

AD-R181 394


INFERENCE AND PREDICTION FOR A GENERAL ORDER STATISTIC
MODEL WITH UNKNOWN POPULATION SIZE(U) WASHINGTON UNIV
SEATTLE DEPT OF STATISTICS A E RAFTERY AUG 86 TR-88
N00014-84-C-0169


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/3

NL





DTIC FILE COPY

2

AD-A181 354

INFERENCE AND PREDICTION
FOR A GENERAL ORDER STATISTIC MODEL
WITH UNKNOWN POPULATION SIZE

ARSHAN S. RAFTERY

DTIC
COLLECTED
SERIALS
SECTION

TECHNICAL REPORT No. 23
August 1981

Department of Statistics, GN-22
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98194 USA

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 88	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Inference and prediction for a general order statistic model with unknown population size		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED TR 12/86 - 6/88
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Adrian E. Raftery		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-84-C-0169
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Statistics, GN-22 University of Washington Seattle, WA 98195		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR-661-003
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS ONR Code N63374 1107 NE 45th Street Seattle, WA 98105		12. REPORT DATE August 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 23
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/ DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Bayes empirical Bayes; Bayes factor; Non-nested models; Pareto order statistic model; Software reliability; Weibull order statistic model		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Suppose that the first n order statistics from a random sample of N positive random variables are observed, where N is unknown. A Bayes empirical Bayes approach to inference is presented. This permits the comparison of competing, perhaps non-nested, models in a natural way, and also provides easily implemented inference and prediction procedures which avoid the difficulties of non-Bayesian methods. Applications to three software reliability data sets indicate that the much-used / CONTINUED ...		

exponential order statistic model may give rather optimistic estimates of system reliability, while the, not previously considered, Weibull order statistic model seems promising for such applications.

Inference and Prediction for a General Order Statistic Model With Unknown Population Size

Adrian E. Raftery

Department of Statistics, GN-22,
University of Washington,
Seattle, WA 98195.

ABSTRACT

Suppose that the first n order statistics from a random sample of N positive random variables are observed, where N is unknown. A Bayes empirical Bayes approach to inference is presented. This permits the comparison of competing, perhaps non-nested, models in a natural way, and also provides easily implemented inference and prediction procedures which avoid the difficulties of non-Bayesian methods. Applications to three software reliability data sets indicate that the much-used exponential order statistic model may give rather optimistic estimates of system reliability, while the, not previously considered, Weibull order statistic model seems promising for such applications.

KEY WORDS: Bayes empirical Bayes; Bayes factor; Non-nested models; Pareto order statistic model; Software reliability; Weibull order statistic model.



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Adrian E. Raftery is Associate Professor of Statistics and Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research under contract N00014-84-C-0169. I am grateful to W.S. Jewell for helpful discussions, and to Peter Guttorp for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose X_1, \dots, X_N is a random sample of positive random variables from a distribution with *probability density function* (pdf) at x equal to $\beta f_{\theta}(\beta x)$. Here β is a scalar precision parameter, θ is a, possibly vector, shape parameter, and N is unknown. In applications, X_i is often a length of time, such as a lifelength, and $X_i = x$ corresponds to the occurrence of an event at time x . I shall use this temporal imagery without further explanation.

The first n order statistics, $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$, are observed, where $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq T$. T is the period of observation: there is no X_i such that $t_n < X_i \leq T$. Inference is to be made about the unknown parameters, and future observations are to be predicted.

I shall call this the *general order statistic* (GOS) model. Special cases have been proposed as models for market penetration and capture-recapture studies (Anscombe 1961), burn-in in repairable systems (Bazovsky 1961, chap. 8; Cozzolino 1968), software reliability growth (Jelinski and Moranda 1972; Littlewood 1981), estimating the number of individuals exposed to radiation (Hoel 1968), and estimating the number of unseen species (Efron and Thisted 1976, and references therein).

