

SOME INEQUALITIES FOR RELIABILITY FUNCTIONS

Z. W. BIRNBAUM

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

and

J. D. ESARY

BOEING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH LABORATORIES

1. Basic concepts and definitions

1.1. With the advent of very complex engineering designs such as those of high-speed computers or supersonic aircraft, it has become increasingly important to study the relationship between the functioning and failure of single components and the performance of the entire system and, in particular, to be able to make quantitative statements about the probability that the system will perform according to specifications. It is the aim of this paper to present some inequalities for this probability.

1.2. We shall assume that there are only two states possible for every component of a system, as well as for the system itself: either it functions or it fails. When the system consists of n components, we shall ascribe to each of them a binary variable which will indicate its state

$$(1.2.1) \quad x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when the } i\text{-th component functions,} \\ 0 & \text{when the } i\text{-th component fails} \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Similarly, we ascribe to the entire system a binary indicator variable

$$(1.2.2) \quad u = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when the system functions,} \\ 0 & \text{when the system fails.} \end{cases}$$

When the design of a system is known, then the states of all n components (that is, the values of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) determine the state of the system, that is the value of u so that

$$(1.2.3) \quad u = \phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

where ϕ is a function assuming the values 0 or 1. This function ϕ will be called the *structure function* of the system. The indicator variable x_i will sometimes be referred to as "component x_i " and ϕ will sometimes be called "structure ϕ ." The n -tuple of 0's or 1's

$$(1.2.4) \quad (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \underline{x}$$

will be called the *vector of component states* or, in short, the "state vector." It

can assume any one of the 2^n values represented by the vertices of the unit cube in n -dimensional space: $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $(1, 1, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$. This set of all possible values of \underline{x} will be denoted by I_n . Thus the structure function $\phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \phi(\underline{x})$ is a binary function on I_n .

1.3. Furthermore, we shall assume that the state of each component is decided by chance, so that the value actually assumed by x_i is a binary random variable X_i with the probability distribution

$$(1.3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pr\{X_i = 1\} &= p_i, \\ \Pr\{X_i = 0\} &= q_i = 1 - p_i, \end{aligned} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n),$$

and we shall make the assumption that X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are totally independent. The probability p_i will be called the *reliability of the i -th component*.

In the following, it will always be assumed that

$$(1.3.2) \quad p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_n = p,$$

that is, that all components have the same reliability, for example, the reliability of the least reliable component.

1.4. For a known structure function $\phi(\underline{X})$, the value of p determines the probability that the system will function

$$(1.4.1) \quad \Pr\{\phi(\underline{X}) = 1 | p\} = h_\phi(p),$$

that is, the *reliability of the system* for given component reliability p . The function $h_\phi(p)$ is called the *reliability function* for ϕ ; we will mostly denote it by $h(p)$, omitting the subscript ϕ .

In this paper we shall present inequalities for $h'(p)$, the derivative of the reliability function, which can be obtained when only partial information about $\phi(\underline{x})$ is available. We shall then discuss a procedure by which such inequalities can be used to obtain some conclusions about $h(p)$.

1.5. The assumption of 1.2 is restrictive, since it precludes consideration of systems whose components may function only partially and yet the systems will deliver a satisfactory performance. Similarly, the assumption of 1.3 is rather special, since, often, functioning or failure of different components of a system is correlated. Nevertheless, these two assumptions are a reasonable approximation to many practical situations, and they make it possible to simplify the theory to a manageable level.

1.6. For state vectors $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$, we shall use the following notations:

- (i) $\underline{x} \leq \underline{y}$ when $x_i \leq y_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$;
- (ii) $\underline{x} < \underline{y}$ when $\underline{x} \leq \underline{y}$ and $x_j < y_j$ for some j ;
- (iii) $(0_k, \underline{x}) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$;
- (iv) $(1_k, \underline{x}) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}, 1, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$;
- (v) $\underline{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\underline{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$.

