

Bayesian Test for the Difference of Exponential Guarantee Time Parameters

Sang Gil Kang¹, Dal Ho Kim², Woo Dong Lee³

Abstract

When X and Y have independent two parameter exponential distributions, we develop a Bayesian testing procedures for the equality of two location parameters. Under the noninformative prior, we propose a Bayesian test procedures for the equality of two location parameters using fractional Bayes factor and intrinsic Bayes factor. Simulation study and some real data examples are provided.

Keywords : Fractional Bayes Factor, Intrinsic Bayes Factor, Reference Prior, Matching Prior, Exponential Location Parameters

1. Introduction

The two parameter exponential distribution plays an important role in the field of life testing and reliability theory since it is the only continuous distribution with a constant hazard function. The reciprocal of the scale parameter is the hazard rate. The location (threshold) parameter can translate the distribution along the time axis, so it is also known as the minimum life or guarantee time parameter. The guarantee time parameter can be used to model warranty periods for some products.

The present paper focuses on Bayesian testing procedure for the equality of two location parameters. In Bayesian testing problem, the Bayes factor under proper priors or informative priors have been very successful. However, limited information and time constraints often require the use of noninformative priors. Since noninformative priors such as Jeffreys' priors or reference priors (Berger and Bernardo, 1989, 1992) are typically improper so that such priors are only defined up to arbitrary constants which affects the values of Bayes factors. Spiegelhalter and Smith (1982), O'Hagan (1995) and Berger and Pericchi (1996) have made

¹Department of Applied Statistics, Sangji University, Wonju, 220-702, Korea712-702

²Department of Statistics, Kyungpook National University, Taegu, 702-701, Korea712-702

³Faculty of Information Science, Daegu Hanny University, Kyungsan, 712-715, Korea712-702,

efforts to compensate for that arbitrariness.

Berger and Pericchi (1996) introduced the intrinsic Bayes factor using a data-splitting idea, which would eliminate the arbitrariness of improper priors. O'Hagan (1995) proposed the fractional Bayes factor. For removing the arbitrariness he used to a portion of the likelihood with a so-called the fraction b . These approaches have shown to be quite useful in many statistical areas.

For the statistical inference of the exponential distribution, Epstein and Tsao (1953) studied some statistical tests for two exponential distributions. Epstein and Sobel (1954) obtained the minimum variance unbiased estimator for the scale and location parameters. The shrinkage estimators for the scale parameter have been proposed by Bhattacharya and Srivastava (1974). Chiou and Han (1989) proposed a pre-test estimator and a pre-test shrinkage estimator for the location parameter. Chiou and Miao (2004) studied the shrinkage estimator for the difference between location parameters.

Almost all the work mentioned above is the analysis based on the classical point of view, there is a little work on this problem from the viewpoint of the objective Bayesian framework. Because the two parameter exponential distribution is the non-regular case, so the noninformative priors such as reference prior or probability matching prior were hard to derive. Almost all theory related to these priors were developed based on the assumption of regular distribution. Recently, Ghosal (1997, 1999) developed the procedures to derive the reference and matching priors for non-regular cases. Using his results, we feel a strong necessity to develop objective Bayesian testing procedure for the difference between location parameters. For dealing this problem, we use the fractional Bayes factor (O'Hagan, 1995) and the intrinsic Bayes factor (Berger and Pericchi, 1996).

The outline of the remaining sections is as follows. In Section 2, using the noninformative priors, we provide the Bayesian testing procedure based on the fractional Bayes factor and intrinsic Bayes factor for the testing equality of two location parameters. In Section 3, simulation study and some real examples are given.

2. Bayesian Test Procedures

2.1 Preliminaries

Models (or Hypotheses) H_1, H_2, \dots, H_q are under consideration, with the data $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ having probability density function $f_i(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ under model $H_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, q$. The parameter vectors $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ are unknown. Let $\pi_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ be the prior

distribution of model H_i , and let p_i be the prior probabilities of model $H_i, i=1, 2, \dots, q$. Then the posterior probability that the model H_i is true is

$$P(H_i | \mathbf{x}) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^q \frac{p_j}{p_i} \cdot B_{ji} \right)^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where B_{ji} is the Bayes factor of model H_j to model H_i defined by

$$B_{ji} = \frac{m_j(\mathbf{x})}{m_i(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\int f_j(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) \pi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_j}{\int f_i(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \pi_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}. \quad (2)$$

The B_{ji} interpreted as the comparative support of the data for the model j to i . The computation of B_{ji} needs specification of the prior distribution $\pi_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ and $\pi_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)$. Usually, one can use the noninformative prior, often improper, such as uniform prior, Jeffreys prior, reference prior or probability matching prior. Denote it as π_i^N . The use of improper priors $\pi_i^N(\cdot)$ in (2) causes the B_{ji} to contain unspecified constants. To solve this problem, O'Hagan (1995) proposed the fractional Bayes factor for Bayesian testing and model selection problem as follow.

