

The Kumaraswamy-Generalized Exponentiated Pareto Distribution

Tarek M. Shams

Department of Statistics,
Faculty of Commerce, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt

Abstract: The modeling and analysis of lifetimes is an important aspect of statistical work in a wide variety of scientific and technological fields. For the first time the Kum-GEP distribution is introduced and studied. This distribution can have a decreasing and upside-down bathtub failure rate function depending on the value of its parameters; it's including some special sub-model like exponentiated Pareto Distribution and its original form. Some structural properties of the proposed distribution are studied including explicit expressions for the moments. We provide the density functions of the order statistics and obtain their moments. The method of maximum likelihood is used for estimating the model parameters and the observed information matrix is derived. The real data is provided to illustrate the theoretical results in the complete data.

Key words: Exponentiated Pareto distribution • Hazard function • Kumaraswamy distribution • Maximum likelihood estimation • Moment

INTRODUCTION

The Pareto distribution is the most popular model for analyzing skewed data. The Pareto distribution was first proposed by Pareto [1] as a model for the distribution of income. It can be used to represent various other forms of distributions (other than income data) that arise in human life. It has played a very important role in the investigation of city population sizes, occurrence of natural resources, insurance-risk and business failures. Arnold and Press [2] give an extensive historical survey of its use in the context of income distribution. The cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the two parameter exponentiated Pareto distribution is:

$$F(x; \theta, \lambda) = [1 - (1 + x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta}, \quad x > 0, (\theta, \lambda) > 0, \quad (1)$$

A random variable X is said to follow the Pareto distribution with four parameters, if the probability density function (pdf) of X is as follows:

$$f(x; \theta, \lambda) = \theta \lambda [1 - (1 + x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta-1} (1 + x)^{-(\lambda+1)}, \quad x > 0, (\theta, \lambda) > 0 \quad (2)$$

where θ and λ are the shape parameters.

The generalized Pareto distribution was introduced by Pickands [3] and has since been applied to a number of areas including socio-economic phenomena, physical and biological processes [4], reliability studies and the analysis of environmental extremes. Davison and Smith [5] pointed out that the GP distribution might form the basis of a broad modeling approach to high-level exceedances. DuMouchel [6] applied it to estimate the stable index α to measure tail thickness, whereas, Davison [7, 8] modeled contamination due to long-range atmospheric transport of radio nuclides.

Van Montfort and Witter [9,10] and van Montfort and Otten [11] applied the GP distribution to model the peaks over a threshold (POT) stream flows and rainfall series and Smith [12-14] applied it to develop a POT model for flood frequencies and wave heights. Similarly, Joe [15] employed it to estimate quintiles of the maximum of N observations. Wang [16] applied it to develop a POT model for flood peaks with Poisson arrival time, whereas Rosbjerg *et al.* [17] compared the use of the 2-parameters GP and exponential distributions as distribution models for exceedances with the parent distribution being a generalized GP distribution. In an extreme value analysis of the flow of Buebage Brook, Davison [8] presented a

comprehensive analysis of the extremes of data by use of the GP distribution for modeling the sizes and occurrences of exceedances over high thresholds, Abdul Fattah *et al.* [18] introduced the new model of generalized Pareto distribution.

In this context and based on the Kumaraswamy distribution [19]. We propose an extension of the exponentiated Pareto distribution based on the family of Kumaraswamy generalized denoted with the prefix “Kw-G” for short distributions introduced by Cordeiro and de Castro [20]. Nadarajah *et al.* [21] studied some mathematical properties of this family. The Kumaraswamy (Kw) distribution is not very common among statisticians and has been little explored in the literature. Its cdf (for $0 < x < 1$) is $F(x) = 1 - (1 - x^a)^b$, where $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ are shape parameters and the density function has a simple form $f(x) = abx^{a-1}$, which can be unimodal, increasing, decreasing or constant, depending on the parameter values. It does not seem to be very familiar to statisticians and has not been investigated systematically in much detail before, nor has its relative interchangeability with the beta distribution been widely appreciated. However, in a very recent paper [19] explored the background and genesis of this distribution and, more importantly, made clear some similarities and differences between the beta and Kw distributions.