A component x_k is called *essential* for the structure $\phi(x)$ if there exists a state vector \underline{x}^* such that

(1.6.1) $\phi(1_k, \underline{x}^*) \neq \phi(0_k, \underline{x}^*)$.

If $\phi(x)$ is any function on I_n , not necessarily a structure function, the same definition of an essential component can be used.

1.7. For given n there are $2^{(2^n)}$ possible different structure functions. Among all these possible structure functions we shall single out the class of *coherent* structure functions which is defined in the following (this definition was introduced in [1]), and which not only has some intuitive appeal, but also has been found to have a number of rather interesting properties [2].

A structure function $\phi(\underline{x})$ is coherent when it fulfills the following conditions:

(1.7.1) $\phi(\underline{x}) \leq \phi(\underline{y})$ for $\underline{x} \leq \underline{y}$,

(1.7.2) $\phi(\underline{0}) = 0, \quad \phi(\underline{1}) = 1$.

From now on we shall assume that all structure functions considered are coherent.

1.8. A state vector \underline{x} is called a *path* for ϕ when $\phi(\underline{x}) = 1$, and \underline{x} is called a *cut* for ϕ when $\phi(\underline{x}) = 0$. This terminology is analogous to that used in circuit theory.

That ϕ is coherent implies immediately that (a) if \underline{x} is a path for ϕ and $\underline{x} \leq \underline{y}$, then \underline{y} is a path for ϕ , and (b) if \underline{x} is a cut for ϕ and $\underline{x} \geq \underline{y}$, then \underline{y} is a cut for ϕ .

For every state vector $\underline{x} \in I_n$, we define $S(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ equal to the number of functioning components in \underline{x} and call $S(\underline{x})$ the *size* of \underline{x} .

For a given structure $\phi(\underline{x})$ we consider the following numbers:

(1.8.1) $A_j = \text{number of paths of size } j, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Obviously one has

(1.8.2) $A_j \leq \binom{n}{j}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

1.9. For $\phi(\underline{x})$ coherent, one can prove [1] that

(1.9.1) $\frac{A_j}{\binom{n}{j}} \leq \frac{A_{j+1}}{\binom{n+1}{j}} \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1,$

(1.9.2) $h(0) = 0, \quad h(1) = 1,$

(1.9.3) $h'(p) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < p < 1.$

2. Inequalities for $h'(p)$ and grids for $h(p)$

2.1. Let us assume that for all reliability functions $h(p)$ belonging to a certain class \mathcal{H} , one can prove an inequality of the form

(2.1.1) $h'(p) \geq \psi(p, h), \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq p \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq h \leq 1.$

This means that there exists a function $\psi(p, h)$ on the unit square $0 \leq p \leq 1, 0 \leq h \leq 1$, such that when a curve representing $h(p) \in \mathcal{H}$ passes through a

point (p, h) , then the slope of that curve at that point must be at least $\psi(p, h)$.

If the inequality is replaced by equality, then (2.1.1) becomes a differential equation

$$(2.1.2) \quad \mathfrak{X}' = \psi(p, \mathfrak{X}),$$

which, under very general assumptions on $\psi(p, \mathfrak{X})$, has a one-parametric family of solutions $\mathfrak{X}_c(p)$ with the parameter c . We shall say that the family of curves representing the functions $\mathfrak{X}_c(p)$ for $0 \leq p \leq 1$ forms a *grid for the class* \mathfrak{C} . In view of (2.1.1), this grid has the following properties:

- (1) through every point (p, h) in the unit square goes exactly one grid curve $\mathfrak{X}_c(p)$;
- (2) if the curve representing a reliability function $h(p) \in \mathfrak{C}$ goes through a point (p, h) and $\mathfrak{X}_c(p)$ is the grid curve going through the same point, then $h'(p) \geq \mathfrak{X}'_c(p) = \psi(p, h)$. This means that if the curve $h(p) \in \mathfrak{C}$ intersects any grid curve, then it intersects it from below. It should be noted, however, that there may be points in the unit square $0 \leq p \leq 1$, $0 \leq h \leq 1$ such that no curve $h(p) \in \mathfrak{C}$ goes through them.

