A PROCESS CAPABILITY INDEX THAT IS BASED ON THE PROPORTION OF CONFORMANCE

MICHAEL PERAKIS and EVDOKIA XEKALAKI*

Department of Statistics, Athens University of Economics and Business, 76 Patission St., 104 34, Athens, Greece

(Received 19 October 2001; In final form 20 March 2002)

In this paper a new process capability index is proposed, which is based on the proportion of conformance of the process and has several appealing features. This index is simple in its assessment and interpretation and is applicable to normally or non-normally distributed processes. Likewise, its value can be assessed for continuous or discrete processes, it can be used under either unilateral or bilateral tolerances and the assessment of confidence limits for its true value is not very involved, under specific distributional assumptions. Point estimators and confidence limits for this index are investigated, assuming two very common continuous distributions (normal and exponential).
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1 INTRODUCTION

Process capability indices (PCIs) aim to quantify the capability of a process \( \lambda \) to meet some specifications that are related to a measurable characteristic of its produced items. These specifications are determined through the lower specification limit (L), the upper specification limit (U) and the target value (T). A variety of such indices has been developed in the last two decades. Unambiguously, the most prominent among them are \( C_p \), \( C_{pk} \), \( C_{pm} \) and \( C_{pmk} \). A comprehensive discussion of these four indices (and many other indices too) is provided by Kotz and Johnson (1993), Kotz and Lovelace (1998) and Kotz and Johnson (2002).

A deficiency of the indices \( C_p \), \( C_{pk} \), \( C_{pm} \) and \( C_{pmk} \) is that their values can be assessed solely for processes for which both the lower and the upper specification limits have been specified. Nevertheless, sometimes one may be faced with a unilateral process, i.e. a process for which only a lower or an upper specification limit has been set. In such cases, the assessment of these four indices becomes impossible and we have to resort to the indices CPL and CPU suggested by Kanji (1986). Therefore, it is apparent that there exists a limitation in the use of the four standard indices.
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One further weakness of the four standard PCIs, is that their definition is based on the restrictive assumption that the distribution of the process is normal. Even though this assumption is not quite evident, it is reflected from the constants that appear in their denominators, whose selection is related to the properties of the normal distribution. This has the implication that their assessment and interpretation for processes not normally distributed may lead to utterly wrong conclusions. In order to overcome this deficiency, Clements (1989) proposed some generalizations of \( C_p \) and \( C_{pk} \), while Pearn and Kotz (1994–1995) extended the initial idea of Clements to \( C_{pm} \) and \( C_{pmp} \).

Despite the fact that these generalized indices can be used regardless of the form of the distribution of the process, they have some drawbacks. In particular, they do not have a direct relationship with the proportion of conformance \( (p) \) of the process, defined as the probability of producing within specifications (sometimes instead of this term the term yield is used). Besides, they cannot be assessed if the examined process is discrete and the derivation of the distributions of their estimators and the construction of confidence limits for them are very cumbersome without assuming particular distributional forms (see, e.g. Perakis and Xikalaki, 1999). However, even in this case the distributions of the estimators of the more involved generalized indices, such as \( C_{pm} \) and \( C_{pmp} \), are intractable thus making the construction of confidence limits for them a rather difficult task.

Borges and Ho (2000) derived the approximate distribution of the estimator of the generalized index \( C_{pk} \) making no specific distributional assumptions. They also proposed a method that leads to approximate conservative lower confidence limits for the true value of the same index.

Another important disadvantage of the four standard indices and their generalizations is that they are not applicable to situations where except for the specification limits, a minimum acceptable yield has been set. For instance, let us assume that we have two processes, say A and B. The yield of process A is supposed to be 0.996, while that of process B is 0.985. Moreover, the customer of the product produced from process A requires a yield at least equal to 0.997, while the customer of the product produced from process B is less strict and requires a yield at least equal to 0.980. Obviously, in such situations the capability of a process does not depend solely on the specification limits, while it is also dependent on the value of the minimum acceptable yield. This value may differ, depending on the nature of the process. Therefore, a yield that is regarded as high for a process may be regarded as low for another. Indeed, according to the requirements of the customer of process B, the process is capable since its yield exceeds the minimum allowable yield. On the other hand, even though the yield of process A is higher than that of process B, the customer will not regard it as capable because its yield is smaller than its minimum acceptable value. The use of the four standard PCIs is not appropriate in such situations, since their values do not take into account the minimum acceptable yield of the process.

