


5-1-2014

# A Comparison of Shape and Scale Estimators of the Two-Parameter Weibull Distribution

Florence George

Florida International University, [fgeorge@fiu.edu](mailto:fgeorge@fiu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/jmasm>

 Part of the [Applied Statistics Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Statistical Theory Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

George, Florence (2014) "A Comparison of Shape and Scale Estimators of the Two-Parameter Weibull Distribution," *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*: Vol. 13 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.

DOI: 10.22237/jmasm/1398916920

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/jmasm/vol13/iss1/3>

This Regular Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Access Journals at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

# A Comparison of Shape and Scale Estimators of the Two-Parameter Weibull Distribution

**Florence George**

Florida International University  
Miami, FL

---

Weibull distributions are widely used in reliability and survival analysis. In this paper, different methods to estimate the shape and scale parameters of the two-parameter Weibull distribution have been reviewed and compared, based on the bias, mean square error and variance. Because a theoretical comparison is not possible, an extensive simulation study has been conducted to compare the performance of different estimators. Based on the simulation study it was observed that MLE consistently performs better than other methods.

*Keywords:* Two-parameter Weibull distribution, scale parameters, shape parameters

---

## Introduction

The Weibull distribution is a commonly used model in reliability, life time and environmental data analysis. A considerable literature discussing the methods of estimation of Weibull parameters exists (Sharoon, et al., 2012; Saralees et al., 2011; Saralees et al., 2008) because of its applications in different fields. Kantar and Senoglu (2008) did a simulation comparison of different estimators for scale parameter when shape is known. Balakrishnan and Kateri (2008) showed the existence and uniqueness of maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) of Weibull distribution. Dubey (1967) derived the percentile estimators (Percentile 1) which uses 4 different percentiles to estimate the shape and scale parameters. Seki and Yokoyama (1993) proposed a simple and robust method that uses only two percentiles, 31<sup>st</sup> and 63<sup>rd</sup> percentile (Percentile 2) to estimate both parameters. Moment estimators (MOM) and median rank regression estimators (MRRS) are also commonly used in literature (Kantar and Senoglu, 2008) because of their

---

*Dr. George is Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Email her at: fgeorge@fiu.edu.*

## COMPARISON OF ESTIMATORS OF THE WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION

easiness in computation. Existing methods (namely MLE, MOM, MRRS, Percentile 1, and Percentile 2) for estimating both shape and scale parameters of two-parameter Weibull distribution are here reviewed and compared. A simulation study has been conducted to compare the performance of these methods under same simulation conditions.

### Statistical Methodology

The Weibull distribution has the probability density function,  $f(x) = \alpha\beta^{-\alpha}x^{\alpha-1}e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^\alpha}$  for  $x \geq 0, \alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ , where  $\alpha$  is the shape parameter and  $\beta$  is the scale parameter. The cumulative distribution function is given by

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^\alpha} \text{ for } x \geq 0.$$

The distribution is reversed J-shaped when  $\alpha < 1$ , exponential when  $\alpha = 1$  and bell-shaped when  $\alpha > 1$  (Kantar and Senoglu, 2008). Because of its wide-variety of shapes it is used extensively in practice for modeling real life data in different fields.

### Maximum Likelihood Estimators (MLE)

The log-likelihood function of a random sample from the two-parameter Weibull distribution is given by

$$\ln L = n \ln \alpha - n\alpha \ln \beta + (\alpha - 1) \sum \ln x - \sum \left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^\alpha.$$

This will yield the following two score equations

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \beta} = -\frac{n\alpha}{\beta} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta^{\alpha+1}} \sum x^\alpha = 0 \text{ and}$$
$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{n}{\alpha} - n \ln \beta + \sum \ln x + \frac{\ln \beta}{\beta^\alpha} \sum x^\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta^\alpha} \sum x^\alpha \ln x = 0$$

The above two equations can be solved numerically to obtain MLEs.