Perhaps the simplest special case is the *exponential order statistic* (EOS) model where $f_{\theta}(x) = \exp(-x)$, statistical analysis of which has been extensively studied (Blumenthal and Marcus 1975; Forman and Singpurwalla 1977; Goudie and Goldie 1981; Jewell 1985; Joe and Reid 1985; Raftery 1986a). It has been used extensively as a simple, physical, debugging model for software reliability. In this context it is often called the Jelinski-Moranda model, and is based on the assumption that a system has N faults, each of which causes a failure of the system, and is

then located and removed; the times at which the N failures occur are independent and identically distributed exponential random variables. However, the examples in Section 6 show that it may give rather optimistic estimates of system reliability.

The EOS model can be generalised by assuming that X_1, \dots, X_n are independent exponential random variables with different means $\xi_1^{-1}, \dots, \xi_N^{-1}$, where ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N is itself a random sample from a distribution with pdf at ξ equal to $\beta^{-1}w_\theta(\xi\beta^{-1})$. This is a special case of the GOS model, where

$$f_\theta(x) = \int y w_\theta(y) \exp(-xy) dy \quad (1.1)$$

Miller (1986) has pointed out that many proposed software reliability models are, in fact, of this form. When the ξ_i have a gamma distribution, the X_i have a Pareto distribution. This, the *Pareto order statistic* (POS) model, is discussed in more detail in Section 5.2.

I adopt a Bayes empirical Bayes approach (Deely and Lindley 1981) to the problem of inference for the GOS model. This has the advantage of permitting comparisons between competing, perhaps non-nested, models for $f_\theta(x)$ in a natural way (Section 2), as well as providing easily implemented inference and prediction procedures which avoid the difficulties of non-Bayesian methods (Section 3). One such difficulty is that the maximum likelihood estimator of N may be infinite. Indeed, Goudie and Goldie (1981) concluded that for the special case they considered, all standard non-Bayesian point estimation techniques are liable to fail. Attention is paid to the situation where vague prior information about the model parameters is approximated by limiting, improper, prior forms.

Some analytic simplification is possible for the *Weibull order statistic* (WOS) model, where the X_i have a Weibull distribution (Section 5.1). The examples in Section 6 suggest that this model may be promising for software reliability applications, for which it has not previously been considered.

2. MODEL COMPARISON

Consider the GOS model described in Section 1. In this section and the next one I assume that θ is known and omit it from the notation; this assumption is relaxed in Section 4. I assume that N has a Poisson distribution in the GOS model; this defines an empirical Bayes model in the sense of Morris (1983).

It is equivalent to a non-homogeneous Poisson process with $\lambda(s)$, the intensity function at time s , given by $\lambda(s) = \rho f(\beta s)$ ($\rho > 0$). The likelihood is

$$p(t | \rho, \beta) = \rho^n \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(\beta t_i) \right\} \exp\{-\rho \beta^{-1} F(\beta T)\} \quad (2.1)$$

where $F(x) = \int_0^x f(y) dy$.

Consider the problem of comparing competing, perhaps non-nested, models for $f(x)$, M_1 and M_2 , say. Such comparisons will be based on the *Bayes factor*, or ratio of posterior to prior odds for M_1 against M_2 ,

$$B_{12} = p(t | M_1) / p(t | M_2) \quad (2.2)$$

the ratio of the marginal likelihoods. In (2.2),

$$p(t | M_i) = \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} p(t | \rho, \beta, M_i) p(\rho, \beta | M_i) d\rho d\beta \quad (i=1,2) \quad (2.3)$$

If the priors $p(\rho, \beta | M_i)$ ($i=1,2$) are proper, (2.2) can be evaluated directly.

I now develop an expression for B_{12} in the situation where vague prior knowledge is approximated by limiting, improper, prior forms. This is done by comparing M_1 and M_2 in turn with the constant rate Poisson process, $M_0: \lambda(s) = \mu$, which is nested within each of M_1 and M_2 . This yields Bayes factors B_{01} and B_{02} , where

$$B_{0i} = p(t | M_0) / p(t | M_i) \quad (i=1,2) \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$p(t | M_0) = \int_0^{\infty} p(t | \mu, M_0) p(\mu | M_0) d\mu \quad (2.5)$$

Then $B_{12} = B_{01} / B_{02}$. Comparison of M_0 with M_i using (2.4) may itself be of interest. For example, in the software reliability context, it provides a test of whether the system is, indeed, being debugged.

