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1. Introduction

Nowadays individuals and companies depend more and more on complex systems for their daily functioning. The potential costs of breakdowns of these systems are quite high, so the maintenance of systems is crucial to increase their availability. Therefore, during the past decades, there has been a growing interest in the modeling and optimization of the maintenance of systems consisting of multiple components. For overviews on multicomponent maintenance optimization, we refer to Nicolai and Dekker (2006) and the references therein.

Maintenance activities usually involve an intervention cost and a component replacement cost. Typically, the intervention cost (e.g., set-up, repair, instrument or system down cost, etc.) is relatively high. To avoid immediate failure replacements, there is usually some redundancy, so that one can postpone the replacement of a failed component until the number of failed components reaches a certain predefined number. Moreover, the intervention cost can be reduced when maintenance activities on different components are executed simultaneously. Therefore, it is worthwhile to replace components preventively during maintenance of failed components.

In this paper, we consider the following modified $F$-group failure replacement rule. There are $J$ interchangeable components that may have different lifetime distributions. We say that two components are of the same type if their lifetime distribution is identical. We assume that there are $N$ types of components in the system and an age threshold is assigned to each type of component. Failed components will be kept idling for a certain time until there are in total $F$ failed components. Then, all failed components are replaced together with "old" nonfailed components. More precisely, if the age of a component of type $n$ upon the maintenance action has passed the critical threshold age $\theta_n$, then this component is preventively replaced. The age policy for the system is completely described by the vector $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_N)$. This is an opportunistic maintenance rule; see Dekker et al. (1998). According to the terminology in maintenance theory, we study an $N$-type $(J - F + 1)$-out-of-$J$ system, which means that at least $J - F + 1$ out of $J$ components must operate. If $F > 1$, then there is redundancy in the system and it fails less often than its individual components. This way a certain reliability can be guaranteed.

Upon each $F$-group failure, a maintenance action is taken. With each maintenance action, costs are associated. The optimal age policy is given by the value of $\theta$ that yields minimal average cost $C(T, \theta)$ over a given time period $T > 0$, which, for example, models the length of the contract period for maintenance. Note that under suitable stability conditions, choosing $T$ appropriately, $C(T, \theta)$ approximates the long-run average cost.

A typical application of the age-replacement policy to an $(N - 1)$-type $(J - F + 1)$-out-of-$J$ system is given in Dekker et al. (1998). Therein, the authors deal with maintenance of light standards illuminating a container terminal.
at Rotterdam harbor. Such a light standard consists of $J$ identical lights. To guarantee a minimum luminance, the lamps are replaced if the number of failed lamps reaches a predefined number $F$. To replace the lamps, the assembly has to be lowered. This set-up activity is an opportunity to combine corrective and preventive maintenance.

An example of applying the age-replacement policy to an $(N = 2)$-type $(J - F + 1)$-out-of-$J$ system is given in Ván der Duyn Schouten et al. (1998), where the problem of replacing light bulbs in traffic control signals is studied. More specifically, each installation consists of three compartments in which light bulbs serve the green, red, and yellow lights. The components (light bulbs) seem to be identical, but the yellow lights burn less often, and their failure rate differs from that of the other lights. Hence, two types of components can be defined in such a system.

In cost minimization, one is searching for the optimal solution $\theta^*$ such that

$$C(T, \theta^*) = \min_{0 < \theta < \infty, \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} C(T, \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n)}$$

(1)

However, most real-world systems violate the rather restrictive conditions for obtaining an explicit expression for $C(T, \theta)$ in terms of $\theta$ or suffer from intractability when the number of components grows. Thus, one has to resort to simulation for obtaining the optimal threshold value. A standard method for finding the optimal threshold value in an iterative procedure is stochastic approximation (SA). The general form of SA is

$$\theta(k + 1) = \Pi_{[0, \infty)}(\theta(k) - a_k \nabla C_k),$$

(2)