In the next section, a new index is defined that overcomes the deficiencies of the standard PCIs described above and has several appealing features. Its basic properties are examined and a general estimator of it is proposed. Sections 3 and 4 deal with the new index in the case of normal and exponential processes. Under each distributional assumption, point estimators for the new index are suggested and lower confidence limits (lcls) are constructed. Upper confidence limits can also be obtained in a similar manner. However, only the case of lcls is considered as these are of greater interest (due to the fact that large values of PCIs are desirable) and have thus attracted a lot of attention in the literature (see, e.g. Chou et al., 1990; Li et al., 1990; Boyles, 1991; Kushler and Hurley, 1992). Finally, in Section 5 the obtained results are briefly discussed and some topics that deserve further investigation in connection with the new index are pointed out.
2 THE INDEX $C_{pc}$

In this section, a new PCI is introduced which overcomes the drawbacks of the standard indices discussed in the previous section. It is defined as the ratio

$$C_{pc} = \frac{1 - p_0}{1 - p},$$

where $p_0$ denotes the minimum allowable proportion of conformance (pc). The value of $p_0$ must be intuitively close to unity and depends on the nature of the examined process and the requirements of the customers.

It is worth noting at this point, that this index has some further appealing features:

- it is applicable even to situations of the type “quantify the capability of a process if the specification limits are $L$, $U$ and the minimum allowable yield is $p_0$”
- it can be assessed under either unilateral or bilateral specifications
- its definition is not based on the usual assumption of normality
- it is directly associated with $p$ and thus its interpretation in its terms is simple
- it satisfies (under some conditions) the property that all the standard PCI have, which is, to be equal to the unity if the process mean is located exactly at the midpoint of the specification area (i.e. $\mu = M = (L + U)/2$) and $p = 0.9973$
- its assessment is relatively simple
- it can be readily understood by practitioners
- assuming that the distribution of the process is normal, the assessment of confidence limits for its true value is fairly simple
- under specific non-normal distributional assumptions the construction of confidence limits for its true value is feasible
- it can be assessed for discrete processes as well

As mentioned before, the value of the minimum allowable proportion of conformance $p_0$ is intuitively required to be close to 1. Whenever the value of $p_0$ is not specified, the value 0.9973 seems to be a plausible choice. By this selection the index has the property of being equal to unity if $p = 0.9973$ and the process mean equals $M$ — a property that all the standard PCIs possess. Note that despite the fact that the value 0.9973 is connected with the properties of the normal distribution, it plays an important role in statistical process control and is customarily regarded as a sufficiently large value of $p$.

In the sequel, for simplicity, it is assumed that $p_0 = 0.9973$. Nonetheless, the discussion given below can be modified easily assuming any other value of $p_0$. Selecting $p_0$ to be equal to 0.9973, the index $C_{pc}$ can be rewritten in the form

$$C_{pc} = \frac{0.0027}{1 - p}. \quad (2.1)$$

From the definition of $C_{pc}$ it follows that the yield of the process can be expressed directly in terms of this index. Indeed, solving (2.1) for $p$, it follows that $p = 1 - 0.0027/C_{pc}$.