In this note, we combine the works of Kumaraswamy [22] and Shawky *et al.* [23], to derive some mathematical properties of a new model, called the Kumaraswamy Generalized exponentiated Pareto (Kw-GEP) distribution, which stems from the following general construction: if G denotes the baseline cumulative function of a random variable, then a generalized class of distributions can be defined by:

$$F(x; a, b) = 1 - (1 - G(x)^a)^b \tag{3}$$

where $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ are two additional shape parameters which govern skewness and tail weights. Because of its tractable distribution function (2), the Kw-G distribution can be used quite effectively even if the data are censored. Correspondingly, its density function is distributions have a very simple form:

$$f(x; a, b) = abg(x)G(x)^{a-1}(1 - G(x)^a)^{b-1} \tag{4}$$

The density family (3) has many of the same properties of the class of beta-G distributions [24], but has some advantages in terms of tractability, since it does not involve any special function such as the beta function. Equivalently, as occurs with the beta-G family of distributions, special Kw-G distributions can be generated as follows: the Kw-normal distribution is obtained by taking $G(x)$ in (2) to be the normal cumulative function. Analogously, the Kw-Weibull [25] Kw-generalized gamma [26] Kw-Birnbaum-Saunders [27] and Kw-Gumbel [21] distributions are obtained by taking $G(x)$ to be the cdf of the Weibull, generalized gamma, Birnbaum-Saunders and Gumbel distributions, respectively, among several others. Hence, each new Kw-G distribution can be generated from a specified G distribution. This paper is outlined as follows. In section 2, we define the KW-GEP distribution and provide expansions for its cumulative and density functions. A range of mathematical properties of this distribution is considered in sections 3 and 4. These include quantile function, simulation, skewness and kurtosis. Maximum likelihood estimation is performed and the observed information matrix is determined in section 5. In section 6, we provide simulation study for the generated data. Finally, some conclusions are addressed.

The Kumaraswamy-Generalized Pareto Distribution: If $G(x; \vartheta)$ is the exponentiated Pareto cumulative distribution with parameter $\vartheta = (\theta, \lambda)$ then equation (1) yields the Kw-GEP cumulative distribution for ($x \geq 0$)

$$F(x; \xi) = 1 - \left(1 - [1 - (1 + x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta a}\right)^b \tag{5}$$

where $\xi = (a, b, \theta, \lambda)$ and $a, b, \theta, \lambda, > 0$ are non-negative shape Parameter. The corresponding pdf and hazard rate function are:

$$f(x; \xi) = ab\theta\lambda \left[1 - (1 + x)^{-\lambda}\right]^{\theta a - 1} (1 + x)^{-(\lambda + 1)} \left\{1 - [1 - (1 + x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta a}\right\}^{b - 1} \tag{6}$$

and

$$S(x; \underline{\xi}) = 1 - F(x; \underline{\xi}) = \left\{ 1 - [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta a} \right\}^b$$

$$H(x; \underline{\xi}) = \frac{f(x; \underline{\xi})}{S(x; \underline{\xi})} = \frac{ab\theta\lambda [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta-1} (1+x)^{-(\lambda+1)} \left[[1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta} \right]^{a-1}}{\left\{ 1 - [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta a} \right\}}$$

respectively

Special Distributions: The following well-known and new distributions are special sub-models of the Kum-GP distribution.

If $b = 1$ in (6) we get the Kum-GEP distribution reduces to

$$f(x; \underline{\xi}) = ab\theta\lambda [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta-1} (1+x)^{-(\lambda+1)} \left[[1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta} \right]^{a-1}$$

Which is the exponentiated Pareto (EGP) for $a = b = 1$, we obtain the exponentiated Pareto distribution, for $a = b = \theta = 1$, we obtain the Pareto distribution.

