

Interval Prediction of Order Statistics Based on Records by Employing Inter-Record Times: A Study Under Two Parameter Exponential Distribution

Morteza Amini¹ and S.M.T.K. MirMostafae²

Abstract

In this note, we propose a parametric inferential procedure for predicting future order statistics, based on record values, which takes inter-record times into account. We utilize the additional information contained in inter-record times for predicting future order statistics on the basis of observed record values from an independent sample. The two parameter exponential distribution is assumed to be the underlying distribution.

1 Introduction

Suppose Y_1, \dots, Y_m are independent and identically distributed (iid) observations from an absolutely continuous cumulative distribution function (cdf) F , possessing probability density function (pdf) f . The order statistics of the sample Y_1, \dots, Y_m , represented by $Y_{1:m} < \dots < Y_{m:m}$, are obtained by arranging the sample in an increasing order. Order statistics have been used in a wide range of applications, including robust statistical estimation, detection of outliers, characterization of probability distributions, goodness-of-fit tests, entropy estimation, analysis of censored samples, reliability analysis, quality control and strength of materials. A useful survey of available results until 2003 is given in the book of David and Nagaraja (2003).

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be a sequence of iid random variables, independent of and identically distributed to Y_1 . An observation X_j is called an upper (lower) record value if its value exceeds (resp. falls below) those of all the previous observations, that is the n^{th} upper (resp. lower) record value, U_n (resp. L_n), is defined as X_{T_n} , where $T_1 = 1$, with probability 1, and $T_n = \min\{j : j > T_{n-1}, X_j > X_{T_{n-1}}\}$ (resp. $T_n = \min\{j : j > T_{n-1}, X_j < X_{T_{n-1}}\}$), for $n > 1$. Throughout this paper we

¹Department of Statistics, School of Mathematics, Statistics and computer Science, College of Science, University of Tehran, P.O. Box 14155-6455, Tehran, Iran; morteza.amini@ut.ac.ir

² Department of Statistics, Faculty of Mathematical Sciences, University of Mazandaran, P.O. Box 47416-1467, Babolsar, Iran; m.mirmostafae@umz.ac.ir

deal with upper record values for a predictive inference. Similar results can be obtained for the case of lower record values. The inter-record time statistic, defined as

$$\Delta_s = T_{s+1} - T_s, \quad s \geq 1,$$

is the number of observations between s^{th} and $(s + 1)^{\text{th}}$ record values. For more details we refer the reader to Arnold et al. (1998). Record data arise in a wide variety of practical situations including industrial stress testing, finance, meteorological analysis, hydrology, seismology, sporting and athletic events, and mining surveys.

The problem of predicting future observations has been extensively studied in the literature and several parametric and non-parametric procedures are developed for prediction. In many practical data-analytic situations, one is interested in constructing a prediction interval on the basis of available observations. There are situations in which the available observations and the predictable future observation are of the same type. The prediction of future records on the basis of observed records from the same distribution and prediction of order statistics based on order statistics are studied, among others, by Dunsmore (1983), Nagaraja (1984), Chou (1988), Awad and Raqab (2000), Raqab and Balakrishnan (2008) and the references therein.

Recently, Ahmadi and Balakrishnan (2010), Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009), Ahmadi et al. (2010) and MirMostafae and Ahmadi (2011), discussed the prediction of future records from a Y -sequence based on the order statistics observed from an independent X -sequence, and vice versa.

In predicting future order statistics on the basis of observed record statistics, sometimes the available observations also include inter-record times which can be utilized as additional information to improve the predictive inference. In other words, when both record values and the inter-record times are available, it would be nice to employ the information included in both records and record times. Feuerverger and Hall (1998) emphasized that "However, the record times and record values jointly contain considerably more information about F than the record values alone." Actually, applying the additional information about record times is not a new subject and several authors focused on inference based on both record values and record times, see for example Samaniego and Whitaker (1986), Lin et al. (2003), Doostparast (2009), Doostparast and Balakrishnan (2013), Kızılaslan and Nadar (2014) and MirMostafae et al. (2016).

