Model and Properties of Cauchy Modified Inverse Gompertz Distribution with Application to a Real Data Set
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Abstract: In this study, we introduce the Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz distribution as a new probability model. Utilizing the modified inverse Gompertz distribution as its baseline distribution, this model blends the Cauchy family of distributions. Our aim is to utilize this model for lifetime data analysis. We have inferred formulas for some basic properties of the model. We have also included graphic representations of the hazard rate and probability density curves. We observed that the probability density function displays positive skewness, while the hazard rate function plot shows an increasing-decreasing pattern. We used the Cramer-Von Mises method, the least squares approach, and maximum likelihood estimation to estimate the model parameters. We employed several statistical criteria to validate our model, including the corrected Akaike’s, the Bayesian, the Hannan-Quinn, as well as Akaike’s information criterion. We also utilized Q-Q and P-P graphs for further confirmation. To assess goodness of fit, we used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Anderson-Darlin, and Cramer-von Mises tests. The empirical results of the study show that it gives a better fit to the real data set. All numerical computations were conducted using the R programming language.
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1 Introduction

The Gompertz model stands as one of the extensively employed probability models, drawing from the laws of mortality to formulate its survival function. It finds application in analyzing lifetime data related to human mortality and behavioral sciences data, enabling exploration of actuarial tables. Originally introduced by Gompertz [18], the Gompertz distribution has found utility not only in mortality analysis but also as a growth model and in fitting tumor growth patterns. By leveraging the Gompertz model’s function, a significant array of life table data can be synthesized into a single function. This function facilitates the calculation of the number of individuals expected to survive to a specific age, as a function of their live age. This calculation involves utilizing the Gompertz function, which provides insights into the likelihood of individuals reaching various ages. By applying this model, researchers and actuaries can gain a deeper understanding of mortality patterns and make informed decisions regarding insurance, healthcare, and other related fields. The Gompertz model’s versatility and accuracy make it a valuable tool in demographic analysis and risk assessment, contributing to advancements in public health and social policy. The article presented here is the formulation and study of a new probability model. Here we have discussed some important characteristics of the probability distribution relating to proposed model. Model is based on the scientific study as the proposed model and their features follow the properties of scientific probability models. This study will help the researchers in study of probability as well as formulation of new models in future. In this study, we have discussed a real data set and the proposed model may be suitable to analyze other real-life datasets.

The Gompertz distribution is particularly suited for modeling phenomena where the risk of failure or mortality increases exponentially with age or time. With a scale parameter of $\alpha$ and a shape parameter of $\lambda$, let $x$ be the non-negative random variable that follows the Gompertz distribution. Consequently, the Gompertz distribution’s cumulative distribution function (CDF) is provided by

$$H_{GD}(x) = 1 - \exp\left\{ \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha/x} \right) \right\}; x > 0, \alpha > 0, \lambda > 0$$ (1)

However, in numerous practical fields like lifetime analysis, behavioral sciences, and describing adult mortality patterns for insurance purposes, there is a clear need for more comprehensive versions of these categories.
This is because traditional distributions frequently fall short in accurately capturing real-world data across different practical situations. As a result, there is a rising interest in developing more flexible models, with one notable approach being the "Inverse Distribution." Eliwa et al. [15] introduced new distribution called the inverse Gompertz distribution (IGD) with an upside-down bathtub-shaped hazard rate function. Let \( x \) be the non-negative random variable. Then the distribution function of Inverse Gompertz distribution (IGD) described by Eliwa et al. [15] is given by

\[
H_{IGD}(x) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \left(1 - e^{\alpha/x}\right)\right); x > 0, \alpha > 0, \lambda > 0
\]  

(2)