I use the standard vague prior for μ ,

$$p(\mu | M_0) = c_0 \mu^{-1} \quad (2.6)$$

(Jaynes 1968), and consider the evaluation of B_{01} . In order to provide a satisfactory approximation for vague prior knowledge over all scales, the prior distribution of (ρ, β) should yield a Bayes factor B_{01} which is *time-invariant*, i.e. invariant to scale changes in the time variable.

Theorem 1: B_{01} is time-invariant if and only if there is a function $\phi(\cdot)$ such that

$$p(\rho, \beta | M_1) = c_1 \rho^{-2} \phi(\rho^{-1} \beta) \quad (2.7)$$

Proof: Suppose B_{01} is time-invariant. By (2.6)

$$p(t | M_0) = c_0 (n-1)! T^{-n} \quad (2.8)$$

Using (2.1), and substituting ρT for ρ and βT for β in (2.3), and then dividing the result into (2.8), yields, by (2.4),

$$B_{01} = c_{01} \left[\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \rho^n \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(\beta u_i) \right\} \exp\{-\rho \beta^{-1} F(\beta)\} T^{-2} p(\rho T^{-1}, \beta T^{-1} | M_1) d\rho d\beta \right]^{-1} \quad (2.9)$$

Thus

$$T^{-2} p(\rho T^{-1}, \beta T^{-1} | M_1) = p(\rho, \beta | M_1) \quad (\rho, \beta, T > 0) \quad (2.10)$$

Setting $T = \rho$ in (2.10) yields (2.7), where $\phi(x) = p(\rho=1, \beta=x | M_1)$. Also, when (2.7) holds, the time-invariance of B_{01} follows by direct substitution in (2.9). This completes the proof.

If the prior is to be asymptotically non-increasing in ρ and β , then, by Theorem 1, $\phi(x)$ must be bounded above by γ_1 and below by $\gamma_2 x^{-2}$ for x sufficiently large, where γ_1 and γ_2 are positive constants. Consider now the case where the likelihood (2.1) is of exponential family form, so that

$$f(\beta x) = \exp \left\{ a(\beta) + a(x) + \sum_{j=1}^J (\beta x)^{d_j} + \text{const.} \right\} \quad (2.11)$$

This is quite a general family, and includes, for example, the gamma and Weibull distributions.

By (2.1), a natural family of conjugate prior distributions is

$$p(\rho, \beta | M_1) = c_1 \exp \{k_0 a(\beta) + \sum_{j=1}^J k_j \beta^{d_j}\} \rho^{k_{j+1}} \exp \{-k_{j+2} F(\beta T)\} \quad (2.12)$$

By Theorem 1, the unique prior of the form (2.12) which is independent of T and yields time-invariant Bayes factors for all models of the form (2.11) is

$$p(\rho, \beta | M_1) = c_1 \rho^{-2} \quad (2.13)$$

This prior is also independent of the shape parameter.

It follows from (2.9) that, with the priors (2.6) and (2.13), the Bayes factor has the form

$$B_{01} = c_{01} (n-1) h(u)^{-1} \quad (2.14)$$

where $c_{01} = c_0 / c_1$, $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$, $u_i = t_i / T$ ($i=1, \dots, n$), and

$$h(u) = \int_0^{\infty} y^{n-1} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(yu_i) \right\} F(y)^{-(n-1)} dy \quad (2.15)$$

However, (2.14) involves the arbitrary, undefined, multiplicative constant c_{01} , which appears because the priors used are improper. Akman and Raftery (1986a) have shown how this may be assigned using the minimal imaginary training sample idea of Spiegelhalter and Smith (1982). This consists of imagining that a data set is available which involves the smallest possible sample size permitting a comparison of M_0 and M_1 , and provides maximum possible support for M_0 . It is then argued that the resulting Bayes factor, B_{01} , should be only slightly greater than one. Raftery and Akman (1986) have applied this approach to the change-point Poisson process; their results may be compared with the non-Bayesian solution of Akman and Raftery (1986b). This approach has also been applied to log-linear models for contingency tables by Raftery (1986b).