In this paper, a two parameter exponential distribution, $Exp(\mu, \sigma)$, with pdf

$$f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} e^{-(x-\mu)/\sigma}, \quad x > \mu, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \sigma > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

is considered as the underlying distribution. We write $Z \sim Exp(\mu, \sigma)$ if the pdf of Z can be expressed as (1.1). Note that μ and σ are the location and scale parameters, respectively. Throughout this paper we assume that both parameters, μ and σ , are unknown.

Now, suppose that Y_1, \dots, Y_m constitute a future random sample from a two parameter exponential distribution, i.e. $Y_1, \dots, Y_m \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Exp(\mu, \sigma)$ and $Y_{1:m} < \dots < Y_{j:m}$ are the corresponding order statistics of this sample. In addition, $\bar{Y}_m = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m Y_{i:m}$ denotes the mean of this future sample. If Y_1, \dots, Y_m denote the times to failure of m independent units in a lifetime test, then \bar{Y}_m can be interpreted as the mean time on test of these failed units. We assume that the available data include the observed upper record

values, U_1, \dots, U_n , given the inter-record times, $(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{n-1})$. We emphasize that these record values are assumed to be extracted from a sequence of iid random variables $\{X_j, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ where $X_j \sim \text{Exp}(\mu, \sigma)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, the sequence $\{X_j, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ and the sample $\{Y_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}$ are statistically independent. Note that n is the number of the observed record values and depends on the experiment, however, m is the sample size of the future observations and it can be considered arbitrary. In addition, n and m are unrelated. The problem of interest is to obtain conditional prediction intervals for j^{th} future order statistic, $Y_{j:m}$, as well as for the mean, \bar{Y}_m , in a future sample on the basis of the available data. We compare our conditional prediction intervals with the unconditional ones proposed by Ahmadi and MirMostafaei (2009) and observe an improvement over the predictive inference without inter-record times. Therefore, we consider two cases: (a) The informative data contain only the upper record values, (b) The informative data contain the upper record values and the inter-record times, and then we observe that case (b) has some predictive inferential improvement in comparison with case (a).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Some general preliminaries are presented in Section 2. Conditional prediction intervals for the future j^{th} order statistic, $Y_{j:m}$, and the mean of the future sample, \bar{Y}_m , based on record values of given inter-record times for the two parameter exponential distribution are studied in Sections 3 and 4. An illustrative example and some concluding remarks are involved in Sections 5 and 6. The R codes for computing some results of the paper are given in the appendix.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present some general preliminary results used in future sections. Given upper record values u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} , which are observed and extracted from the sequence $\{X_j; j \geq 1\}$, inter-record times $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{n-1}$ are independent geometrically distributed random variables with success probabilities $\bar{F}(u_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Furthermore, the record values U_1, \dots, U_n form a Markov Chain with adjacent transition pdf equal to the left truncated pdf of the underlying distribution, see Arnold et al. (1998). Thus, the joint distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n = (U_1, \dots, U_n)$ and $\mathbf{\Delta}_n = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{n-1})$ is

$$f_{\mathbf{U}_n, \mathbf{\Delta}_n}(\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{\delta}_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f(u_i) [F(u_i)]^{\delta_i - 1} f(u_n), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_n = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{X}^n$, in which \mathbb{X} is the support of X and $\mathbf{\delta}_n = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$, see Samaniego and Whitaker (1986) and Arnold et al. (1998) page 169. We emphasize that $\mathbf{\Delta}_n$ contains $n-1$ positive integer-valued discrete random variables and $\mathbf{\delta}_n$ is the observed vector of $\mathbf{\Delta}_n$. By integrating (2.1) with respect to (w.r.t.) u_1, \dots, u_n , we can easily prove the following result.