The Gompertz distribution has been extensively explored and applied, as detailed in the work of Ahuja and Nash [6]. Gompertz-Sinh distributions are a family of distributions that Cooray and Ananda [12] established and used to examine reliability data with distributions that were extremely negatively skewed. The flexible model known as the generalized Gompertz distribution was introduced by El-Gohary et al. [14]. Depending on the shape parameter, this model can display failure rates that are declining, increasing, constant, or bathtub-shaped. Abu-Zinadah and Al-Oufi [2] have investigated various estimation methods for the exponentiated Gompertz distribution. Additionally, the inverse generalized Gompertz distribution has been introduced by Chaudhary and Kumar [9]. Telee and Kumar [32] developed new distribution called Half-Cauchy Gompertz distribution by compounding Gompertz distribution with Half-Cauchy family of distributions. The Kumaraswamy inverse Gompertz distribution is an expansion of the inverse Gompertz distribution first presented by El-Morshedy et al. [16]. It includes a hazard rate function shaped like an upside-down bathtub, determined by its shape parameters. This extension provides a refined framework for modeling data with characteristics that align with the inverse Gompertz distribution, offering valuable insights and applications in various fields. Chaudhary et al. [11] created the Half-Cauchy inverse Gompertz distribution by combining the inverse Gompertz distribution with the Half-Cauchy family of distributions. This improves the accuracy of utilizing the inverse Gompertz distribution to fit real data. Some further Gompertz distribution extensions found in the literature are the gamma-Gompertz distribution [28], the transmuted generalized Gompertz distribution [22], the Marshall Olkin exponential Gompertz distribution [21], the exponentialized generalized inverted Gompertz distribution [17]. On the inverse power Gompertz distribution [1], the transmuted inverse Gompertz distribution [4], the inverted Gompertz-Frêchet distribution [5], Topp-Leone inverse Gompertz distribution [3]. A generalized Gompertz distribution with hazard power parameter and its bivariate extension [25]. New generalized Weibull inverse Gompertz distribution [7]. On the moments of the 3-parameter Gompertz distribution [20] and a weighted Gompertz-G family of distributions for reliability and lifetime data analysis [13]. Chaudhary et al. [11] also created novel model called Cauchy modified generalized exponential distribution. To enhance the accuracy of fitting real data with the inverse Gompertz distribution, we propose the Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz distribution. This alternative distribution offers greater flexibility with two additional parameters. We analyze the characteristics of the Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz distribution and demonstrate its suitability and potential applications.

The following are the discussion of the remaining sections: in section 2, we present a new distribution known as the Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz distribution and explore some statistical features. We use three widely used estimation techniques to estimate the parameters listed in section 3, namely, LSE, CVM, and MLE. A real-time dataset is used in section 4 to illustrate the applicability of the proposed model. Here, we assess the goodness-of-fit attained by the Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz distribution using statistics like AIC, AICC, HQIC, and BIC. Lastly, in section 5, we present some conclusions drawn from our analysis.

## 2 Model Formulation

Adding an extra scale parameter \( \beta \) to modify the inverse Gompertz distribution [2], resulting in a new probability distribution called modified inverse Gompertz distribution (MIG) is provided by

\[
G_{MIG}(x) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x}\right)\right)\right); x > 0, \alpha > 0, \lambda > 0, \beta > 0
\]  

(3)
Here, we have used Cauchy family of distribution to introduce a new probability distribution called Cauchy Modified Inverse Gompertz (CMIG) distribution taking distribution function \( G_{MIG}(x) \) of the modified inverse Gompertz distribution as base function. Distribution function of the Cauchy family of distribution is provided by

\[
F(x) = 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{1}{\theta} \log G_{MIG}(x) \right); \quad x > 0, \theta > 0
\]  

The new distribution called Cauchy modified inverse Gompertz (CMIG) distribution is formulated by combining Cauchy family distribution with modified inverse Gompertz distribution as the base line distribution. The CMIG distribution’s cumulative distribution function is obtained by applying \( G_{MIG}(x) \) to \( F(x) \) in equation (4). Given a non-negative random variable \( x \) that follows \( CMIG(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) \), the CDF can be found by

\[
F(x; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x} \right) \right) \right); \quad x > 0, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta > 0
\]  

**2.1 Survival function**

The CMIG’s survival function is

\[
S(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x}/x} \right) \right); \quad x > 0, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta > 0
\]  

**2.2 Hazard rate function**

The CMIG’s Hazard rate function is

\[
h(x) = \frac{\lambda}{\theta x^2} e^{-\beta x} (1 + \beta x) \exp \left( \frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x} \right) \left[ \arctan \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x} \right) \right) \right) \right]^{-1}; \quad x > 0, \alpha, \beta, \theta > 0
\]  

