5 compare the cost values estimated by (4) and the exact cost values obtained by the formula (3) for the optimal \bar{X} and T^2 charts. This comparison again shows that estimated cost values are very close to the original values with absolute errors less than 0.1, so one can make sure that the simulation model works correctly and the estimated cost values are adequately accurate.

Table 4. Comparison of optimal univariate Bayesian and \bar{X} charts ($N = 100,000$).

Instance	Bayesian control chart										\bar{X} chart			Deviation percentage between costs of optimal univariate Bayesian and \bar{X} charts (%)
	$N = 10,000$		$N = 20,000$		$N = 100,000$		$N = 500,000$		$N = 1,000,000$		Optimal control limit UCL	Exact optimal cost by (3)	Estimated optimal cost, $N = 100,000$	
	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost				
U_1	0.23	115.7744	0.23	115.7644	0.25	115.8631	0.25	115.8203	0.25	115.7826	1.3	112.2115	112.1365	3.15
U_2	0.13	127.4918	0.12	127.6473	0.08	127.9789	0.08	128.2238	0.08	128.0745	0.2	128.3188	128.4011	0.01
U_3	0.71	91.9308	0.64	92.0200	0.72	92.082	0.72	92.0808	0.72	92.055	2.6	95.0783	95.1052	-3.27
U_4	0.57	227.378	0.58	227.2876	0.56	227.8019	0.56	227.6849	0.56	227.6676	2	234.7104	234.7903	-3.04
U_5	0.24	107.6498	0.2	107.6231	0.2	107.6635	0.2	107.6491	0.2	107.6451	1.5	109.2737	109.3109	-1.49
U_6	0.08	173.5593	0.14	173.5794	0.09	173.7947	0.09	173.8278	0.09	173.8037	1.8	174.8296	174.8935	-0.59
U_7	0.73	109.6859	0.72	109.472	0.69	110.5560	0.69	110.5814	0.69	110.6012	1.5	105.7185	105.7149	4.12
U_8	0.6	262.6473	0.64	263.2302	0.61	263.3509	0.61	263.2902	0.61	263.2064	1.8	255.762	255.8208	2.88
U_9	0.17	59.7603	0.2	60.0536	0.19	60.308	0.19	60.4293	0.19	60.367	1.4	61.5145	61.5561	-1.85
U_{10}	0.11	207.5182	0.11	207.594	0.11	207.6232	0.11	207.6327	0.11	207.6301	1.8	208.7504	208.7545	-0.54
U_{11}	0.79	174.2434	0.83	173.9908	0.83	174.4787	0.83	174.5552	0.83	174.5992	1.6	172.4217	172.4658	1.25
U_{12}	0.6	229.4376	0.58	229.695	0.58	230.2572	0.58	230.0909	0.58	230.0957	1.7	221.81	221.7973	3.61
U_{13}	0.21	102.8313	0.28	102.8104	0.23	102.8503	0.23	102.8943	0.23	102.8649	1.2	99.635	99.6465	3.16
U_{14}	0.13	223.984	0.15	224.2273	0.13	224.3377	0.13	224.3202	0.13	224.2849	0.3	224.2201	224.1882	0.05
U_{15}	0.7	110.5042	0.7	110.5232	0.73	110.6129	0.73	110.6167	0.73	110.5711	2.6	113.985	113.9918	-3.05
U_{16}	0.4	135.133	0.49	135.5448	0.47	135.9659	0.47	136.0164	0.47	135.9675	1.9	140.5281	140.5138	-3.36
U_{17}	0.34	22.7044	0.34	22.8138	0.36	22.8965	0.36	22.8791	0.36	22.8715	1.4	20.272	20.3019	11.37
U_{18}	0.26	12.7971	0.33	12.8404	0.28	12.8454	0.28	12.8414	0.28	12.8421	2.1	13.5168	13.5125	-5.25

Table 5. Comparison of optimal multivariate Bayesian and T^2 charts ($N = 100,000$).