Lemma 1 *The joint probability mass function of $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{n-1}$ is*

$$P_{\mathbf{\Delta}_n}(\mathbf{\delta}_n) = \Pr(\mathbf{\Delta}_n = \mathbf{\delta}_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j(n, \mathbf{\delta}_n) [(a_1(n, j, \mathbf{\delta}_n) + 1)(a_1(n, j, \mathbf{\delta}_n) + a_n(n, j, \mathbf{\delta}_n) + 2)]^{-1},$$

where

$$c_j(n, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) = (-1)^{n-j-1} \left[\prod_{j_1=0}^{j-2} \left(\sum_{t=n-j+1}^{n-j_1-1} \delta_t \right) \prod_{j_2=0}^{n-j-2} \left(\sum_{t=j_2+2}^{n-j} \delta_t \right) \right]^{-1},$$

$$a_1(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \delta_t - 1, \quad a_n(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) = \sum_{t=n-j+1}^{n-1} \delta_t,$$

in which we assume for $a > b$, $\sum_{t=a}^b \delta_t = 0$ and $\prod_{t=a}^b \delta_t = 1$.

In this paper, we need the conditional distribution of U_1 and U_n given by $\Delta_n = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n$ as follows.

Lemma 2 *The conditional pdf of U_1 and U_n given $\Delta_n = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n$ is*

$$f_{U_1, U_n | \Delta_n}(u_1, u_n | \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) = [P_{\Delta_n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_n)]^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j(n, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) [F(u_1)]^{a_1(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)} [F(u_n)]^{a_n(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)} f(u_1) f(u_n),$$

where $c_j(n, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)$, $a_1(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)$, $a_n(n, j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)$ and $P_{\Delta_n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_n)$ are as in Lemma 1.

The proof of Lemma 2 is straightforward by integrating (2.1) w.r.t. u_2, \dots, u_{n-1} and dividing the obtained equation by $P_{\Delta_n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_n)$.

3 Conditional prediction intervals for order statistics

In this section, the goal is to find a conditional prediction interval for $Y_{j:m}$ when the observed U_1, \dots, U_n are available given $\Delta_n = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n$ for the two parameter exponential distribution.

To this end, we consider the pivotal quantity

$$W_j = \frac{Y_{j:m} - U_1}{U_n - U_1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that the pivotal quantity W_j is the same as the one considered by Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009). This quantity is location and scale invariant namely it is free of both unknown parameters i.e. the location parameter μ and the scale parameter σ . It is also a simple function of both observed and future statistics, so that the future statistic can be derived from it easily. Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009) found the unconditional distribution of W_j while we present the conditional distribution of W_j given $\Delta_n = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n$, (i.e. the inter-record times are assumed to be known and fixed) in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *The conditional cdf of W_j in (3.1) given $\Delta_n = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n$ is for $w > 0$*

$$F_{W_j | \Delta_n}(w | \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) = \sum_{l=j}^m \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)} \frac{\binom{m}{l} \binom{a_1(n, j_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_2+j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_n)} \\ \times c_{j_1}(n, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n) [(j_2 + m - l + j_3 + j_4 + 2)((j_2 + m - l)w + j_4 + 1)]^{-1},$$

and for $w < 0$

$$F_{W_j | \Delta_n}(w | \delta_n) = \sum_{l=j}^m \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \frac{\binom{m}{l} \binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_2+j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n)} \\ \times c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n) [(j_2 + m - l + j_3 + j_4 + 2)(j_4 + 1 - w(j_3 + j_4 + 2))]^{-1},$$

where $a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)$ and $a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)$ are defined in Lemma 1 and $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n)$ is the joint mass function of $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{n-1}$ which is also given in Lemma 1.