When the $\pi_i^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ is noninformative prior under H_i , equation (2) becomes

$$B_{ji}^N = \frac{\int f_j(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) \pi_j^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_j}{\int f_i(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \pi_i^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}.$$

Then the fractional Bayes factor of model H_j versus model H_i is

$$B_{ji}^F = B_{ji}^N \cdot \frac{\int f_i^b(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \pi_i^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}{\int f_j^b(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) \pi_j^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_j},$$

and $f_i(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ is the likelihood function and b specifies a fraction of the likelihood which is to be used as a prior density. He proposed three ways for the choice of the fraction b . One frequently suggested choice is $b = m/n$, where m is the size of the minimal training sample, assuming this is well defined. (see O'Hagan, 1995, 1997 and the discussion by Berger and Mortera of O'Hagan, 1995).

Berger and Pericchi (1996) proposed the intrinsic Bayes factor (IBF) for Bayesian testing and model selection. The arithmetic intrinsic Bayes factor is given by

$$B_{ji}^I = B_{ji}^N \cdot \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L B_{ij}^N(\mathbf{x}(l)),$$

where

$$B_{ij}^N(\mathbf{x}(l)) = \frac{m_i(\mathbf{x}(l))}{m_j(\mathbf{x}(l))} = \frac{\int f_i(\mathbf{x}(l) | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \pi_i^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}{\int f_j(\mathbf{x}(l) | \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) \pi_j^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_j}.$$

Here $\mathbf{x}(l)$ is minimal training sample and L is the number of all possible minimal training samples.

2.2 Bayesian Test

Let X be a two parameter exponential distribution with density function

$$f(x | \eta, \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} \exp\left\{-\frac{x-\eta}{\theta}\right\}, \quad x > \eta, \theta > 0, \quad (3)$$

where η is the location parameter (guarantee parameter) and θ is the scale parameter. Suppose that $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{n_1})$ is a random sample of size n_1 from a two parameter exponential distribution with location parameter η_1 and scale parameter θ_1 and $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2})$ is a random sample of size n_2 from a two parameter exponential distribution with location parameter η_2 and scale parameter θ_2 . Then the joint probability density function is

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} | \eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \theta_1^{-n_1} \theta_2^{-n_2} \exp\left\{-\frac{n_1(\bar{x} - \eta_1)}{\theta_1} - \frac{n_2(\bar{y} - \eta_2)}{\theta_2}\right\},$$

where $\theta_1 > 0$, $\theta_2 > 0$, $x_i > \eta_1$, $i = 1, \dots, n_1$ and $y_j > \eta_2$, $j = 1, \dots, n_2$, and \bar{x} and \bar{y} are the sample mean for each population.

We want to test the hypotheses $H_1: \eta_1 = \eta_2$ vs. $H_2: \eta_1 \neq \eta_2$. Our interest is to develop a Bayesian test based on the fractional and intrinsic Bayes factors for H_1 vs. H_2 under the noninformative priors. The two parameter exponential distribution is belong to non-regular cases. However for non-regular cases, the reference and probability matching prior is developed by Ghosal (1997,1999). In our model (3), the reference prior is given by $\pi(\eta, \theta) \propto 1/\theta$.