**2.3 Reversed hazard rate function**

The Reversed hazard rate function is

\[
h_{rev}(x) = \frac{2\lambda}{\pi \theta x^2} e^{-\beta x} (1 + \beta x) e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x}/x} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x} \right) \right) \right)^2 \right]^{-1}; \quad x > 0, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta > 0
\]  

**2.4 Cumulative hazard rate function**

The suggested model’s cumulative hazard rate function is given by

\[
H(x) = -\log \left[ \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \frac{\alpha e^{-\beta x}}{x} \right) \right) \right) \right]
\]
The various shapes of PDF and HRF of with various possible parameter values at $\alpha = 56.71$ and $\theta = 0.0065$ are displayed in Figure 1. The PDF graph illustrates a distribution that peaks once with a positive skew. In contrast, the hazard rate function plot demonstrates a trend of increasing followed by decreasing.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1.png}
\caption{Probability density curves (Left) and hazard rate function (Right).}
\end{figure}

### 2.5 Quantile function

Assuming $X$ is a non-negative random variable with CDF $F_X(x)$, the quantile function is

$$Q_X(p) = F_X^{-1}(p)$$

$$Q_x(p) = \alpha e^{-\beta x} - x \log \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\alpha \theta}{\lambda} \right) \tan(1 - p) \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right]; \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The random deviate generation is

$$\alpha e^{-\beta x} - x \log \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\alpha \theta}{\lambda} \right) \tan(1 - u) \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right] = 0; \quad 0 < u < 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

### 2.6 Skewness and Kurtosis

The quantile coefficient of measure of symmetry is

$$S_B = \frac{Q \left( \frac{1}{4} \right) - 2Q \left( \frac{3}{8} \right) + Q \left( \frac{5}{8} \right)}{Q \left( \frac{1}{4} \right) - Q \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)}$$

Expression for testing normality by using octiles of the data [24] is

$$K - Moors = \left[ Q \left( \frac{3}{8} \right) - Q \left( \frac{5}{8} \right) - Q \left( \frac{1}{8} \right) + Q \left( \frac{7}{8} \right) \right] \left[ Q \left( \frac{3}{4} \right) - Q \left( \frac{1}{4} \right) \right]^{-1}$$

### 3 Parameter Estimation

**Maximum Likelihood Estimation**

In this subsection, we have shown the CMIG model’s MLE approach for parameter estimation. Let $x =$
To provide the matrix for variance-covariance through observed data matrix, ultimately aiming to optimize the likelihood function. Consequently, it is possible to maximize the likelihood, the Newton-Raphson method constructs the observed information matrix.

The MLE of the $CMIG(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta)$ can be found by taking the first order derivative of (13) with respect to $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$, and $\theta$, and equating $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{\partial l}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\partial l}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{\partial l}{\partial \theta} = 0$, and solving for the $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$, and $\theta$ simultaneously. These non-linear equations are normally unsolvable, but we can solve them with ease if we use the suitable computer language. Let $\Delta = (\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta)$ be the parameter vector and the related maximum likelihood estimation for be represented by $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\theta})$, then resulting asymptotic normality is $N_4 \left[ 0, \left(K(\hat{\Delta})\right)^{-1} \right]$. Here, Fisher’s information matrix is denoted by $K(\hat{\Delta})$ which is given by

\[
K(\hat{\Delta}) = - E \begin{pmatrix} E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha^2} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \theta} \right) \\ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta^2} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \theta} \right) \\ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \alpha} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \beta} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda^2} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \theta} \right) \\ E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \alpha} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \beta} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \lambda} \right) & E \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta^2} \right) \end{pmatrix}
\]

We actually do not know $\hat{\Delta}$, thus the asymptotic variance $\left(K(\hat{\Delta})\right)^{-1}$ of the MLE is worthless. Therefore, we approximate the asymptotic variance by substituting the calculated parameter values. An approximation of the information matrix $K(\hat{\Delta})$ is given by the observed Fisher information matrix, denoted by the symbol $O(\hat{\Delta})$. Thus, we approximate the asymptotic variance using the calculated parameter values

\[
O(\hat{\Delta}) = - \begin{pmatrix} \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha^2} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \lambda} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha \partial \theta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} \\ \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta^2} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta \partial \theta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} \\ \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \alpha} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \beta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda^2} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda \partial \theta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} \\ \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \alpha} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \beta} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta \partial \lambda} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} & \left( \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta^2} \right)_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}, \beta=\hat{\beta}, \lambda=\hat{\lambda}, \theta=\hat{\theta}} \end{pmatrix}
\]

where $H$ denotes the Hessian.