In the present situation, the appropriate imaginary data set consists of two observations at the same value, $u = (u_1, u_2) = (v, v)$, where v is chosen so as to maximise the value of B_{01} in (2.14). In practice, in all the examples considered, B_{01} is maximised at either $v=1$ or $v=0$. When B_{01} is maximised at $v=0$, however, the maximum value is infinite. In such cases, I use the local maximum at $v=1$, because this corresponds, in the software reliability situation, for example, to the data set which suggests most strongly that the system is not being debugged. This yields

$$c_{01} \approx \int_0^{\infty} y f(y)^2 F(y)^{-1} dy \quad (2.16)$$

Strictly speaking, any value of B_{12} less than one suggests that the data provide evidence against M_1 for M_2 . However, as a rough order of magnitude interpretation, Jeffreys (1961, Appendix B) has suggested that the evidence should be regarded as strong only if $B_{12} < 10^{-1}$, and as decisive only if $B_{12} < 10^{-2}$.

3. ESTIMATION AND PREDICTION

I now consider estimation of N , and prediction of future observations for the GOS model. The framework developed in Section 2 is used. It follows from (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} p(N, \beta) &= \int_0^{\infty} p(N | \rho, \beta) p(\rho, \beta) d\rho \\ &\propto \{N(N-1)\}^{-1} \beta^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Also,

$$p(t | N, \beta) = \{N!/(N-n)!\} \beta^n \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(\beta t_i) \right\} \bar{F}(\beta T)^{N-n} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$. Combining (3.1) with (3.2) and integrating over β yields the posterior distribution of the number of unobserved variables $M = N - n$,

$$p(M | t) \propto \{(M+n-2)!/M!\} g(u, M) \quad (M=0, 1, \dots) \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$g(u, M) = \int_0^{\infty} y^{n-1} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(y u_i) \right\} \bar{F}(y)^M dy \quad (3.4)$$

Point estimators of N may be obtained by combining (3.3) with an appropriate loss function; examples are the posterior mode and the posterior median. However, experience with the simple EOS model indicates that point estimators of N are liable to perform badly (Raftery 1986a). Interval estimators of N , such as highest posterior density regions, can readily be found from (3.3), and may well be more useful.

Various prediction problems may be of interest, and can be solved, often quite easily, using the present approach. One example is finding the probability, given the data, that there is no X_i such that $T < X_i < T+z$. In the software reliability context, this is the current reliability of the system for a task of length z . If $Z = t_{n+1} - T$, where $t_{N+1} = \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P[Z > z | t] &= \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} P[Z > z | t] p(M, \beta | t) d\beta \\ &= P[M=0 | t] + \{T/(T+x)\}^n \sum_{M=1}^{\infty} \{g(uT/(T+x), M)/g(u, M)\} p(M | t) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

4. SHAPE PARAMETER UNKNOWN

Suppose now that the shape parameter θ in the GOS model is unknown. I continue to use the framework of Sections 2 and 3, but quantities which depend on θ are now written with a subscript θ . I know of no single prior which can provide a satisfactory approximation for vague prior knowledge about θ in all situations. I therefore assume that

$$p(\rho, \beta, \theta) = c_1 \rho^{-2} p(\theta) \quad (4.1)$$

where $p(\theta)$ is proper. I denote the set of possible values of θ by Θ .

The results of Sections 2 and 3 can be generalised to this situation by conditioning on θ and using the total probability law in an appropriate way. Thus (2.14) becomes

$$B_{01} = c_{01}(n-1)H(u)^{-1} \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$H(u) = \int_{\Theta} h_{\theta}(u) p(\theta) d\theta \quad (4.3)$$

and $h_{\theta}(u)$ is defined by (2.15). (2.16) becomes

$$c_{01} = \int_{\Theta} \int_0^{\infty} y f_{\theta}(y)^2 F_{\theta}(y)^{-1} dy p(\theta) d\theta \quad (4.4)$$

For estimation of N , (3.3) becomes

$$p(M | t) \propto \{(M+n-2)!/M!\} G(u, M) \quad (M=0, 1, \dots) \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$G(u, M) = \int_{\Theta} g_{\theta}(u, M) p(\theta) d\theta \quad (4.6)$$

and $g_{\theta}(u, M)$ is defined by (3.4).

