ON DYNAMIC GENERALIZED MEASURES OF INACCURACY

Suchandan Kayal
Department of Mathematics, National Institute of Technology Rourkela, Rourkela 769008, Rourkela, India

Sreenarayanapurath Madhavan Sunoj
Department of Statistics, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Cochin 682022, Kerala, India

Ganapathy Rajesh
Department of Statistics, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Cochin 682022, Kerala, India

1. Introduction

Let $X$ and $Y$ be two absolutely continuous non-negative random variables (rv’s), which may be assumed as lifetimes of two components of a system. The probability density function (pdf), cumulative distribution function (cdf) and survival function (sf) of $X$ are respectively denoted by $f$, $F$ and $\bar{F}$; and that of $Y$ by $g$, $G$ and $\bar{G}$. Let $\eta_X = \frac{f}{\bar{F}}$ and $\eta_Y = \frac{g}{\bar{G}}$ be the hazard rate functions of $X$ and $Y$, respectively; and $\xi_X = \frac{f}{F}$ and $\xi_Y = \frac{g}{G}$ be their corresponding reversed hazard rate functions. Kerridge (1961) proposed a measure of inaccuracy between two pdf’s $f$ and $g$, given by

$$K_{X,Y} = -E_f(\ln g(X)) = -\int_0^\infty (\ln g(x))f(x)dx = I_{KL}^{X,Y} + I_S^X, \quad (1)$$

where $I_{KL}^{X,Y} = E_f(\ln \frac{f(X)}{g(X)}) = \int_0^\infty (\ln \frac{f(x)}{g(x)})f(x)dx$ denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence (see Kullback and Leibler, 1951), a popular measure of discrimination between $X$ and $Y$; and $I_S^X = -E_f(\ln f(X)) = -\int_0^\infty (\ln f(x))f(x)dx$ denotes the well-known Shannon (1948) entropy of $X$. The inaccuracy given in (1) measures the average information required to convey which of a number of possibilities is true, to someone who believes that the probability distribution of the possibilities is $g$ when it is actually $f$. Measuring inaccuracy through (1) between two probability distributions involving current age is not an appropriate tool. To overcome this difficulty, Taneja et al. (2009) proposed a measure of inaccuracy between $X$ and $Y$ at time $t$ ($t > 0$) as

$$K_{X,Y}(t) = K_{X,Y} = -\int_t^\infty \left( \frac{\ln g(x)}{G(t)} \right) \frac{f(x)}{F(t)}dx \quad (2)$$
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and studied its properties, where $X_t = (X - t | X > t)$ and $Y_t = (Y - t | Y > t)$ denote the residual lifetime rv's. $K_{X,Y}(t)$ in (2) is known as the measure of residual inaccuracy between two rv's $X_t$ and $Y_t$. Note that $K_{X,Y}(t)$ reduces to residual entropy due to Muliere et al. (1993) $I_X^R(t) = -\int_t^\infty \left( \ln \frac{f(x)}{F(t)} \right) \frac{f(x)}{F(t)} dx$, when $f = g$. Some situations arise in real life where inaccuracy relies on the past. Based on this idea, Kumar et al. (2011) defined a measure of inaccuracy between past lifetime distributions of $X$ and $Y$ as

$$\bar{K}_{X,Y}(t) = K_{X,Y}(t) = -\int_0^t \left( \ln \frac{g(x)}{G(t)} \right) \frac{f(x)}{F(t)} dx, \quad (3)$$

where $X_t = (t - X | X < t)$ and $Y_t = (t - Y | Y < t)$ denote the past lifetime rv's. $\bar{K}_{X,Y}(t)$ in (3) is known as the measure of past inaccuracy between $X$ and $Y$. Kundu and Nanda (2015) obtained several characterization results based on the measure of inaccuracy for truncated rv's.

Note that the measure (1) is based on the Kullback-Leibler discrimination and the Shannon entropy. There have been several attempts on generalizations of these two measures in the literature. For more on this direction, we refer to Rényi (1961), Varma (1966), Tsallis (1988), Kapur and Kesavan (1992) and Kapur (1994). These generalized information measures have many important properties such as smoothness, large dynamic range with respect to certain conditions that make them applicable in practice. Pharwaha and Singh (2009) showed that non-Shannon measures can be used to determine the randomness of mammograms because of having higher dynamic range than Shannon’s entropy over a variety of scattering conditions. Non-Shannon measures are also applicable in estimating scatter density and regularity (see Smolikova et al., 2002).

