

Received 16 March 2023, accepted 26 April 2023, date of publication 28 April 2023, date of current version 18 May 2023.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3271604

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Inverse XLindley Distribution: Properties and Application

ABDELFATEH BEGHRICHE^{®1}, YUSRA A. TASHKANDY², M. E. BAKR^{®2}, HALIM ZEGHDOUDI^{®3}, AHMED M. GEMEAY^{®4}, MD. MOYAZZEM HOSSAIN^{®5}, AND ABDISALAM HASSAN MUSE^{®6} ¹Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Exact Sciences, University the Brothers Mentouri Constantine 1, Constantine 25019, Algeria

²Department of Statistics and Operations Research, College of Science, King Saud University, P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

³LaPS Laboratory, Badji Mokhtar-Annaba University, Annaba 23000, Algeria

⁴Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Tanta University, Tanta 31527, Egypt

⁵School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics, Newcastle University, NE1 7RU Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K.

⁶Faculty of Science and Humanities, School of Postgraduate Studies and Research (SPGSR), Amoud University, Borama 25263, Somalia

Corresponding author: Abdisalam Hassan Muse (abdisalam.hassan@amoud.edu.so)

This work was supported by the Researchers Supporting Project, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, under Grant RSP2023R488.

ABSTRACT This work proposes a new extension to the XLindley model called an inverse XLindley distribution (IXLD). Its probability density function and hazard rate function shapes were deduced mathematically. Several statistical properties of the IXLD were derived mathematically. We use ten different approaches to calculate the parameters of the IXLD. The asymptotic behaviour of these estimators were studied thanks to a comprehensive simulation investigation. Through modelling real data sets, the effectiveness and applicability of the IXLD are examined. This proves that the IXLD better fits the real data set than competing models.

INDEX TERMS Lindley distribution, stress-strength, Anderson-Darling estimation, engineering data, maximum likelihood estimation, maximum product of spacing.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key methods in the study of statistics and probability is the simulation of real occurrences and natural phenomena using probability distributions. Because of these factors, researchers have concentrated on creating probability distributions, despite the fact that the data produced by natural events cannot be adequately described by existing probability distributions. This has several implications for how probability distributions are generalised and extended.

A new kind of probability distribution, generalised probability distributions, emerged as a result of the broad accessibility of additional components. The accuracy and sufficiency of data gathered from natural occurrences as well as the precision with which the distribution tail shape is described enhance when a specific parameter is added to a known probability function. We resorted to probability to lower the risk element in many sectors and productions to minimise cost and time since these events are crucial and are surrounded by

The associate editor coordinating the review of this manuscript and approving it for publication was Dost Muhammad Khan¹⁰.

complexity and hazard. An important topic of statistics is survival and reliability analysis, which has several applications in fields including engineering, economics, demography, medical, actuarial science, and life testing. In the statistical literature, many lifespan distributions have been established to provide data modelling in these applied disciplines more flexibility.

However, there is a method that may be used to increase the flexibility of the traditional distributions, such the inverse transformation (IT). Let's assume that X and T are two random variables. Many writers have used the PT, such as $X = T^{-1}$, to create inverted distributions. For example, the generalized inverse-gamma [18], the inverse power Maxwell [2], the inverse power-Lindley [8], two-parameter Burr-Hatke distribution [1], the inverse-Lindley with twoparameter [4], the reverse-Lindley [28], and inverse Power-Lomax [13]. Some of these models can be obtained as a special case from the family of distributions presented by Omair et al. [21].

The primary goal of this study is to provide a novel flexible distribution that is based on the IT approach, and that has the potential to be applied to a variety of phenomena that occur in real life. This novel model that has been suggested is known as the inverse XLindley distribution (IXLD). The model that has been suggested just has one parameter. Hence it can be classified as a unimodal model. For more information about papers related to Lindley distribution, see [5], [9], [12], [14], [15], and [22]. We are concerned with a one-parameter distribution similar of the one-parameter Lindley distribution presented by Chouia and Zeghdoudi [10] and defined below by its probability density function (PDF)

$$g(x) = \frac{\theta^2 e^{-\theta x} (\theta + x + 2)}{(\theta + 1)^2},$$
 (1)

and its distribution function (CDF) taking the following form

$$G(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{\theta x}{(\theta+1)^2} + 1\right)e^{-\theta x}.$$
 (2)

This paper is presented in the following six sections. Derivation of our proposed model was presented in Section II. Many statistical properties of our proposed model were derived in Section III such as fuzzy reliability, quantile function, moments, stochastic orders, entropy, and stressstrength. Ten different methods of estimation were used to determine proposed model parameters in Section IV and behaviour of these method were checked in Section V. Analyzing of the real data set to show the superiority and flexibility of our proposed model was presented in Section VI. Finally, in Section VII, we presented some of our concluding remarks.

II. FORMULATION OF THE IXLD

In this section, we proposed an inverted version of the XLindley distribution. If a random variable (r.v for shortly) *Y* has the XLindley model (*XL*), then the r.v $X = \frac{1}{Y}$ follows the IXLD with scale parameter θ , its PDF is defined as follows

$$f(x;\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\theta^2 ((2+\theta)x+1)}{(1+\theta)^2 x^3} e^{\frac{-\theta}{x}} & x, \theta > 0\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(3)

Proposition 1: $\forall \theta > 0$, the PDF (3) is an increasing-decreasing function.

Proof: The first derivative of the PDF (3) is determined as follows

$$\frac{d}{dx}f(x) = -\frac{\theta^2}{(1+\theta)^2} \frac{e^{-\frac{\theta}{x}}}{x^5} ((2\theta+4)x^2 - (\theta^2+2\theta-3)x - \theta)$$

by equating last equation to zero and solve it with respect to *x*, we have

$$x = \frac{\theta}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{(\theta+1)^4 + 8} - 3}{4(\theta+2)} < 0,$$

$$x = \frac{\theta}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{(\theta+1)^4 + 8} - 3}{4(\theta+2)} > 0,$$

then, our critical point is

$$x' = \frac{\theta}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{(\theta+1)^4 + 8} - 3}{4(\theta+2)}.$$

The second derivative of the PDF (3) is determined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} f(x) &= \frac{\theta^2 e^{-\frac{\theta}{x}}}{x^7 (\theta+1)^2} \left(6(\theta+2)x^3 - 6(\theta^2 + 2\theta - 2)x^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. + \theta(\theta^2 + 2\theta - 8)x + \theta^2 \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{d^2}{dx^2} f(x) \right|_{x=x'} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

then, $\forall \theta > 0, x' = \frac{\theta}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{(\theta+1)^4+8}-3}{4(\theta+2)}$ is the unique critical point which maximize the PDF (3).

Therefore, the mode of IXLD is defined as follws

$$M^* = \frac{\theta}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{(\theta+1)^4 + 8 - 3}}{4(\theta+2)}.$$
(4)

A. SURVIVAL AND HAZARD RATE FUNCTIONS The CDF of the IXLD is

$$F(x;\theta) = \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x(1+\theta)^2}\right)e^{-\frac{\theta}{x}}.$$
 (5)

The following formulas represent the survival and hazard rate functions of the IXLD respectively

$$S(x) = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x(1+\theta)^2}\right)e^{-\frac{\theta}{x}},\tag{6}$$

$$h(x) = \frac{\theta^2 e^{-\frac{x}{x}} \left((2+\theta)x + 1 \right)}{x^2 \left((1-e^{-\frac{\theta}{x}})(1+\theta)^2 x - \theta e^{-\frac{1}{x}\theta} \right)}.$$
 (7)

Proposition 2: Let f(x) and h(x) be the PDF and hazard rate function of the IXLD respectively, $\lim_{x\to 0} f_{IXL}(x) = 0$. Then h(x) is an increasing-decreasing function.

Proof: According to Glaser [11] and from the PDF (3), we have

$$o(x) = -\frac{f'(x;\theta)}{f(x;\theta)} = -\frac{\left(-2x^2\theta - 4x^2 + x\theta^2 + 2x\theta - 3x + \theta\right)}{x^2((2+\theta)x+1)}.$$

We have after computations

$$\rho'(x) = \frac{H(x)}{x^3 (2x + x\theta + 1)^2},$$

where $H(x) = ax^3 + bx^2 + cx + d$, $a = (-2\theta^2 - 8\theta - 8) < 0$, $b = (2\theta^3 + 8\theta^2 + 2\theta - 12)$, $c = (4\theta^2 + 8\theta - 3)$, and $d = 2\theta$.

In algebra, a cubic equation of the form $ax^3 + bx^2 + cx + d = 0$, has $a \neq 0, b, c, d$ are real numbers, and its discriminant Δ has three cases as the following

- If $\Delta > 0$, the cubic has three distinct real roots.
- If Δ < 0, the cubic has one real root and two non-real complex conjugate roots.
- If $\Delta = 0$, the cubic has three multiple real root. In our case

$$\Delta = -336\theta^{10} - 4032\theta^9 - 17696\theta^8 - 29120\theta^7 + 10900\theta^6 + 76448\theta^5 + 15128\theta^4 - 97840\theta^3 - 16524\theta^2 + 63504\theta - 432.$$





When $\Delta > 0$, H(x) has three distinct real roots $x_0 > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 < 0$.

When $\Delta < 0$, H(x) has one real root and two non-real complex conjugate roots, $x_0 > 0$ and z, \overline{z} .

When $\Delta = 0$, H(x) has three multiple real root, $x_0 = x_1 = x_2 > 0$.

Then $\rho'(x) > 0$, $\forall x < x_0$, and $\rho'(x) = 0$ and $\rho'(x) < 0$ for all $x > x_0$, then the hazard function h(x) is an increasing decreasing function.

Different Plots of the PDF of the proposed model are presented in Figure 1 which satisfied Proposition 1. ALso, hazard function plots of proposed model are presented garphically in Figure 2 which satisfied Proposition 2.



FIGURE 2. Plots of the HF of the IXLD.

III. STATISTICAL PROPERTIES

A. FUZZY RELIABILITY

The failure time of a system (component) will be represented by a continuous random variable T. For the calculation of fuzzy reliability using the following fuzzy probability

$$R_{FU}(t) = \int_t^\infty v(y) f(y) dy, \ 0 \le y < \infty,$$

with v(y) is a membership function (degree to which each element of given universe belongs to a fuzzy set). Thus, assuming that v(y) is

$$\nu(\mathbf{y}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0, & \mathbf{y} \leq t_1 \\ \frac{y-t_1}{t_2-t_1}, & t_1 < \mathbf{y} < t_2, t_1 \geq 0 \\ 1, & \mathbf{y} \geq t_2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

TABLE 1. Fuzzy reliability with different values of θ , t_1 , t_2 , I.