The knowledge of a grid may be utilized in various ways which will be discussed later, but the most immediate application is the following.

Assume that all one knows about a reliability function $h(p) \in \mathfrak{C}$ is that for given component reliability p_0 , it assumes a known value $h(p_0) = h_0$. Then there exists a parameter value c_0 such that $\mathfrak{X}_{c_0}(p_0) = h_0$, and from grid property 2, it follows that $h(p) \geq \mathfrak{X}_c(p)$ for all $p \geq p_0$.

2.2. It is well known that for the class \mathfrak{C}_c consisting of reliability functions for all coherent structures, the inequality

$$(2.2.1) \quad h'(p) \geq \frac{h(p)[1 - h(p)]}{p(1 - p)}$$

holds for $0 \leq p \leq 1$. This inequality, obtained for two-terminal networks in [3] and generalized in [1] to all coherent systems, and in [4] to the case of components with unequal reliabilities, is of the form (2.1.1). The corresponding differential equation of the form (2.1.2) is

$$(2.2.2) \quad \mathfrak{X}' = \frac{\mathfrak{X}(1 - \mathfrak{X})}{p(1 - p)}.$$

Its general integral is

$$(2.2.3) \quad \frac{\mathfrak{X}_c(p)}{1 - \mathfrak{X}_c(p)} = c \frac{p}{1 - p}, \quad c > 0, \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1,$$

and this one-parameter family of curves forms the so-called *Moore-Shannon grid*. Figure 1 indicates the shape of the curves of this family which, for $c = 1$, includes the diagonal $\mathfrak{X}_1(p) = p$.

2.3. We shall need the following concepts defined by analogy with terms




FIGURE 1

used in the theory of circuits: the *length* l_ϕ of a system ϕ is the smallest number of components such that if only they function, the structure functions; the *width* w_ϕ of ϕ is the smallest number of components such that if only they fail, the structure fails.

According to these definitions we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.3.1) \quad & \phi(\underline{x}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \underline{x} \text{ such that } S(\underline{x}) \leq l - 1, \\
 & \phi(\underline{x}) = 0 \quad \text{for some } \underline{x} \text{ such that } l \leq S(\underline{x}) \leq n - w, \\
 & \phi(\underline{x}) = 1 \quad \text{for some } \underline{x} \text{ such that } l \leq S(\underline{x}) \leq n - w, \\
 & \phi(\underline{x}) = 1 \quad \text{for all } \underline{x} \text{ such that } n - w + 1 \leq S(\underline{x}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Sometimes the only information one has about a system ϕ consists of the knowledge of l_ϕ , or w_ϕ , and, possibly, A_l or A_w . The remainder of this section will be devoted to the problem of obtaining grids when some or all of the parameters l, w, A_l, A_w are known.

According to (2.3.1), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.3.2) \quad E\{\phi(\underline{X})[S(\underline{X}) - l]\} &= \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{S(\underline{x})=j} \phi(\underline{x})(j-l)P\{\underline{X} = \underline{x}\} \\
 &= \sum_{j=l}^{n-w} (j-l) \sum_{S(\underline{x})=j} \phi(\underline{x})p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \sum_{S(\underline{x})=j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &= \sum_{j=l}^{n-w} (j-l)A_j p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using formula (6.3) in [4] for $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.3.3) \quad \text{cov}\{\phi(\underline{X}), S(\underline{X})\} &= p(1-p)h'(p) \\
 &= E\{\phi(\underline{X})S(\underline{X})\} - E\{\phi(\underline{X})\}E\{S(\underline{X})\} \\
 &= lh(p) + \sum_{j=l}^{n-w} (j-l)A_j p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} - h(p)np \\
 &= (l-np)h(p) + \sum_{j=l}^{n-w} (j-l)A_j p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $A_j \geq 1$ for $l \leq j \leq n-w$, which follows from (2.3.1), and inequality (1.9.1), one obtains

$$(2.3.4) \quad A_j \geq \max \left\{ A_l \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}}, 1 \right\}, \quad \text{for } l \leq j \leq n-w.$$