After the seminal work by Kerridge (1961), several authors devoted their attention to generalize inaccuracy measure in the discrete domain. They studied their properties and characterizations. These measures are useful in different areas of science and technology, particularly in coding theory. For detail, we refer to Nath (1968), Rathie and Kannappan (1973), Sharma and Autar (1973), Sharma and Gupta (1976), Taneja and Tuteja (1986), Bhatia and Taneja (1991), Bhatia (1999) and the references therein. Motivated by their work, based on the Renyi entropy and its discrimination, in this paper, we propose dynamic generalized measures of inaccuracy of order $\alpha (\neq 1) > 0$. A generalization of Kerridge’s measure of inaccuracy (1) is given by

$$K_{X,Y}^R = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_0^\infty (f(x))^\alpha (g(x))^{1-\alpha} dx}{\int_0^\infty (f(x))^\alpha dx} \right) = I_{X,Y}^R + I_X^R, \quad (4)$$

where

$$I_{X,Y}^R = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( E_f \left( \frac{f(X)}{g(X)} \right)^{\alpha - 1} \right) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \int_0^\infty (f(x))^\alpha (g(x))^{1-\alpha} dx \right)$$

and

$$I_X^R = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left( E_f (f(X))^{\alpha - 1} \right) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left( \int_0^\infty (f(x))^{\alpha - 1} dx \right)$$
are the Renyi’s discrimination measure between \( X \) and \( Y \) Asadi et al. (2005), Gil (2011); and Renyi’s entropy measure of \( X \) Renyi (1961), respectively. Note that when \( \alpha \to 1 \), then (4) reduces to (1). Also for \( f = g \), (4) coincides with the Renyi entropy \( I_R^\alpha \). In analogy to (2) and (3), generalized measures of inaccuracy of order \( \alpha \) between the residual lifetime distributions; and the past lifetime distributions are respectively defined as

\[
K_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{g(s)}{G(t)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \, ds}{\int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds} \right) \tag{5}
\]

and

\[
I_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_0^t \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{g(s)}{G(t)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \, ds}{\int_0^t \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds} \right) \tag{6}\]

In Equations (6) and (8), \( I_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{g(s)}{G(t)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \, ds}{\int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds} \right) \) and \( \tilde{I}_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_0^t \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{g(s)}{G(t)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \, ds}{\int_0^t \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds} \right) \) respectively represent residual and past Renyi discrimination measures of order \( \alpha \) between \( X \) and \( Y \), whereas

\[
I_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds \right) \tag{7}
\]

and

\[
\tilde{I}_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \int_0^t \left( \frac{f(s)}{F(t)} \right)^\alpha \, ds \right) \tag{8}\]

represent the residual and past Renyi entropy measures of order \( \alpha \). We call the measures given in (5) and (7) as measures of residual and past inaccuracy of order \( \alpha \), respectively. Henceforth, increasing and decreasing are used as non-strict sense. Throughout the paper, we also assume that \( \alpha (\neq 1) > 0 \).

In the following examples, we discuss the role of the generalized inaccuracy measures of order \( \alpha \) between the residual and past lifetime distributions.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Consider the rv’s as described in Example 1.1 of Di Crescenzo and Longobardi (2004) with different notation. The pdf’s of the rv’s \( X \) and \( Y_\beta \) are given by

\[
f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < x < 1 \\ \beta \left( x - \frac{1}{2} \right) + 1, & 0 < x < 1, \quad -2 \leq \beta \leq 2, \end{cases}
\]

Note that when \( x = \frac{1}{2} \), \( K_{X,Y_\beta}^R(t) = \tilde{K}_{X,Y_\beta}^R(t) \) for \( \beta \in [-2, 2] \), that is, the inaccuracy measure of order \( \alpha \) between \( X \) and \( Y_\beta \) is equal to the inaccuracy measure of order \( \alpha \) between \( X \) and \( Y_{-\beta} \). Further, for \( \beta \neq 0 \), we have from (5)

\[
K_{X,Y_\beta}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_t^\infty (\beta \left( x - \frac{1}{2} \right) + 1)^{1-\alpha} \, dx}{\int_t^\infty (1 - t)^{1-\alpha} \, dx} \right) \tag{9}
\]
Moreover, from Figure 1(a) we observe that $K_{R,X,Y}^R(t) \neq K_{R,X,Y}^R(t)$ in general for all $t \in (0,1)$. Hence, we reach to the conclusion that though $K_{R,X,Y}^{R,\beta} = K_{R,X,Y}^{R,\beta}$, the inaccuracy measure of order $\alpha$ of $X$ and $Y_{\beta}$ is different from that of $X$ and $Y_{-\beta}$.

**Example 2.** Note that under the assumptions of Example 1, we can show that $K_{R,X,Y}^R(t) = K_{R,X,Y}^R(t)$ for $x = \frac{1}{2}$, where $\beta \in [-2,2]$, that is, the inaccuracy measure of order $\alpha$ between $X$ and $Y_{\beta}$ is equal to that of $X$ and $Y_{-\beta}$. Further, for $\beta \neq 0$, we have from (7)

$$
\tilde{K}_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \left( \int_0^t \left( \beta \left( x - \frac{1}{2} \right) + 1 \right)^{1-\alpha} dx \right),
$$

(10)

which is plotted in Figure 1(b). From the figure, we observe that $\tilde{K}_{X,Y}^R(t) \neq \tilde{K}_{X,Y}^R(t)$ in general for all $t \in (0,1)$. Thus, we conclude that though $K_{R,X,Y}^{R,\beta} = K_{R,X,Y}^{R,\beta}$, the inaccuracy measure of order $\alpha$ of $X^\beta$ and $Y_{\beta}$ is not equal to that of $X^\beta$ and $Y_{-\beta}$.