Proof: Letting $J_{n,1}^* = (U_n - U_1)/\sigma$, $U_1^* = (U_1 - \mu)/\sigma$ and $Y_{j:m}^* = (Y_{j:m} - \mu)/\sigma$, we may write

$$F_{W_j | \Delta_n}(w | \delta_n) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty F_{Y_{j:m}^*}(vw + u) f_{U_1^*, J_{n,1}^* | \Delta_n}(u, v | \delta_n) du dv. \quad (3.2)$$

For $t > 0$, we have

$$F_{Y_{j:m}^*}(t) = \sum_{l=j}^m \binom{m}{l} (1 - e^{-t})^l e^{-(m-l)t}. \quad (3.3)$$

Also, from Lemma 2, we obtain

$$f_{U_1^*, J_{n,1}^* | \Delta_n}(u, v | \delta_n) = [P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n)]^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j(n, \delta_n) [1 - e^{-u}]^{a_1(n, j, \delta_n)} [1 - e^{-(u+v)}]^{a_n(n, j, \delta_n)} e^{-(2u+v)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Hence, by substituting (3.4) and (3.3) in (3.2) and using the binomial expansions, we have for $w > 0$,

$$F_{W_j | \Delta_n}(w | \delta_n) = \sum_{l=j}^m \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \frac{\binom{m}{l} \binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2} c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n)}{(-1)^{j_2+j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n)} \\ \times \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-(j_2+m-l+j_3+j_4+2)u} e^{-((j_2+m-l)w+j_4+1)v} du dv,$$

and therefore we naturally arrive at the desired expression. Similarly, we may attain the expression for $F_{W_j | \Delta_n}(w | \delta_n)$ when $w < 0$ after substituting (3.4) and (3.3) in (3.2) by noting that the integral w.r.t. u must be taken from $-vw$ to ∞ . \square

Let $w_\gamma(n, m, j; \delta_n)$ be the γ^{th} conditional quantile of W_j given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, i.e.

$$\Pr(W_j < w_\gamma(n, m, j; \delta_n) | \Delta_n = \delta_n) = \gamma.$$

To find $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ two-sided conditional prediction intervals for $Y_{j:m}$ based on record values given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, we have to find the conditional quantiles $w_{\alpha_1}(n, m, j; \delta_n)$ and $w_{1-\alpha_2}(n, m, j; \delta_n)$, for $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$, $0 < \alpha_i < 1$, $i = 1, 2$, numerically.

Now, a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ conditional prediction interval for $Y_{j:m}$ based on record values given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, is given by

$$(U_1 + w_{\alpha_1}(n, m, j; \delta_n)(U_n - U_1), U_1 + w_{1-\alpha_2}(n, m, j; \delta_n)(U_n - U_1)). \quad (3.5)$$

Table 1: The values of $w_{0.025}(3, m, j)$, $w_{0.975}(3, m, j)$, $w_{0.975}(3, m, j) - w_{0.025}(3, m, j)$, $w_{0.025}(3, m, j; \delta_n)$, $w_{0.975}(3, m, j; \delta_n)$, $w_{0.975}(3, m, j; \delta_n) - w_{0.025}(3, m, j; \delta_n)$, for $m = 10, 20$, $j = 5, 7, 10$ (for $m = 10$), $j = 12, 17, 20$ (for $m = 20$) and different values of δ_n .