Instance	Optimal Bayesian chart		Optimal T^2 chart			Deviation percentage between optimal costs of multivariate Bayesian and T^2 charts (%)
	Optimal control limit p	Optimal cost	Optimal control limit UCL	Exact optimal cost by (3)	Estimated optimal cost	
M_1	0.24	115.7922	1.8	112.633	112.5964	2.73
M_2	0.11	127.8628	0.5	128.3293	128.2860	-0.36
M_3	0.65	92.0264	2.9	97.3044	97.2858	-5.74
M_4	0.58	227.5824	2.4	242.2665	242.3154	-6.45
M_5	0.22	107.6107	1.9	111.0332	111.031	-3.18
M_6	0.1	173.6736	2.1	176.0648	176.0986	-1.38
M_7	0.74	110.0987	1.9	107.3582	107.7394	2.49
M_8	0.64	263.4121	2.2	258.4578	258.3954	1.88
M_9	0.18	60.2712	1.8	62.6657	62.7122	-3.97
M_{10}	0.12	207.6264	2.2	210.1279	210.1499	-1.2
M_{11}	0.82	174.554	2.1	174.7514	174.7394	-0.11
M_{12}	0.58	230.1549	2.2	224.452	224.4430	2.48
M_{13}	0.23	102.8634	1.7	99.9902	99.9598	2.79
M_{14}	0.14	224.322	0.8	224.2872	224.2898	0.02
M_{15}	0.71	110.5764	2.9	116.4523	116.4722	-5.31
M_{16}	0.48	135.8226	2.3	145.6523	145.6273	-7.24
M_{17}	0.35	22.8479	1.9	20.6512	20.6133	9.61
M_{18}	0.3	12.8397	2.5	14.2119	14.2117	-10.69

Table 6. Comparisons between optimal solutions reported by Makis (2008) and the actual optimal solutions ($N = 100,000$)

Instance	d^2	C_1	Results reported by Makis (2008)				Optimal policy			
			Reported optimal control limit p	Reported optimal cost	Actual cost for reported optimal control limit p	Deviation percentage between reported and actual costs (%)	Actual optimal control limit p	Deviation percentage between actual and reported optimal control limits (%)	Actual Optimal cost	Deviation percentage between actual optimal cost and actual cost for reported optimal control limit (%)
I_1	0.5	5	0.66	1.84	2.5095	26.68	0.91	27.47	2.0898	20.08
I_2		10	0.49	2.41	3.7233	35.27	0.81	39.51	2.925	27.29
I_3		15	0.4	2.88	4.7684	39.60	0.74	45.95	3.6662	30.06
I_4		30	0.26	4.03	7.3894	45.46	0.6	56.67	5.5051	34.23
I_5		45	0.2	4.97	9.4686	47.51	0.48	58.33	7.0034	35.20
I_6	1	5	0.74	1.65	1.8588	11.23	0.89	16.85	1.7455	6.49
I_7		10	0.57	2.07	2.5135	17.64	0.77	25.97	2.2916	9.68
I_8		15	0.47	2.43	3.0918	21.41	0.77	38.96	2.7722	11.53
I_9		30	0.32	3.35	4.5415	26.24	0.62	48.39	4.0195	12.99
I_{10}		45	0.24	4.13	5.8424	29.31	0.51	52.94	5.0709	15.21
I_{11}	2	5	0.8	1.48	1.5366	3.68	0.92	13.04	1.5153	1.41
I_{12}		10	0.65	1.77	1.9028	6.98	0.81	19.75	1.8508	2.81
I_{13}		15	0.55	2.03	2.2327	9.08	0.69	20.29	2.1561	3.55
I_{14}		30	0.38	2.7	3.0861	12.51	0.57	33.33	2.9476	4.70
I_{15}		45	0.3	3.28	3.8048	13.79	0.46	34.78	3.651	4.21
I_{16}	3	5	0.83	1.4	1.427	1.89	0.88	5.68	1.4161	0.77
I_{17}		10	0.69	1.63	1.6894	3.52	0.8	13.75	1.6682	1.27
I_{18}		15	0.6	1.84	1.9238	4.36	0.67	10.45	1.8973	1.40
I_{19}		30	0.42	2.37	2.543	6.80	0.53	20.75	2.4961	1.88
I_{20}		45	0.33	2.84	3.0866	7.99	0.48	31.25	3.019	2.24

3. Incorrectness of the algorithm proposed by Makis (2008)

In this section, the simulation-based optimization method used in the previous section is applied to show that the algorithm proposed by Makis (2008) to determine the optimal control limit p of a Bayesian control chart does not work correctly. Makis (2008) reported the optimal control limits and objective functions for 20 instances, which are tabulated in Table 6. In all instances, $a = 0.5$, $b = 0.1$, $h = 1.5$, $n = 1$, $\lambda = 0.01$, $C_0 = 0$, $T_{LR} = T_S = 0$, $C_F = 50$, and $C_{LR} = 75$.