For the prediction problem considered in Section 3, (3.5) becomes

$$P[Z > z | t] = P[M=0 | t] + \{T/(T+x)\}^n \sum_{M=1}^{\infty} \{G(uT/(T+x), M) \gamma G(u, M)\} p(M | t) \quad (4.7)$$

5. SPECIAL CASES

5.1 The Weibull Order Statistic (WOS) Model

Among commonly used models for positive random variables, the Weibull distribution yields some analytic simplification of the results in Section 4. The WOS model is defined by setting

$$f_{\theta}(x) = \theta x^{\theta-1} \exp(-x^{\theta}) \quad (\theta > 0) \quad (5.1)$$

in the GOS model. Then B_{01} is given by (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4), where

$$h_{\theta}(u) = \theta^{n-1} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n u_i\right)^{\theta-1} \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-y \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^{\theta}) \{y/(1-e^{-y})\}^{n-1} dy$$

and $c_{01} = (\frac{n}{\theta} - 1) E[\theta]$.

The solutions to the estimation and prediction problems are given by (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7),

where

$$g_{\theta}(u, M) \propto \theta^{n-1} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n u_i\right)^{\theta-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^{\theta} + M\right)^{-n}$$

5.2 The Pareto Order Statistic (POS) Model

Consider the POS model described in Section 1, where in (1.1),

$$w_{\theta}(y) = \Gamma(\theta)^{-1} y^{\theta-1} e^{-\theta y} \quad (5.2)$$

so that, by (1.1),

$$f_{\theta}(y) = \theta (1+y)^{-(\theta+1)} \quad (5.3)$$

B_{01} is again given by (4.2) and (4.3), where

$$h_{\theta}(u) = \theta^n \prod_{i=1}^n (1+\beta u_i)^{-(\theta+1)} \int_0^{\infty} y^{n-1} \{1-(1+y)^{-\theta}\}^{-(n-1)} dy$$

and (4.4) becomes

$$c_{01} = \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} y (1+y)^{-2(\theta+1)} \{1-(1+y)^{-\theta}\}^{-1} dy \theta^2 p(\theta) d\theta$$

The solutions to the estimation and prediction problems are somewhat simplified if a gamma prior for θ is used, namely, in (4.1),

$$p(\theta) \propto \theta^{\kappa_1-1} e^{-\kappa_2 \theta} \quad (5.4)$$

The solutions are given by (4.5) and (4.7), where

$$G(u, M) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n (1+\beta u_i)^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} y^{n-1} \left\{ \kappa_2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1+y u_i) + M \log(1+y) \right\}^{-(n+\kappa_1)} dy$$

Most of the integrals in this section, which require numerical evaluation, could be replaced by convergent infinite series. However, this was not found to be computationally advantageous.

6. EXAMPLES

I now apply the techniques proposed here to three, previously analyzed, software reliability data sets.

Example 1: Goel and Okumoto (1979) gave the 31 failure times of a piece of software developed as part of the Naval Tactical Data System. The Bayes factors for comparing the models considered in this paper are shown in Table 1. As explained in Section 2, these were obtained as quotients of the Bayes factors for the constant rate Poisson process against each of the models individually, given by (4.2). The necessary single and double numerical integrations were carried out using the IMSL routines DCADRE and DBLIN, respectively.

Table 1 about here

For the WOS model (5.1), only distributions with tails at least as heavy as exponential were considered, and $p(\theta)$ was taken to be uniform between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1. $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to a quite heavy-tailed distribution, while $\theta = 1$ is the exponential distribution. With this prior, the WOS model can be thought of as representing a situation where the bugs become harder to detect as the debugging process proceeds.