Since

$$(2.3.5) \quad \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} = \frac{l!(n-l)!}{j!(n-j)!} = \frac{(n-j+1)(n-j+2) \cdots (n-l)}{(l+1)(l+2) \cdots j},$$

and $n-j \geq l$ implies

$$(2.3.6) \quad \frac{n-j+1}{l+1} > \frac{n-j+2}{l+2} > \dots > \frac{n-l}{j} \geq 1,$$

hence $\frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} > 1$. Similarly, $n-j < l$ implies

$$(2.3.7) \quad \frac{n-j+1}{l+1} < \frac{n-j+2}{l+2} < \dots < \frac{n-l}{j} < 1,$$

hence $\binom{n}{j} / \binom{n}{l} < 1$.

We conclude

$$(2.3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} A_j &> A_l \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} && \text{for } j \leq n-l, \\ A_j &\geq 1 && \text{for } j > n-l. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we obtain the inequality

$$(2.3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} p(1-p)h'(p) &\geq (l-np)h(p) \\ &+ \frac{A_l}{\binom{n}{l}} \sum_{j=l}^{n-l} (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^j (1-p)^{n-j} \\ &+ \sum_{j=n-l+1}^{n-w} (j-l) p^j (1-p)^{n-j} \\ &+ \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^j (1-p)^{n-j}. \end{aligned}$$

In this inequality, the first sum may be empty if $l > n-l$, and the second sum may be empty if $w > l-1$. Both these sums are empty when $l > n-l$ and $w > l-1$, which implies $l+w \geq n$, so that, in view of the known inequality $l+w \leq n+1$, one then has $l+w = n$ or $l+w = n+1$.

Inequality (2.3.9) is of the form (2.1.1). The corresponding differential equation of the form (2.1.2) is

$$(2.3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{x}' &= \frac{l-np}{p(1-p)} + \frac{A_l}{\binom{n}{l}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{n-l} (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^{j-1} (1-p)^{n-j-1} \\ &+ \sum_{j=n-l+1}^{n-w} (j-l) p^{j-1} (1-p)^{n-j-1} \\ &+ \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n (j-l) \binom{n}{j} p^{j-1} (1-p)^{n-j}, \end{aligned}$$

and, again, the first or the second sum, or both, can be empty.

The general solution of (2.3.10) is

$$(2.3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{x}_c &= cp^l(1-p)^{n-l} + A_l \sum_{j=l+1}^{n-l} \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} p^j (1-p)^{n-j} \\ &+ \sum_{j=n-l+1}^{n-w} p^j (1-p)^{n-j} + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n \binom{n}{j} p^j (1-p)^{n-j}. \end{aligned}$$

The family of functions (2.3.11) constitutes a grid for the class of reliability functions corresponding to coherent systems with given n, l, w , and A_l . This class will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_c(n, l, w, A_l)$.

If l and w are known, but A_l is not known, then (2.3.9) can be replaced by a (weaker) inequality by setting $A_l = 1$, and one obtains the grid

$$(2.3.12) \quad \mathfrak{X}_c = cp^l(1-p)^{n-l} + \sum_{j=l+1}^{n-l} \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\ + \sum_{j=n-l+1}^{n-w} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} + \sum_{j=n-w+1}^n \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j}$$

for the class $\mathcal{H}_c(n, l, w)$ of reliability functions corresponding to coherent systems with given n, l , and w .