Expansions for the Cumulative and Density Functions: Here, we give simple expansions for the Kw-GEP cumulative distribution. By using the generalized binomial theorem (for $0 < a < 1$)

$$(1+a)^v = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{v}{i} a^i \tag{7}$$

In equation (5), we can write:

$$F(x; \underline{\xi}) = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \binom{b}{i} [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta ai} = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \eta_i \tau(x; \underline{\zeta})$$

where $\eta_i = (-1)^i \binom{b}{i}$ and $\tau(x; \underline{\zeta})$ denotes the EP cumulative distribution with parameters $\underline{\zeta} = (\theta, ai, \lambda)$. Now, using the power series (7) in the last term of (6), we obtain:

$$f(x; \underline{\xi}) = \frac{b\lambda\theta a (i+1)}{(i+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \binom{b-1}{i} (1+x)^{-(\lambda+1)} [1 - (1+x)^{-\lambda}]^{\theta a(i+1)-1}$$

We can write

$$f(x; \underline{\xi}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} k_i g(x; \vartheta) \tag{8}$$

where:

$$k_i = \frac{b}{(i+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \binom{b-1}{i}$$

and

$g(x; \underline{\vartheta})$, denotes the Exponentiated Pareto Distribution with parameters $\underline{\vartheta} = (\theta, a(i + 1), \lambda)$.

Thus, the Kw-GEP density function can be expressed as an infinite linear combination of Pareto densities. Thus, some of its mathematical properties can be obtained directly from those properties of the Exponentiated Pareto distribution. For example, the ordinary, inverse and factorial moments, moment generating function (mgf) and characteristic function of the Kw-GEP distribution follow immediately from those quantities of the Pareto distribution.

Quantile Function and Simulation: We present a method for simulating from the Kw-GEP distribution (6). The quantile function corresponding to (5) is:

$$Q(u) = F^{-1}(u) = \left\{ 1 - \left(1 - (1-u)^{\frac{1}{b}} \right)^{\frac{1}{a\theta}} \right\}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}} - 1 \tag{9}$$

Simulating the Kw-GEP random variable is straight forward. Let U be a uniform variate on the unit interval $(0, 1)$. Thus, by means of the inverse transformation method, we consider the random variable x given by:

$$X = \left\{ 1 - \left(1 - (1-u)^{\frac{1}{b}} \right)^{\frac{1}{a\theta}} \right\}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}} - 1$$

Which, KW, i.e. $X \sim KW - GEP(\alpha, b, \theta, \lambda)$

Skewness and Kurtosis: The shortcomings of the classical kurtosis measure are well-known. There are many heavy tailed distributions for which this measure is infinite. So, it becomes uninformative precisely when it needs to be. Indeed, our motivation to use quantile-based measures stemmed from the non-existence of classical kurtosis for many of the Kw distributions. The Bowley's skewness [28] is based on quartiles:

$$S_k = \frac{Q_{3/4} - 2Q_{1/2} + Q_{1/4}}{Q_{3/4} - Q_{1/4}}$$

and the Moors' kurtosis (see Moors^[29]) is based on cortiles:

$$K_u = \frac{Q_{7/8} - Q_{5/8} - Q_{3/8} + Q_{1/8}}{Q_{6/8} - Q_{2/8}}$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ represents the quantile function

Estimation and Information Matrix: In this section, we discuss maximum likelihood estimation and inference for the Kw-GEP distribution. Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be a random sample from $X \sim KW - GEP(\underline{\xi})$ where $\underline{\xi} = (a, b, \theta, \lambda)$ be the vector of the model parameters, the log-likelihood function for $\underline{\xi}$ reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\underline{\xi}) = & n \log a + n \log b + n \log \theta + n \log \lambda - (\lambda + 1) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \log(1 + x_i) \\ & + (\theta a - 1) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \log\left(1 - (1 + x_i)^{-\lambda}\right) + (b - 1) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \log\left\{1 - \left[1 - (1 + x_i)^{-\lambda}\right]^{\theta a}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