To maximize the likelihood, the Newton-Raphson method constructs the observed information matrix. This method iteratively updates the parameter estimates by leveraging the information contained in the observed data matrix, ultimately aiming to optimize the likelihood function. Consequently, it is possible to provide the matrix for variance-covariance through

\[
\left[ -H(\hat{\Delta}) \right]_{\Delta=\hat{\Delta}}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} & A_{14} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} & A_{24} \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} & A_{34} \\ A_{41} & A_{42} & A_{43} & A_{44} \end{pmatrix}
\]
where, \(A11 = Var \text{ of } \hat{\alpha}, A22 = Var \text{ of } \hat{\beta}, A33 = Var \text{ of } \hat{\lambda}, A44 = Var \text{ of } \hat{\theta}\)
\(A12 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\alpha} \& \hat{\beta}, A13 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\alpha} \& \hat{\lambda}, \ A14 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\alpha} \& \hat{\theta}\)
\(A21 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\beta}, \ & \hat{\alpha}, A23 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\beta} \& \hat{\lambda}, \ A24 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\beta} \& \hat{\theta}\)
\(A31 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\lambda}, \ & \hat{\alpha}, A32 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\lambda} \& \hat{\beta}, \ A34 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\lambda} \& \hat{\theta}\)
\(A41 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\theta}, \ & \hat{\alpha}, A42 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\theta} \& \hat{\beta}, \ A43 = \text{Co-var of } \hat{\theta} \& \hat{\lambda}\)

If \(Z_{\delta/2}\) is upper percentile for standard normal distribution, then the following method can be employed to estimate confidence intervals, with a confidence level of 100(1-\(\delta\)%) for computing \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\). This approach relies on the asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs). The confidence intervals are estimated by \(\hat{\alpha} \pm Z_{\delta/2}\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\alpha})}, \hat{\beta} \pm Z_{\delta/2}\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\beta})}, \hat{\lambda} \pm Z_{\delta/2}\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\lambda})}\) and \(\hat{\theta} \pm Z_{\delta/2}\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\theta})}\) respectively.

**Least-Square Estimation**

The function is minimized when the unknown parameters of the CMIG distribution, \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\), are estimated via least-square estimation

\[
B(X; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ F(X_i) - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2
\]

with respect to \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\). Let us consider \(\{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}\) be a random sample with \(n\) units from ordered random variable \(X_{(1)} < X_{(2)} < \ldots < X_{(n)}\) having CDF as \(\lambda = \text{LSE of } \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\) can be calculated by minimizing the relation \(15\) with respect to \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\)

\[
B(X; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \text{arctan} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x(i)/x(i)}} \right) \right) - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2
\]

The estimated parameters can be found by differentiating the relation \(16\) with respect to \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\), and then solving the simultaneous equation. We can minimize following relation to get weighted least square estimators as

\[
B(X; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \text{arctan} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x(i)/x(i)}} \right) \right) - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2
\]

where \(w_i\) are weight and is given as

\[
w_i = \frac{1}{\text{Var}(X_{(i)})} = \frac{(n+1)^2 (n+2)}{i(n-i+1)}
\]

We can estimate unknown parameters \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\) using the weighted least square technique by minimizing relation \(17\) with respect to \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\)

\[
B(X; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{(n+1)^2 (n+2)}{i(n-i+1)} \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \text{arctan} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x(i)/x(i)}} \right) \right) \right] - \frac{i}{n+1} \right]^2
\]

**Cramer-Von Mises estimation**

By minimizing relation \(18\) we can get estimated values of unknown parameters \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \text{ and } \theta\) using Cramer-Von Mises technique of estimation

\[
C(X; \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) = \frac{1}{12n} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ F(x_{(i)}|\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \theta) - \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right]^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{12n} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \text{arctan} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha \theta} \left( 1 - e^{\alpha e^{-\beta x(i)/x(i)}} \right) \right) - \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right]^2
\]
The CVM estimators of the parameters can be obtained by differentiating equation (18) with respect to $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$, and $\theta$ and by solving the non-linear equations