2.2 Bayesian Test using the Fractional Bayes Factor

Under the hypothesis H_1 , the reference prior for $\eta(\equiv \eta_1 = \eta_2)$, θ_1 and θ_2 is

$$\pi_1(\eta, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \pi(\eta, \theta_1)\pi(\eta, \theta_2) = \theta_1^{-1}\theta_2^{-1}.$$

The likelihood function under H_1 is

$$L(\eta, \theta_1, \theta_2 | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \theta_1^{-n_1}\theta_2^{-n_2} \exp\left\{-\frac{n_1(\bar{x}-\eta)}{\theta_1} - \frac{n_2(\bar{y}-\eta)}{\theta_2}\right\}.$$

Then the element of fractional Bayes factor under H_1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \int_0^{m_{x,y}} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty L^b(\eta, \theta_1, \theta_2 | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \pi_1(\eta, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 d\eta \\ &= (n_1 b)^{-n_1 b} (n_2 b)^{-n_2 b} \Gamma(n_1 b) \Gamma(n_2 b) \int_0^{m_{x,y}} (\bar{x}-\eta)^{-n_1 b} (\bar{y}-\eta)^{-n_2 b} d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_{x,y} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n_1, 1 \leq j \leq n_2} \{x_i, y_j\}$. For the H_2 , the reference prior for η_1, η_2, θ_1 and θ_2 is

$$\pi_2(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \pi(\eta_1, \theta_1)\pi(\eta_2, \theta_2) = \theta_1^{-1}\theta_2^{-1}.$$

The likelihood function under H_2 is

$$L(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2 | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \theta_1^{-n_1}\theta_2^{-n_2} \exp\left\{-\frac{n_1(\bar{x}-\eta_1)}{\theta_1} - \frac{n_2(\bar{y}-\eta_2)}{\theta_2}\right\}.$$

Thus the element of fractional Bayes factor under H_2 gives as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} m_2^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \int_0^{m_x} \int_0^{m_y} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty L^b(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2 | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \pi_2(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\theta_2 d\theta_1 d\eta_2 d\eta_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{(n_1 b - 1)(n_2 b - 1)} (n_1 b)^{-n_1 b} (n_2 b)^{-n_2 b} \Gamma(n_1 b) \Gamma(n_2 b) \\ &\quad \times [(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 b + 1} - (\bar{x})^{-n_1 b + 1}] [(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 b + 1} - (\bar{y})^{-n_2 b + 1}], \end{aligned}$$

where $m_x = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n_1} \{x_i\}$ and $m_y = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n_2} \{y_j\}$. Therefore the B_{21}^N is given by

$$B_{21}^N = \frac{[(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 + 1} - (\bar{x})^{-n_1 + 1}][(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 + 1} - (\bar{y})^{-n_2 + 1}]}{(n_1 - 1)(n_2 - 1)S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_0^{m_{x,y}} (\bar{x}-\eta)^{-n_1} (\bar{y}-\eta)^{-n_2} d\eta.$$

And

$$\frac{m_1^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{m_2^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \frac{(n_1 b - 1)(n_2 b - 1)S^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{[(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 b + 1} - \bar{x}^{-n_1 b + 1}][(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 b + 1} - \bar{y}^{-n_2 b + 1}]},$$

where

$$S^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_0^{m_x, y} (\bar{x} - \eta)^{-n_1 b} (\bar{y} - \eta)^{-n_2 b} d\eta.$$

Thus the fractional Bayes factor of H_2 versus H_1 is given by

$$B_{21}^F = \frac{(n_1 b - 1)(n_2 b - 1)S^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{(n_1 - 1)(n_2 - 1)S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \\ \times \frac{[(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 + 1} - (\bar{x})^{-n_1 + 1}][(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 + 1} - (\bar{y})^{-n_2 + 1}]}{[(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 b + 1} - \bar{x}^{-n_1 b + 1}][(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 b + 1} - \bar{y}^{-n_2 b + 1}]}.$$

Note that the calculation of the fractional Bayes factor of H_2 versus H_1 is requires a one dimensional integration.

Remark. In the calculation of $m_1^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, if $n_1 b$ is 1, then $m_1^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is $\log(\bar{x}/(\bar{x} - m_x))$. In like manner, if $n_2 b$ is 1, then $m_2^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is $\log(\bar{y}/(\bar{y} - m_y))$.

2.3 Bayesian Test using the Intrinsic Bayes Factor

The element B_{21}^N , (4), of the intrinsic Bayes factor is computed in the fractional Bayes factor. So using minimal training sample, we only calculate the marginal densities $m^N(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l)$ under H_1 and H_2 , respectively.