The score vector $U(\underline{\xi}) = (\partial\ell/\partial a, \partial\ell/\partial b, \partial\ell/\partial\theta, \partial\ell/\partial\lambda)^T$, where the components corresponding to the parameters in $\underline{\xi}$ are given by differentiating (10). By setting

$$z_i = 1 - (1 + x_i)^{-\lambda}$$

$$\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial a} = \frac{n}{a} + \theta \sum_{i=1}^n \log z_i - \theta(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} \log z_i}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}}$$

$$\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial b} = \frac{n}{b} + \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - z_i^{\theta a})$$

$$\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial\theta} = \frac{n}{\theta} + a \sum_{i=1}^n \log z_i - a(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} \log \log z_i}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} = & \frac{n}{\lambda} - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + x) - (\theta a - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1 + x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1 + x_i)}{z_i} \\ & - \theta a(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} (1 + x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1 + x_i)}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}} \end{aligned}$$

The maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs) of the parameters are the solutions of the nonlinear equations $\nabla\ell = 0$, which are solved iteratively. The observed information matrix given

$$J_n(\underline{\xi}) = n \begin{pmatrix} J_{aa} & J_{ab} & J_{a\theta} & J_{a\lambda} \\ J_{ba} & J_{bb} & J_{b\theta} & J_{b\lambda} \\ J_{\theta a} & J_{\theta b} & J_{\theta\theta} & J_{\theta\lambda} \\ J_{\lambda a} & J_{\lambda b} & J_{\lambda\theta} & J_{\lambda\lambda} \end{pmatrix}$$

whose elements are,

$$J_{aa} = -\frac{n}{a^2} - \theta(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta z_i^{\theta a} \log^2 z_i}{(1 - z_i^{\theta a})^2}$$

$$J_{ab} = -\theta \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} \log z_i}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}}$$

$$J_{a\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^n \log z_i - (b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} \log z_i (a\theta \log z_i - z_i^{\theta a} + 1)}{(1 - z_i^{\theta a})^2}$$

$$J_{a\lambda} = \theta \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1+x_i)}{z_i} - \theta(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a-1} (1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1+x_i) [1 + a\theta \log z_i - z_i^{\theta a}]}{(1 - z_i^{\theta a})^2}$$

$$J_{bb} = -\frac{n}{b^2} \quad J_{b\theta} = -a \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} \log z_i}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}}$$

$$J_{b\lambda} = -\theta a \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a-1} (1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1+x_i)}{1 - z_i^{\theta a}}$$

$$J_{\theta\theta} = -\frac{n}{\theta^2} - a(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a z_i^{\theta a} \log^2 z_i}{(1 - z_i^{\theta a})^2}$$

$$J_{\theta\lambda} = a \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1+x_i)}{z_i} - a(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a-1} (1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log(1+x_i) [1 + \theta a - z_i^{\theta a}]}{(1 - z_i^{\theta a})^2}$$

$$J_{\lambda\lambda} = -\frac{n}{\lambda^2} + (\theta a - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log^2(1+x_i)}{z_i^2} - \theta a(b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_i^{\theta a} (1+x_i)^{-\lambda} \log^2(1+x_i) \left[z_i^{\theta a} + \theta a \frac{(1+x_i)^{-\lambda}}{z_i} - 1 \right]}{\left[(1 - z_i^{-\alpha})^{-(a-1)} - (1 - z_i^{-\alpha}) \right]^2}$$