If only n and l are known, then the resulting grid is

$$(2.3.13) \quad \mathfrak{X}_c = cp^l(1-p)^{n-l} + \sum_{j=l+1}^{n-l} \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n}{l}} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\ + \sum_{j=n-l+1}^n p^j(1-p)^{n-j}.$$

When in (2.3.9) all terms but the first on the right side are omitted, one arrives at the particularly simple grid for $\mathcal{H}_c(n, l)$:

$$(2.3.14) \quad \mathfrak{X}_c = cp^l(1-p)^{n-l}.$$

For $h(p) \in \mathcal{H}_c(n, l, w, A_l)$, one always has

$$(2.3.15) \quad h(p) = A_l p^l(1-p)^{n-l} + \sum_{j=l+1}^n A_j p^j(1-p)^{n-j} > A_l p^l(1-p)^{n-l},$$

so that no $h(p)$ in this class can go through points in the region $h \leq A_l p^l(1-p)^{n-l}$.

2.4. Again using (2.3.1), one computes

$$(2.4.1) \quad E\{[1 - \phi(\underline{X})][n - w - S(\underline{X})]\} \\ = \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{S(\underline{x})=j} [1 - \phi(\underline{x})](n - w - j)P\{\underline{X} = \underline{x}\} \\ = \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} (n - w - j) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\ + \sum_{j=l}^{n-w-1} (n - w - j) A_j^* p^j(1-p)^{n-j}$$

where $A_j^* = \binom{n}{j} - A_j =$ number of cuts of size j . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.4.2) \quad \text{cov} \{ \phi(\underline{X}), S(\underline{X}) \} &= p(1-p)h'(p) \\
 &= E\{ \phi(\underline{X})S(\underline{X}) \} - E\{ \phi(\underline{X}) \} E\{ S(\underline{X}) \} \\
 &= [1-h(p)][np - (n-w)] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} (n-w-j) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=l}^{n-w-1} (n-w-j) A_{j,l}^* p^j(1-p)^{n-j},
 \end{aligned}$$

and duplicating the arguments of section 2.3 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.4.3) \quad p(1-p)h'(p) &\geq [1-h(p)][np - (n-w)] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} (n-w-j) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=l}^{w-1} (n-w-j) p^j(1-p)^{n-j} \\
 &\quad + \frac{A_{n-w}^*}{\binom{n}{w}} \sum_{j=w}^{n-w-1} (n-w-j) \binom{n}{j} p^j(1-p)^{n-j},
 \end{aligned}$$

an inequality of the form (2.1.1).

As was done in section 2.3 with regard to inequality (2.3.9), we may retain all or some terms of the right side of (2.4.3), replace in each case inequality by equality, integrate the resulting differential equations, and obtain grids for the respective classes of reliability functions. We consider here, explicitly, only the case when all but the first term on the right side of (2.4.3) are omitted. One obtains then the simple grid

$$(2.4.4) \quad \mathfrak{X}_c(p) = 1 - cp^{n-w}(1-p)^w$$

for the class $\mathcal{H}_c(n, w)$ of reliability functions for coherent systems for which n and w are known.

3. The use of several grids for the same class of reliability functions

3.1. If there are several different grids for a given class \mathcal{H} of reliability functions, then all these grids can be used to obtain lower bounds for an $h(p) \in \mathcal{H}$ which are better than bounds based on any single one of the grids. For example, let us consider a class \mathcal{H} for which there are two grids $\mathfrak{X}_a(p)$ and $\lambda_b(p)$, with parameters a and b , respectively. If for an $h(p) \in \mathcal{H}$ it is known that $h(p_0) = h_0$, then one can determine a_0 and b_0 so that $\mathfrak{X}_{a_0}(p_0) = \lambda_{b_0}(p_0) = h_0$, and choose that one of the curves $\mathfrak{X}_{a_0}(p)$, $\lambda_{b_0}(p)$ which is steeper at p_0 . If, for instance,