	m j	10			20		
		5	7	10	12	17	20
Unconditional	$w_{0.025}$	-3.671	-2.814	-0.907	-3.140	-1.760	-0.380
	$w_{0.975}$	1.278	2.635	9.761	1.827	4.767	12.186
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	4.949	5.449	10.668	4.967	6.527	12.566
$\delta_n = (1, 2)$ $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) = 0.0833$	$w_{0.025}$	-1.097	-0.500	0.249	-0.651	0.055	0.464
	$w_{0.975}$	1.766	3.502	11.868	2.459	6.108	14.586
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	2.863	4.002	11.619	3.110	6.053	14.122
$\delta_n = (1, 3)$ $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) = 0.05$	$w_{0.025}$	-1.288	-0.652	0.201	-0.827	-0.025	0.420
	$w_{0.975}$	1.290	2.627	9.481	1.786	4.675	11.690
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	2.578	3.279	9.280	2.613	4.700	11.270
$\delta_n = (1, 4)$ $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) = 0.0333$	$w_{0.025}$	-1.427	-0.774	0.160	-0.965	-0.098	0.386
	$w_{0.975}$	1.022	2.106	7.984	1.398	3.793	9.872
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	2.449	2.880	7.824	2.363	3.891	9.486
$\delta_n = (2, 3)$ $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) = 0.0167$	$w_{0.025}$	-2.181	-1.267	0.045	-1.538	-0.320	0.324
	$w_{0.975}$	1.027	2.413	10.212	1.502	4.669	12.787
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	3.208	3.680	10.167	3.040	4.989	12.463
$\delta_n = (2, 4)$ $P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) = 0.0119$	$w_{0.025}$	-2.330	-1.409	-0.008	-1.697	-0.415	0.289
	$w_{0.975}$	0.823	1.976	8.880	1.193	3.896	11.163
	$w_{0.975} - w_{0.025}$	3.153	3.385	8.888	2.890	4.311	10.874

Conditionally on δ_n , we get more information about the unknown parameters μ and σ , or generally more information about F , which leads to better prediction intervals for $Y_{j:m}$. It is noted that conditioning on inter-record times does not decrease the length of the prediction interval necessarily and increase or decrease in the location and scale of the interval depend on the values of δ_n . For the purpose of illustration, consider the conditional quantiles of W_j , which are computed and tabulated in Table 1, for $\alpha = 0.05$, $n = 3$, $m = 10, 20$, $j = 5, 7, 10$ ($m = 10$), $j = 12, 17, 20$ ($m = 20$) and some values of δ_n . The values of unconditional quantiles of W_j in Table 1 are taken from Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009), Tables 3 and 4. By comparing the entries of Table 1, one can observe that for a few cases, the conditional prediction intervals have bigger lengths, especially when we predict the biggest future order statistic, i.e. $Y_{m:m}$. But note that in the most cases the conditional intervals are shorter than the unconditional ones for different values of δ_n , so we may conclude that generally the conditional prediction approach leads to shorter (and hence better) prediction intervals in average for different values of δ_n and this can be considered as an improvement.

4 Conditional Prediction Intervals for the mean of future sample

The problem of constructing a conditional prediction interval for \bar{Y}_m on the basis of observed U_1, \dots, U_n , given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, using the pivotal quantity

$$V_m = \frac{\bar{Y}_m - U_1}{U_n - U_1}, \quad (4.1)$$

is considered for the two parameter exponential distribution in this section. Note that the pivotal quantity V_m has been also considered by Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009) and its unconditional distribution has been obtained by them. Moreover, V_m is also location and scale invariant and therefore is free of the unknown location and scale parameters. The following theorem presents the conditional distribution function of V_m given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$.

Theorem 2 *The conditional distribution function of V_m in (4.1) given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$ is*

$$F_{V_m | \Delta_n}(x | \delta_n) = 1 - \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \frac{\binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) l!} \\ \times \frac{c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n) x^{j_2} m^l \Gamma(l - j_2 + 1) \Gamma(j_2 + 1)}{(m + j_3 + j_4 + 2)^{l-j_2+1} (mx + j_4 + 1)^{j_2+1}},$$

for $x > 0$, and

$$F_{V_m | \Delta_n}(x | \delta_n) = \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \frac{(-1)^{j_3+j_4} \binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n)}{P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) (2 + j_3 + j_4) [j_4 + 1 - (2 + j_3 + j_4)x]} \\ - \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_4=0}^{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)} \sum_{j_5=0}^{l-j_2} \frac{\binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_3+j_4+j_5} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) l!} \\ \times \frac{c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n) x^{j_2+j_5} m^l \Gamma(l - j_2 + 1) \Gamma(j_2 + j_5 + 1)}{j_5! (m + j_3 + j_4 + 2)^{l-j_2-j_5+1} [j_4 + 1 - (j_3 + j_4 + 2)x]^{j_2+j_5+1}},$$

for $x < 0$, where $a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)$ and $a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)$ are given in Lemma 1