The marginal densities $m_1^N(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l)$ under H_1 is given by

$$m_1^N(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l) = \int_0^{m_x} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l | \eta, \theta_1, \theta_2) \pi_1(\eta, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 d\eta \\ = \int_0^{m_x} (x_i + x_j - 2\eta)^{-2} (y_k + y_l - 2\eta)^{-2} d\eta \\ \equiv T(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l),$$

where $1 \leq i < j \leq n_1, 1 \leq k < l \leq n_2$. And the marginal density $m_2^N(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l)$ under H_2 is given by

$$m_2^N(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l) \\ = \int_0^{m_x} \int_0^{m_y} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l | \eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) \pi_2(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\theta_2 d\theta_1 d\eta_2 d\eta_1 \\ = \frac{m_x m_y}{(x_i + x_j)(y_k + y_l)(x_i + x_j - 2m_x)(y_k + y_l - 2m_y)}.$$

Therefore the IBF of H_2 versus H_1 is given by

$$B_{21}^I = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} \frac{(x_i + x_j)(y_k + y_l)(x_i + x_j - 2m_x)(y_k + y_l - 2m_y) T(x_i, x_j, y_k, y_l)}{(n_1 - 1)(n_2 - 1)S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \\ \times \frac{[(\bar{x} - m_x)^{-n_1 + 1} - (\bar{x})^{-n_1 + 1}][(\bar{y} - m_y)^{-n_2 + 1} - (\bar{y})^{-n_2 + 1}]}{m_x m_y},$$

where $L = n_1(n_1 - 1)n_2(n_2 - 1)/4$. Note that the calculation of the IBF of H_2 versus H_1 is requires a one dimensional integration. In Section 3, we investigate our testing procedures using some real examples.

3. Numerical Examples

Example 1. To investigate the Bayesian test procedures, we examine the cases when $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (1, 3), (3, 1), (\eta_1, \eta_2) = (1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3)$ and $(n_1, n_2) = (5, 5), (5, 10), (10, 10), (10, 20)$. The posterior probabilities of H_1 being true are computed assuming equal prior probabilities. The Table 1 shows that the results of the averages and the standard deviations in parentheses of posterior probabilities for each case based on 1,000 replications.

From the Table 1, when $(\eta_1, \eta_2) = (1, 1)$, the fractional Bayes factor does not select H_1 for some small sample size cases. However the intrinsic Bayes factor gives fairly reasonable answers. Also for moderate sample sizes, the fractional and intrinsic Bayes factors give fairly reasonable answers.

[Table 1]. The averages (the standard deviations) of posterior probabilities

(θ_1, θ_2)	(η_1, η_2)	(n_1, n_2)	$P^F(H_1 \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$	$P^I(H_1 \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$
1,3	1,1	5,5	0.4699(0.1280)	0.5870(0.1598)
		5,10	0.5122(0.1491)	0.6552(0.1752)
		10,10	0.5491(0.1572)	0.6984(0.1749)
		10,20	0.6245(0.1696)	0.7703(0.1713)
	1,2	5,5	0.3269(0.1171)	0.4187(0.1519)
		5,10	0.2034(0.1273)	0.2866(0.1732)
		10,10	0.1786(0.1038)	0.2721(0.1541)
		10,20	0.0376(0.0448)	0.0657(0.0713)
	1,3	5,5	0.2133(0.1011)	0.2997(0.1427)
		5,10	0.0591(0.0522)	0.0915(0.0883)
		10,10	0.0482(0.0432)	0.0865(0.0768)
		10,20	0.0014(0.0026)	0.0026(0.0051)
3,1	1,1	5,5	0.4682(0.1257)	0.5839(0.1594)
		5,10	0.4861(0.1409)	0.6154(0.1650)
		10,10	0.5449(0.1616)	0.6900(0.1799)
		10,20	0.5755(0.1649)	0.7210(0.1755)
	1,2	5,5	0.2669(0.1816)	0.3113(0.2228)
		5,10	0.1673(0.2285)	0.1969(0.2644)
		10,10	0.0826(0.1671)	0.1021(0.1981)
		10,20	0.0237(0.1042)	0.0290(0.1227)
	1,3	5,5	0.1181(0.1367)	0.1270(0.1600)
		5,10	0.0415(0.1384)	0.0446(0.1524)
		10,10	0.0037(0.0277)	0.0042(0.0315)
		10,20	0.0005(0.0121)	0.0006(0.0139)

Example 2. The data in Table 2 is taken from Bain and Engelhardt (1991). Suppose a certain additive is proposed for increasing the length of time of tread wear of a tire. Suppose 40 of the present and 40 tires made under the new process are placed in service and the experiment is continued until the 20 smallest observations are obtained for each sample.