At this point, it would be interesting to remark that $C_{pc}$ can be associated with Yeh and Bhattacharya’s (1998) index defined as

$$C_f = \min \left\{ \frac{\phi(p)}{\phi(p_1)}, \frac{\phi(p)}{\phi(p_2)} \right\},$$

where $p_1 = P(X < L)$, $p_2 = P(X > U)$, and $\phi(p_1), \phi(p_2)$ are the expected proportions of non-conforming products that the manufacturer can tolerate on the lower and upper specification limits.
limits, respectively. The value of $C_{pc}$ coincides with that of $C_p$ provided that the process is symmetric, its mean coincides with $M$, and $p_1^0 = p^0_2$. However, separating $p$ into two parts ($p_1$ and $p_2$) and taking their minimum leads (for any assumption on the distribution of the process) to a distribution of the estimator of the index with a quite involved form and thus the construction of confidence limits for the index $C_p$ becomes extremely tough without resorting to the method of bootstrap. Moreover, the yield of the process cannot be expressed directly as a function of the index $C_p$, something that is possible in the case of the index $C_{pc}$.

Let us now examine the behavior of the index $C_{pc}$ for different values of $p$. Obviously if $p = 0.9973$, then $C_{pc} = 1$. If the yield of the process is greater than 0.9973, then $C_{pc} > 1$ and as $p$ approaches unity it tends to infinity. On the other hand, if $p < 0.9973$, then $C_{pc} < 1$ and the value of the index becomes negligible as $p$ tends to zero. Obviously, the smallest value that $p$ may take is zero and so the smallest possible value of this index is 0.0027 (or, generally, $1 - p_0$).

The only unknown parameter involved in the definition of the index $C_{pc}$ is $p$. Its value depends on the form of the distribution of the process and can be estimated on the basis of a random sample collected from the examined process. If we denote the estimator of $p$ by $\hat{p}$ (the functional form of $\hat{p}$ depends on the distribution of the process), then the index $C_{pc}$ can be estimated by

$$\hat{C}_{pc} = \frac{0.0027}{1 - \hat{p}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

In the next two sections the properties of estimator (2.2) are examined for two very common distributions: the normal and the exponential.

3 THE INDEX $C_{pc}$ FOR NORMAL PROCESSES

Assuming normality of the examined process, its yield is given by

$$p = P(L < X < U) = \Phi\left(\frac{U - \mu}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{L - \mu}{\sigma}\right),$$

where $\mu, \sigma$ denote the mean and the standard deviation of the process, respectively and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. The value of $p$ can be estimated using the estimator

$$\hat{p} = \Phi\left(\frac{U - \bar{X}}{S}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{L - \bar{X}}{S}\right),$$

where $\bar{X}, S$ are the sample mean and the sample standard deviation respectively, obtained from a random sample. As Kotz and Johnson (1993) stress, the estimator $\hat{p}$ is biased. However, due to the complexity of the minimum variance unbiased estimator of $p$, they conclude that the use of $\hat{p}$ is in most of the times fairly adequate.

Three alternative techniques for constructing approximate lower confidence limits for the true value of $p$ are described by Wang and Lam (1996), while Perakis and Xekalaki (2001) consider a modification of one of them which achieves a better coverage. In view of the fact that the index $C_{pc}$ is a function of $p$, it becomes evident that a proper modification of these methods makes the construction of lcls for the index $C_{pc}$ feasible. The four methods and their implementation for the construction of lcls for $C_{pc}$ are discussed in the sequel.
The first two methods are based on the articles of Owen and Hua (1977) and Chou and Owen (1984), respectively. In particular, Owen and Hua (1977) sought confidence limits for the probabilities \( p_1 = P(X < L) \) and \( p_2 = P(X > U) \), while Chou and Owen (1984) constructed one-sided simultaneous confidence regions on the lower (\( p_1 \)) and the upper (\( p_2 \)) tails of the normal distribution. Extensive tables containing the values of the confidence limits obtained from these two methods are included in the corresponding articles. Denoting the upper confidence limits for \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) obtained by any of these two methods by \( p_1^* \) and \( p_2^* \), respectively, Wang and Lam (1996) stress that a 100(1 - \( z \))% lcl for \( p \) is given by

\[
1 - p_1^* - p_2^*. 
\]

(3.1)

This limit can be used as a basis for constructing a lcl for \( C_{pc} \). Actually, starting from lcl (3.1) one may find that a 100(1 - \( z \))% approximate lcl for the index \( C_{pc} \) is given by

\[
\frac{0.0027}{p_1^* + p_2^*}. 
\]