### Moment Estimators (MOM)

The moment estimators are obtained by equating the population moments to the corresponding sample moments. The first and second moments of Weibull distribution are respectively

$$\mu_1' = \beta \Gamma(1 + \alpha^{-1}) \text{ and}$$

$$\mu_2' = \beta^2 \Gamma(1 + 2\alpha^{-1})$$

The first two moments from the sample are  $m_1' = \frac{1}{n} \sum x$  and  $m_2' = \frac{1}{n} \sum x^2$ .

The moment estimates are obtained by solving the following two equations

$$m_1' = \beta \Gamma(1 + \alpha^{-1})$$

$$m_2' = \beta^2 \Gamma(1 + 2\alpha^{-1})$$

### Median Rank Regression Estimators (MRRS)

MRR is a procedure for estimating the Weibull parameters by fitting a least squares regression line through the points on a probability plot. Thus,

$$\log(1 - F(x)) = -\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^\alpha \text{ and hence}$$

$$\log(\log(1 - F(x))) = \alpha \log x = \alpha \log \beta.$$

This is now a linear model and method of least squares can be used to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The sample data are first sorted in ascending order and then following Abernethy (2006), the distribution function,  $F(x_i)$  is approximated for each point  $(x_i)$  in the sorted sample as  $F(x_i) = \frac{i - 0.3}{n + 0.4}$ , where  $I$  is the ascending rank of the data point  $x_i$ .

### Percentile Estimators (Percentile 1)

Percentile estimators for both shape and scale parameters were derived by Dubey (1967). He proposed an estimator based on 17<sup>th</sup> and 97<sup>th</sup> percentiles for shape parameter and one based on 40<sup>th</sup> and 82<sup>nd</sup> percentile for scale parameter. The formulae for the shape and scale percentile estimators are presented here; for details refer to Dubey (1967). Let  $p_1 = 0.1673$  and  $p_2 = 0.9737$ . Define  $k_1 = \log(-\log(1 - p_1)) - \log(-\log(1 - p_2))$ . Let  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  represent the 100 $p_1$ th percentile from the data. Then

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{-k_1}{\log(y_1) - \log(y_2)}$$

Similarly to estimate  $\beta$ , define  $p_3 = 0.3978$  and  $p_4 = 0.8211$ . Let  $k_2 = \log(-\log(1 - p_3)) - \log(-\log(1 - p_4))$ ;  $k_3 = -\log(1 - p_3)$  and  $w = 1 - \frac{\log(k_3)}{k_2}$ . Let  $y_3$  and  $y_4$  represent the 100 $p_3$ th and 100 $p_4$ th percentile from the data. Then

$$\beta = \exp(w \log(y_3) + (1 - w) \log(y_4)).$$

### Improved Percentile Estimators (Percentile 2)

Seki and Yokoyama (1993) proposed this simple and robust method that uses only two percentiles, 31<sup>st</sup> and 63<sup>rd</sup> percentile to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The Weibull cumulative distribution function is given by

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^\alpha} \text{ for } x \geq 0.$$

Hence the 100 $p$ th percentile of the Weibull distribution can be written as  $x_p = \beta(-\log(1 - p))^{1/\beta}$ . Then the 100(1 -  $e^{-1}$ ) = 63.2<sup>th</sup> percentile is  $x_{0.632} = \beta$  for any Weibull distribution. This can be used to compute  $\hat{\beta}$ . Therefore, the estimate of the shape parameter can be obtained as  $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\log(-\log(1 - p))}{\log\left(\frac{x_p}{x_{0.632}}\right)}$ . Seki and

Yokoyama (1993) approximated the numerator of this estimator as  $-1$  and then obtained  $p = 0.31$ , approximately, to obtain  $\hat{\alpha}$ .

## Simulation Study

A simulation study has been conducted to explore the performances of the different methods discussed in this article.

### Simulation Technique

The main objective of this study is to compare the performance of five different methods to estimate the shape and scale parameters of two-parameter Weibull distribution. Weibull distribution with parameters scale = 10 and shape = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 3 and 4 were used to generate 5,000 samples of sizes  $n = 5, 10, 20, 30, 50$  and 100. The estimates are compared using the values of average bias, mean squared error (MSE) and variance. The simulation was done using statistical software R version 2.15.2.