Proof: Let $J_{n,1}^* = (U_n - U_1)/\sigma$, $U_1^* = (U_1 - \mu)/\sigma$ and $\bar{Y}_m^* = (\bar{Y}_m - \mu)/\sigma$. Note that

$$F_{V_m | \Delta_n}(x | \delta_n) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty F_{\bar{Y}_m^*}(vx + u) f_{U_1^*, J_{n,1}^* | \Delta_n}(u, v | \delta_n) du dv, \quad (4.2)$$

where $f_{U_1^*, J_{n,1}^* | \Delta_n}(u, v | \delta_n)$ is given in (3.4). Since $m\bar{Y}_m^* \sim \Gamma(m, 1)$, that is for $t > 0$

$$F_{\bar{Y}_m^*}(t) = 1 - \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \frac{(mt)^l e^{-mt}}{l!}, \quad (4.3)$$

so by substituting (3.4) and (4.3) in (4.2) and using the binomial expansions, we get for $x < 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{V_m | \Delta_n}(x | \delta_n) &= \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_3=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j_4=0}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n)}{(-1)^{j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n)} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\infty \int_{-vx}^\infty e^{-(j_3+j_4+2)u} e^{-(j_4+1)v} \, du \, dv \\
&\quad - \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j_4=0}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_3+j_4} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) l!} \\
&\quad \times c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n) x^{j_2} m^l \int_0^\infty \int_{-vx}^\infty e^{-(m+j_3+j_4+2)u} e^{-(mx+j_4+1)v} u^{l-j_2} v^{j_2} \, du \, dv \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_3=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j_4=0}^{n-1} \frac{(-1)^{j_3+j_4} \binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n)}{P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) (2+j_3+j_4) [j_4+1 - (2+j_3+j_4)x]} \\
&\quad - \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^l \sum_{j_3=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j_4=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j_5=0}^{l-j_2} \frac{\binom{a_1(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_3} \binom{a_n(n, j_1, \delta_n)}{j_4} \binom{l}{j_2}}{(-1)^{j_3+j_4+j_5} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) l!} \\
&\quad \times \frac{c_{j_1}(n, \delta_n) x^{j_2+j_5} m^l \Gamma(l-j_2+1)}{j_5! (m+j_3+j_4+2)^{l-j_2-j_5+1}} \int_0^\infty e^{-(j_4+1-(j_3+j_4+2)x)v} v^{j_2+j_5} \, dv
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore we naturally attain the desired result. Similarly, we may deduce the desired expression for $F_{V_m | \Delta_n}(x | \delta_n)$ when $x > 0$. \square

To find conditional prediction interval for \bar{Y}_m based on records given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, we have to find the conditional quantiles of V_m given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$, $v_{\alpha_1}(n, m; \delta_n)$ and $v_{1-\alpha_2}(n, m; \delta_n)$, for $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$, $0 < \alpha_i < 1$, $i = 1, 2$, numerically, where

$$\Pr(V_m < v_\gamma(n, m; \delta_n) | \Delta_n = \delta_n) = \gamma.$$

A $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ conditional prediction interval for \bar{Y}_m based on record values given $\Delta_n = \delta_n$ then is

$$(U_1 + v_{\alpha_1}(n, m; \delta_n)(U_n - U_1), U_1 + v_{1-\alpha_2}(n, m; \delta_n)(U_n - U_1)). \quad (4.4)$$

An illustrative example has been presented in Section 5.

5 An illustrative example

In this section, we illustrate the proposed procedures by considering a real data set. A rock crushing machine has to be reset if, at any operation, the size of rock being crushed

Table 2: 95% CPIs and UPIs for $Y_{12:20}$, $Y_{20:20}$ and \bar{Y}_{20} for Example 1.