					R_{Fu}	R_{Fu}	R_{Fu}
θ	t_1	t_2	$S(t_1)$	$S(t_2)$	I=0.25	I=0.5	I=0.9
0.2	0.01	1	3.068829e-08	0.9324434	0.6009217	0.6026285	0.603442
0.5	0.5	2	0.5313814	0.8653342	0.1288808	0.06102	0.03547
1	0.1	3	0.0001588998	0.7762423	0.5067757	0.420571	0.38036
3	0.2	1	5.926857e-07	0.05912214	0.38660	0.4006923	0.4429233
5	0.1	1.5	4.607569e-22	0.03897714	0.6000978	0.7514442	0.8416038

Using computational analysis of fuzzy number function for v(y) whose lifetime y(I) can be obtained corresponds to some value of $I - Cut, I \in [0, 1]$ by $v(y) = I \to \frac{(y-t_1)}{(t_2-t_1)} = I$, then

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} y(I) \leq t_1 & I = 0\\ y(I) = t_1 + I(t_2 - t_1) & 0 < I < 1\\ y(I) \geq t_2, & I = 1 \end{array} \right\}.$$

As a result, the fuzzy reliability values may be determined for all I values. The fuzzy dependability of the inverse X-Lindley distribution is determined by the fuzzy reliability definition. The fuzzy reliability of the inverse X-Lindley distribution can be defined as follows

$$R_{Fu}(t) = (1 + \frac{\theta}{t_1(1+\theta)^2})e^{-\frac{\theta}{t_1}} - (1 + \frac{\theta}{y(I)(1+\theta)^2})e^{-\frac{\theta}{y(I)}}.$$

Also, we obtained comparison between traditional reliability and Fuzzy reliability, where the traditional reliability is defined in Equation (6). We executed this comparison by the following steps

- initial values of a, interval time (t_1, t_2) and I where 0 <I < 1.
- Calculate: $y(I) = t_1 + I(t_2 t_1)$.
- Estimate IXLD parameter $\hat{\theta}$, then calculate

$$\widehat{R}_{Fu}(t) = (1 + \frac{\theta}{t_1(1+\theta)^2})e^{-\frac{\theta}{t_1}} - (1 + \frac{\theta}{y(I)(1+\theta)^2})e^{-\frac{\theta}{y(I)}}$$

The numerical results of these comparison are presented in Table 1. The following observations are based on the comparison findings

- When the *I*-Cut increases, the fuzzy reliability increases and decreases according to the values of t_1 and t_2 .
- The traditional reliability with t_1 is lower than the traditional reliability with t_2 .

B. QUANTILE FUNCTION

Formulas for mean and variance are difficult to obtain explicitly since explicit algebraic expressions for the integrals involved are not available, quantiles are easy to evaluate. The quantile function of the IXLD is defined as follows

$$Q_X(q) = F_X^{-1}(q) = \frac{-\theta}{(\theta+1)^2 + \Omega(q)}, \ q \in [0, 1],$$

where
$$\Omega(q) = W\left(-e^{-(\theta+1)^2}(\theta+1)^2q\right)$$
 is Lambert function.

C. MOMENTS

The *r*th moments of the IXLD is determined as follows

$$E(x^{r}) = \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{r} \frac{\theta^{2}((2+\theta)x+1)}{(1+\theta)^{2}x^{3}} e^{\frac{-\theta}{x}} dx$$
$$= \frac{\theta^{2}}{(\theta+1)^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} (2x+x\theta+1)x^{r-3} e^{-\frac{1}{x}\theta} dx$$

by using the definition of the inverse gamma function $\int_0^\infty x^{-\alpha-1} e^{\frac{-\theta}{x}} = \theta^{-\alpha} \Gamma(\alpha), \text{ we have}$

$$E(\mathbf{x}^r) = \frac{\theta^2}{(\theta+1)^2} \left(\theta^{r-2} \Gamma(2-r) + \theta^r \Gamma(1-r) + 2\theta^{r-1} \Gamma(1-r) \right),$$

for r < 1 which $E(x^r) = \infty$, for r > 1, which implies that all moments of the IXLD are infinite. Thus, the IXLD has no mean and no variance. On the other hand, the negative moments are useful in many domain and application (life testing problems, estimation purposes). Therefore, we discuss the r^{th} negative moments for this distribution. The r^{th} negative moment of the IXLD is determined as follows

$$E(x^{-r}) = \int_0^\infty x^{-r} \frac{\theta^2((2+\theta)x+1)}{(1+\theta)^2 x^3} e^{\frac{-\theta}{x}} dx$$

= $\frac{\theta^2}{(\theta+1)^2} \int_0^\infty (2x+x\theta+1) x^{-r-3} e^{-\frac{1}{x}\theta} dx = \frac{\theta^2}{(\theta+1)^2}$
× $(\theta^{-2-r} \Gamma(r+2) + \theta^{-r} \Gamma(r+1))$
+ $2\theta^{-1-r} \Gamma(r+1)), \forall r > 0.$

D. STOCHASTIC ORDERS

Definition 1: Consider T_1 and T_2 , two random variables. Therefore, T1 is seen as being smaller than T2 in

- Stochastic order $(T_1 \prec_s T_2, \text{ if } F_{T_1}(y) \prec F_{T_2}(y), \forall y.$
- Convex order $(T_1 \leq_{ct1} T_2)$, if for all convex functions ϕ and provided expectation exist, $E[\phi(T_1)] <$ $E[\phi(T_2)].$
- Hazard rate order (T₁ ≺_{hr} T₂), if h_{T1}(y) ≥ h_{T2}(y), ∀y.
 Likelihood ratio order (T₁ ≺_{lr} T₂), if ^{f_{T1}(y)}/_{f_{T2}(y)} is decreasing in y.

Theorem 1: Suppose that $X_i \sim IXL(\theta_i), i = 1, 2$. If $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, then $X_1 \prec_{lr} X_2, X_1 \prec_{hr} X_2, X_1 \prec_s X_2$ and $X_1 \leq_{cx} X_2$.

Proof: We have

$$\frac{f_{X_1}(t)}{f_{X_2}(t)} = \frac{\theta_1^2 \left(1 + \theta_2\right)^2 \left((2 + \theta_1)t + 1\right)}{\theta_2^2 \left(2 + \theta_1\right)^2 \left((1 + \theta_2)t + 1\right)} e^{-\frac{(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}{t}}$$

For simplify we use $\ln \left(\frac{f_{X_1}(t)}{f_{X_2}(t)}\right)$. Now, we can find

$$\frac{d}{dt}\ln\left(\frac{f_{X_1}(t)}{f_{X_2}(t)}\right) = \frac{2+\theta_1}{(\theta_1+2)t+1} - \frac{(2+\theta_2)}{(\theta_2+2)t+1} + \frac{(\theta_1-\theta_2)}{t^2}.$$

To this end, if $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, we have $\frac{d}{dt} \ln \left(\frac{f \chi_1(t)}{f \chi_2(t)} \right) \leq 0$. This means that $X_1 \prec_{lr} X_2$. proved.

E. ENTROPY

The entropy of a random variable, denoted by the letter X, is used to quantify the degree to which uncertainty varies. Rényi entropy [26] is defined by

$$J(\gamma) = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \log\{\int f^{\gamma}(x) dx\}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ and $\gamma \neq 1$. For the IXLD, it is determined as follows

$$J(\gamma) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \log \int_0^\infty \frac{\theta^{2\gamma}}{(1+\theta)^{2\gamma}} \frac{((2+\theta)x+1)^{\gamma}}{x^{3\gamma}} e^{\frac{-\theta\gamma}{x}} dx$$
$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \log \left[\frac{\theta^{2\gamma}}{(1+\theta)^{2\gamma}} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \binom{\gamma}{j} (2+\theta)^j \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{\frac{-\theta\gamma}{x}}}{x^{3\gamma-j}} dx$$
$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \log \left[\frac{\theta^{2\gamma}}{(1+\theta)^{2\gamma}} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \binom{\gamma}{j} (2+\theta)^j \frac{\Gamma(3\gamma-j-1)}{(\theta\gamma)^{3\gamma-j-1}} \right].$$

F. ESTIMATION OF THE STRESS-STRENGTH PARAMETER

As it measures system performance, the stress-strength parameter (*R*) is crucial to the reliability analysis. Additionally, the chance of a system failure is provided by *R*; a system fails anytime the applied stress exceeds its capacity. Let $X \sim IXL(\theta_1)$ be the strength of a system subject to stress *Y*, and $Y \sim IXL(\theta_2)$, *X* and *Y* are independent of each other. In our case, the stress-strength parameter *R* is given by

$$R = P(Y \prec X)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_{1}^{2}((2+\theta_{1})x+1)}{(1+\theta_{1})^{2}x^{3}} e^{\frac{-\theta_{1}}{x}} \left(1 + \frac{\theta_{2}}{x(1+\theta_{2})^{2}}\right) e^{-\frac{\theta_{2}}{x}} dx$$

$$= \frac{\theta_{1}^{2}}{(1+\theta_{1})^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} (\frac{(2+\theta_{1})x+1}{x^{3}}) e^{-\frac{\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}}{x}} dx$$

$$+ \frac{\theta_{1}^{2}\theta_{2}(2+\theta_{1})}{(1+\theta_{1})^{2}(1+\theta_{2})^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{-3} e^{-\frac{\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}}{x}} dx + \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{-4} e^{-\frac{\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}}{x}} dx.$$

by using $\int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\frac{a}{x}}}{x^{b+1}} dx = \frac{\Gamma(b)}{a^{b2}}$, we have

$$R = \frac{\theta_1^2}{(\theta_1 + 1)^2 (\theta_2 + 1)^2 (\theta_1 + \theta_2)^3} (\theta_1^2 \theta_2^2 + 3\theta_1^2 \theta_2 + \theta_1^2 + \theta_1^2 + \theta_1^2 \theta_2^2 + 9\theta_1 \theta_2 + 3\theta_1 + 3\theta_2^3 + 10\theta_2^2 + 7\theta_2 + 2).$$

IV. ESTIMATION OF IXLD PARAMETERS

In this section, we'll examine how to estimate IXLD parameter using standard methods. Maximizing or minimising an objective function will provide this estimator, as we'll see.