(3.2)

An obvious drawback of the two methods described above is that their implementation requires use of the entries of the tables provided in the corresponding articles for the confidence limits of \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \). This restricts their use and thus Wang and Lam (1996) introduced a third method for constructing an approximate lcl for \( p \) which is much simpler and does not require any special tables. In particular, Wang and Lam (1996) sought a value \( p^* \) such that

\[
P(p \geq p^*) = 1 - \alpha. 
\]

Substituting \( P(L < X < U) \) for \( p \) they obtained

\[
P(P(\bar{X} - K_1S < X < \bar{X} + K_2S) \geq p^*) = 1 - \alpha, 
\]

where \( K_1 = (\bar{X} - L)/S \) and \( K_2 = (U - \bar{X})/S \). Standardizing the terms, so as to result in the standard normal distribution function, the left hand side term in this equation reduces to

\[
P\left[ \Phi\left( \frac{Z_Y + K_2}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - \Phi\left( \frac{Z_Y - K_1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \geq p^* \right], 
\]

where \( Z = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - \mu)/\sigma \) follows the standard normal distribution and \( Y = (n - 1)S^2/\sigma^2 \) follows the chi-square distribution with \( n - 1 \) degrees of freedom (df). Wang and Lam (1996) point out that if the probabilities that \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are negative are negligible, this probability can be approximated rather accurately through

\[
P\left[ \Phi\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + K_2 \sqrt{\frac{2\chi^2}{n-1}} \right) - \Phi\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - K_1 \sqrt{\frac{2\chi^2}{n-1}} \right) \geq p^* \right]
\]

and concluded that the desired 100(1 - \( z \))% approximate lcl for \( p \) is given by

\[
p^* = \Phi\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \max(K_1, K_2) \sqrt{\frac{2\chi^2}{n-1}} \right) - \Phi\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \min(K_1, K_2) \sqrt{\frac{2\chi^2}{n-1}} \right). 
\]

(3.3)
where $\chi^2_{n-1, z}$ denotes the z quantile of the chi-square distribution with $(n - 1)$ df. Based on lcl (3.3) one can easily find that a $100(1 - z \%)$ approximate lcl for $C_{pe}$ is given by

$$
\frac{0.0027}{1 - \mu^*}.
$$

(3.4)

Perakis and Xekalaki (2001) showed that the coverage of lcl (3.3) can be improved substantially using a variant of it given by

$$
\hat{p} = \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + C_1\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - C_2\right),
$$

(3.5)

where

$$
C_1 = \max(K_1, K_2)\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{2}{2z-1, z}}\frac{\chi^2_{n-1, z}}{n - 1}
$$

and

$$
C_2 = \min(K_1, K_2)\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{2}{2z-1, z}}\frac{\chi^2_{n-1, z}}{n - 1}
$$

Taking advantage of this result, one can obtain an alternative lcl for $C_{pe}$. Indeed, from (3.5) it can be shown easily that a $100(1 - z \%)$ approximate lcl for $C_{pe}$ is given by

$$
\frac{0.0027}{1 - \hat{p}}.
$$

(3.6)

In order to investigate the performance of lcls (3.4) and (3.6) an extensive simulation study was conducted. Specifically, random samples of various sizes were generated from the normal distribution for various parameter combinations. For every combination of parameters and sample size, the total number of the generated samples was 25,000. For each of these samples, lcls for the index $C_{pe}$ were assessed using formulae (3.4) and (3.6) and the percentage of times at which the actual index value exceeded each of the two lcls was calculated.