Application: Here, we use a real data set to compare the fits of the Kum-GEP distribution and those of other sub-models, i.e., the Exponentiated Pareto (EP) and Pareto distributions. We make a results comparison of the models fit. We consider an uncensored data set corresponding an uncensored data set from consisting of 100 observations on breaking stress of carbon fibers (in Gba): 3.7, 2.74, 2.73, 2.5, 3.6, 3.11, 3.27, 2.87, 1.47, 3.11, 4.42, 2.41, 3.19, 3.22, 1.69, 3.28, 3.09, 1.87, 3.15, 4.9, 3.75, 2.43, 2.95, 2.97, 3.39, 2.96, 2.53, 2.67, 2.93, 3.22, 3.39, 2.81, 4.2, 3.33, 2.55, 3.31, 3.31, 2.85, 2.56, 3.56, 3.15, 2.35, 2.55, 2.59, 2.38, 2.81, 2.77, 2.17, 2.83, 1.92, 1.41, 3.68, 2.97, 1.36, 0.98, 2.76, 4.91, 3.68, 1.84, 1.59, 3.19, 1.57, 0.81, 5.56, 1.73, 1.59, 2, 1.22, 1.12, 1.71, 2.17, 1.17, 5.08, 2.48, 1.18, 3.51, 2.17, 1.69, 1.25, 4.38, 1.84, 0.39, 3.68, 2.48, 0.85, 1.61, 2.79, 4.7, 2.03, 1.8, 1.57, 1.08, 2.03, 1.61, 2.12, 1.89, 2.88, 2.82, 2.05, 3.65. These data are used here only for illustrative purposes. The required numerical evaluations are carried out using the Package of Mathcad software.

Table 1 provides the MLEs (with corresponding standard errors in parentheses) of the model parameters. The model selection is carried out using the AIC (Akaike information criterion), the BIC (Bayesian information criterion) and the CAIC (consistent Akaike information criteria):

$$AIC = -2\ell(\hat{\theta}) + 2q, \quad BIC = -2\ell(\hat{\theta}) + q \log(n), \quad CAIC = -2\ell(\hat{\theta}) + \frac{2qn}{n - q - 1}$$

Table 1: MLEs of the model parameters, the corresponding SEs (given in parentheses) and the statistics AIC, BIC and CAIC

Model	Estimates				Statistic		
	\tilde{a}	\tilde{b}	$\tilde{\theta}$	$\tilde{\lambda}$	AIC	BIC	CAIC
Kw – GEP	1	4.368	4.134	3.142	257.762	257.762	257.665
EP	1.519	--	6.041	4.361	245.137	245.137	256.04
P	--	--	7.423	3.985	276.106	267.106	258.009

where $\ell(\hat{\theta})$ denotes the log-likelihood function evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimates, q is the number of parameters and n is the sample size.

Since the values of the AIC, BIC and CAIC are smaller for the Kum-GP distribution compared with those values of the other models, the new distribution seems to be a very competitive model to these data.

Concluding Remarks: The well-known two-parameter exponentiated Pareto distribution, introduced by Shawky *et al.* [23], is extended by introducing two extra shape parameters, thus defining the KW-G exponentiated Pareto (KW-GEP) distribution having a broader class of hazard rate and density functions. This is achieved by taking (1) as the baseline cumulative distribution of the generalized class of KW-G distributions defined by Cordeiro and de Castro [20]. A detailed study on the mathematical properties of the new distribution is presented. The new model includes as special sub-models the Pareto, exponentiated Pareto (EP) [29] and Pareto distributions. We obtain the quantile function, skewness and kurtosis. The estimation of the model parameters is approached by maximum likelihood and the observed information matrix is obtained. An application to a real data set indicates that the fit of the new model is superior to the fits of its principal sub-models. We hope that the proposed model may be interesting for a wider range of statistical research.

REFERENCES

1. Pareto, V., 1986. Cours Economic Politique. Lausanne and Paris, Range and Cie.
2. Arnold, B.C. and S.J. Press, 1983. Bayesian inference for Pareto populations. *Journal of Econometrics*, 21: 287-306.
3. Pickands, J., 1975. Statistical inference using extreme order statistics. *Ann. Statist.*, 3: 119-131.
4. Saksena, S.K. and A.M. Johnson, 1984. Best unbiased estimators for the parameters of a two-parameter Pareto distribution. *Biometrika*, 31: 77-83.
5. Davison, A.C. and R.L. Smith, 1990. Models for exceedances over high thresholds. *Roy. Statist. Soc.*, B 52(3): 393-442.