Table 6 provides the deviation percentages between the actual costs for optimal control limits reported by Makis (2008), obtained using our simulation method for $N = 100,000$, and the costs reported by Makis (2008). This comparison clearly reveals that the reported costs are not correct as the deviation percentages are values from 1.89% to 47.51%. This means that the procedure used by Makis (2008) to compute the cost for a given control limit is not correct.

Table 6 also presents the deviation percentages between the actual optimal control limits computed by simulation-based optimization and those reported by Makis (2008). The deviation percentages are considerably large, varying from 5.68% to 58.33%. Moreover, the deviation percentages between the optimal costs and the actual costs of the control limits reported by Makis range from 0.77% to 35.20%. These observations clearly show that the algorithm proposed by Makis (2008) does not work correctly.

Unfortunately, we cannot determine why this algorithm works incorrectly, but we guess that, if the algorithm is designed correctly, the discretization that is required to compute the recursive value functions at sampling epochs should be the main source of errors. Actually, we can only suggest the usage of our simulation-based optimization method as an alternative that can successfully determine the optimal limits in reasonable times. Moreover, using this method enables one to easily consider more complex modeling assumptions under other desired objective functions.

4. Conclusions

Our findings highlight the importance of simulation-based optimization. Considering that the number of decision variables in the economic design of a quality control chart is typically less than three, and the corresponding objective functions are complex expectations, simulation-based optimization may be the only available accurate method to determine the optimal decisions. One should note that control-chart decisions are generally considered tactical, and consequently the decision maker has enough time to carefully optimize them using simulation-based optimization.

As the algorithm proposed by Makis (2008) works incorrectly, developing efficient analytical algorithms to find the optimal control limits in Bayesian charts still remains as a future research direction. This note suggests that the correctness and accuracy level of any analytical algorithm in economic design of control charts should be checked by a simulation model so that a similar error does not reoccur.

Another important open area is to characterize the class of optimal quality control charts for the continuous-time production setting considered in Makis (2008), and many other papers with slight differences. For this setting, we guess that the current Bayesian charts cannot be optimal. The reason is that Girshick and Rubin (1952) and Taylor (1965) showed that these Bayesian charts were not optimal even for their discrete-time production setting with non-100% inspection.

References

- Ahmadi-Javid, A., & Ebadi, M. (2017). Economic design of memory-type control charts: The fallacy of the formula proposed by Lorenzen and Vance (1986). [arXiv:1708.06160](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06160).
- Calabrese, J. M. (1995). Bayesian process control for attributes. *Management Science*, 41(4), 637-645.

- Girshick, M. A., & Rubin, H. (1952). A Bayes approach to a quality control model. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(1), 114-125.
- Lorenzen, T. J., & Vance, L. C. (1986). The economic design of control charts: A unified approach. *Technometrics*, 28(1), 3-10.
- Makis, V. (2008). Multivariate Bayesian control chart. *Operations Research*, 56(2), 487-496.
- Makis, V. (2009). Multivariate Bayesian process control for a finite production run. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 194(3), 795-806.
- Molnau, W. E., Montgomery, D. C., & Runger, G. C. (2001). Statistically constrained economic design of the multivariate exponentially weighted moving average control chart. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 17(1), 39-49.
- Montgomery, D. C., Torng, J. C., Cochran, J. K., & Lawrence, F. P. (1995). Statistically constrained economic design of the EWMA control chart. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 27(3), 250-256.
- Nikolaidis, Y., & Tagaras, G. (2017). New indices for the evaluation of the statistical properties of Bayesian \bar{x} control charts for short runs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 259(1), 280-292.
- Tagaras, G. (1994). A dynamic programming approach to the economic design of X-charts. *IIE transactions*, 26(3), 48-56.
- Taylor III, H. M. (1965). Markovian sequential replacement processes. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(6), 1677-1694.
- Taylor, H. M. (1967). Statistical control of a Gaussian process. *Technometrics*, 9(1), 29-41.
- Wang, J., & Lee, C. G. (2015). Multistate Bayesian control chart over a finite horizon. *Operations Research*, 63(4), 949-964.