### Table 1: The Examined Processes and Their $C_{pe}$ Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$C_{pe}$</th>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$C_{pe}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00850</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.285</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>1.95403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>0.01488</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.99947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.01687</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>1.99989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.667</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.01701</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>42.6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.428</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.01701</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.444</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>84.4396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.01701</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.05933</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.636</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>85.2049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4701.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.11850</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.545</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>9371.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.857</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.11867</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.166</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>943.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.11867</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1363367.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.222</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.1186</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.615</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>2737338.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.99995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>10536237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_1$</td>
<td>$k_2$</td>
<td>$n = 25$</td>
<td>$n = 50$</td>
<td>$n = 100$</td>
<td>$n = 200$</td>
<td>$n = 400$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5248</td>
<td>0.9492</td>
<td>0.9225</td>
<td>0.9004</td>
<td>0.8418</td>
<td>0.7818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5618</td>
<td>0.9675</td>
<td>0.9292</td>
<td>0.9125</td>
<td>0.8518</td>
<td>0.7818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.5988</td>
<td>0.9856</td>
<td>0.9392</td>
<td>0.9265</td>
<td>0.8618</td>
<td>0.7918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.6358</td>
<td>0.9936</td>
<td>0.9492</td>
<td>0.9301</td>
<td>0.8718</td>
<td>0.8018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.6728</td>
<td>0.9984</td>
<td>0.9592</td>
<td>0.9350</td>
<td>0.8818</td>
<td>0.8118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.7098</td>
<td>1.0012</td>
<td>0.9692</td>
<td>0.9390</td>
<td>0.8918</td>
<td>0.8218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.7468</td>
<td>1.0072</td>
<td>0.9792</td>
<td>0.9430</td>
<td>0.9018</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.7838</td>
<td>1.0132</td>
<td>0.9892</td>
<td>0.9470</td>
<td>0.9118</td>
<td>0.8418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.8208</td>
<td>1.0184</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>0.9218</td>
<td>0.8518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.8528</td>
<td>1.0264</td>
<td>1.0092</td>
<td>0.9560</td>
<td>0.9318</td>
<td>0.8618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II** The Observed Coverage of kl (Top Value) and kl (Point Value) (Bottom Value for Confidence Level 0.9)
TABLE III  The Observed Coverage of lcl (3.4) (Top Value) and ucl (3.6) (Bottom Value) for Confidence Level 0.95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$n = 25$</th>
<th>$n = 50$</th>
<th>$n = 100$</th>
<th>$n = 200$</th>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$n = 25$</th>
<th>$n = 50$</th>
<th>$n = 100$</th>
<th>$n = 200$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97904</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.9674</td>
<td>0.9652</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97076</td>
<td>0.9706</td>
<td>0.97312</td>
<td>0.97132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96204</td>
<td>0.95884</td>
<td>0.95996</td>
<td>0.95448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.9592</td>
<td>0.96352</td>
<td>0.96484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97748</td>
<td>0.97744</td>
<td>0.97388</td>
<td>0.9744</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>0.96956</td>
<td>0.96972</td>
<td>0.96732</td>
<td>0.97332</td>
<td>0.97148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95556</td>
<td>0.96684</td>
<td>0.97008</td>
<td>0.96736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95556</td>
<td>0.95836</td>
<td>0.96512</td>
<td>0.96372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97268</td>
<td>0.9712</td>
<td>0.97056</td>