• The estimated parameter of IXLD is obtained by the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) approach by maximizing the following definition

$$\ln L = 2\ln\theta - 2\ln(\theta+1) - 3\ln x + \ln((2+\theta)x+1) - \frac{\theta}{x}.$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via Anderson-Darling estimation (ADE), by minimizing the

$$A(x_i) = -n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (2i-1) \left[-\frac{\theta}{x_i} + \log\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right) + \log\left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right)e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}}\right) \right].$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via right-tail Anderson-Darling estimation (RADE), by minimizing the following equation

$$R(x_i) = \frac{n}{2} - 2\sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (2i-1) \log\left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_{n+1-i}(1+\theta)^2}\right)\right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_{n+1-i}}}\right).$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via left-tailed Anderson-Darling estimation (LTADE), by minimizing the following equation

$$L(x_i) = -\frac{3}{2}n + 2\sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (2i-1) \left[-\frac{\theta}{x_i} + \log\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right)\right].$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via Cramérvon Mises estimation (CVME), by minimizing the following equation

$$C(x_i) = -\frac{1}{12n} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2} \right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right]^2.$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via leastsquares estimation (LSE), by minimizing the following equation

$$V(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2} \right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2.$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via weighted least-squares estimation (WLSE), by minimizing the following equation

$$W(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n+1)^2(n+2)}{i(n-i+1)} \left[\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2} \right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2.$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via maximum product of spacing estimation (MPSE), by maximizing the following equation

$$\Psi(x_i) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \log \Phi_i(x_i),$$

TABLE 2. Simulation values of BIAS, MSE and MRE of IXLD for ($\theta = 0.25$).

n	Est	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
15	BIAS	0.039299 ^[2]	0.040062 ^[4]	0.042823 ^{8}	0.03805[1]	0.041812 ^{6}	0.047553 ^{10}	0.041277 ⁽³⁾	0.039606 ^[3]	0.046883 ^[9]	0.041838 ^[7]
	MSE	0.002598 ^[2]	0.00279 ^{{5} }	0.003255 ^{8}	0.002327 ⁽¹⁾	0.003033 ⁽⁷⁾	0.004256 ⁽⁹⁾	0.002947 ⁽⁶⁾	0.002715 ⁽³⁾	0.004407 ^[10]	0.002785 ⁽⁴⁾
	MRE	0.157196 ^[2]	$0.160249^{\{4\}}$	0.171292 ^{8}	0.152199 ^[1]	$0.167249^{\{6\}}$	$0.190213^{\{10\}}$	0.16511 ⁽⁵⁾	0.158423 ⁽³⁾	0.187532 ^{9}	0.167351 ⁽²⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	13(4)	24(8)	3(1)	19(7)	29(10)	16 ^{5}	9{3}	28 ^{9}	18 ^{6}
35	BIAS	$0.024682^{\{2\}}$	0.025262 ^{4}	0.027614 ^{7}	0.024559[1]	$0.027424^{\{6\}}$	0.029979 ⁽⁹⁾	0.026341 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.025072^{\{3\}}$	$0.031494^{\{10\}}$	0.028007 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.001 ^{2}	0.001038 ^{4}	$0.001224^{\{7\}}$	0.000949[1]	0.001221 ^{6}	0.0015 ⁽⁹⁾	0.001121 ⁽⁵⁾	0.001009 ⁽³⁾	0.001641 ^{10}	0.00124 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	0.098729 ^[2]	0.101049 ^{4}	0.110456 ^{7}	0.098235[1]	$0.109694^{\{6\}}$	0.119917 ⁽⁹⁾	0.105365 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.100287^{(3)}$	0.125978 ^{10}	0.112029 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\sum Ranks$	6(2)	$12^{\{4\}}$	21(7)	3(1)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	27 ^{9}	15(5)	$9^{\{3\}}$	30(10)	24 ^{8}
80	BIAS	0.01628(1)	0.016565 ⁽³⁾	0.017778 ⁽⁶⁾	0.016632 ^[4]	0.017933 ⁽⁷⁾	0.019465 ⁽⁹⁾	0.017234 ⁽⁵⁾	0.016505 ⁽²⁾	0.020392 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.01849 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	$0.000429^{\{3\}}$	0.000436 ^{4}	$0.000504^{\{6\}}$	0.000427 ^[1]	$0.000515^{\{7\}}$	0.000614 ⁽⁹⁾	0.000467 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.000428^{\{2\}}$	$0.000681^{\{10\}}$	0.000535 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	0.06512[1]	0.066259 ^[3]	$0.071114^{\{6\}}$	0.066526 ⁽⁴⁾	0.071732 ^{7}	0.077861 ⁽⁹⁾	0.068935 ⁽⁵⁾	0.06602 ^[2]	0.081568 ^{10}	0.073961 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\sum Ranks$	5(1)	10 ^{4}	18 ^[6]	9{3}	21(7)	27 ^{9}	15 ^{5}	6 ^[2]	30(10)	24 ^{8}
120	BIAS	$0.013575^{\{4\}}$	0.01354 ^{3}	0.014661 ^{7}	0.013263[1]	$0.014464^{\{6\}}$	0.015661 ⁽⁹⁾	0.014233 ⁽⁵⁾	0.013309 ⁽²⁾	0.017048 ^{10}	0.015552 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.000288 ^[3]	0.000295 ^{4}	$0.000342^{\{7\}}$	0.000274 ^[1]	0.000338 ^{6}	0.000392 ⁽⁹⁾	0.000318 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.000282^{\{2\}}$	0.000463 ^{10}	0.000378 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	$0.0543^{\{4\}}$	$0.054162^{\{3\}}$	$0.058645^{\{7\}}$	0.053054[1]	$0.057856^{\{6\}}$	0.062644 ⁽⁹⁾	0.056933 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.053237^{\{2\}}$	$0.068192^{\{10\}}$	0.062206 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	11(4)	10(3)	21(7)	3(1)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	27 ^{9}	15(5)	6(2)	30(10)	24 ^{8}
180	BIAS	0.01073 ^[1]	0.01146 ^{5}	$0.011928^{\{7\}}$	0.010754 ⁽²⁾	$0.011809^{\{6\}}$	0.012868 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.011304^{(4)}$	$0.010949^{\{3\}}$	0.013535 ^{10}	0.012393 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	$0.000182^{\{2\}}$	0.000209 ^[5]	0.000226 ^[7]	0.000181 ⁽¹⁾	0.000222 ^{6}	0.000264 ⁽⁹⁾	0.000205 ^[4]	0.000191 ^[3]	0.000293 ^{10}	0.000242 ^[8]
	MRE	0.042921 ⁽¹⁾	0.04584 ^{5}	0.047711 ^{7}	0.043015 ⁽²⁾	0.047238 ⁽⁶⁾	0.051472 ⁽⁹⁾	0.045216 ⁽⁴⁾	0.043795 ⁽³⁾	$0.054141^{\{10\}}$	0.049573 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	4(1)	15(5)	21(7)	5(2)	18(6)	27 ^{9}	12 ^{{4} }	9{3}	30(10)	24 ^{8}
250	BIAS	0.009126 ^[1]	0.00979 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.009949^{\{6\}}$	0.009298 ^[3]	0.010113 ^{7}	0.011016 ⁽⁹⁾	0.009669 ⁽⁴⁾	0.009169 ⁽²⁾	0.011665 ^{10}	0.010438 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.000131{1}	$0.000152^{\{5\}}$	0.000158 ^{6}	0.000135 ^{2.5}	0.00016 ⁽⁷⁾	0.000191 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.000146^{(4)}$	0.000135{2.5}	$0.000215^{\{10\}}$	0.000171 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	0.036502[1]	0.039162 ^{5}	0.039797 ^{6}	0.037192 ^[3]	0.040454 ⁽⁷⁾	0.044065 ⁽⁹⁾	0.038676 ⁽⁴⁾	0.036676 ⁽²⁾	0.046662 ^{10}	0.041753 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\sum Ranks$	3(1)	15(5)	18 ^[6]	8.5 ^{3}	21 ^{7}	27 ^{9}	12 ^{4}	6.5 ⁽²⁾	30(10)	24 ^{8}
500	BIAS	0.006515 ^[2]	0.006725 ^[4]	0.007161 ⁽⁷⁾	0.006456(1)	0.007053 ^[6]	0.007678 ⁽⁹⁾	0.00697 ^[5]	0.006602 ^[3]	0.008226 ^{10}	0.007544 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	$6.7e - 05^{\{2\}}$	$7.2e - 05^{\{4\}}$	$7.9e - 05^{(6.5)}$	$6.5e - 05^{(1)}$	$7.9e - 05^{(6.5)}$	$9.4e - 05^{(9)}$	$7.6e - 05^{(5)}$	$6.8e - 05^{(3)}$	0.000106 ^{10}	$9e - 05^{\{8\}}$
	MRE	0.026061 ^{2}	$0.026898^{\{4\}}$	0.028644 ^{7}	0.025824(1)	0.028213 ^{6}	0.030712 ⁽⁹⁾	0.027881 ⁽⁵⁾	0.026407 ^[3]	0.032905 ^{10}	0.030178 ^[8]

where

$$\Phi_i(\xi) = \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_i(1+\theta)^2}\right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_i}} - \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{x_{i-1}(1+\theta)^2}\right) e^{-\frac{\theta}{x_{i-1}}}.$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via minimum spacing absolute distance estimation (MSADE), by minimizing the following equation

$$\Delta_1(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |\Phi_i - \frac{1}{n+1}|$$

• The estimated IXLD parameter is obtained via minimum spacing absolute-log distance estimation method (MSALDE), by minimizing the following equation

$$\Delta_2(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |\log \phi_i - \log \frac{1}{n+1}|.$$

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

All of the estimate methods covered in Section IV will be used in this section. Now that we have these various estimation methods, we will examine how well they perform when used to estimate the IXLD's parameter. Additionally, by contrasting the numerical values of each strategy, we assess a comparison of each approach by determining average of bias (BIAS) $|Bias(\hat{\theta})| = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} |\hat{\theta} - \theta|$, mean squared errors (MSE), $MSE = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} |\hat{\theta} - \theta|/\theta$. Selecting the best approach for model parameter estimate may be based on simulation results. The M = 10000 random samples from IXLD are generated using the R programming language with sample sizes of 15, 35, 80, 120, 180, 250, and 500.

Tables 2-6 provide the numerical results of the simulation, and each number's power is related to its rank in relation to other methods of estimating along the same line. Table 7 displays the partial and total ranks of our estimator. When taking random samples from the IXLD, we discover that MPSE is the most effective method for estimated IXLD parameter.