	CPI	UPI
$Y_{12:20}$	(0, 24.17836)	(0, 54.061745)
$Y_{20:20}$	(13.290315, 183.67385)	(0, 307.85602)
\bar{Y}_{20}	(0, 26.233175)	(0, 61.32183)

is larger than any that has been crushed before. The following data given by Dunsmore (1983) are the sizes dealt with up to the third time that the machine has been reset:

9.3, 0.6, 24.4, 18.1, 6.6, 9.0, 14.3, 6.6, 13.0, 2.4, 5.6, 33.8.

The record values were the sizes at the operation when resetting was necessary. Dunsmore (1983) assumed that these data follow an $Exp(0, \sigma)$ distribution. Clearly, we have

$$U_1 = 9.3, \quad U_2 = 24.4, \quad U_3 = 33.8,$$

$$T_1 = 1, \quad T_2 = 3, \quad T_3 = 12,$$

$$\Delta_1 = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_2 = 9.$$

Consider a future sample of size $m = 20$. We want to find equi-tailed 95% conditional prediction intervals (CPIs) for $Y_{12:20}$, $Y_{20:20}$ and \bar{Y}_{20} using (3.5) and (4.4) and compare these intervals with unconditional ones (UPIs). The results are given in Table 2. Note that some lower bounds have got negative values, which were replaced by zero. We can see that the conditional prediction intervals are shorter than the corresponding unconditional ones.

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we found prediction intervals for the future order statistics based on record values, given record time statistics, when the underlying distribution is two parameter exponential. These intervals have the advantage of utilizing more information embedded in the observed sequence in comparison with their corresponding unconditional ones obtained by Ahmadi and MirMostafae (2009). These ideas can be extended to the non-parametric and the Bayesian context. The conditional point predictors are also of interest. Work on these problems is currently under process and we hope to report these findings in future papers.

Acknowledgement

We are very grateful to the respected editor and the respected referees for their insightful comments and suggestions which have led to this improved version.

References

- [1] Ahmadi, J. and Balakrishnan, N. (2010): Prediction of order statistics and record values from two independent sequences, *Statistics*, **44**, 417–430.
- [2] Ahmadi, J. and MirMostafae, S.M.T.K. (2009): Prediction intervals for future records and order statistics coming from two parameter exponential distribution, *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **79**, 977–983.
- [3] Ahmadi, J. and MirMostafae, S.M.T.K. and Balakrishnan, N. (2010): Nonparametric prediction intervals for future record intervals based on order statistics, *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **80**, 1663–1672.
- [4] Arnold, B.C., Balakrishnan, N., and Nagaraja, H.N. (1998): *Records*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [5] Awad, A.M. and Raqab, M.Z. (2000): Prediction intervals for the future record values from exponential distribution: comparative study. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **65**, 325–340.
- [6] Chou, Youn-Min. (1988): One-sided simultaneous prediction intervals for the order statistics of l future samples from an exponential distribution. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, **17**, 3995–4003.
- [7] David, H.A. and Nagaraja, H.N. (2003): *Order Statistics*, Third edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [8] Dunsmore, I.R. (1983): The future occurrence of records. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **35**, 276–277.
- [9] Doostparast, M. (2009): A note on estimation based on record data. *Metrika*, **69**, 69–80.
- [10] Doostparast, M. and Balakrishnan, N. (2013): Pareto analysis based on records. *Statistics*, **47**, 1075–1089.
- [11] Feuerverger, A. and Hall, P. (1998): On statistical inference based on record values. *Extremes*, **1**, 169–190.
- [12] Kızılaslan, F. and Nadar, M. (2015): Estimation with the generalized exponential distribution based on record values and inter-record times. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **85**, 978–999.
- [13] Lin, C.T., Wu, S.J.S and Balakrishnan, N. (2003): Parameter estimation for the linear hazard rate distribution based on records and inter-record times. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, **32**, 729–748.
- [14] MirMostafae, S.M.T.K. and Ahmadi, J. (2011): Point prediction of future order statistics from exponential distribution, *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **81**, 360–370.