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial \alpha} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial \beta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta} = 0$$

4 Application to Real Dataset

Data set

This segment includes a study of an real dataset that validates the suggested model. Because atoms in circuits migrate about and create microcircuit failures, electromigration can occasionally occur in a circuit. 59 conductors were used in the accelerated life test [26, 29], where without any observational censoring, failure time in hours was determined as follows:


Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)

Exploratory data analysis is crafted by combining various statistical analyses that elucidate and summarize the dataset used in research. Gaining a thorough understanding of the data set being used is the aim of this. In addition to the graphical displays of the data, it could also contain some descriptive statistics. The key metrics that can be incorporated into EDA are listed below.

- The density curve, histogram, boxplot, and so forth are the graphical plots that aid in identifying patterns in the data as well as identifying any odd patterns or findings.
- Certain aspects and characteristics of the data are revealed by measurements such as location, scatter, skewness, kurtosis, and so forth.

The data summary was found using the R programming language, and the results are shown in the table below.

The data is positively skewed and non-normal, according to summary statistics.

The boxplot, histogram, and density fit of the suggested CMIG model are shown in Figure 2. The data set’s boxplot and TTT plot are also shown in Figure 2. Using R software (R Core Team[27]) having optim () function, by maximizing the likelihood function (13), calculations of MLEs of CMIG model is done. We got the value of Log-Likelihood as $l = -111.2442$. Table 2 contains the estimated parameter values of $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\lambda$, and $\theta$. The Probability-Probability plot on the left and the Quantile-Quantile plot on the right of

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Estimated parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>Theta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>56.7169</td>
<td>0.7480</td>
<td>7.7269</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>51.9078</td>
<td>0.7001</td>
<td>7.8161</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVME</td>
<td>51.9078</td>
<td>0.7297</td>
<td>7.8161</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 have also been included to assess the model’s normality. Using above estimated parameter values by all three methods we have calculated log-likelihood and AIC criterion and are presented in Table 3.
Table 3: Log likelihood (LL), AIC, BIC, CAIC and HQIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>CAIC</th>
<th>HQIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>-111.259</td>
<td>230.518</td>
<td>238.828</td>
<td>231.259</td>
<td>233.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>-111.324</td>
<td>230.647</td>
<td>230.647</td>
<td>231.388</td>
<td>233.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVM</td>
<td>-111.259</td>
<td>230.518</td>
<td>238.828</td>
<td>231.259</td>
<td>233.762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the $A^2$, $W$ and KS statistics together with the corresponding $p$-values of the LSE, MLE, and CVE estimations for evaluating the model’s goodness of fit.

The suggested model CMIG distribution’s empirical CDF, fitted CDF plot, density function and histogram of fitted distributions of estimation techniques utilizing LSE, MLE, and CVM are displayed in Figure 3.
Table 4: KS, W, and ($A^2$) statistics with corresponding $p$-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>KS($p$-value)</th>
<th>W($p$-value)</th>
<th>$A^2$($p$-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>0.0531(0.9932)</td>
<td>0.0199(0.9974)</td>
<td>0.1321(0.9995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>0.0488(0.9977)</td>
<td>0.0205(0.9967)</td>
<td>0.1329(0.9995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVME</td>
<td>0.0515(0.9953)</td>
<td>0.0194(0.9978)</td>
<td>0.1264(0.9997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Histogram versus density curve (Left) and ECDF versus CDF (Right) for different estimation methods.

Model Comparison

Here, we’ve evaluated how well the CMIG model applies compared to other models used by researchers with the same dataset. Here we have chosen five distributions to compare the potentiality of the CMIG. Five distributions considered are Exponential Power (EP) model [30], Generalized Exponential (GE) model [19], Modified Weibull (MW) Model [23], Weibull Extension (WE) Model [31], and Lindley-Exponential (LE) model [8]. The estimated parameters of both the competing models under investigation and the suggested model are shown in Table 5. We also displayed the histogram of the dataset, graph for goodness-of-fit of CMIG model along with models taken in considerations in left panel of Figure 5. In right panel of the graph, empirical CDF and fitted CDF are shown. From plotting it is observed that CMIG distribution fits the dataset better than other models taken in consideration. Examples of the HQIC, BIC, AIC, and CAIC can be used to determine the applicability of the CMIG distribution. These values are presented in Table 6. Validation criteria obtained clearly show that model CMIG has fewer values than the value of other considered models. This suggests that proposed model fit data better than other models taken in considerations.