VI. REAL DATA ANALYSIS

The use of data obtained from the "real world" helps illustrate the adaptability of the distribution that is being discussed in this section. The first real world data set describes the

TABLE 3. Simulation values of BIAS, MSE and MRE of IXLD for ($\theta = 0.75$).

n	Est.	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
15	BIAS	0.131128 ^{3}	0.131178 ^[4]	0.13869 ^[8]	0.118673 ^[1]	0.136034 ^{7}	0.158192 ^{10}	0.131335 ⁽⁵⁾	0.128883 ⁽²⁾	0.149423 ⁽⁹⁾	0.133231[6]
	MSE	0.03363 ^{6}	0.031028 ^[3]	0.040997 ⁽⁸⁾	0.025957 ⁽¹⁾	0.035288 ^[7]	0.052231 {10}	0.031206 ^{4}	$0.030383^{(2)}$	0.04323 ⁽⁹⁾	0.032283 ⁽⁵⁾
	MRE	0.174838 ^[3]	$0.174904^{\{4\}}$	0.18492 ^[8]	0.158231(1)	0.181379 ^{7}	$0.210923^{\{10\}}$	0.175113 ^{5}	0.171844 ⁽²⁾	0.199231 ⁽⁹⁾	0.177641 ⁽⁶⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	12 ^[4]	11(3)	24 ^{8}	311	21(3)	30(10)	14 ⁽⁵⁾	6 ^{2}	27 ^{9}	17 ^{6}
35	BIAS	0.082018 ⁴	0.081115 ⁽²⁾	0.086562 ⁽⁷⁾	0.081016 ^[1]	0.086278 ⁽⁶⁾	0.096531 ⁽⁹⁾	0.084059 ^{5}	0.081208 ^[3]	0.098961 [10]	0.091099 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	$0.0152^{\{7\}}$	0.011112 ^[1]	0.012985 ⁽⁵⁾	0.014909 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.012709^{\{4\}}$	0.016505 ⁽⁸⁾	$0.011832^{\{3\}}$	0.011404 ⁽²⁾	0.01738 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.017402^{\{10\}}$
	MRE	0.109357 ⁽⁴⁾	0.108153 ⁽²⁾	0.115416 ⁽⁷⁾	0.108021 ⁽¹⁾	0.115037 ⁽⁶⁾	0.128708 ⁽⁹⁾	0.112078 ⁽⁵⁾	0.108278 ⁽³⁾	0.131947 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.121466 ⁽⁸⁾
	$\sum Ranks$	15(5)	5(1)	19 ^{7}	8(2.5)	16 ⁽⁶⁾	26(8.5)	13 ^[4]	8(2.5)	29{10}	26(8.5)
80	BIAS	0.053471 ^{4}	0.051591(1)	0.055752 ⁽⁶⁾	0.053077 ⁽³⁾	0.054896 ⁽⁵⁾	0.062726(9)	0.060188 ^{8}	0.052123(2)	0.071511 ^{10}	0.058816 ⁽⁷⁾
	MSE	$0.008925^{\{7\}}$	0.004438 ^[2]	$0.005152^{(4)}$	0.008971 ⁽⁸⁾	0.004961 ^{3}	0.006565 ⁽⁶⁾	0.005918 ^{5}	0.004426 ⁽¹⁾	0.009049 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.010392^{\{10\}}$
	MRE	0.071294 ^{4}	0.068788 ^[1]	0.074335 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.07077^{(3)}$	0.073194 ⁽⁵⁾	0.083634 ⁽⁹⁾	0.080251 [8]	0.069498 ⁽²⁾	0.095348 ^{10}	$0.078421^{(7)}$
	$\Sigma Ranks$	15(5)	4(1)	16 ^{6}	14 ^{4}	13(3)	24(8.5)	21 ^{7}	5{2}	29{10}	24(8.5)
120	BIAS	0.039718 ^{2}	0.04144 ^{3}	$0.045148^{(6)}$	0.037273 ⁽¹⁾	0.044354 ^{5}	0.049786 ⁽⁸⁾	0.054434 ^{9}	0.041723 ⁽⁴⁾	$0.066142^{\{10\}}$	0.04653 ⁽⁷⁾
	MSE	0.006476 ^{8}	0.002821{1}	$0.00332^{\{4\}}$	0.005492 ^[7]	0.003195 ⁽³⁾	0.004054 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.005011^{\{6\}}$	0.002831 ⁽²⁾	$0.008372^{\{10\}}$	0.008062 ⁽⁹⁾
	MRE	$0.052957^{\{2\}}$	0.055253 ^{3}	0.060197 ⁽⁶⁾	0.049697 ^{1}	0.059139 ^[5]	0.066381 ⁽⁸⁾	0.072579 ^{9}	0.055631 ⁽⁴⁾	$0.08819^{\{10\}}$	0.06204 ⁽³⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	12 ⁽⁴⁾	7(1)	16 ^{{6} }	9{2}	13(5)	21 (7)	24 ^{9}	10{3}	30(10)	23 ^{8}
180	BIAS	0.030404 ^[1]	$0.033108^{\{3\}}$	0.036278 ⁽³⁾	0.030737 ⁽²⁾	0.036229 ^{5.5}	0.040245 ⁽⁸⁾	0.054939 ^{9}	0.033138 ⁽⁴⁾	$0.062045^{\{10\}}$	0.036229 ^{5.5}
	MSE	0.004558 ^{6}	$0.001844^{\{2\}}$	0.002116 ⁽⁴⁾	0.004783 ⁽⁷⁾	0.002093 ⁽³⁾	0.002637 ⁽⁵⁾	0.005107 ^{8}	0.001796 ^[1]	$0.007974^{\{10\}}$	0.006415 ⁽⁹⁾
	MRE	0.040538 ^[1]	0.044143 ^{3}	0.04837 ^[7]	0.040983 ⁽²⁾	0.048305 ^{5.5}	0.05366 ⁽⁸⁾	0.073253 ^{9}	$0.044184^{\{4\}}$	$0.082727^{\{10\}}$	$0.048305^{\{5.5\}}$
	$\Sigma Ranks$	8(1.5)	8(1.5)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	11 ⁽⁴⁾	14(5)	21 ⁽⁸⁾	26(9)	9(3)	30(10)	20(7)
250	BIAS	0.023459 ^{2}	$0.027464^{\{5\}}$	0.030601 ⁽⁷⁾	0.022219 ^[1]	0.030595 ⁽⁶⁾	0.033546 ⁽⁸⁾	$0.05742^{\{9\}}$	$0.027274^{\{4\}}$	$0.062409^{\{10\}}$	$0.025505^{(3)}$
	MSE	0.003512 ^{7}	0.001266 ^[2]	0.001485 ⁽³⁾	0.00331 ⁽⁶⁾	0.001488 ^[4]	0.001815 ⁽⁵⁾	0.005633 ^{9}	0.001208 ^[1]	0.008601 {10}	0.004053 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	0.031279 ^{2}	0.036618 ⁽⁵⁾	0.040801 ⁽⁷⁾	0.029626 ^[1]	0.040793 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.044728^{(8)}$	0.07656 ^{9}	0.036366 ^[4]	$0.083212^{\{10\}}$	0.034007 ⁽³⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	11(3)	12 ⁽⁴⁾	17 ^{7}	8(1)	16 ⁽⁶⁾	21 [8]	27 ^{9}	9 ^{2}	30(10)	14 ^{5}
500	BIAS	$0.008102^{\{1\}}$	$0.01784^{\{4\}}$	$0.022096^{(6)}$	0.008751 ⁽²⁾	0.022214 ^{7}	0.024085 ⁽⁸⁾	0.067327 ^[10]	0.018706 ⁽⁵⁾	0.056483 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.008817^{\{3\}}$
	MSE	0.001016 ^{6}	0.000554 ^[1]	0.000767 ^[3]	0.001133 ⁽³⁾	0.000786 ^[4]	0.000923 ⁽⁵⁾	0.006658 ^{9}	0.000578 ⁽²⁾	$0.007628^{\{10\}}$	0.001301 ⁽⁸⁾
	MRE	$0.010802^{\{1\}}$	0.023787 ^[4]	0.029461 ⁽⁶⁾	0.011669 ⁽²⁾	0.029618 ⁽⁷⁾	0.032114 ⁽⁸⁾	0.089769 ^[10]	0.024941 ⁽⁵⁾	0.075311 ⁽⁹⁾	0.011756 ⁽³⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	811	9(2)	15 ^{6}	11 ^{3}	18(3)	21 [8]	29 ^{10}	12 ^{4}	28 ^{9}	14 ^{5}

TABLE 4. Simulation values of BIAS, MSE and MRE of IXLD for ($\theta = 1.0$).