$$(3.1.1) \quad \mathfrak{X}'_{a_0}(p_0) > \lambda'_{b_0}(p_0),$$

then $\mathfrak{X}_{a_0}(p)$ will be used as a lower bound for $h(p)$ for $p \geq p_0$ until, possibly, it

intersects some curve of the λ -grid which is steeper at the point of intersection, that is, until the first value $p_1 > p_0$ such that for some b_1 , one has

$$(3.1.2) \quad \lambda_{b_1}(p_1) = \mathfrak{X}_{a_0}(p_1), \quad \lambda'_{b_1}(p_1) > \mathfrak{X}'_{a_0}(p_1).$$

Then $\lambda_{b_1}(p)$ can be used as a lower bound for $p \geq p_1$, and so on. Figure 2 illustrates this procedure.




FIGURE 2

In some cases, an analytic discussion can be carried out for the use of several grids, and a practically useful example of such a discussion follows.

3.2. In sections 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 we have seen that the families of curves (2.3.14), (2.2.3), and (2.4.4) are grids for the class $\mathcal{H}_c(n, l, w)$. For the purposes of our discussion we rewrite the equations of these grids to be

$$(3.2.1) \quad \mathfrak{X}_a(p) = ap^l(1-p)^{n-l},$$

$$(3.2.2) \quad \lambda_b(p) = \frac{bp}{1 + (b-1)p},$$

$$(3.2.3) \quad \mu_c(p) = 1 - cp^{n-w}(1-p)^w.$$

In order that the curve of each of these families passes through a given point (p_1, h_1) , the corresponding parameters must assume the values

$$(3.2.4) \quad a_1 = \frac{h_1}{p_1^l(1 - p_1)^{n-l}},$$

$$(3.2.5) \quad b_1 = \frac{h_1}{p_1} \cdot \frac{1 - p_1}{1 - h_1},$$

$$(3.2.6) \quad c_1 = \frac{1 - h_1}{p_1^{n-w}(1 - p_1)^w}.$$

The derivatives of the three curves passing through (p_1, h_1) at that point are

$$(3.2.7) \quad \mathfrak{X}'_{a_1}(p_1) = \frac{h_1(l - np_1)}{p_1(1 - p_1)},$$

$$(3.2.8) \quad \lambda'_{b_1}(p_1) = \frac{h_1(1 - h_1)}{p_1(1 - p_1)},$$

$$(3.2.9) \quad \mu'_{c_1}(p_1) = \frac{(1 - h_1)(w - n + np_1)}{p_1(1 - p_1)}.$$

We have

$$(3.2.10) \quad \mathfrak{X}'_{a_1}(p_1) > 0 \quad \text{if and only if } 0 < p_1 < \frac{l}{n},$$

$$(3.2.11) \quad \lambda'_{b_1}(p_1) > 0 \quad \text{for all } p_1, 0 < p_1 < 1,$$

$$(3.2.12) \quad \mu'_{c_1}(p_1) > 0 \quad \text{if and only if } \frac{n - w}{n} < p_1 < 1,$$

so that (3.2.1) is a nontrivial grid only for $0 < p < l/n$, (3.2.3) only for $(n - w)/n < p < 1$, whereas the Moore-Shannon grid (3.2.2) consists of functions which increase for all p , and hence is useful for $0 < p < 1$.

In view of the known inequality $l + w \leq n + 1$, w_p have $l/n \leq (n - w)/n$, except for the case when $l + w = n + 1$, which occurs if and only if the structure is "l out of n"; in this case,

$$(3.2.13) \quad h(p) = \sum_{j=i}^n \binom{n}{j} p^j(1 - p)^{n-j}$$

and is completely known. In all other cases the intervals $(0, l/n)$, $(l/n, (n - w)/n)$, $((n - w)/n, 1)$ are nonoverlapping, and for $0 < p < l/n$ we need to consider only grids (3.2.1) and (3.2.2), for $l/n < p < (n - w)/n$ only grid (3.2.2) and for $(n - w)/n < p < 1$ only grids (3.2.2) and (3.2.3).