Table 5: Estimated parameters models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>Theta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIG</td>
<td>56.7170</td>
<td>0.7480</td>
<td>7.7270</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>32.2529</td>
<td>4.6823</td>
<td>26.6786</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>52.4066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6424</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6422</td>
<td>53.3296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>3.14011</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>0.0070</td>
<td>0.2216</td>
<td>0.5782</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5: Histogram versus density curves (Left) and ECDF versus CDFs (Right) models.

Table 6: Log likelihood (LL), AIC, BIC, CAIC and HQIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>CAIC</th>
<th>HQIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIG</td>
<td>-111.2590</td>
<td>230.5180</td>
<td>238.8284</td>
<td>231.2591</td>
<td>233.7620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>-112.5054</td>
<td>231.0108</td>
<td>237.2434</td>
<td>231.447</td>
<td>233.4437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>-114.9471</td>
<td>233.8946</td>
<td>238.0497</td>
<td>234.109</td>
<td>235.5166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>-114.9525</td>
<td>233.9055</td>
<td>238.0606</td>
<td>234.1198</td>
<td>235.5275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>-117.3520</td>
<td>240.7041</td>
<td>246.9367</td>
<td>241.1404</td>
<td>243.1370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing of goodness of fit of fitted model and comparing it with other model is essential part of statistical modeling. We generated the statistics for the Anderson-Darling (AD), Cramer-Von Mises (CVM), and Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) tests in order to assess the goodness-of-fit of the CMIG distribution in comparison to alternative distributions. These test statistic values are displayed in Table[7]. It is found that the CMIG distribution has lesser values of the test statistics and higher p-value in every method of goodness of fit. This concludes that the CMIG distribution fits real data set more consistently compared to other models taken in consideration.

Table 7: KS, W, and $A^2$ statistics with p-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>$A^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIG</td>
<td>0.0531(0.9932)</td>
<td>0.0199(0.9973)</td>
<td>0.1321(0.9995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.0964(0.6089)</td>
<td>0.0858(0.6606)</td>
<td>0.4845(0.7619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>0.1042(0.5103)</td>
<td>0.1173(0.5079)</td>
<td>0.7368(0.5282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>0.1042(0.5099)</td>
<td>0.1173(0.5077)</td>
<td>0.7373(0.5279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.1365(0.2021)</td>
<td>0.2398(0.2021)</td>
<td>1.3735(0.2098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>0.1345(0.2160)</td>
<td>0.2236(0.2263)</td>
<td>1.3349(0.2213)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Conclusion

The Cauchy Modified Inverse Gompertz Distribution is a newly introduced distribution that is featured here. Some fundamental statistical properties of the new model are thoroughly examined. We have derived some important expression for the hazard rate, survival, the quantile function etc. We have also calculated summary of the data as mean, median skewness and kurtosis etc. and are displayed. For estimating the unknown parameters, three important and more effective methods of estimation as MLE, LSE and CVME are used. In this case, we discovered that the CVM approach outperforms the MLE and LSE approaches. PDF curve of the proposed model CMIG has different shaped density curve for different values of parameters showing that curve is positively skewed having increasing-decreasing hazard rate curve. Here, we have also taken into account a real dataset and have compared the applicability and suitability of the suggested model with a few other models that have been introduced by previous researchers utilizing the same dataset and parameter estimation techniques. The suggested model outperforms the other models that were considered in terms of data fit. We also considered different methods of model validation techniques to test the validity showing that proposed model has lesser values of information criteria than competing models. So, we can conclude that model CMIG will play significant role in data analysis and new model formulations. The model CMIG is original and new probability model so it can be useful in data analysis and probability model formulation. The main limitation of the study is that we have applied on a single data set. To generalize the model application of model on different data sets may be required.
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