n	Est.	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
15	BIAS	0.177532 ^{3}	$0.182104^{\{4\}}$	0.195381 ^{8}	0.167736 ^[1]	0.19234 ^{7}	0.222946 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.191251 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.174685^{(2)}$	0.207039 ^{9}	0.183757 ^[5]
	MSE	0.059479 ⁽⁵⁾	0.058051(3)	0.072198 ⁽⁸⁾	0.047702(1)	0.069218 ⁽⁷⁾	0.104885 ^{10}	0.06877 ⁽⁶⁾	0.054521(2)	0.079176 ⁽⁹⁾	0.058234 ⁽⁴⁾
	MRE	0.177532 ^{3}	$0.182104^{\{4\}}$	0.195381 ^{8}	0.167736 ^{1}	$0.19234^{\{7\}}$	0.222946 ^{10}	0.191251 ^{6}	0.174685 ^[2]	$0.207039^{\{9\}}$	0.183757 ⁽⁵⁾
	Σ Ranks	11(3.5)	11(3.5)	24 ^{{8} }	311	21 ^{7}	30 ⁽¹⁰⁾	18 ⁽⁶⁾	6(2)	27 ^{9}	14(5)
35	BIAS	0.110927 ^{2}	0.115467 ^{5}	0.124646 ^{8}	0.107386 ^{1}	0.124133 ^{7}	0.136297 ^{10}	$0.114304^{(4)}$	0.111865 ⁽³⁾	0.134548 ^{9}	0.122086 ⁽⁶⁾
	MSE	0.023143 ⁽⁵⁾	0.022043 ^{3}	0.02655 ⁽⁷⁾	0.020635{1}	0.026485 ^{6}	0.032156 ⁽⁹⁾	0.02236 ^{4}	0.020651 ^[2]	0.032573 ^[10]	0.02717 ^{8}
	MRE	0.110927 ^{2}	0.115467 ^{5}	0.124646 ^{8}	0.107386 ^{1}	0.124133 ^{7}	$0.136297^{\{10\}}$	$0.114304^{\{4\}}$	0.111865 ^[3]	$0.134548^{\{9\}}$	$0.122086^{\{6\}}$
	$\Sigma Ranks$	9{3}	13 ^{5}	23 ^{{8} }	311	20 ^{{6.5} }	29[10]	12 ⁽⁴⁾	8(2)	28 ^{9}	20 ^{{6.5} }
80	BIAS	0.074552 ⁽²⁾	0.074592 ⁽³⁾	0.081162 ⁽⁷⁾	0.074698 ⁽⁴⁾	0.078519 ⁽⁶⁾	0.085365 ⁽⁹⁾	0.075405 ⁽⁵⁾	0.073894 ⁽¹⁾	0.090041(10)	0.085109 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.012843 ^{7}	0.009089 ^{2}	0.01077 ^{5}	0.013801 ^{8}	$0.010104^{\{4\}}$	0.011997 ^[6]	0.009238 ^[3]	0.008741 ⁽¹⁾	0.015525 ^{9}	$0.016797^{\{10\}}$
	MRE	$0.074552^{\{2\}}$	$0.074592^{\{3\}}$	$0.081162^{\{7\}}$	$0.074698^{\{4\}}$	0.078519 ^{6}	0.085365 ⁽⁹⁾	0.075405 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.073894^{\{1\}}$	0.090041 ^[10]	$0.085109^{\{8\}}$
	$\Sigma Ranks$	11 ^{3}	8(2)	19(7)	16 ^(5.5)	16(5.5)	24 ^{8}	13(4)	3(1)	29(10)	26(9)
120	BIAS	0.06181 ^[4]	0.060218 ^{3}	0.064196 ^{6}	0.062061 ^{5}	0.064336 ^{7}	0.070192 ^[8]	0.059553 ^[2]	0.058685 ^[1]	0.07379 ^[10]	0.070722 ^{9}
	MSE	$0.010927^{\{7\}}$	$0.005894^{\{3\}}$	$0.006614^{\{4\}}$	0.011085 ^{8}	0.006655 ^{5}	0.0081 ⁽⁶⁾	0.005686 ^[2]	0.005567[1]	0.012563 ^{9}	$0.013699^{\{10\}}$
	MRE	0.06181 ^[4]	$0.060218^{\{3\}}$	0.064196 ^{6}	0.062061 ^{5}	0.064336 ^{7}	0.070192 ^[8]	0.059553 ^{2}	0.058685 ⁽¹⁾	0.07379 ^[10]	0.070722 ^{9}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	15(4)	9(3)	16(5)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	19(7)	22 ⁽⁸⁾	6(2)	3(1)	29(10)	28(9)
180	BIAS	$0.050405^{\{4\}}$	0.048721 ^{2}	$0.051421^{\{5\}}$	$0.052465^{\{7\}}$	0.051927 ^{6}	0.056792 ^[8]	$0.04891^{\{3\}}$	0.047369(1)	0.06483 ^[10]	0.057177 ^[9]
	MSE	0.00853 ^[3]	0.003799 ^{3}	0.004231 ^{4}	0.009686 ^{8}	$0.004242^{\{5\}}$	$0.005112^{(6)}$	0.003796 ^[2]	0.003613 ⁽¹⁾	0.013914 ^[10]	0.010731 ^{9}
	MRE	0.050405 ⁽⁴⁾	0.048721 ⁽²⁾	0.051421 ⁽⁵⁾	0.052465 ^{7}	0.051927 ^{6}	0.056792 ⁽⁸⁾	0.04891 ⁽³⁾	0.047369 ⁽¹⁾	0.06483 ^[10]	0.057177 ⁽⁹⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	15 ^{5}	7{2}	14 ⁴⁴	22(7.5)	17(6)	22(7.5)	8(3)	3(1)	30(10)	27(9)
250	BIAS	$0.042145^{\{4\}}$	$0.040848^{\{2\}}$	0.043785 ^{5}	$0.044072^{\{6\}}$	0.044556 ^{7}	0.048133 ⁽⁸⁾	0.041793 ^{3}	0.040419 ^[1]	0.057862 ^[10]	0.049162 ^{9}
	MSE	0.007061 ⁽⁷⁾	0.002706 ^{2}	0.003045 ^{4}	0.007826 ^{8}	0.00314 ^{5}	0.003668 ^[6]	0.002735 ⁽³⁾	0.00257 ^[1]	0.015266 ^[10]	0.009857 ^[9]
	MRE	0.042145 ⁽⁴⁾	0.040848 ^[2]	0.043785 ^{5}	$0.044072^{\{6\}}$	0.044556 ^{7}	0.048133 ⁽⁸⁾	0.041793 ⁽³⁾	0.040419 ⁽¹⁾	0.057862 ^[10]	0.049162 ⁽⁹⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	15 ^{5}	6{2}	14 ^{4}	20 ^{7}	19 ^{6}	22 ^{8}	9(3)	3(1)	30{10}	27(9)
500	BIAS	$0.029359^{\{4\}}$	$0.028383^{\{2\}}$	0.030363 ^{5}	$0.029285^{\{3\}}$	$0.030896^{\{6\}}$	0.03443 ⁽⁹⁾	0.033464 ^{8}	$0.028208^{\{1\}}$	0.057602[10]	0.032689 ^{7}
	MSE	0.004504 ⁽⁷⁾	0.001317 ⁽²⁾	0.001465 ⁽³⁾	0.004629 ⁽⁸⁾	0.001508 ⁴	0.001883 ⁽⁶⁾	0.001747 ⁽⁵⁾	0.001254 ⁽¹⁾	0.024202 ^[10]	0.005551 ⁽⁹⁾
	MRE	$0.029359^{\{4\}}$	0.028383 ^{2}	0.030363 ^{5}	$0.029285^{\{3\}}$	0.030896 ^{6}	0.03443 ⁽⁹⁾	0.033464 ⁽⁸⁾	$0.028208^{(1)}$	0.057602[10]	0.032689 ^{7}
	$\sum Ranks$	15 ^{5}	6 ^{2}	13 ^{3}	14 ^{4}	16 ^{6}	24 ^{9}	21(2)	3(1)	30 ^{10}	23(8)

TABLE 5. Simulation values of BIAS, MSE and MRE of IXLD for ($\theta = 2.5$).

n	Est.	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
15	BIAS	0.510314 ⁽³⁾	0.532652 ^[5]	0.572809 ^{9}	0.47832{1}	0.568873[8]	0.666956 ^{{10} }	0.54115[6]	0.507411 ^{2}	0.56729 ^[7]	0.522378 ^[4]
	MSE	$0.474942^{\{4\}}$	$0.527089^{\{5\}}$	0.641358 ^{8}	0.370274 ^[1]	0.628301 ^[7]	0.964916 ^{10}	0.545387 ^[6]	$0.458388^{\{2\}}$	0.646266 ^{9}	$0.461219^{\{3\}}$
	MRE	0.204125 ⁽³⁾	0.213061 ⁽⁵⁾	0.229124 ^{9}	0.191328 ^[1]	0.227549 ^[8]	$0.266782^{\{10\}}$	0.21646 ^[6]	$0.202964^{\{2\}}$	0.226916 ^{7}	0.208951 ^{4}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	10(3)	15(5)	26 ^{9}	3(1)	23(7.5)	30(10)	18(6)	6(2)	23(7.5)	11(4)
35	BIAS	0.310225 ^[2]	0.336527 ^[4]	0.35256 ^{7}	0.305786 ^[1]	0.353501 ⁽⁸⁾	0.392075 ^{10}	0.346403 ⁽⁵⁾	0.316516 ^{3}	0.385454 ^{9}	0.349171 ^{6}
	MSE	0.162031 ^{2}	0.189306 ^[4]	$0.213022^{\{7\}}$	0.146212 ^[1]	0.216481 ^[8]	$0.270749^{\{10\}}$	0.205619 ⁽⁶⁾	0.167467 ^{3}	0.255861 ^{9}	0.194947 ^{5}
	MRE	$0.12409^{\{2\}}$	0.134611 ⁽⁴⁾	$0.141024^{\{7\}}$	$0.122314^{\{1\}}$	0.141401 ^[8]	$0.15683^{\{10\}}$	0.138561 ^[5]	$0.126606^{\{3\}}$	$0.154182^{\{9\}}$	0.139668 ^{6}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	12(4)	21(7)	3(1)	24(8)	30(10)	16(5)	g(3)	27 ⁽⁹⁾	17(6)
80	BIAS	0.208083 ^[2]	$0.218222^{\{4\}}$	0.229612 ^{7}	0.199422 ⁽¹⁾	0.2256 ⁽⁶⁾	0.256566 ⁽⁹⁾	0.218298 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.208806^{\{3\}}$	0.258095 ^[10]	0.235311 ^{8}
	MSE	0.070904 ^[3]	$0.076897^{\{4\}}$	0.085731 ^{7}	0.062938 ^[1]	$0.084107^{\{6\}}$	$0.111063^{\{10\}}$	0.078212 ^[5]	$0.070724^{\{2\}}$	0.109313 ^{9}	0.085962 ^{8}
	MRE	$0.083233^{(2)}$	$0.087289^{\{4\}}$	0.091845 ^{7}	0.079769 ^[1]	0.09024 ^[6]	0.102626 ⁽⁹⁾	0.087319 ^[5]	0.083523 ^{3}	0.103238[10]	0.094124 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	7(2)	12(4)	21(7)	3(1)	18(6)	28(9)	15(5)	8(3)	29(10)	24 ⁽⁸⁾
120	BIAS	0.165564 ⁽²⁾	0.179962 ^{5}	0.191356 ^{7}	0.164768 ⁽¹⁾	0.188021 ^[6]	0.206747 ^[9]	0.178297 ^[4]	0.168783 ^{3}	0.208252 ^{10}	0.192033 ^[8]
	MSE	0.044233 ^[2]	0.05139 ^[5]	0.059069 ^{8}	0.042927 ^[1]	0.056551 ^{6}	$0.07033^{\{10\}}$	$0.051082^{(4)}$	0.045143 ^{3}	0.069937 ^{9}	0.057437 ^{7}
	MRE	0.066226 ^[2]	0.071985 ^[5]	$0.076542^{\{7\}}$	0.065907 ^[1]	$0.075208^{\{6\}}$	0.082699 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.071319^{\{4\}}$	0.067513 ^{3}	0.083301 ^{10}	0.076813 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	15(5)	22(7)	3(1)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	28 ⁽⁹⁾	12 ^{4}	9{3}	29(10)	23 ⁽⁸⁾
180	BIAS	0.134608 ⁽¹⁾	$0.14442^{[4]}$	$0.153182^{\{6\}}$	0.135821 ^{2}	0.153406 ⁽⁷⁾	0.166779 ⁽⁹⁾	0.146094 ⁽⁵⁾	0.139999 ³	0.170301 ^[10]	0.156523 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	$0.02868^{\{1\}}$	$0.033322^{\{4\}}$	0.037211 ^{6}	0.028881 ^{2}	$0.038118^{\{7\}}$	0.045103 ⁽⁹⁾	0.033849 ^[5]	0.031686 ^{3}	0.046179 ^[10]	0.038438 ^{8}
	MRE	0.053843 ⁽¹⁾	$0.057768^{\{4\}}$	0.061273 ^{6}	$0.054328^{\{2\}}$	0.061362 ^[7]	0.066712 ⁽⁹⁾	0.058438 ^[5]	0.055999 ^{3}	$0.06812^{\{10\}}$	0.062609 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	3(1)	12 ^{4}	18 ^{{6} }	6(2)	21(7)	27 ⁽⁹⁾	15(5)	9{3}	30(10)	24 ^{8}
250	BIAS	0.114682 ⁽²⁾	0.122735 ⁽⁴⁾	0.129587 ^{6}	0.110574 ⁽¹⁾	0.132528 ⁽⁷⁾	0.141999 ⁽⁹⁾	0.124578 ⁽⁵⁾	0.11625 ⁽³⁾	0.147439 ^{10}	0.13394 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.020761 ^{2}	$0.023659^{\{4\}}$	0.026451 ^{6}	0.019421 ⁽¹⁾	0.027773 ⁽⁷⁾	0.032593 ⁽⁹⁾	0.024667 ^[5]	0.021345 ^{3}	0.034133 ^{10}	$0.028098^{\{8\}}$
	MRE	$0.045873^{(2)}$	$0.049094^{\{4\}}$	0.051835 ^{6}	$0.04423^{\{1\}}$	0.053011 ⁽³⁾	0.056799 ⁽⁹⁾	0.049831 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.0465^{(3)}$	0.058976 ^[10]	0.053576 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	12 ^{4}	18 ^{{6} }	3(1)	21(7)	27 ^{9}	15(5)	9{3}	30(10)	24 ^{8}
500	BIAS	0.07906 ⁽²⁾	0.087704 ⁽⁵⁾	0.089675 ^{6}	0.078979(1)	0.090961 ⁽⁷⁾	0.099542 ⁽⁹⁾	0.08615 ⁽⁴⁾	0.082347 ^{3}	0.100966 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.095352 ⁽⁸⁾
	MSE	0.009995 ^[1]	$0.012162^{\{5\}}$	$0.0128^{\{6\}}$	0.010137 ^[2]	0.013077 ^[7]	0.015728 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.011674^{\{4\}}$	$0.010582^{\{3\}}$	0.016268 ^[10]	0.014279 ^{8}
	MRE	0.031624 ^{2}	$0.035082^{\{5\}}$	0.03587 ^{6}	0.031592 ^[1]	$0.036384^{\{7\}}$	0.039817 ⁽⁹⁾	$0.03446^{(4)}$	$0.032939^{\{3\}}$	0.040386 ^{10}	0.038141 ^{8}
	$\sum Ranks$	5(2)	15 ^{5}	18 ^{6}	4(1)	21 ^{7}	27 ^{9}	12 ^{4}	9{3}	30[10]	24 ^{8}