The value of fractional Bayes factor and arithmetic intrinsic Bayes factor of H_2 versus H_1 is $B_{21}^F = 0.1314$ and $B_{21}^I = 0.0563$, respectively. We assume that the prior probabilities are equal. Then the posterior probability for H_1 is 0.8839 and 0.9467, respectively. Thus there are strong evidence for H_1 in terms of the posterior probability.

[Table 2]. Length of time of tread wear

Present	10.03 10.47 10.58 11.48 11.60 12.41 13.03 13.51
	14.48 16.96 17.08 17.27 17.90 18.21 19.30 20.10
	20.51 21.78 21.79 25.34
Additive	10.10 11.01 11.20 12.95 13.19 14.81 16.03 17.01
	18.96 24.10 24.15 24.52 26.05 26.44 28.59 30.24
	31.03 33.51 33.61 40.68

Example 3. Proschan (1963) gives the time of successive failures of the air conditioning system of each member of a fleet of Boeing 720 jet airplanes. The hours of flying time between failures are listed Table 3 for two of the planes.

The value of fractional Bayes factor and arithmetic intrinsic Bayes factor of H_2 versus H_1 is $B_{21}^F = 4.0977$ and $B_{21}^I = 1.3836$, respectively. We assume that the prior probabilities are equal. Then the posterior probability for H_1 is 0.1962 and 0.4195, respectively. Thus there are evidence for H_1 in terms of the posterior probability

Therefore both of the fractional and intrinsic Bayes factors factor give reasonable answers in our examples.

[Table 3]. Time of successive failures

Plane 7911	55 320 56 104 220 239 47 246 176 182 33
Plane 7912	23 261 87 7 120 14 62 47 225 71 246 21
	42 20 5 12 120 11 3 14 71 11 14 11 16
	90 1 16 52 95

References

- [1] Bain, L. J. and Engelhardt, M. (1991). *Statistical Analysis of Reliability and Life-Testing Models*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- [2] Berger, J. O. and Bernardo, J. M. (1989). Estimating a Product of Means: Bayesian Analysis

with Reference Priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84, 200-207.

- [3] Berger, J. O. and Bernardo, J. M. (1992). On the Development of Reference Priors (with discussion). *Bayesian Statistics IV*, J. M. Bernardo, et. al., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 35-60.
- [4] Berger, J. O. and Pericchi, L. R. (1996). The Intrinsic Bayes Factor for Model Selection and Prediction, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 109-122.
- [5] Bhattacharya, S. K. and Srivastava, V. K. (1974). A Preliminary Test Procedure in Life Testing, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69, 726-729.
- [6] Chiou, P. and Han, C. P. (1989). Shrinkage Estimation of Threshold Parameter of the Exponential Distribution. *IEEE Trans. Reliability*, 38, 449-453.
- [7] Chiou, P. and Miao, W. (2004). Shrinkage Estimation for the Difference Between Exponential Guarantee Time Parameters. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, in press.
- [8] Epstein, B. and Sobel, M. (1954). Some Theorems Relevant to Life Testing form an Exponential Populations. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 25, 373-381.
- [9] Epstein, B. and Tsao, C. K. (1953). Some Tests Based on Ordered Observations form Two Exponential Populations. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 24, 458-466.
- [10] Ghosal, S. (1997). Reference Prior in Multiparameter Nonregular Cases. *Test.*, 6, 159-186.
- [11] Ghosal, S. (1999). Probability Matching Prior for Non-regular Cases. *Biometrika.*, 86, 956-964.
- [12] O' Hagan, A. (1995). Fractional Bayes Factors for Model Comparison (with discussion), *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, B, 57, 99-118.
- [13] O' Hagan, A. (1997). Properties of Intrinsic and Fractional Bayes Factors, *Test*, 6, 101-118.
- [14] Proschan, F. (1963). Theoretical Explanation of Observed Decreasing Failure Rate, *Technometrics*, 5, 375-383.
- [15] Spiegelhalter, D. J. and Smith, A. F. M. (1982). Bayes Factors for Linear and Log-Linear Models with Vague Prior Information, *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, B, 44, 377-387.