### Results and Discussion

The results of the simulation are shown in Tables 1 to 3. The bias and MSEs from Weibull (10, 0.5) and Weibull (10, 3) are also presented in Figures 1 to 4. From Tables 1 to 3, it can be observed that as sample size increases, bias, MSE and variance decrease. For small sample size, the performance of methods differs significantly. For all methods, absolute bias, MSE and variance decrease as sample size increases. It can be observed from Tables 1 to 3 and Figures 1 to 4, in almost all cases MLE performed better than the other 4 methods and percentile method-1 performed the worst. In some situations, MRRS also performs well, especially for shape estimates. It can also be observed that both percentile estimators perform poorly in estimation of shape. There is no consistency in the performance of estimates by the method of moments. Because MLE is performing consistently better than the other 4 methods practitioners are encouraged to use MLE whenever possible.

# COMPARISON OF ESTIMATORS OF THE WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION

**Table 1.** Bias, Variance and MSE of both Scale and Shape estimates  $\alpha=10$  and  $\beta=0.5$ ; 1

$\alpha, \beta$	$n$	Scale					Shape						
		MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2	MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2		
10, 0.5	5	Bias	2.929	6.216	5.361	5.340	4.394	0.219	0.351	0.025	0.661	0.497	
		Vars	156.930	224.302	219.866	282.068	197.209	0.147	0.092	0.085	5.231	0.313	
		MSEs	165.511	262.939	248.610	310.581	216.516	0.195	0.216	0.085	5.668	0.560	
	10	Bias	1.525	4.606	2.998	2.334	1.773	0.085	0.218	-0.015	0.283	0.193	
		Vars	65.147	96.815	84.821	110.433	73.834	0.031	0.033	0.026	0.349	0.050	
		MSEs	67.473	118.026	93.811	115.879	76.977	0.038	0.081	0.026	0.429	0.087	
	20	Bias	0.705	3.217	1.643	0.979	0.656	0.036	0.136	-0.021	0.112	0.079	
		Vars	25.634	40.337	32.389	43.623	30.013	0.010	0.016	0.012	0.069	0.015	
		MSEs	26.131	50.689	35.088	44.582	30.444	0.012	0.035	0.013	0.082	0.021	
	30	Bias	0.556	2.621	1.258	0.707	0.442	0.026	0.107	-0.017	0.072	0.054	
		Vars	17.111	25.216	20.965	26.613	19.722	0.006	0.013	0.008	0.036	0.009	
		MSEs	17.420	32.084	22.548	27.113	19.917	0.007	0.024	0.008	0.041	0.012	
	50	Bias	0.283	1.912	0.783	0.405	0.207	0.014	0.076	-0.016	0.039	0.034	
		Vars	9.585	15.077	11.172	15.220	11.347	0.003	0.008	0.005	0.017	0.005	
		MSEs	9.665	18.731	11.785	15.384	11.390	0.004	0.014	0.005	0.019	0.006	
	100	Bias	0.174	1.257	0.487	0.236	0.158	0.008	0.048	-0.011	0.021	0.018	
		Vars	4.664	8.153	5.320	7.373	5.727	0.002	0.005	0.003	0.007	0.002	
		MSEs	4.694	9.734	5.557	7.429	5.752	0.002	0.008	0.003	0.008	0.003	
	10, 1	5	Bias	0.284	0.312	1.232	0.485	0.304	0.443	0.353	0.049	1.297	0.926
			Vars	23.380	23.097	27.835	29.087	24.408	0.621	0.411	0.347	10.932	1.147
			MSEs	23.461	23.194	29.353	29.322	24.501	0.817	0.535	0.349	12.614	2.005
		10	Bias	0.190	0.222	0.840	0.223	0.060	0.173	0.173	-0.032	0.507	0.371
			Vars	11.082	11.192	12.944	15.822	12.013	0.127	0.108	0.106	0.991	0.199
			MSEs	11.118	11.241	13.650	15.872	12.016	0.157	0.137	0.107	1.247	0.336
20		Bias	0.072	0.100	0.486	0.067	-0.047	0.074	0.087	-0.042	0.225	0.158	
		Vars	5.576	5.707	6.335	8.386	6.348	0.043	0.046	0.048	0.281	0.063	
		MSEs	5.581	5.717	6.571	8.390	6.350	0.049	0.053	0.050	0.331	0.088	
30		Bias	0.075	0.098	0.412	0.049	-0.006	0.049	0.062	-0.040	0.141	0.108	
		Vars	3.671	3.796	4.182	5.412	4.340	0.025	0.029	0.032	0.134	0.037	
		MSEs	3.676	3.805	4.351	5.414	4.340	0.027	0.033	0.033	0.154	0.048	
50		Bias	0.050	0.062	0.281	0.028	-0.010	0.029	0.039	-0.031	0.087	0.069	
		Vars	2.173	2.269	2.426	3.332	2.635	0.014	0.018	0.020	0.072	0.020	
		MSEs	2.175	2.273	2.504	3.332	2.635	0.015	0.019	0.021	0.080	0.025	
100		Bias	0.032	0.034	0.179	0.012	0.002	0.016	0.021	-0.021	0.045	0.037	
		Vars	1.117	1.178	1.232	1.698	1.349	0.007	0.010	0.010	0.031	0.010	
		MSEs	1.118	1.179	1.264	1.698	1.349	0.007	0.010	0.011	0.033	0.011	