TABLE 6. Simulation values of BIAS, MSE and MRE of IXLD for ($\theta = 4$).

n	Est.	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
15	BIAS	0.846319 ^[3]	0.867557 ^[4]	0.967914 ^{8}	0.795308[1]	0.948681 ⁽⁷⁾	1.140412 ^{10}	0.919615[8]	0.83177 ^[2]	0.968646 ^{9}	0.872303 ⁽⁵⁾
	MSE	1.345118 ⁽⁴⁾	1.357288 ⁽⁵⁾	1.824064 ^{9}	1.046334 ⁽¹⁾	1.699417 ⁽⁷⁾	2.904661 10}	1.580291 ⁽⁶⁾	1.230171 ^{2}	1.819101 ⁽⁸⁾	1.287198 ⁽³⁾
	MRE	0.21158(3)	0.216889 ⁽⁴⁾	0.241979 ⁽⁸⁾	0.198827 ⁽¹⁾	0.23717 ⁽⁷⁾	0.285103(10)	0.229904 ⁽⁶⁾	0.207943 ⁽²⁾	0.242161 ⁽⁹⁾	0.218076(5)
	$\Sigma Ranks$	10(3)	13(4.5)	25 ^{8}	3(1)	21(7)	30{10}	18(6)	6{2}	26 ^{9}	13(4.5)
35	BIAS	0.527838 ^[2]	0.544991 ^{4}	0.611545 ^{8}	0.508347 ^[1]	0.59428 ⁽⁷⁾	0.665411 ^{10}	0.569593 ⁽⁵⁾	0.534908 ^{3}	0.634747 ^{9}	0.587853 ⁽⁶⁾
	MSE	0.472314 ⁽²⁾	0.499771 ⁽⁴⁾	0.648194 ^{8}	$0.409448^{(1)}$	0.595716 ⁽⁷⁾	0.771601 ^{10}	0.563354 ⁽⁶⁾	0.478991 ^{3}	0.686715 ^{9}	0.558028 ^{5}
	MRE	0.131959 ⁽²⁾	0.136248 ^[4]	0.152886 ^{8}	0.127087 ⁽¹⁾	0.14857 ⁽⁷⁾	0.166353 ^{10}	0.142398 ⁽⁵⁾	0.133727 ^{3}	0.158687 ⁽⁹⁾	0.146963 ⁽⁶⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	12 ^{{4} }	24 ^{{8} }	3(1)	21(7)	30{10}	16(5)	9{3}	27 ^{9}	17(6)
80	BIAS	0.336702 ⁽¹⁾	0.364301 ⁽⁴⁾	0.39081 ^{8}	0.339879 ^[2]	$0.387841^{\{6\}}$	0.431374 ^{10}	0.367714 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.344281^{\{3\}}$	$0.42444^{\{9\}}$	0.389661 ^[7]
	MSE	0.184216 ⁽²⁾	$0.215182^{\{4\}}$	$0.248803^{\{8\}}$	0.181573 ^[1]	0.246621 ⁽³⁾	$0.310827^{\{10\}}$	0.215756 ⁽⁵⁾	0.190739 ^{3}	$0.292803^{\{9\}}$	$0.235014^{\{6\}}$
	MRE	0.084175 ⁽¹⁾	0.091075 ^[4]	0.097702 ^{8}	$0.08497^{\{2\}}$	0.09696 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.107843^{\{10\}}$	0.091929 ⁽⁵⁾	0.08607 ^{3}	0.10611 ⁽⁹⁾	0.097415 ⁽⁷⁾
	$\Sigma Ranks$	4(1)	12 ^{{4} }	24 ^{{8} }	5(2)	19(6)	30(10)	15(5)	9{3}	27 ^{9}	20 ^{7}
120	BIAS	0.271679 ^[1]	$0.292434^{\{4\}}$	0.319886 ^{7}	0.278625 ^[2]	0.318298 ⁽⁶⁾	0.350675 ⁽⁹⁾	0.30163 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.285786^{\{3\}}$	0.35745 ^{10}	0.320724 ^{8}
	MSE	$0.11862^{\{1\}}$	$0.136399^{\{4\}}$	$0.164118^{\{8\}}$	$0.12485^{\{2\}}$	0.163922 ^[7]	0.198703 ⁽⁹⁾	0.144515 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.130742^{\{3\}}$	$0.2042^{\{10\}}$	$0.16111^{\{6\}}$
	MRE	0.06792 ⁽¹⁾	$0.073109^{\{4\}}$	0.079972 ^{7}	0.069656 ⁽²⁾	0.079575 ⁽⁶⁾	0.087669 ^[9]	0.075407 ^[5]	0.071446 ^{3}	0.089363 ^[10]	0.080181 ^[8]
	$\Sigma Ranks$	3(1)	12 ⁽⁴⁾	22(7.5)	6(2)	19(6)	27(9)	15(5)	9(3)	30(10)	22(7.5)
180	BIAS	0.222081 ^{2}	0.24723 ⁽⁵⁾	0.258318 ^{6}	0.220523[1]	0.259158 ⁽⁷⁾	$0.293942^{\{10\}}$	0.246371 ^[4]	$0.234493^{\{3\}}$	0.288311 ^{9}	0.261901 ^[8]
	MSE	0.079601 ^{2}	0.096683 ^[5]	$0.106855^{\{7\}}$	0.078856 ^[1]	0.106253 ⁽⁶⁾	$0.136874^{\{10\}}$	$0.09656^{(4)}$	0.088157 ^{3}	0.13325 ⁽⁹⁾	0.109069 ^{8}
	MRE	$0.05552^{\{2\}}$	0.061807 ^[5]	0.064579 ^{6}	0.055131 ⁽¹⁾	0.064789 ^[7]	$0.073486^{\{10\}}$	0.061593 ^[4]	0.058623 ^{3}	0.072078 ^{9}	0.065475 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	15(5)	19 ⁽⁶⁾	3(1)	20(7)	30(10)	12 ⁽⁴⁾	9(3)	27 ⁽⁹⁾	24 ⁽⁸⁾
250	BIAS	$0.18938^{\{2\}}$	$0.203017^{\{4\}}$	$0.215812^{\{6\}}$	0.184372 ⁽¹⁾	0.21939 ^[7]	0.239758 ⁽⁹⁾	0.207722 ^[5]	0.195755 ^{3}	0.243253 ^[10]	0.222716 ^[8]
	MSE	$0.056853^{\{2\}}$	$0.065547^{\{4\}}$	0.073078 ^{6}	0.054681 ^{1}	0.075911 ⁽⁷⁾	0.093271 ⁽⁹⁾	0.068403 ⁽⁵⁾	0.061126 ^{3}	0.094006 ^[10]	0.077766 ^[8]
	MRE	$0.047345^{\{2\}}$	$0.050754^{\{4\}}$	0.053953 ^{6}	0.046093 ^[1]	0.054848 ^{7}	0.05994 ⁽⁹⁾	0.051931 ⁽⁵⁾	$0.048939^{\{3\}}$	$0.060813^{\{10\}}$	0.055679 ^{8}
	$\Sigma Ranks$	6(2)	12(4)	18 ⁽⁶⁾	3(1)	21(7)	27(9)	15(5)	9(3)	30(10)	24 ⁽⁸⁾
500	BIAS	0.132678 ^[2]	0.146507 ^[5]	0.154622 ^{6}	0.128449 ^[1]	0.154893 ⁽⁷⁾	0.170336 ^{10}	0.143698 ^[4]	0.137441 ^{3}	0.166852 ^{9}	0.16051 ^[8]
	MSE	$0.027774^{\{1\}}$	$0.034342^{\{5\}}$	0.037583 ^{7}	0.027821 ^{2}	0.037555 ⁽⁶⁾	0.046354 ^{10}	$0.03272^{\{4\}}$	$0.029844^{\{3\}}$	$0.044299^{\{9\}}$	0.039993 ^{8}
	MRE	0.033169 ^[2]	0.036627 ^[5]	0.038655 ^{6}	0.032112 ^[1]	0.038723 ^[7]	$0.042584^{\{10\}}$	0.035924 ^[4]	0.03436 ^{3}	0.041713 ^{9}	0.040128 ^[8]
	$\Sigma Ranks$	5(2)	15(5)	19 ^{6}	4(1)	20 ⁽⁷⁾	30(10)	12(4)	9{3}	27 ^{9}	24 ^{8}
_											

lengths of time it takes for 20 different components to fail. It was given by Murthy et al. [20], and its values are as follows: 70.175, 8.851, 2.968, 9.763, 57.637, 57.337, 9.773, 48.442, 6.662, 37.386, 79.333, 85.283, 8.608, 6.56, 54.145, 4.229, 7.11, 10.578, 30.112, 19.136. The second real world

TABLE 7. Partial and overall ranks of all the methods of estimation of IXLD by various values of model parameters.