For the POS model (5.3), the prior distribution of θ was given by (5.4) with $\kappa_1 = 2$ and $\kappa_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, so that about 95% of the prior distribution of θ was concentrated between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 10. $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ in (5.2) corresponds to a heavy-tailed distribution for ξ_i , while $\theta = 10$ corresponds to a distribution for ξ_i which is close to normality.

Table 1 shows that no model performs markedly better than any other. Indeed, the EOS model, originally proposed for this data by Jelinski and Moranda (1972), seems quite acceptable.

Example 2: Meinhold and Singpurwalla (1983) gave the 136 failure times of a real-time command and control system, and analyzed them using the EOS model. The same priors are used as in Example 1. The Bayes factors in Table 1 suggest that the WOS model is better than both the EOS and POS models. The posterior distribution of M for the EOS and WOS models is shown in Figure 1, and salient features are summarised in Table 2. It appears that the EOS model substantially underestimates the number of faults still present.

Figure 1 about here

Table 2 about here

Example 3: Forman and Singpurwalla (1977) analyzed a data set consisting of 107 failures using the EOS model. The priors used are the same as in the first two examples. The data were grouped, and I distributed the failures randomly according to a uniform distribution over the time intervals in which they occurred. The conclusions of all the model comparisons were the same for each of four different sequences of random numbers used to distribute the failure times; the results reported here are for one of these.

The WOS model was again the preferred one. There were other signs of the inadequacy of the EOS model. For example, after 99 of the 107 recorded failures, the probability of eight or more failures occurring was less than 10^{-4} under the EOS model, but 0.18 under the WOS model.

The posterior distributions of the number of remaining faults under the EOS and WOS models are shown in Figure 2. The EOS model gave rather optimistic estimates of the state of the system. For example, under the EOS model, the probability of the system having been fully debugged was 0.95, while under the WOS model it was only 0.27.

Figure 2 about here

In addition to its capacity for representing slowly decreasing failure rates, the WOS model can also represent failure rates which increase and then decrease, when $\theta > 1$ in (5.1). This possibility has not been exploited here, but Littlewood and Verrall (1981) and Ascher and Feingold (1984, pp.110-111) have described software reliability data sets of which this is a feature.

REFERENCES

- Akman, V.E., and Raftery, A.E. (1986a), "Bayes Factors for Non-Homogeneous Poisson Processes With Vague Prior Information," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 48, no. 3, to appear.

- Akman, V.E., and Raftery, A.E. (1986b), "Asymptotic Inference for a Change-Point Poisson Process," *Annals of Statistics*, 14, no. 4, to appear.
- Anscombe, F.J. (1961), "Estimating a Mixed Exponential Response Law," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 56, 493-502.
- Ascher, H., and Feingold, H. (1984), *Repairable Systems Reliability*, New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Bazovsky, I. (1961), *Reliability Theory and Practice*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Blumenthal, S., and Marcus, R. (1975), "Estimating Population Size With Exponential Failure," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 70, 913-922.
- Cozzolino, J.M. (1968), "Probabilistic Models of Decreasing Failure Rate Processes," *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 15, 361-374.
- Deely, J.J., and Lindley, D.V. (1981), "Bayes Empirical Bayes," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76, 833-841.
- Efron, B., and Thisted, R. (1976), "Estimating the Number of Unseen Species: How Many Words did Shakespeare Know?" *Biometrika*, 63, 435-447.
- Forman, E.H., and Singpurwalla, N.D. (1977), "An Empirical Stopping Rule for Debugging and Testing Computer Software," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 72, 750-757.
- Goel, A.L., and Okumoto, K. (1979), "Time-Dependent Error-Detection Rate Model for Software Reliability and Other Performance Measures," *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, R-28, 206-211.
- Goudie, I.B.J., and Goldie, C.M. (1981), "Initial Size Estimation for the Linear Pure Death Process," *Biometrika*, 68, 543-550.