FLORENCE GEORGE

**Table 2.** Bias, Variance and MSE of both Scale and Shape estimates  $\alpha=10$  and  $\beta=1.5$ ; 2


$\alpha, \beta$	$n$		Scale					Shape					
			MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2	MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2	
10, 1.5	5	Bias	-0.081	-0.149	0.513	-0.149	-0.226	0.650	0.398	0.059	2.045	1.298	
		Vars	9.333	9.331	10.477	11.069	9.546	1.374	0.947	0.713	47.203	2.365	
		MSEs	9.340	9.353	10.740	11.091	9.597	1.797	1.106	0.717	51.386	4.050	
	10	Bias	0.038	-0.002	0.451	-0.016	-0.092	0.257	0.171	-0.048	0.755	0.537	
		Vars	4.948	4.986	5.542	6.870	5.493	0.275	0.231	0.232	2.331	0.427	
		MSEs	4.950	4.986	5.746	6.870	5.501	0.342	0.260	0.235	2.901	0.715	
	20	Bias	0.039	0.016	0.317	0.016	-0.046	0.114	0.081	-0.065	0.339	0.248	
		Vars	2.508	2.517	2.763	3.802	2.851	0.097	0.090	0.109	0.606	0.144	
		MSEs	2.509	2.517	2.863	3.802	2.853	0.110	0.096	0.113	0.721	0.205	
	30	Bias	0.014	-0.003	0.227	-0.006	-0.064	0.075	0.054	-0.054	0.209	0.167	
		Vars	1.669	1.677	1.816	2.439	1.947	0.055	0.054	0.074	0.324	0.083	
		MSEs	1.669	1.677	1.867	2.439	1.952	0.061	0.057	0.077	0.368	0.111	
	50	Bias	-0.008	-0.019	0.145	-0.021	-0.050	0.041	0.030	-0.050	0.121	0.099	
		Vars	0.973	0.979	1.048	1.486	1.166	0.031	0.032	0.045	0.155	0.048	
		MSEs	0.973	0.979	1.069	1.486	1.168	0.033	0.033	0.048	0.170	0.058	
	100	Bias	0.003	-0.004	0.102	-0.020	-0.027	0.022	0.016	-0.032	0.067	0.054	
		Vars	0.493	0.495	0.533	0.748	0.591	0.014	0.016	0.023	0.070	0.021	
		MSEs	0.493	0.495	0.543	0.749	0.592	0.015	0.016	0.024	0.074	0.024	
	10, 2	5	Bias	-0.102	-0.123	0.339	-0.200	-0.263	0.868	0.510	0.089	2.499	1.673
			Vars	5.328	5.376	5.763	6.306	5.441	2.301	1.833	1.321	43.582	3.716
			MSEs	5.339	5.391	5.878	6.345	5.511	3.055	2.093	1.329	49.828	6.516
		10	Bias	-0.049	-0.065	0.254	-0.132	-0.189	0.338	0.191	-0.060	1.024	0.699
			Vars	2.797	2.830	3.090	3.811	3.062	0.459	0.390	0.394	4.718	0.699
			MSEs	2.799	2.834	3.154	3.829	3.098	0.573	0.427	0.398	5.767	1.187
20		Bias	-0.041	-0.051	0.157	-0.089	-0.136	0.151	0.087	-0.080	0.473	0.331	
		Vars	1.359	1.368	1.461	2.068	1.560	0.171	0.159	0.197	1.296	0.262	
		MSEs	1.361	1.371	1.486	2.076	1.578	0.194	0.166	0.203	1.520	0.371	
30		Bias	-0.004	-0.009	0.157	-0.023	-0.059	0.096	0.054	-0.081	0.275	0.222	
		Vars	0.911	0.915	0.991	1.347	1.059	0.096	0.090	0.125	0.540	0.142	
		MSEs	0.911	0.915	1.016	1.348	1.062	0.105	0.093	0.131	0.615	0.191	
50		Bias	-0.007	-0.010	0.110	-0.028	-0.049	0.059	0.035	-0.063	0.166	0.141	
		Vars	0.543	0.546	0.596	0.829	0.654	0.055	0.054	0.080	0.269	0.084	
		MSEs	0.543	0.546	0.608	0.830	0.656	0.059	0.055	0.084	0.297	0.104	
100		Bias	0.001	-0.002	0.071	-0.020	-0.022	0.031	0.019	-0.040	0.088	0.073	
		Vars	0.276	0.276	0.296	0.427	0.332	0.025	0.025	0.041	0.120	0.037	
		MSEs	0.276	0.276	0.301	0.427	0.333	0.026	0.026	0.042	0.128	0.043	