The remainder of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we study some properties and characterization results of the measure of inaccuracy of order $\alpha$ between residual lifetime distributions. Several bounds of $K_{R,X,Y}^R(t)$ are obtained. Results are extended to weighted distributions and examples are provided. Similar results are derived based on the measure of inaccuracy of order $\alpha$ between past lifetime distributions in Section 3. In Section 4, a nonparametric estimator for the residual inaccuracy of order $\alpha$ is proposed, and is validated through a numerical example. Finally, some concluding remarks have been added in Section 5.

2. **Some Results on $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$**

As mentioned earlier, in this section, we study some properties and characterizations of $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ given by (5). Our first theorem shows how $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ is affected by a common
increasing transformation of $X$ and $Y$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\phi$ be a strictly increasing function. Then
\[
K^R_{X,Y}(\phi^{-1}(t)) = K^R_{\phi(X),\phi(Y)}(t).
\]

**Proof.** From (5) we have
\[
K^R_{\phi(X),\phi(Y)}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left[ \ln \frac{\int^\infty_{t} \left( \frac{(f(\phi^{-1}(s)))^\alpha}{(F(\phi^{-1}(s)))^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1} ds}{\int^\infty_{t} \left( \frac{(f(\phi^{-1}(s)))^\alpha}{(F(\phi^{-1}(s)))^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1} \phi'(\phi^{-1}(s)) ds} \right] = K^R_{X,Y}(\phi^{-1}(t)).
\]

This completes the proof.

As an application of Theorem 1, we consider the following example.

**Example 3.** Suppose that $X_1$ follows Pareto I $(b_1, a)$ and $X_2$ follows Pareto I $(b_2, a)$ such that $f_{X_1}(x) = \frac{b_1}{a} x^{-(b_1+1)}$, $x > a$; $a, b_1 > 0$ and $f_{X_2}(x) = \frac{b_2}{a} x^{-(b_2+1)}$, $x > a$; $a, b_2 > 0$. Then
\[
K^R_{X_1,X_2}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left[ (1 - \alpha) \ln b_2 - \ln t + \ln \frac{\alpha(b_1 + 1) - 1}{\alpha(b_1 + 1) - (1 - \alpha)(b_2 + 1) - 1} \right].
\]

Clearly $K^R_{X_1,X_2}(t)$ is a function of $t$. Now let $\phi(x) = x - a$. Then $\phi(X)$ follows Pareto II (Lomax) distribution. Note that $\phi(x)$ is a strictly increasing function. If $Y_1 = \phi(X_1)$ and $Y_2 = \phi(X_2)$ then $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ follow Pareto II distribution with common parameter $a$.

Using Theorem 1, we can easily find the expression of $K^R_{Y_1,Y_2}(t)$, given by
\[
K^R_{Y_1,Y_2}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left[ (1 - \alpha) \ln b_2 - \ln(t + a) + \ln \frac{\alpha(b_1 + 1) - 1}{\alpha(b_1 + 1) - (1 - \alpha)(b_2 + 1) - 1} \right]
\]

which otherwise not directly obtain.

Next, we obtain characterization of exponential distribution.

**Theorem 2.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be two non-negative rv’s with cdf’s $F$ and $G$, respectively. Further, let $K^R_{X,Y}(t)$ be independent of $t$ for all $t > 0$. Then $G$ is exponential if $F$ is exponential.

**Proof.** From (5) it is not hard to obtain the following relation
\[
[K^R_{X,Y}(t)]' + \eta_Y(t) = \frac{\eta_X(t) e^{(\alpha-1)K^R_{X,Y}(t)}}{\alpha - 1} \left[ 1 - \eta_Y^{1-\alpha}(t) e^{-(\alpha-1)K^R_{X,Y}(t)} \right].
\]
As $F$ is exponential, we have $\eta_X(t)$ is constant. Also, from Theorem 3.1 of Abraham and Sankaran (2006), we know that if $X$ is exponentially distributed then $I_{X}^{R}(t) = \text{constant}$. Under the given assumptions, from (11)

$$A\eta_Y^{1-\alpha}(t) + \eta_Y(t) = B,$$

where $A$ and $B$ are arbitrary constants. Assume that $\eta_Y(t)$ is differentiable. Now by differentiating from (12) with respect to $t$, we get

$$\eta_Y'(t)[A(1-\alpha)\eta_Y^{1-\alpha}(t) + 1] = 0,$$

implies $\eta_Y(t) = \text{constant}$. Thus $G$ is exponential. This completes the proof.