<td>0.97004</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>0.96804</td>
<td>0.97092</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.97304</td>
<td>0.96408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95888</td>
<td>0.96332</td>
<td>0.96208</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95464</td>
<td>0.96164</td>
<td>0.9638</td>
<td>0.96408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96976</td>
<td>0.96912</td>
<td>0.96628</td>
<td>0.9648</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>0.97188</td>
<td>0.97188</td>
<td>0.97192</td>
<td>0.97296</td>
<td>0.9764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9574</td>
<td>0.93848</td>
<td>0.95844</td>
<td>0.95956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95364</td>
<td>0.95852</td>
<td>0.96456</td>
<td>0.9674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96844</td>
<td>0.96828</td>
<td>0.96644</td>
<td>0.96456</td>
<td>4, 4</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.97148</td>
<td>0.96848</td>
<td>0.96464</td>
<td>0.95652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95644</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.95952</td>
<td>0.96124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95768</td>
<td>0.95712</td>
<td>0.95692</td>
<td>0.95652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97248</td>
<td>0.96884</td>
<td>0.96676</td>
<td>0.96532</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>0.96908</td>
<td>0.96816</td>
<td>0.96752</td>
<td>0.97096</td>
<td>0.9634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96036</td>
<td>0.95756</td>
<td>0.95996</td>
<td>0.96072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94908</td>
<td>0.95572</td>
<td>0.9586</td>
<td>0.9634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96964</td>
<td>0.96788</td>
<td>0.96612</td>
<td>0.96564</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>0.9672</td>
<td>0.9682</td>
<td>0.96956</td>
<td>0.97036</td>
<td>0.96276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95504</td>
<td>0.95872</td>
<td>0.96052</td>
<td>0.96196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95112</td>
<td>0.95428</td>
<td>0.95988</td>
<td>0.96276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97512</td>
<td>0.97112</td>
<td>0.96804</td>
<td>0.96348</td>
<td>4, 7</td>
<td>0.96576</td>
<td>0.97004</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.96664</td>
<td>0.96336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96152</td>
<td>0.95664</td>
<td>0.95708</td>
<td>0.9572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95152</td>
<td>0.9544</td>
<td>0.95852</td>
<td>0.96336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97464</td>
<td>0.9744</td>
<td>0.97584</td>
<td>0.97296</td>
<td>5, 5</td>
<td>0.97156</td>
<td>0.96984</td>
<td>0.96676</td>
<td>0.96268</td>
<td>0.95728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95992</td>
<td>0.96448</td>
<td>0.9654</td>
<td>0.96688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95352</td>
<td>0.95648</td>
<td>0.95372</td>
<td>0.95728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.97228</td>
<td>0.97252</td>
<td>0.97376</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>0.96704</td>
<td>0.96872</td>
<td>0.96752</td>
<td>0.96728</td>
<td>0.95852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95796</td>
<td>0.96392</td>
<td>0.96564</td>
<td>0.96752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.95216</td>
<td>0.95764</td>
<td>0.95852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9728</td>
<td>0.97428</td>
<td>0.97312</td>
<td>0.97164</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>0.9676</td>
<td>0.9674</td>
<td>0.96868</td>
<td>0.96724</td>
<td>0.96076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95936</td>
<td>0.96172</td>
<td>0.96332</td>
<td>0.96556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94704</td>
<td>0.95448</td>
<td>0.95784</td>
<td>0.96076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97108</td>
<td>0.97388</td>
<td>0.97556</td>
<td>0.97118</td>
<td>6, 6</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
<td>0.9704</td>
<td>0.96704</td>
<td>0.96476</td>
<td>0.95312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9602</td>
<td>0.96104</td>
<td>0.9656</td>
<td>0.9694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94952</td>
<td>0.95356</td>
<td>0.95516</td>
<td>0.95312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.97936</td>
<td>0.97164</td>
<td>0.97304</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>0.9624</td>
<td>0.96548</td>
<td>0.96696</td>
<td>0.96616</td>
<td>0.9616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9568</td>
<td>0.96376</td>
<td>0.96536</td>
<td>0.96852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94336</td>
<td>0.94868</td>
<td>0.95492</td>
<td>0.9584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97388</td>
<td>0.97252</td>
<td>0.96652</td>
<td>0.96412</td>
<td>7, 7</td>
<td>0.86624</td>
<td>0.94796</td>
<td>0.9656</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96092</td>
<td>0.95888</td>
<td>0.9594</td>
<td>0.95756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86584</td>
<td>0.94652</td>
<td>0.95208</td>
<td>0.95296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A PROCESS CAPABILITY INDEX