## COMPARISON OF ESTIMATORS OF THE WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION

**Table 3.** Bias, Variance and MSE of both Scale and Shape estimates  $\alpha=10$  and  $\beta=3; 4$

$\alpha, \beta$	$n$		Scale					Shape				
			MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2	MLE	MOM	MRRS	Perctle1	Perctle2
10, 3	5	Bias	-0.166	-0.138	0.122	-0.275	-0.320	1.295	0.767	0.131	3.899	2.417
		Vars	2.392	2.439	2.515	2.865	2.489	5.768	5.041	3.285	243.739	8.976
		MSEs	2.419	2.458	2.530	2.941	2.591	7.446	5.629	3.302	258.938	14.818
	10	Bias	-0.053	-0.037	0.147	-0.129	-0.152	0.505	0.276	-0.102	1.461	1.048
		Vars	1.221	1.234	1.290	1.659	1.352	1.100	0.998	0.911	9.896	1.722
		MSEs	1.224	1.235	1.312	1.676	1.374	1.354	1.074	0.922	12.032	2.820
	20	Bias	-0.017	-0.009	0.120	-0.060	-0.070	0.218	0.113	-0.134	0.689	0.487
		Vars	0.602	0.605	0.649	0.896	0.690	0.374	0.359	0.428	2.594	0.572
		MSEs	0.602	0.605	0.663	0.900	0.695	0.422	0.372	0.445	3.070	0.810
	30	Bias	-0.022	-0.017	0.082	-0.049	-0.057	0.153	0.084	-0.110	0.452	0.341
		Vars	0.415	0.417	0.442	0.618	0.487	0.230	0.227	0.294	1.387	0.343
		MSEs	0.416	0.417	0.448	0.620	0.491	0.253	0.234	0.306	1.592	0.459
	50	Bias	-0.020	-0.017	0.058	-0.039	-0.044	0.083	0.044	-0.101	0.254	0.209
		Vars	0.243	0.243	0.259	0.358	0.288	0.121	0.123	0.185	0.643	0.183
		MSEs	0.243	0.243	0.262	0.360	0.290	0.128	0.125	0.196	0.707	0.226
	100	Bias	0.000	0.001	0.047	-0.003	-0.014	0.035	0.014	-0.075	0.098	0.096
		Vars	0.118	0.118	0.128	0.186	0.144	0.058	0.059	0.092	0.265	0.087
		MSEs	0.118	0.118	0.130	0.186	0.144	0.059	0.059	0.098	0.274	0.096
10, 4	5	Bias	-0.125	-0.081	0.091	-0.230	-0.258	1.716	1.051	0.164	4.996	3.156
		Vars	1.388	1.411	1.442	1.683	1.471	9.001	7.677	5.003	141.435	13.999
		MSEs	1.404	1.418	1.451	1.736	1.537	11.945	8.782	5.029	166.393	23.962
	10	Bias	-0.078	-0.054	0.076	-0.140	-0.156	0.686	0.401	-0.131	2.017	1.402
		Vars	0.670	0.675	0.709	0.913	0.747	2.063	1.999	1.723	16.360	3.181