To estimate the effects of different covariates influencing the times to the failures of a system, Cox introduced the notion of proportional hazard rate model in 1972. This model has some useful applications in different areas of science and technology. We refer to Cox and Oakes (1984) for various applications of this model. Assume that the survival functions of the rv’s $X$ and $Y$ are related by

$$\bar{F}(x) = (\bar{G}(x))^\theta, \quad x > 0,$$

where $\theta > 0$ is known as proportionality constant.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that $K_{X,Y}(t)$ is independent of $t$. Also let the distribution functions of $X$ and $Y$ satisfy the proportional hazard rate model. Then

$$I_{X}^{R}(t) = \ln\left(\frac{B - C\eta_X^{\alpha-1}(t)}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}},$$

where $B = \frac{\theta}{A(1-\alpha)}$ and $C = \frac{\theta}{1-\alpha}$.

**Proof.** Under the assumption that $K_{X,Y}(t)$ is independent of $t$, we have

$$A\bar{G}^{1-\alpha}(t) \int_t^\infty f^2(x)dx = \int_t^\infty f^2(x)\bar{g}^{1-\alpha}(x)dx,$$

where $A$ is a constant independent of $t$. Differentiating (14) with respect to $t$ and rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$\int_t^\infty f^2(x)dx = \frac{f^2(t)}{A(1-\alpha)}\left[\frac{1}{\eta_Y(t)} - \frac{A}{\eta_Y(t)}\right].$$

(15)

Now using the proportional hazard rate model (13), we have $\eta_X(t) = \theta\eta_Y(t)$. Thus from (15), the required result follows.

The following remark is an immediate consequence of the Theorem 3.

**Remark 4.** Let $X$ be an exponentially distributed rv. Then, $K_{X,Y}(t)$ is independent of $t$ if and only if $X$ and $Y$ satisfy the proportional hazard rate model.
Example 4. Consider a series system with \(n\) components having lifetimes \(X_i, i = 1, \ldots, n\). Assume that \(X_i\)'s are independent and identically distributed with a common pdf \(f(x|\sigma) = \sigma e^{-\sigma x}, x > 0, \sigma > 0\). The lifetime of the system is \(Z = \min\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}\). Moreover, it is not difficult to show that \(\alpha\) hazard rate model. For \(i\)

\[
K^{R}_{X_i,Z}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[ \frac{(\sigma/n)^{\alpha - 1}}{a(n + a - n\alpha)} \right],
\]

provided \(n + \alpha - n\alpha \neq 0\), independent of \(t\).

In our next two consecutive theorems we provide relation between \(K^{R}_{X_i,Y}(t)\) and \(K^{R}_{X,Y}\). The following definition is useful in this regard.

Definition 5. A non-negative rv \(X\) is said to have

(i) increasing (decreasing) failure rate (IFR (DFR)) if \(\eta_X(t)\) is increasing (decreasing) in \(t > 0\).

(ii) new better (worse) than used (NBU (NWU)) if \(\tilde{F}(x + t) \leq (\geq) F(x)\tilde{F}(t)\) for all \(x, t > 0\).

Also,

\[
IFR \Rightarrow NBU \quad \text{and} \quad DFR \Rightarrow NWU.
\]

Theorem 6. For the rv's \(X\) and \(Y\), if

(i) \(\frac{D}{F}(t)\) is increasing (decreasing) in \(t\),

(ii) both \(X\) and \(Y\) have increasing (decreasing) failure rate, then for \(\alpha < 1\)

\[
K^{R}_{X,Y}(t) \geq (\leq) K^{R}_{X_i,Y}.
\]

Proof. Note that \(K^{R}_{X,Y}(t)\) is the sum of the measures \(I^{R}_{X,Y}(t)\) and \(I^{R}_{X_i}(t)\). Also, it is easy to show that \(I^{R}_{X,Y}(t)\) can be expressed as

\[
I^{R}_{X,Y}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int_0^1 \frac{f_{i-1}^{-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}{g_{i-1}^{-1}(G_i^{-1}(y))} \, dy,
\]

where \(f_{i-1}(g_i)\) is the pdf of \(X_i\) (\(Y_i\)) and \(F_i(G_i)\) is the cdf of \(X_i\) (\(Y_i\)). Moreover, along the arguments used in the proof of the Theorem 2.2 of Ebrahimi and Kirmani (1996) and for \(\alpha < 1\), we obtain

\[
\frac{f_{i-1}^{-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}{g_{i-1}^{-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))} \leq \frac{\eta_X^{a-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}{\eta_Y^{a-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))} \frac{G_i^{a-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}{G_i^{a-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))} \leq \frac{f_{i-1}^{-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}{g_{i-1}^{-1}(F_i^{-1}(y))}.
\]
where the first and second inequalities are due to the conditions stated in (i) and (ii), respectively. Therefore, for $\alpha < 1$ we have

$$I^R_{X,Y}(t) \geq (\leq) \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int_0^1 \frac{f^{\alpha-1}(F^{-1}(y))}{g^{\alpha-1}(F^{-1}(y))} dy = I^R_{X,Y}. \quad (17)$$

Thus, from (17) and the Corollary 4.1 of Abraham and Sankaran (2006), the proof completes.

**Remark 7.** From the Theorem 6, we conclude that under the assumptions made, the inaccuracy between two systems of age $t$ is never smaller (larger) than the inaccuracy when those systems were new for $\alpha < 1$.