Parameter	п	MLE	ADE	CVME	MPSE	LSE	RTADE	WLSE	LTADE	MSADE	MSALDE
$\theta = 0.25$	15	2.0	4.0	8.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	6.0
	35	2.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	80	1.0	4.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	2.0	10.0	8.0
	120	4.0	3.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	2.0	10.0	8.0
	180	1.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	250	1.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	2.0	10.0	8.0
	500	2.0	4.0	8.0	1.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	9.0
$\theta = 0.75$	15	4.0	3.0	8.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	2.0	9.0	6.0
	35	5.0	1.0	7.0	2.5	6.0	8.5	4.0	2.5	10.0	8.5
	80	5.0	1.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	8.5	7.0	2.0	10.0	8.5
	120	4.0	1.0	6.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	9.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	180	1.5	1.5	6.0	4.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	10.0	7.0
	250	3.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	8.0	9.0	2.0	10.0	5.0
	500	1.0	2.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	5.0
$\theta = 1.0$	15	3.5	3.5	8.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	5.0
	35	3.0	5.0	8.0	1.0	6.5	10.0	4.0	2.0	9.0	6.5
	80	3.0	2.0	7.0	5.5	5.5	8.0	4.0	1.0	10.0	9.0
	120	4.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	2.0	1.0	10.0	9.0
	180	5.0	2.0	4.0	7.5	6.0	7.5	3.0	1.0	10.0	9.0
	250	5.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	3.0	1.0	10.0	9.0
	500	5.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	8.0
$\theta = 2.5$	15	3.0	5.0	9.0	1.0	7.5	10.0	6.0	2.0	7.5	4.0
	35	2.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	6.0
	80	2.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	120	2.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	180	1.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	250	2.0	4.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	500	2.0	5.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
$\theta = 4.0$	15	3.0	4.5	8.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	4.5
	35	2.0	4.0	8.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	6.0
	80	1.0	4.0	8.0	2.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	7.0
	120	1.0	4.0	7.5	2.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	7.5
	180	2.0	5.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	4.0	3.0	9.0	8.0
	250	2.0	4.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0
	500	2.0	5.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	4.0	3.0	9.0	8.0
Σ Ranks		92.0	123.	5 231.5	78.5	223.5	316.5	183.0	85.5	333.5	257.5
Overall Rank		3	4	7	1	6	9	5	2	10	8

TABLE 8. Numerical values for analyzing the failure real data set.

Model	AC	CAC	BC	HC	F_1	F_2	F_3	$F_3(p)$	Est. parameters (SEs)
IXLD	179.174	179.396	180.169	179.368	0.644124	0.106358	0.156424	0.711985	$\hat{\theta} = 11.375 (2.51345)$
XL	182.005	182.227	183.001	182.2	2.28279	0.372274	0.323007	0.0308015	$\hat{\theta} = 0.061498 (0.00973999)$
PYI	181.365	182.071	183.357	181.754	0.925262	0.164139	0.231357	0.234683	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.806945 \ (0.11294)$
TAL									$\hat{\theta} = 0.120863 (0.0498503)$
LD	182.624	182.846	183.619	182.818	2.61818	0.411485	0.334687	0.0226526	$\dot{\alpha} = 0.0632012 \ (0.0100018)$
	182.809	184.309	185.796	183.392	0.917479	0.164326	0.234539	0.221231	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.06888 \ (0.216503)$
WL									$\lambda = 0.00395764 \ (0.0340549)$
									$\hat{\beta} = 0.0313653 (0.00825867)$
TPI	180.901	181.606	182.892	181.289	0.828547	0.144275	0.218699	0.294275	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.0122613 \ (0.0398799)$
II L									$\hat{\theta} = 0.040183 (0.0182127)$
01	180.901	181.606	182.892	181.289	0.828547	0.144275	0.218699	0.294275	$\hat{\alpha} = 3.27724 \ (9.32825)$
Qu									$\hat{\theta} = 0.040183 \ (0.0182127)$
GL	188.923	189.629	190.915	189.312	1.20231	0.181282	0.210009	0.340942	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.0284764 \ (0.00972155)$
									$\hat{a} = 0.428945 (0.118199)$
	201.032	201.254	202.028	201.227	6.9511	1.3774	0.475084	0.000239961	$\lambda = 0.691053 (0.268356)$
EXL									$\hat{\alpha} = 0.955171 \ (0.264794)$
									$\beta = 0.471578 (0.0356972)$
W	180.815	181.52	182.806	181.203	0.920548	0.164954	0.234796	0.220169	$\hat{a} = 1.0754 \ (0.191493)$
									b = 31.6069 (6.95357)
ILL	223.703	223.925	224.699	223.898	12.8012	2.72979	0.63583	< 0.00001	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.512287 \ (0.0902661)$
	183.019	184.519	186.006	183.602	0.685175	0.112581	0.159365	0.689997	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.862769 \ (0.511305)$
IPLE									$\beta = 1.19757 (0.615642)$
									$\tilde{\lambda} = 17.948 \ (26.7311)$
TW	181.073	181.779	183.064	181.462	0.707628	0.119133	0.161147	0.676607	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.05766 \ (0.184225)$
100									$\hat{\lambda} = 11.0416 (2.4702)$
IWI	180.987	181.693	182.979	181.376	0.748945	0.127082	0.168565	0.6207	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.12874 (0.31877)$
TWL									$\hat{\lambda} = 13.621 \ (4.51066)$
INM	182.229	182.935	184.221	182.618	0.751121	0.118901	0.176226	0.563607	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.399727 \ (0.102249)$
114191									$\hat{\lambda} = 0.0148783 \ (0.00526206)$

TABLE 9. Numerical values for analyzing the repair time real data set.

Model	AC	CAC	BC	HC	F_1	F ₂	F_3	$F_1(p)$	Est. parameters (SEs)
IXLD	182.773	182.878	184.462	183.383	0.478557	0.0571118	0.0904688	0.898846	$\hat{\theta} = 1.74964 (0.23767)$
XL	197.026	197.131	198.715	197.637	1.7312	0.284439	0.183717	0.134348	$\hat{\theta} = 0.381191 (0.044247)$
PVI	196.242	196.566	199.619	197.463	1.07368	0.139945	0.138667	0.425246	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.854674 (0.086109)$
TAL									$\hat{\theta} = 0.476243 \ (0.0819999)$
LD	199.583	199.688	201.272	200.193	2.43938	0.412189	0.215695	0.0483734	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.42421 \ (0.0485164)$
	197.023	197.689	202.089	198.855	1.02116	0.135904	0.129041	0.518136	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.960359 \ (0.108864)$
WL									$\tilde{\lambda} = 1.1811 \times 10^{-9} (0.0541138)$
									$\hat{\beta} = 0.254644 \ (0.0445577)$
TDI	195.153	195.477	198.531	196.374	1.09572	0.157425	0.138093	0.430522	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.000 \ (0.0502191)$
II L									$\hat{\theta} = 0.249221 (0.0638337)$
01	195.153	195.477	198.531	196.374	1.09572	0.157425	0.138093	0.430522	$\hat{\alpha} = 2.86815 \times 10^{6} (9.1869 \times 10^{11})$
QL									$\hat{\theta} = 0.249221 (0.0482434)$
CI	215.012	215.336	218.39	216.233	3.36143	0.557059	0.197084	0.0894283	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.21701 \ (0.0462074)$
- OL									$\hat{a} = 0.494563 (0.0924458)$
	200.123	200.228	201.812	200.734	1.8998	0.223112	0.194746	0.0962283	$\hat{\lambda} = 0.627259 (0.181589)$
EXL									$\hat{\alpha} = 0.918778 \ (0.194457)$
									$\hat{\beta} = 0.841764 (0.0230003)$
w	195.023	195.347	198.4	196.244	1.02116	0.135904	0.129041	0.518136	$\hat{a} = 0.960359 (0.108864)$
									$\hat{b} = 3.92706 (0.687158)$
ILL	205.638	205.743	207.326	206.248	9.20838	1.76469	0.309551	0.0009372	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.3462 \ (0.177977)$
	183.875	184.541	188.941	185.707	0.485365	0.0889935	0.102409	0.79558	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.616222 \ (0.258219)$
IPLE									$\hat{\beta} = 1.82068 \ (0.657385)$
									$\hat{\lambda} = 1.93911 (0.462155)$
IW	182.898	183.222	186.276	184.119	0.530118	0.0704862	0.0952589	0.860995	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.20778 (0.151779)$
1.0									$\hat{\lambda} = 1.45177 (0.200576)$
DWI	182.921	183.245	186.299	184.142	0.529969	0.0701772	0.0944512	0.867757	$\hat{\alpha} = 1.26956 (0.268988)$
INC									$\hat{\lambda} = 2.48746 \ (0.518827)$
INM	183.247	183.572	186.625	184.469	0.515138	0.0892427	0.103308	0.786761	$\hat{\alpha} = 0.479887 (0.088247)$
114104									$\hat{\lambda} = 0.693045 (0.158184)$

data set describes repair times for an airborne communication transceiver. It was given by Lemonte et al. [16], and its values are as follows: 0.50, 0.60, 0.60, 0.70, 0.70, 0.70, 0.80, 0.80, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.10, 1.30, 1.50, 1.50, 1.50, 1.50, 2.00, 2.00, 2.20, 2.50, 2.70, 3.00, 3.00, 3.30, 4.00, 4.00, 4.50, 4.70, 5.00, 5.40, 5.40, 7.00, 7.50, 8.80, 9.00, 10.20, 22.00, 24.50.



FIGURE 3. Histogram of the failure real data set with the fitted PDF, CDF, SF and P-P plots.



FIGURE 4. Histogram of the repair time real data set with the fitted PDF, CDF, SF and P-P plots.

In order to demonstrate how adaptable IXLD is, we are going to test it in contrast to a variety of well recognised models, including as XL, power XLindley (PXL) [19], Lindley (L), Weibull Lindley (WL) [6], two parameter Lindley (TPL) [27], Quasi Lindley (QL) [24], gamma Lindely (GL), extend Lindley (EXL) [7], Weibull (W), inverse log-logistic (ILL) [23], inverse-power logistic-exponential (IPLE) [3], inverse Weibull (IW), inverse weighted Lindley (IWL) [25], inverse Nakagami-M (INM) [17] distributions.

We make use of a variety of analytical criteria in order to identify which of the models available to us is the most relevant one to apply with the failure data set. These analytical criteria are Akaike information criterion (AC), the correct Akaike information criterion (CAC), Bayesian information criterion (BC), Hannan information criterion (HC). In addition to this, we base our decision on a range of other variables on the overall goodness-of-fit of the model,



FIGURE 5. TTT plot and fitted HRF of the IXL model for the failure real data set.

such as Anderson Darling (F_1) , Cramér–von Mises (F_2) and Kolmogorov–Smirnov (F_3) with its p-value $(F_3(p))$. The model that has the smallest values for all of these metrics, with the exception of $F_3(p)$, is the best one that will match the failure real data set.

For the two real data sets that were being taken into consideration for assessment, analytical measurements are provided together with the estimations made by MLE and the related standard errors (SE). Tables 8 and 9 display a report of these numerical values. This leads us to conclude that the IXLD outperforms other compared models. The P-P plot and the fitted PDF, CDF, and SF plots are used to fit IXLD to the two real data sets which shown in Figures 3 and 4. The IXLD was shown to be a good match using the two actual data sets. For the two real data sets, the TTT and estimated HRF of the IXLD plots are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. Figures 7 and 8 illustrate the behaviour of the unimodal



FIGURE 6. TTT plot and fitted HRF of the IXL model for the repair time real data set.