The sample sizes selected were \( n = 25, 50, 100 \) and 200. It was assumed that \( L = 10 \) and \( U = 20 \) and various combinations of \( k_1 = (\mu - L)/\sigma \) and \( k_2 = (U - \mu)/\sigma \) were chosen. Due to the symmetry of the normal distribution, processes with \( \mu > 15 \) (i.e. \( k_1 > k_2 \)) have not been considered. The examined processes and their \( C_{pe} \) values are summarized in Table I, while the results of the study are summarized in Tables II and III.

The top value in the entries of the latter two tables corresponds to the observed coverage (OC) of the lcl given by (3.4), while the bottom value corresponds to that of lcl (3.6). Table II refers to the OC for confidence level 0.90, while Table III refers to the OC for confidence level 0.95. One may observe that in almost all cases the OC of lcl (3.4) is greater than the nominal coverage. This implies that lcl (3.4) is conservative, namely it includes the actual value at a higher percentage than the nominal. In addition, the OC seems to approach the nominal coverage as the sample size increases, only in the case where \( k_1 = k_2 \). In all the other cases, the improvement that is achieved increasing the sample size seems to be unimportant. Finally, it is obvious that in almost all the cases the OC of lcl (3.6) is closer to the nominal than that of lcl (3.4).

4 THE INDEX \( C_{pe} \) FOR EXPONENTIAL PROCESSES

In practical situations, one may often be faced with processes whose distributions are far from being normal. In this section, the index \( C_{pe} \) is considered under the assumption that the underlying distribution of the examined process is of a non-normal form and, in particular, exponential. Such a distributional assumption is generally valid for data that have a natural one-sided boundary (frequently located at zero) with a large probability mass concentrated near this boundary. Examples of cases where this distributional assumption seems to be reasonable are the time required until failure in a life test, the surface roughness and the coating thickness, as Gunter (1989) points out. It should also be remarked that, the fact that the exponential distribution arises frequently in industrial processes is also pointed out in the article by Yeh and Bhattacharya (1998).

In measuring the capability of a process whose distribution can be regarded to be the exponential distribution, it is reasonable to assume that in most of the times only one specification limit has been set. This may be either \( U \) (e.g. surface roughness), or \( L \) (e.g. time until failure). In the sequel, to avoid confusion, we adopt the notation \( C_{peu} \) for the case of an upper specification limit and \( C_{pel} \) for the case of a lower specification limit. In the rare case where both \( U \) and \( L \) have been assigned, the distribution of the estimator of the index \( C_{pe} \) becomes quite complicated and therefore this case is not considered here.

If only \( U \) has been set, the process yield is given by \( P(X < U) = 1 - e^{-xU} \) and the index \( C_{peu} \) is defined as

\[
C_{peu} = \frac{0.0027}{e^{-xU}}. \tag{4.1}
\]

On the other hand, if only \( L \) has been specified, \( p = P(X > L) = e^{-xL} \) and thus the index \( C_{pel} \) is defined as

\[
C_{pel} = \frac{0.0027}{1 - e^{-xL}}. \tag{4.2}
\]

The only unknown parameter that is involved in the expressions of the indices \( C_{peu} \) and \( C_{pel} \) is \( \lambda \). In practice, the true value of \( \lambda \) is unknown, and hence the need for its estimation.
becomes evident. As is well known, if a random sample \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) from the exponential distribution with parameter \( \lambda \) is available, the maximum likelihood estimator (mle) \( \hat{\lambda} \) of \( \lambda \) is the reciprocal of the sample mean, i.e.

\[
\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\bar{X}},
\]

Substituting \( \hat{\lambda} \) for \( \lambda \) in formulae (4.1) and (4.2) results in the following estimators of \( \hat{C}_{\text{pca}} \) and \( \hat{C}_{\text{pel}} \):

\[
\hat{C}_{\text{pca}} = \frac{0.0027}{e^{-2\hat{\lambda}}}, \quad \hat{C}_{\text{pel}} = \frac{0.0027}{1 - e^{-2\hat{\lambda}}}.
\]

The probability density functions (pdfs) of \( \hat{C}_{\text{pca}} \) and \( \hat{C}_{\text{pel}} \) are given in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, which are given below. The results stated in both these theorems can be verified readily.