**Remark 8.** For two absolutely continuous non-negative random variables $X$ and $Y$, if (i) $\frac{f_X(t)}{g_Y(t)}$ is increasing (decreasing) in $t$, (ii) both $X$ and $Y$ are NBU (NWU) and (iii) $X$ has DFR (IFR), then for $\alpha > 1$, we obtain $K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq (\geq) K^R_{X,Y}$. However, if $X$ is both NBU and DFR (NWU and IFR), then $X$ follows exponential.

Bounds of probability measures are useful when either the measure does not have a closed form or it is difficult to compute. The following theorems provide some upper and lower bounds of $K^R_{X,Y}(t)$, which are functions of hazard rate and Renyi’s residual entropy.

**Definition 9.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be two non-negative rv’s with pdf’s $f$ and $g$, respectively. Then $X$ is said to be less than or equal to $Y$ in likelihood ratio ordering, denoted by $X \lessdot Y$, if $\frac{f(t)}{g(t)}$ is decreasing in $t > 0$.

**Theorem 10.** Let $X \lessdot Y$. Then

(a) $K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_X(t)}{\eta_Y(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t)$, if $\alpha > 1$

and

(b) $K^R_{X,Y}(t) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_X(t)}{\eta_Y(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t)$, if $\alpha < 1$.

**Proof.** (a) Making use of $X \lessdot Y$ and $x > t$ in (5), we obtain

$$K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int_t^\infty \frac{f^\alpha(t)g(x)}{F^\alpha(t)G^{\alpha-1}(t)g^\alpha(t)} dx + I^R_X(t)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_X(t)}{\eta_Y(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t)$$

as $\left( \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \right)^\alpha \leq \left( \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} \right)^\alpha$ for $\alpha > 1$. Similarly, for $\alpha < 1$, it is not hard to obtain the inequality given in Part (b). This completes the proof.
Let the pdf of $X$ be $f$, and $w$ be a non-negative function with $\mu_w = E(w(X)) < \infty$. Also, let $f_w$, $F_w$ and $\bar{F}_w$, respectively be the pdf, cdf and sf of a weighted rv $X_w$, where $f_w = w f / \mu_w$, $F_w = E(w(X)|X < t)F/\mu_w$ and $\bar{F}_w = E(w(X)|X > t)\bar{F}/\mu_w$. The next corollary is a consequence of the Theorem 10, since

$$\eta_X(t) \eta_{X_w}(t) = E(w(X)|X \geq t) w(t).$$

We omit the proof here. Note that the corollary provides the bounds of the dynamic measure of inaccuracy of order $\alpha$ for residual lifetime distributions of $X$ and $X_w$. Let $w$ be increasing. Then it is easy to show that $f f_w$ is decreasing. Hence, $X l r \leq X_w l r$.

**Corollary 11.** Let $w$ be increasing. Then

(a) $K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{E(w(X)|X > t)}{w(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t)$, if $\alpha > 1$

and

(b) $K^R_{X,Y}(t) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{E(w(X)|X > t)}{w(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t)$, if $\alpha < 1$.

We consider the following example which illustrates the Corollary 11.

**Example 5.** Let a rv $X$ follow Pareto I $(a, b)$, where $b > 0$ and $a > 1$. Consider the weight function $w(x) = x$. Therefore, it can be easily established that $X l r \leq X_w l r$. Moreover,

$$K^R_{X,Y}(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{E(w(X)|X > t)}{w(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{a - 1}{a + \alpha - 1} \right). \quad (18)$$

Thus from (18), the inequalities in Corollary 11 follow.

**Remark 12.** For all $\alpha (\neq 1)$,

$$K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq \ln \left( \frac{\eta_X(t)}{\eta_Y(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t), \text{ if } X l r \leq Y$$

and

$$K^R_{X,Y}(t) \leq \ln \left( \frac{E(w(X)|X > t)}{w(t)} \right) + I^R_X(t), \text{ if } X \leq X_w l r.$$

Our next theorem provides lower bound of $K^R_{X,Y}(t)$ in terms of the hazard rate function.

**Theorem 13.** Suppose that $g(x)$ is decreasing in $x$. Then

$$K^R_{X,Y}(t) \geq -\ln(\eta_Y(t))$$

for $\alpha \neq 1$. 
PROOF. We have $g(x) \leq g(t)$, as $g(x)$ is decreasing in $x$ and $x > t$. Using this we have from (5)

\[ K^R_{X,Y}(t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int_t^\infty \frac{f^\alpha(x)}{\bar{F}(t)} \bar{G}^{1-\alpha}(t) \, dx + I^R_X(t) = -\ln(\eta_Y(t)). \]

This completes the proof.

Note that the hazard rate function of $X_w$ can be written as $\eta_{X_w}(t) = \frac{w(t)}{E[w(X)|X > t]} \eta_X(t)$. Therefore, Theorem 13 leads to the following corollary.

COROLLARY 14. Suppose $f_w(x)$ is decreasing in $x$. Then

\[ K^R_{X,X_w}(t) \geq -\ln \left( \frac{w(t)\eta_X(t)}{E[w(X)|X > t]} \right) \]

for $\alpha \neq 1$.