- Hoel, D.G. (1968), "Sequential Testing of Sample Size," *Technometrics*, 10, 331-341.
- Jaynes, E.T. (1968), "Prior Probabilities," *IEEE Transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, SSC-4, 227-241.
- Jeffreys, H. (1961), *Theory of Probability* (3rd ed.), Oxford: University Press.
- Jelinski, Z., and Moranda, P.B. (1972), "Software Reliability Research," in *Statistical Computer Performance Evaluation*, ed. W. Freiberger, London: Academic Press, pp.465-484.
- Jewell, W.S. (1985), "Bayesian Extensions to a Basic Model of Software Reliability," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, SE-12, 1465-1471.
- Joe, H., and Reid, N. (1985), "Estimating the Number of Faults in a System," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80, 222-226.
- Littlewood, B. (1981), "Stochastic Reliability Growth: A Model for Fault Removal in Computer Programs and Hardware Designs," *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, R-30, 313-320.
- Littlewood, B., and Verrall, J.L. (1981), "Likelihood Function of a Debugging Model for Computer Software Reliability," *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, R-30, 145-148.
- Meinhold, R.J., and Singpurwalla, N.D. (1983), "Bayesian Analysis of a Commonly Used Model for Describing Software Failures," *The Statistician*, 32, 168-173.
- Miller, D.R. (1986), "Exponential Order Statistic Models of Software Reliability Growth," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, SE-12, 12-24.
- Morris, C.N. (1983), "Parametric Empirical Bayes Inference: Theory and Applications (with Discussion)," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 78, 47-65.

Raftery, A.E. (1986a), "Analysis of a Simple Debugging Model," Technical Report No. 80,
Department of Statistics, University of Washington.

Raftery, A.E. (1986b), "A Note on Bayes Factors for Log-Linear Contingency Table Models
With Vague Prior Information," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 48, no. 2,
to appear.

Raftery, A.E., and Akman, V.E. (1986), "Bayesian Analysis of a Poisson Process With a
Change-Point," *Biometrika*, 73, 85-89.

Spiegelhalter, D.J., and Smith, A.F.M. (1982), "Bayes Factors for Linear and Log-Linear Models
With Vague Prior Information," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 44, 377-
387.

*Table 1. $\log_{10}(\text{Bayesfactor})$
for the model comparisons in Examples 1,2,3.*

<i>Comparison</i>	<i>Example</i>		
	1	2	3
EOS vs. WOS	.4	-3.7	-8.3
EOS vs. POS	-.1	-1.4	-5.8
WOS vs. POS	-.5	2.3	2.5

Table 2. Features of the posterior distribution of M , the number of remaining bugs, under the EOS and WOS models, in Examples 2 and 3.

Example	Model	Feature			
		Mode	Median	$P[M=0 t]$	95% HPDR
2	EOS	6	6.5	.01	1-16
	WOS	27	40.7	.00	6-122
3	EOS	0	.0	.95	0
	WOS	1	.9	.27	0-6

NOTE: 95% HPDR is the 95% highest posterior density region. $i-j$ denotes the set of integers from i to j inclusive.

Table 2. Features of the posterior distribution of M , the number of remaining bugs, under the EOS and WOS models, in Examples 2 and 3.

Example	Model	Feature			
		Mode	Median	$P[M=0 t]$	95% HPDR
2	EOS	6	6.5	.01	1-16
	WOS	27	40.7	.00	6-122
3	EOS	0	.0	.95	0
	WOS	1	.9	.27	0-6

NOTE: 95% HPDR is the 95% highest posterior density region. $i-j$ denotes the set of integers from i to j inclusive.

Captions for Figures 1 and 2:

Figure 1. Posterior distributions of M , the number of remaining bugs, in Example 2 under (a) the EOS model, and (b) the WOS model. The WOS model, which is favored by the data, estimates a much larger number of remaining bugs than the EOS model.

Figure 2. Posterior distributions of M in Example 3 under (a) the EOS model, and (b) the WOS model. Under the EOS model, almost the entire posterior distribution of M is concentrated at 0, while from the WOS model, which is favored by the data, it appears that there may be up to six remaining bugs with non-negligible probability.

Figure 1







Figure 2



END

7-87

Dttic