- [15] MirMostafae, S.M.T.K., Amini, M. and Balakrishnan, N. (2016): Exact nonparametric conditional inference based on k-records, given inter k-record times. *Journal of the Korean Statistical Society*, Accepted.
- [16] Nagaraja, H.N. (1984): Asymptotic linear prediction of extreme order statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **36**, 289–299.
- [17] Raqab, M.Z. and Balakrishnan, N. (2008): Prediction intervals for future records. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **78**, 1955-1963.
- [18] Samaniego, F.J. and Whitaker, L.R. (1986): On estimating population characteristics from record-breaking observations. I. parametric results. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, **33**, 531–543.

Appendix

Here, we present the R codes for computing the conditional cumulative distribution functions of W_j , (see Theorem 1) and V_m (see Theorem 2). R functions for computing the unconditional cumulative distribution functions of W_j and V_m (see Ahmadi and Mir-Mostafae, 2009) are also given.

```

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%  cjn function  %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

```

```

cjn=function(n, j, delta) {
z=(-1)^(n-j-1)
z1=n-j+1
z2=j-2
z4=n-j-2
z5=n-j
s=1
if(z2>=0 & z1>=0) {
for(j1 in 0:z2) {
z3=n-j1-1
ss=ifelse(z3>=z1, sum(delta[z1:z3]), 0)
s=s*ss
}}
t=1
if(z4>=0) {
for(j2 in 0:z4) {
z6=j2+2
tt=ifelse(z5>=z6, sum(delta[z6:z5]), 0)
t=t*tt
}}
return(z/t/s)
}

```



```
return(pw)
}
```

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%%%%%%%% conditional cdf of V          %%%%%%%%%
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
```

```
Fv=function(n,m,v,delta){
pv=0
n1=n-1
m1=m-1
if(v>=0){
for(l in 0:m1){
for(j1 in 1:n1){
for(j2 in 0:l){
nj1=n-j1+1
nj=n-j1
a1=ifelse(nj>=1,sum(delta[1:nj]),0)-1
an=ifelse(n1>=nj1,sum(delta[nj1:n1]),0)
for(j3 in 0:a1){
for(j4 in 0:an){
A=choose(a1,j3)*choose(an,j4)*choose(l,j2)/factorial(l)
/pdelta(n,delta)*((-1)^(j3+j4))
B=cjn(n,j1,delta)*(v^j2)*(m^l)*gamma(l-j2+1)*gamma(j2+1)
/((m+j3+j4+2)^(l-j2+1))/((m*v+j4+1)^(j2+1))
pv=pv+A*B
}}}}}}
if(v>=0) pv=1-pv
pv1=0
pv2=0
if(v<0){
for(j1 in 1:n1){
nj1=n-j1+1
nj=n-j1
a1=ifelse(nj>=1,sum(delta[1:nj]),0)-1
an=ifelse(n1>=nj1,sum(delta[nj1:n1]),0)
for(j3 in 0:a1){
for(j4 in 0:an){
A=(-1)^(j3+j4)*choose(a1,j3)*choose(an,j4)*cjn(n,j1,delta)
/pdelta(n,delta)/(2+j3+j4)/(j4+1-v*(2+j3+j4))
pv1=pv1+A
}}}}
for(l in 0:m1){
for(j1 in 1:n1){
for(j2 in 0:l){
```



```
m1=m-1
s1=0
s2=0
for(i in 0:m1){
nn=n+i-2
s1=s1+choose(nn,i)*((1-1/(m*v+1))^i)*((1/(m*v+1))^(n-1))
*(m/(m+1))^(m-i)
s2=s2+choose(nn,i)*((1-1/(m*v+1))^i)*((1/(m*v+1))^(n-1))
}
pv=s1+1-s2
}
return(pv)
}
```