EXAMPLE 6. Consider a rv $X$ and the weight function as in Example 5. Then $K^R_{X,X_w}(t)$ in (18) can be written further as the following form

\[ K^R_{X,X_w}(t) = -\ln \left( \frac{w(t)\eta_X(t)}{E[w(X)|X > t]} \right) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{a \alpha + \alpha - 1}{\alpha + \alpha - 1} \right). \] (19)

In the following theorem we obtain upper bound of $K^R_{X,X_w}(t)$, in terms of hazard rate and Renyi’s residual entropy.

THEOREM 15. Let the weight function $w(x)$ be increasing in $x$. Then for $\alpha \neq 1$,

\[ K^R_{X,X_w}(t) \leq I^R_X(t) + \ln \left( \frac{E[w(X)|X > t]}{w(t)} \right). \]

PROOF. Given that $w(x)$ is increasing, Therefore, from (5) we have

\[ K^R_{X,X_w}(t) \leq I^R_X(t) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{w(t)f(x)}{E[w(X)|X > t]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \int_t^\infty \frac{f^\alpha(x)}{\bar{F}(t)} \bar{G}^{1-\alpha}(t) \, dx \]

\[ = I^R_X(t) + \ln \left( \frac{E[w(X)|X > t]}{w(t)} \right). \]

This completes the proof.

EXAMPLE 7. Consider the rv $X$ as described in Example 5. Then $K^R_{X,X_w}(t)$, obtained in (18) can be written as

\[ K^R_{X,X_w}(t) = I^R_X(t) + \ln \left( \frac{E[w(X)|X > t]}{w(t)} \right) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{a}{\alpha + \alpha - 1} \right). \] (20)

Therefore, from (20) it is not hard to verify the Theorem 15.
In the following theorem, we consider three non-negative rv’s $X_1, X_2$ and $X_3$ and obtain bounds of $K_{X_1,X_1}^R(t) - K_{X_2,X_2}^R(t)$.

**THEOREM 16.** Suppose that the rv’s $X_1$, $X_2$ and $X_3$ have pdf’s $f_1$, $f_2$, $f_3$; sf’s $\hat{F}_1$, $\hat{F}_2$, $\hat{F}_3$ and hazard rate functions $\eta_1$, $\eta_2$, $\eta_3$, respectively. Assume $X_1 \leq X_2$, that is, $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is increasing in $x$. Then

(a) $K_{X_1,X_1}^R(t) - K_{X_2,X_2}^R(t) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_1(t)}{\eta_2(t)} \right) + I_{X_1}^R(t) - I_{X_2}^R(t)$, if $\alpha > 1$,

and

(b) $K_{X_1,X_1}^R(t) - K_{X_2,X_2}^R(t) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_1(t)}{\eta_2(t)} \right) + I_{X_1}^R(t) - I_{X_2}^R(t)$, if $\alpha < 1$.

**PROOF.** (a) Under the given hypothesis, we have $\frac{f_1(x)}{f_2(x)} \leq \frac{f_1(t)}{f_2(t)}$. Therefore, for $\alpha > 1$, from (5) we deduce that

\[
K_{X_1,X_1}^R(t) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_0^t f_1(x) f_1^t(x) f_3^{1-x}(x) \, dx + I_{X_1}^R(t)}{\int_0^t f_2(x) \hat{F}_2^t(x) f_3^{1-x}(x) \, dx + I_{X_2}^R(t)} \right)
\]

This completes the proof of Part (a). Part (b) follows similarly.

**EXAMPLE 8.** Suppose $X_i$ follows exponential distribution with parameter $\sigma_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume that $X_1$ and $X_2$ are independently distributed and $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2$. Hence, $X_1 \leq X_2$. Consider another rv $X_3 = \min\{X_1, X_2\}$. Then

\[
K_{X_1,X_1}^R(t) - K_{X_2,X_2}^R(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\eta_1(t)}{\eta_2(t)} \right) + I_{X_1}^R(t) - I_{X_2}^R(t)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_1 \alpha}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_2 \alpha} \right),
\]

provided $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_1 \alpha > 0$ and $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_2 \alpha > 0$, proves the inequality in Theorem 16.

**THEOREM 17.** Consider three rv’s $X_1$, $X_2$ and $X_3$ as described in Theorem 16. Further, assume $X_2 \leq X_3$, that is, $\frac{f_2(x)}{f_1(x)}$ is increasing in $x > 0$. Then for $\alpha \neq 1$,

\[
K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t) - K_{X_2,X_3}^R(t) \geq -\ln \left( \frac{\eta_2(t)}{\eta_3(t)} \right).
\]

**PROOF.** Under the given conditions, we have $\frac{f_2(x)}{f_1(x)} \leq \frac{f_2(t)}{f_1(t)}$. Therefore, from (5) for $\alpha \neq 1$, we obtain

\[
K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\int_0^t f_1(x) f_1^{1-x}(t) f_2^{1-x}(x) \, dx + I_{X_1}^R(t)}{\int_0^t f_2(x) \hat{F}_2^t(x) f_3^{1-x}(x) \, dx + I_{X_2}^R(t)} \right)
\]

\[
= K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t) - \ln \left( \frac{\eta_2(t)}{\eta_3(t)} \right).
\]