**Theorem 4.1** The pdf of \( W = \hat{C}_{\text{pca}} \) is given by

\[
f_\lambda(w) = \frac{(\ln L)^\theta}{\Gamma(\eta)} (5.9145 + \ln w)^{\eta-1} w^{-\eta-1} e^{-(1/(5.9145+\ln w))}, \quad 0.0027 < w < \infty.
\]

**Theorem 4.2** The pdf of \( W = \hat{C}_{\text{pel}} \) is given by

\[
f_\lambda(w) = \frac{(\ln L)^\theta}{\Gamma(\eta)} \left( -\ln \left( \frac{1 - 0.0027}{w} \right) \right)^{-\eta-1} e^{\eta \ln \left( 1 - 0.0027/w \right) / \ln \left( 0.0027 \right)} \frac{0.0027}{w^\eta - 0.0027w}, \quad 0.0027 < w < \infty.
\]

The form of the pdf of \( \hat{C}_{\text{pca}} \) is depicted in Figure 1 for three different sample sizes \( n = 25, 50 \) and 100) and for \( U = 10 \) and \( \lambda = 0.6 \). The vertical line corresponds to the actual value of

---

**FIGURE 1** The probability density function of \( W = \hat{C}_{\text{pca}} \) for various sample sizes assuming that \( U = 10 \) and \( \lambda = 0.6 \).
C_{peu}, which, for the selected combination of \( U \) and \( \lambda \), equals 1.089. One may observe that as the value of \( n \) increases, the amount of mass concentrated near the actual value of the index increases and the mode of the distribution reaches the actual value of \( C_{peu} \).

The remaining part of this section deals with the problem of constructing lcl's for the indices \( C_{peu} \) and \( C_{pec} \). In order to construct a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% exact lcl for \( C_{peu} \), one first has to construct a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% exact lcl for \( \lambda \). Considering that the distribution of \( Y = \sum X_i \) is the Gamma, it can be proved that the distribution of the auxiliary random variable \( Z = \lambda Y \) does not depend on \( \lambda \). Actually, the pdf of \( Z \) is of the form \( g(z) = [\Gamma(\alpha)]^{-1/2} e^{-z} z^{\alpha-1}, z > 0 \). The assessment of a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% lcl for \( \lambda \) can be achieved using the \( 1 - \alpha \) quantile of the distribution of \( Z \). Denoting this quantile by \( c_1 \), we conclude that \( P(c_1 < Z) = 1 - \alpha \Rightarrow P(c_1/Y < \lambda) = 1 - \alpha \). Hence, the quantity \( c_1/Y \) is a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% exact lcl for \( \lambda \). Besides, since

\[
P\left(\frac{c_1}{Y} < \lambda\right) = P\left(\exp\left(-\frac{Uc_1}{Y}\right) > e^{-U}\right) = P\left(\frac{0.0027}{\exp(-Uc_1/Y)} < C_{peu}\right).
\]

it follows that a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% exact lcl for the index \( C_{peu} \) is given by

\[
\frac{0.0027}{\exp(-Uc_1/Y)}.
\] (4.3)

Similarly, denoting the \( 1 - \alpha \) quantile of \( Z \) by \( c_2 \) it can be shown that a 100(1 - \( \alpha \))\% lcl for \( C_{pec} \) is given by

\[
\frac{0.0027}{1 - \exp(-Uc_2/Y)}.
\] (4.4)

Note that the values of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) that are involved in the assessment of (4.3) and (4.4) can be obtained from any statistical package. Finally, if the sample size is sufficiently large, one may obtain approximate lower confidence limits for \( C_{pec} \) and \( C_{peu} \) based on the large sample properties of \( Y \).

5 DISCUSSION

In this paper, a new PCI is presented that overcomes many of the deficiencies of the standard PCIs. Some of the advantages of this index are that it can be used for processes with unilateral or bilateral tolerances, for continuous (normal or non-normal) or discrete processes, and can take into account the minimum acceptable process yield (if such a quantity has been set). Properties and estimation problems connected to this new index have been studied for normal and exponential processes. Because of its appealing features, examining its potential use in other types of processes often arising in connection with applications would be of practical value. Moreover, as already pointed out, one of the advantages of the new index is that its definition allows its use for discrete processes as well. It would therefore be interesting to examine the implementation of \( C_p \) in the case of other types of processes, continuous or discrete (e.g. chi-square, Poisson, negative binomial).
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