		MSEs	0.676	0.678	0.714	0.932	0.772	2.535	2.159	1.740	20.429	5.146
	20	Bias	-0.033	-0.021	0.070	-0.056	-0.076	0.305	0.166	-0.174	0.875	0.659
		Vars	0.362	0.364	0.391	0.545	0.420	0.691	0.695	0.774	4.648	1.023
		MSEs	0.363	0.365	0.396	0.548	0.426	0.783	0.723	0.804	5.414	1.457
	30	Bias	-0.024	-0.016	0.055	-0.038	-0.055	0.194	0.107	-0.156	0.549	0.444
		Vars	0.229	0.230	0.245	0.339	0.271	0.388	0.411	0.523	2.300	0.567
		MSEs	0.229	0.230	0.248	0.341	0.274	0.425	0.423	0.547	2.601	0.764
	50	Bias	-0.016	-0.011	0.042	-0.025	-0.035	0.112	0.060	-0.132	0.322	0.271
		Vars	0.138	0.139	0.149	0.209	0.163	0.224	0.237	0.323	1.087	0.342
		MSEs	0.138	0.139	0.151	0.209	0.165	0.237	0.241	0.341	1.190	0.415
	100	Bias	-0.013	-0.011	0.023	-0.021	-0.025	0.060	0.036	-0.087	0.156	0.147
		Vars	0.066	0.067	0.071	0.104	0.082	0.108	0.116	0.174	0.478	0.157
		MSEs	0.066	0.067	0.072	0.105	0.083	0.111	0.118	0.181	0.503	0.178




**Figure 1.** Absolute Bias of Scale parameter estimate (left), Shape parameter estimate (right) vs. Sample size from Weibull (10, 0.5)




**Figure 2.** MSE of Scale parameter estimate (left), Shape parameter estimate (right) vs. Sample size from Weibull (10, 0.5)

## COMPARISON OF ESTIMATORS OF THE WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION



**Figure 3.** Absolute Bias of Scale parameter estimate (left), Shape parameter estimate (right) vs. Sample size from Weibull (10, 3)



**Figure 4.** MSE of Scale parameter estimate (left), Shape parameter estimate (right) vs. Sample size from Weibull (10, 3)

**Example**

Many researchers modeled wind data using the Weibull distribution (Dorvlo, 2002; Weisser, 2003; Celik, 2003). The five methods with an example in Battacharya and Bhattacharjee (2010) will be discussed next. This example provides the average monthly wind speed (m/s) of Kolkata from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2009 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009. Table 4 presents the data set.