Comparing the derivatives (3.2.7) and (3.2.8), we see that the \mathfrak{X} -grid is steeper for $0 < p < l/n$ if and only if $h > np - l + 1$, and comparing (3.2.8) and (3.2.9), we find that the μ -grid is steeper for $(n - w)/n < p < 1$ if and only if $h > np - n + w$. The parallel lines $h = np - l + 1$ and $h = np - n + w$ divide, therefore, the unit square in three regions, from left to right, such that

the \mathfrak{X} -grid is steepest at all points of the first region, the λ -grid in the second and the μ -grid in the third region.

3.3. A specific example is presented in figure 3. For $n = 10$, $l = 5$, $w = 2$, the lines




FIGURE 3

$$(3.3.1) \quad (l_1)h = 10p - 4$$

$$(3.3.2) \quad (l_2)h = 10p - 8$$

partition the unit square in the three regions described in the preceding section. The curves of the Moore-Shannon grid (3.2.2), shown before in figure 1, are reproduced in figure 3 in solid lines and, in addition, several curves of the \mathfrak{X} -grid (3.2.1) are indicated by dotted lines, and of the μ -grid (3.2.3) by broken lines.

If it is known that $h(p) \in \mathfrak{H}_c$ ($n = 10$, $l = 5$, $w = 2$) and that the graph of $h(p)$ goes through the point $P_1 = (.20, .05)$, then our theory tells us that for

$p \geq .20$, that graph is bounded from below by a curve which first goes along the \mathfrak{X} -curve through P_1 to its intersection with l_1 , then along the Moore-Shannon curve (in this case the diagonal) to its intersection with l_2 , and then along the μ -curve. This lower bound is indicated by a heavy line.

Similarly, if a reliability function $h(p)$ of our family is known to go through $P_2 = (.34, .10)$, then for $p \geq .34$ one obtains for $h(p)$ the lower bound indicated by the heavy line beginning at P_2 .

Another lower bound for $h(p)$ going through $P_3 = (.32, .40)$ is indicated by the heavy line beginning at that point.



ADDENDUM

It should be mentioned that an improvement of the Moore-Shannon grid has been recently obtained. One can show that the following inequalities hold for all $h(p) \in \mathfrak{H}_c$

I $(-p \log p)h'(p) \geq -h \log h,$

II $[-(1 - p) \log (1 - p)]h'(p) \geq -(1 - h) \log (1 - h).$

The corresponding grids are

- (i) $\mathfrak{X}_c(p) = p^c, \quad c > 0,$
- (ii) $\mathfrak{X}_c(p) = 1 - (1 - p)^c, \quad c > 0.$

These grids are an improvement on (2.2.3), since (i) is steeper than the corresponding Moore-Shannon curve at every point such that $p > h$, and (ii) at every point such that $p < h$. A derivation of this new grid is being prepared for publication [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. W. BIRNBAUM, J. D. ESARY, and S. C. SAUNDERS, "Multi component systems and structures and their reliabilities," *Technometrics*, Vol. 3 (1961), pp. 55-77.
- [2] J. D. ESARY and A. W. MARSHALL, "System structure and the existence of a system life," *Technometrics*, Vol. 6 (1964), pp. 459-462.
- [3] E. F. MOORE and C. E. SHANNON, "Reliable circuits using less reliable relays," *J. Franklin Inst.*, Vol. 262 (1956), pp. 191-208 and 281-297.
- [4] J. D. ESARY and F. PROSCHAN, "Coherent structures of non-identical components," *Technometrics*, Vol. 5 (1963), pp. 191-209.
- [5] Z. W. BIRNBAUM, J. D. ESARY, and A. W. MARSHALL, "Stochastic characterization of wear-out for components and systems," Boeing Scientific Research Laboratories Document 01-82-0460, September 1965.