Hence the result follows.
EXAMPLE 9. Let the r.v's $X_2$ and $X_3$ follow Pareto I $(a_2, b_2)$ and Pareto I $(a_3, b_3)$, respectively, where $a_2, b_2, a_3, b_1 > 0$ and $b_2 > b_3$. Also, assume that $X_2$ and $X_3$ are independently distributed. It can be shown that $X_2 \leq X_3$. Consider another r.v $X_1 = \min\{X_2, X_3\}$. Then

$$K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t) - K_{X_1,X_3}^R(t) = -\ln\left(\frac{\eta_2(t)}{\eta_3(t)}\right) + \frac{1}{\sigma - 1}\ln\left(\frac{a_2\sigma + a_1}{a_3\sigma + a_1}\right).$$

(22)

Therefore, from (22) the Theorem 17 can be easily verified.

3. SOME RESULTS ON $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$

In this section we consider time dependent measure of inaccuracy of order $a$ between past lifetime distributions $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ defined in (7). Even if the past lifetime information divergence measures appears to be a dual of its residual version (5), Di Crescenzo and Longobardi (2004) have identified some importance of Kullback-Leibler divergence measure for past lifetime r.v.'s. Since $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ is a generalized divergence, thus a separate study of the same is also worthwhile. However, as most of the results are parallel to its residual version, the statements of the results in past lifetime are omitted. The following theorem shows how $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ is affected by an increasing transformation of $X$ and $Y$.

THEOREM 18. Let $\phi$ be a strictly increasing function. Then

$$K_{X,Y}^R(\phi^{-1}(t)) = K_{\phi(X),\phi(Y)}^R(t).$$

EXAMPLE 10. Consider two r.v's $X_1$ and $X_2$ following exponential distributions with mean $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively. Here, $K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t)$ can be obtained as

$$K_{X_1,X_2}^R(t) = \frac{a}{\sigma_1\sigma_2^2}\left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{a}{\sigma_1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_2}\right)}\right].$$

(23)

Further, let $\phi(x) = x^{1/\gamma}$, $x > 0$, $\gamma > 0$. Note that $\phi$ is a strictly increasing function. It can be showed that $Y_1 = \phi(X_1)$ and $Y_2 = \phi(X_2)$ follow Weibull distribution with a common shape parameter $\gamma$, and scale parameters $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively. Then, in order to derive the expression of $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$, one has to use the result of Theorem 18 which otherwise not able to obtain directly. Note that $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$ can be obtained by substituting $\phi^{-1}(t) = t^{1/\gamma}$ in place of $t$ in (22), given by

$$K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t) = \frac{a}{\sigma_1\sigma_2^2}\left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{a}{\sigma_1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_2}\right)}\right].$$

Further, let $\phi(x) = x^{1/\gamma}$, $x > 0$, $\gamma > 0$. Note that $\phi$ is a strictly increasing function. It can be showed that $Y_1 = \phi(X_1)$ and $Y_2 = \phi(X_2)$ follow Weibull distribution with a common shape parameter $\gamma$, and scale parameters $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively. Then, in order to derive the expression of $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$, one has to use the result of Theorem 18 which otherwise not able to obtain directly. Note that $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$ can be obtained by substituting $\phi^{-1}(t) = t^{1/\gamma}$ in place of $t$ in (22), given by

$$K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t) = \frac{a}{\sigma_1\sigma_2^2}\left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{a}{\sigma_1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_2}\right)}\right].$$

Further, let $\phi(x) = x^{1/\gamma}$, $x > 0$, $\gamma > 0$. Note that $\phi$ is a strictly increasing function. It can be showed that $Y_1 = \phi(X_1)$ and $Y_2 = \phi(X_2)$ follow Weibull distribution with a common shape parameter $\gamma$, and scale parameters $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively. Then, in order to derive the expression of $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$, one has to use the result of Theorem 18 which otherwise not able to obtain directly. Note that $K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t)$ can be obtained by substituting $\phi^{-1}(t) = t^{1/\gamma}$ in place of $t$ in (22), given by