6. DuMouchel, W., 1983. Estimating the stable index α in order to measure tail thickness. *Ann. Statist.*, 11: 1019-1036.
7. Davison, A.C., 1984a. Modeling excesses over high thresholds, with an application. In: *Statistical Extremes and Applications*, Ed. J. Tiago de Oliveira, 461-482. Reidel, Dordrecht, the Netherlands.
8. Davison, A.C., 1984b. A statistical model for contamination due to long-range atmospheric transport of radionuclides. PhD. Thesis, Department of Mathematics, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London, UK.
9. Van Montfort, M.A.J. and J.V. Witter, 1985. Testing exponentiality against generalized Pareto distribution. *Hydrol.*, 78: 305-315.
10. Van Montfort, M.A.J. and J.V. Witter, 1986. The generalized Pareto distribution applied to rainfall depths. *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, 31(2): 151-162.
11. Van Montfort, M.A.J. and A. Otten, 1991. The first and the second e of the extreme value distribution, EV1. *Stochastic Hydrol. Hydraul.*, 5: 69-76.
12. Smith, J.A., 1991. Estimating the upper tail of flood frequency distributions. *Wat. Resour. Res.*, 23(8): 1657-1666.
13. Smith, R.L., 1984. Threshold methods for sample extremes, In: *Statistical Extremes and Applications* Ed. J. Trago de Oliveira, 621-638. Reidel, Dordrecht, the Netherlands.
14. Smith, R.L., 1987. Estimating tails of probability distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 15: 1174-1207.
15. Joe, H., 1987. Estimation of quantile-s of the maximum of N observations. *Biometrika*, 74: 347-354.
16. Wang, Q.J., 1991. The POT model described by the generalized Pareto distribution with Poisson arrival rate. *X Hydro.*, 129: 263-280.
17. Rosbjerg, D., H. Madsen and P.F. Rasmussen, 1992. Prediction in partial duration series with generalized Pareto-distributed exceedances. *Wat. Resour. Res.*, 28(11): 3001-3010.
18. Abd Elfattah, A.M., E.A. Elsherpieny and E.A. Hussein, 2007. Parameters estimation for new generalized Pareto distribution. Submitted.

19. Jones, M.C., 2009. Kumaraswamy's distribution: A beta-type distribution with some tractability advantages. *Statistical Methodology*, 6: 70-81.
20. Cordeiro, G.M. and M. De Castro, 2011. A new family of generalized distributions. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 81: 883-898.
21. Nadarajah, S., G.M. Cordeiro and E.M.M. Ortega, 2011. General results for the Kumaraswamy-G distribution. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*. DOI:10.1080/00949655.2011.562504.
22. Kumaraswamy, P., 1980. A generalized probability density functions for double-bounded random processes. *Journal of Hydrology*, 46: 79-88.
23. Shawky A.I., H. Hanaa and Abu-Zinadah, 2009. Exponentiated Pareto Distribution: Different Method of Estimations. *Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences*, 4(6): 77-693.
24. Eugene, N., C. Lee and F. Famoye, 2002. Beta-normal distribution and its applications. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, 31: 497-512.
25. Cordeiro, G.M., E.M.M. Ortega and S. Nadarajah, 2010. The Kumaraswamy Weibull distribution with application to failure data. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 347: 1399-1429.
26. Pascoa, A.R.M., E.M.M. Ortega and G.M. Cordeiro, 2011. The Kumaraswamy generalized gamma distribution with application in survival analysis. *Statistical Methodology*, 8: 411-433.
27. Saulo, H., J. Leão and M. Bourguignon, 2012. The Kumaraswamy Birnbaum-Saunders Distribution, *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, doi: 10.1080/15598608.2012.698212.
28. Keeping, E.S. and J.F. Kenney, 1962. *Mathematics of Statistics*. Part1.
29. Gupta, R.C., R.D. Gupta and P.L. Gupta, 1998. Modeling failure time data by Lehman alternatives. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, 27: 887-904.