The estimates of the two-parameter Weibull distribution obtained by fitting to the data using the methods discussed in the article are given in the Table 5. It look like the Percentile 1 and Percentile 2 estimates are at the extreme ends and the MLE estimates lie somewhat between the values of other estimates.

**Table 4.** Average daily wind speed in Kolkata during March 2009.

Date	Speed (m/s)	Date	Speed (m/s)
1	0.56	17	0.28
2	0.28	18	0.83
3	0.56	19	1.39
4	0.56	20	1.11
5	1.11	21	1.11
6	0.83	22	0.83
7	1.11	23	0.56
8	1.94	24	0.83
9	1.11	25	1.67
10	0.83	26	1.94
11	1.11	27	1.39
12	1.39	28	0.83
13	0.28	29	2.22
14	0.56	30	1.67
15	0.28	31	2.22
16	0.28		

**Table 5.** Estimates of two-parameter Weibull by different methods.

Method	Scale	Shape
MLE	1.1550	1.9081
MOM	1.1501	1.8456
MRRS	1.1636	1.8031
Percentile 1	1.1100	1.8055
Percentile 2	1.1816	2.1704

**Conclusion**

Five different methods for the joint estimation of both scale and shape parameters of two-parameter Weibull distribution were reviewed in this article. A simulation study was conducted to compare the five methods based on bias, mean square error and variance of estimates. From simulation results, it was observed that MLE performs consistently better than MOM, MRRS, percentile method and

## COMPARISON OF ESTIMATORS OF THE WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION

improved percentile method and therefore MLE estimates are recommended to the practitioners.

### References

Abernethy, R. B. (2006). (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). *The new Weibull handbook : reliability & statistical analysis for predicting life, safety, risk, support costs, failures, and forecasting warranty claims, substantiation and accelerated testing, using Weibull, Log normal, crow-AMSAA, probit, and Kaplan-Meier models*. North Palm Beach, FL: R. B. Abernethy.

Abernethy, R. B., Breneman, J. E., Medlin, C. H., & Reinman, G. L. (1983). *Weibull Analysis Handbook*. Air Force Wright Aeronautical Laboratories Technical Report AFWAL-TR- 83-2079. Available at <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA143100>.

Balakrishanan, N. & Kateri, M. (2008). On the maximum likelihood estimation of parameters of Weibull distribution based on complete and censored data. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 78(17): 2971–2975.

Battacharya, P., & Bhattacharjee, R. (2010). A study on Weibull distribution for estimating the parameters. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 5(2): 234-241.

Celik, A. N. (2003). Energy output estimation for small-scale wind power generators using Weibull-representative wind data. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, 91: 693-707. doi: 10.1016/S0167-6105(02)00471-3

Dorvlo, A. S. (2002). Estimating wind speed distribution. *Energy Conservation and Management*, 43: 2311-2318.

Dubey, S. Y. D. (1967). Normal and Weibull distributions. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 14(1): 69–79. doi: 10.1002/nav.3800140107

Kantar, Y. M. & Senoglu, B. (2008). A Comparative Study for the Location and Scale Parameters of the Weibull Distribution with a given Shape Parameter. *Computers & Geosciences*, 34: 1900-1909.

Saralees, N., & Firoozeh, H. (2011). An extension of the exponential distribution. *Statistics - A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 45(6): 543-558.

Saralees, N., & Kotz, S. (2008). Strength modeling using Weibull distributions. *Journal of Mechanical Science and Technology*, 22: 1247-1254.

FLORENCE GEORGE

Seki, T., & Yokoyama, S. (1993). Simple and robust estimation of the Weibull parameters. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 33(1): 45-52.

Sharoon, H., Muhammad, Q. S., Muhammad, M., & Kibria, B. M. G. (2012). A Note on Beta Inverse - Weibull Distribution. *Communication in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 42(2): 320-335.

Weisser, D. (2003). A wind energy analysis of Grenada: an estimation using the 'Weibull' density function. *Renewable Energy*; 28(11): 1803-1812.