$$K_{Y_1,Y_2}^R(t) = \frac{a}{\sigma_1\sigma_2^2}\left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{a}{\sigma_1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_2}\right)}\right].$$
4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we propose a nonparametric kernel-based density estimator for $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ and is validated through the simulated random samples. We use kernel density estimator for $f$ and empirical estimator for the survival function $\bar{F}$, and $g$ is assumed to be a known density.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Simulation results.}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccc}
\hline
& & \multicolumn{2}{c}{n = 10} & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{n = 25} & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{n = 10} & \hline
$\alpha$ & $t$ & Bias & MSE & Bias & MSE & $\alpha$ & $t$ & Bias & MSE & Bias & MSE \\
\hline
1 & 1 & -1.10 & 1.34 & -0.93 & 0.91 & 2 & 1 & 0.69 & 0.96 & 0.33 & 0.21 \\
0.5 & 1.2 & -1.32 & 1.90 & -0.90 & 0.87 & 1.2 & 0.14 & 0.57 & -0.07 & 0.16 \\
& 1.4 & -1.63 & 2.83 & 1.37 & 1.99 & 1.4 & 0.02 & 0.44 & 0.02 & 0.38 \\
& 1.5 & -1.92 & 3.87 & -1.41 & 2.10 & 1.5 & 0.06 & 0.52 & 0.16 & 0.41 \\
& 1.6 & -1.94 & 3.91 & -1.56 & 2.60 & 1.6 & -0.15 & 0.63 & 0.03 & 0.53 \\
0.75 & 1 & -0.47 & 0.39 & -0.33 & 0.20 & 1 & 0.67 & 0.97 & 1.17 & 3.23 \\
& 1.2 & -0.94 & 1.13 & -0.64 & 0.46 & 2.5 & 1.2 & 0.26 & 0.83 & 0.27 & 0.80 \\
& 1.4 & -1.16 & 1.51 & -0.75 & 0.65 & 1.4 & 0.33 & 0.75 & 0.20 & 0.83 \\
& 1.5 & -1.23 & 1.72 & -0.87 & 0.86 & 1.5 & 0.01 & 0.91 & 0.26 & 1.03 \\
& 1.6 & -1.18 & 1.67 & 0.77 & 0.74 & 1.6 & 0.09 & 0.87 & -0.06 & 0.49 \\
1.5 & 1 & 0.46 & 0.80 & 0.30 & 0.22 & 1.5 & 0.06 & 0.48 & 0.01 & 0.14 \\
& 1.2 & 0.06 & 0.48 & 0.01 & 0.14 & 1.4 & -0.20 & 0.28 & -0.15 & 0.29 \\
& 1.5 & -0.33 & 0.44 & -0.31 & 0.29 & 1.6 & -0.16 & 0.78 & -0.15 & 0.36 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Let $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ be a random sample taken from a population with probability density function $f$ and survival function $\bar{F}$. Then a nonparametric estimator of $K_{X,Y}^R(t)$ is defined by

\[
\hat{K}_{X,Y}^R(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{F}_n(t)} \right)^{\alpha} \left( \frac{g(x)}{G(t)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \, dx \\
+ \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log \int_t^\infty \left( \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{F}_n(t)} \right)^{\alpha} \, dx,
\]  

where $f_n(x) = \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K \left( \frac{x - X_i}{h} \right)$ denotes the kernel density estimator of $f$, $\bar{F}_n(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i > t)$ the empirical estimator of $\bar{F}$, and $I(X_i > t)$ the indicator variable. We assume that $Y$ follows Pareto I $(b,a)$ distribution with probability density function

\[
g(x) = \frac{b}{a} \left( \frac{x}{a} \right)^{-b-1}; x > a; a, b > 0.
\]

For the simulation under complete sample, we have generated samples from Pareto I density $g$ in (25) with $a = 1$ and $b = 3$ respectively. $\hat{K}_{X,Y}^R(t)$ for various values of $t$
and sample sizes $n = 10$ and $n = 25$ are calculated. The kernel function is taken to be Gaussian kernel, $K(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-u^2/2}$, with bandwidth $h_n = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and 50 iterations are carried out. To find the bias, we further assume that $f$ is also Pareto I with the form (25), and parameters $a = 0.5$ and $b = 2.5$ respectively. The bias and mean squared error (MSE) of $\hat{K}_{R, X, Y}(t)$ for different values of $\alpha$ and $t$ are computed and given in Table 1. It is evident from Table 1 that MSE of $\hat{K}_{R, X, Y}(t)$ decreases as the sample size increases and in terms of bias and MSE, the estimator is more ideal when $\alpha = 2$. Since $\hat{K}_{R, X, Y}(t)$ is obtained as a plug-in estimator in the nonparametric setup, the asymptotic normality of (24) is direct using the standard nonparametric estimation theory. A numerical study of $\bar{K}_{R, X, Y}(t)$ is similar and hence omitted.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, based on the Renyi entropy, we proposed some dynamic generalized measures of inaccuracy of order $\alpha(\neq 1) > 0$ between two probability distributions. Note that as $\alpha$ tends to 1, these measures reduce to the dynamic inaccuracy measures due to Taneja et al. (2009) and Kumar et al. (2011). Some characterization results and bounds of the proposed measure in residual time are obtained. Numerical example using a nonparametric estimator is given to illustrate the usefulness of the generalized residual measure of inaccuracy of order $\alpha$.
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SUMMARY

Generalized information measures play an important role in the measurement of uncertainty of certain random variables, where the standard practice of applying ordinary uncertainty measures fails to fit. Based on the Renyi entropy and its divergence, we propose a generalized measure of inaccuracy of order \( \alpha (\neq 1) > 0 \) between two residual and past lifetime distributions of a system. We study some important properties and characterizations of these measures. A numerical example is given to illustrate the usefulness of the proposed measure.
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