FIGURE 7. The profile of the log-likelihood function for θ parameter of the failure real data set.

log-likelihood function with estimated parameter for the two real data set, respectively.



FIGURE 8. The profile of the log-likelihood function for θ parameter of the repair time real data set.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we presented the IXLD, a relatively new extension of the Lindley distribution. The inverse transformation along with the Lindley distribution is used to derive it. A variety of the recommended model's statistical characteristics were demonstrated. Traditional estimation techniques, such as maximum likelihood estimation and nine other methods, were used to estimate the indicated model parameters. The behaviour of the IXLD parameters was examined using estimation approaches and data sets created at random. The IXLD's usefulness and superiority over competing models were shown using a real-world data sets. We came to the conclusion that it was the greatest option out of all its rivals since it had the lowest values of the determined measures and the highest P-value. Additionally, we graphed the profilelikelihood function of the IXLD with its parameter for the real data sets to confirm that the roots of the proposed distribution's MLE give a maximum value. This figure show that the profile-likelihood function of the estimated parameter is unimodal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research project was supported by the Researchers Supporting Project Number (RSP2023R488), King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

REFERENCES

- A. Z. Afify, H. M. Aljohani, A. S. Alghamdi, A. M. Gemeay, and A. M. Sarg, "A new two-parameter Burr-Hatke distribution: Properties and Bayesian and non-Bayesian inference with applications," *J. Math.*, vol. 2021, pp. 1–16, Nov. 2021.
- [2] H. Al-Kzzaz and E.-M. M. Abd, "Inverse power Maxwell distribution: Statistical properties, estimation and application," *J. Appl. Statist.*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2287–2306, 2021.
- [3] M. M. Al Sobhi, "The inverse-power logistic-exponential distribution: Properties, estimation methods, and application to insurance data," *Mathematics*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. 2060, Nov. 2020.
- [4] S. H. Alkarni, "Extended inverse Lindley distribution: Properties and application," *SpringerPlus*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Dec. 2015.
- [5] G. Altun, M. Alizadeh, E. Altun, and O. Gamze, "Odd burr Lindley distribution with properties and applications," *Hacettepe J. Math. Statist.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 255–276, 2017.
- [6] A. Asgharzadeh, S. Nadarajah, and F. Sharafi, "Weibull Lindley distribution," *Revstat-Stat. J.*, vol. 16, pp. 87–113, 2018.

- [7] H. S. Bakouch, B. M. Al-Zahrani, A. A. Al-Shomrani, V. A. A. Marchi, and F. Louzada, "An extended Lindley distribution," *J. Korean Stat. Soc.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 75–85, Mar. 2012.
- [8] K. V. P. Barco, J. Mazucheli, and V. Janeiro, "The inverse power Lindley distribution," *Commun. Statist.-Simul. Comput.*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 6308–6323, Sep. 2017.
- [9] S. Cakmakyapan and O. Gamze, "The Lindley family of distributions: Properties and applications," *Hacettepe J. Math. Statist.*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1113–1137, 2016.
- [10] S. Chouia and H. Zeghdoudi, "The XLindley distribution: Properties and application," J. Stat. Theory Appl., vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 318–327, 2021.
- [11] R. E. Glaser, "Bathtub and related failure rate characterizations," J. Amer. Stat. Assoc., vol. 75, no. 371, pp. 667–672, Sep. 1980.
- [12] R. C. S. Guptha and S. K. Maruthan, "A new generalization of power Lindley distribution and its applications," *Thailand Statistician*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 196–208, 2023.
- [13] A. S. Hassan and M. Abd-Allah, "On the inverse power Lomax distribution," Ann. Data Sci., vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 259–278, Jun. 2019.
- [14] M. R. Irshad, V. D'cruz, R. Maya, and K. N. Mamode, "Inferential properties with a novel two parameter Poisson generalized Lindley distribution with regression and application to INAR (1) process," *J. Biopharmaceutical Statist.*, vol. 33, pp. 1–22, Jan. 2023.
- [15] S. Kadic, B. V. Popovic, and A. I. Genç, "Two families of continuous probability distributions generated by the discrete Lindley distribution," *Mathematics*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 290, Jan. 2023.
 [16] A. J. Lemonte, W. Barreto-Souza, and G. M. Cordeiro, "The exponentiated
- [16] A. J. Lemonte, W. Barreto-Souza, and G. M. Cordeiro, "The exponentiated Kumaraswamy distribution and its log-transform," *Brazilian J. Probab. Statist.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 31–53, Feb. 2013.
- [17] F. Louzada, P. L. Ramos, and D. Nascimento, "The inverse Nakagami-m distribution: A novel approach in reliability," *IEEE Trans. Rel.*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 1030–1042, Sep. 2018.
- [18] M. E. Mead, "Generalized inverse gamma distribution and its application in reliability," *Commun. Statist.-Theory Methods*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1426–1435, Apr. 2015.
- [19] B. Meriem, A. M. Gemeay, E. M. Almetwally, Z. Halim, E. Alshawarbeh, A. T. Abdulrahman, M. M. Abd El-Raouf, and E. Hussam, "The power XLindley distribution: Statistical inference, fuzzy reliability, and COVID-19 application," *J. Function Spaces*, pp. 1–21, Jun. 2022.
- [20] D. P. Murthy, M. Xie, and R. Jiang, Weibull Models. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2004.
- [21] M. A. Omair, Y. A. Tashkandy, S. Askar, and A. A. Alzaid, "Family of distributions derived from whittaker function," *Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 7, p. 1058, Mar. 2022.
- [22] G. Ozel, M. Alizadeh, S. Cakmakyapan, G. G. Hamedani, E. M. M. Ortega, and V. G. Cancho, "The odd log-logistic Lindley Poisson model for lifetime data," *Commun. Statist.-Simul. Comput.*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 6513–6537, Sep. 2017.
 [23] B. A. Para and T. R. Jan, "Transmuted inverse loglogistic model: Proper-
- [23] B. A. Para and T. R. Jan, "Transmuted inverse loglogistic model: Properties and application in medical sciences and engineering," *Math. Theory Model.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 157–181, 2017.
- [24] R. Shanker and A. Mishra, "A quasi Lindley distribution," Afr. J. Math. Comput. Sci. Res., vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 64–71, 2013.
- [25] P. L. Ramos, F. Louzada, T. K. O. Shimizu, and A. O. Luiz, "The inverse weighted Lindley distribution: Properties, estimation and an application on a failure time data," *Commun. Statist.-Theory Methods*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 2372–2389, May 2019.
- [26] A. Renyi, "On measures of entropy and information," in *Proc. 4th Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab.*, vol. 1, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1961, pp. 547–562.
- [27] R. Shanker, S. Sharma, and R. Shanker, "A two-parameter Lindley distribution for modeling waiting and survival times data," *Appl. Math.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 363–368, 2013.
- [28] V. K. Sharma, S. K. Singh, U. Singh, and V. Agiwal, "The inverse Lindley distribution: A stress-strength reliability model with application to head and neck cancer data," *J. Ind. Prod. Eng.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 162–173, Apr. 2015.



ABDELFATEH BEGHRICHE received the Ph.D. degree in mathematics from the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Exact Sciences, University the Brothers Mentouri Constantine 1, Algeria. He is currently a Faculty Member with University the Brothers Mentouri Constantine 1. His research interests include applied statistics and mathematics sciences.

YUSRA A. TASHKANDY received the Ph.D. degree in philosophy of statistics from the Department of Statistics and Operations Research, Faculty of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, in 2018. Her research interests include statistical inference, biostatistics, probability distributions, regression, and multivariate analysis.

M. E. BAKR received the Ph.D. degree in mathematical statistics from the Mathematics Department, Faculty of Science, AL-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt, in 2018. His research interests include theory of reliability, classes of life distributions, censored data, and statistical inference.



HALIM ZEGHDOUDI received the Ph.D. degree in mathematics and the H.D.R. degree in probability and statistics from Badji Mokhtar–Annaba University, Annaba, Algeria. He is a Faculty Member with the Department of Mathematics, Badji Mokhtar–Annaba University. He did his Postdoctoral Research with the Waterford Institute of Technology, Waterford, Ireland. He has published more than 100 research articles in international/national journals and conferences. His research

interests include actuarial science, particles systems, dynamics systems, and applied statistics. Currently, he is a member of two editorial boards, such as *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics* and *Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics*.



AHMED M. GEMEAY received the M.Sc. degree in statistics from Tanta University, Tanta, Egypt, in 2020. He is an Assistant Lecturer of statistics and mathematics with the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Tanta University. His current research interests include generalized classes of distributions and their special models.

MD. MOYAZZEM HOSSAIN received the B.Sc. (Hons.) and M.Sc. (thesis) degrees from the Department of Statistics, Jahangirnagar University (JU), Dhaka, Bangladesh, in 2005 and 2006, respectively, and the M.Phil. degree from JU. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with Newcastle University, U.K. He is also a full-time Faculty Member with the Department of Statistics, JU. He is an applied statistician with expertise in both developing and applying recent methodologies, models, and techniques. He loves to play with data. He is passionate to learn from the insight of data. He started his teaching career as a Lecturer with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Bangladesh University of Business and Technology (BUBT), Mirpur, Dhaka, in 2008, and served until joining as a Lecturer with the Department of Statistics, Islamic University, Kushtia, Bangladesh. Before joining Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka, as an Assistant Professor, in 2014, he served as a Lecturer and an Assistant Professor with the Department of Statistics, Islamic University, from 2010 to 2014. He enjoys research activities and published many research articles in different reputed international peer-reviewed journals and book chapters. His research interests include econometrics, time series analysis, multivariate analysis, data mining, regression analysis, survival analysis, public health, biostatistics, probability distributions, statistical inference, environmental statistics, and business statistics. Moreover, he has established national and international connections. He is an active participant in several collaborative research activities. Furthermore, he has also attended various workshops and trainings on data analysis. He is a Lifetime Member of the Bangladesh Statistical Association.

ABDISALAM HASSAN MUSE was born in Borama, Somalia, in 1988. He received the bachelor's degree in mathematics and physics from the Faculty of Science, Amoud University, Borama, in 2012, the M.Sc. degree in mathematics and statistics from the School of Postgraduate Studies and Research, Amoud University, in 2017, and the Ph.D. degree in statistics from the Institute of Basic Science, Technology and Innovation, Pan African University, hosted with the Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nairobi, Kenya, in 2022. He is the Head of the Faculty of Science and Humanities, School of Postgraduate Studies and Research, Amoud University. He is a maintainer of three R packages, and has over 30 refereed journals. His research interests include applied statistics, survival analysis, Bayesian statistics, distribution theory, disease mapping, spatial statistics, and regression modeling. He received the Post Graduate African Union Scholarship Award during his Ph.D. (statistics) Program.