where $\theta(k)$ is the parameter vector at the beginning of iteration $k$, $\nabla C_k$ is an estimate of $\nabla C(T, \theta(k))$ (the gradient of $C(T, \theta(k))$), $a_k$ is a (positive) sequence of step sizes, and $\Pi_{[0, \infty)}$ is the projection onto $[0, \infty)$. It can be shown that under suitable conditions $\theta(k) \rightarrow \theta^*$ for $k$ toward $\infty$ with probability one. When $\nabla C(T, \theta(k))$ is an unbiased estimator for $\nabla C(T, \theta(k))$, (2) is called a Robbins-Monro algorithm, but when a finite difference estimator is used, it is called a Kiefer-Wolfowitz algorithm; see Kushner and Clark (1978) for more details. It is well known that the Robbins-Monro algorithm has faster convergence rates than the Kiefer-Wolfowitz algorithm. This motivates our research on unbiased, sample-path-based gradient estimation methods.

It is worth noting that, in general, state-independent policies are not optimal; see L’Ecuyer (1983) and Haurie and L’Ecuyer (1986). However, due to the complexity of the problem, computing an optimal state-dependent policy is usually computationally infeasible. Therefore, we restrict our analysis to the class of parameterized age-replacement policies described above.

We establish three unbiased gradient estimators based on measure-valued differentiation (MVD) for the derivative of $C(T, \theta)$ with respect to $\theta$ for a multicomponent system with general lifetime distribution. The key step for applying MVD is to derive a Markov chain description, so that the associated transition kernel is differentiable with respect to the components of the parameter vector. For a multicomponent maintenance system we first show how one can derive a Markov description with a differentiable kernel. Based on this result, we will introduce unbiased phantom estimators for $\nabla C(T, \theta)$.

To evaluate our phantom estimators, we perform a number of numerical experiments. For comparison, we choose finite differences (FD), two-sided FD, and the simultaneous perturbation (SP) method because they are the only estimators available for our problem; see §3 for a detailed discussion of other gradient estimators. We perform a numerical study with respect to two criteria:

1. the “work-normalized variance,” which balances the computational effort and variance of the estimator, and is given by the product of the variance and the expected work per run, see Glynn and Whitt (1992);
2. the number of iterations and the total computation time required for finding the optimal value for $\theta$ via SA.

This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we give a detailed description of the system model. A detailed discussion of the literature is provided in §3. In §4, we provide a brief discussion on the MVD method and the phantom processes, and we present the phantom estimator and the randomized phantom estimator. In §5, we introduce a new estimator, called the combined phantom estimator, and we provide sufficient conditions for unbiasedness of the phantom estimators. In §6, we first compare the performance of the phantom estimator with the FD, two-sided FD, and SP estimator according to the above criterion (1) with the help of a series of numerical experiments. We conclude §6 by comparing the estimators with respect to criterion (2) in an optimization.

2. The System Model

We consider a general maintenance system consisting of $N \geq 1$ types of components. There are $J_n \geq 1$ components of type $n$ and there are in total $\sum_{n=1}^{N} J_n = J$ components in the system. We denote by $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \ldots, J\}$ the set of components, and we denote by $\mathcal{J}_n$ the set of components belonging to type $n$. Without loss of generality, we assume that components are numbered in ascending order; i.e., component $1$ to $J_1$ are of type $1$ and $J_1 + 1$ to $J_1 + J_2$ are of type $2$, and so on. Furthermore, for any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$, we write $\mathcal{A}^c := \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}$.

The lifetime of the components of type $n$ are independent and identically distributed with cumulative distribution function $F_n(\cdot)$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, with density $f_n$. For reference, we introduce the following assumption.

**Assumption 1 (A1).** For each $n$, with $1 \leq n \leq N$, we assume that $f_n(\cdot)$ is continuous on its support and that the support of $f_n(\cdot)$ is a subset of $[0, \infty)$ containing at least $[0, T]$. 
Let \([j]\) denote the type of component \(j\); i.e., \([j] = n\) if and only if \(j \in J_n\). Then, the residual lifetime of the component \(j\) in state \(s = (\tau, u, a_1, \ldots, a_J) \in S\), denoted by \(R_j(s)\), has density
\[
h_j(t | a_j) = \frac{f_{ij}(t + a_j)}{1 - F_{ij}(a_j)}, \quad t \geq 0.
\] (3)

Note that (A1) implies that \(h_j(\cdot | a_j)\) in (3) is continuous on \([0, \infty)\). To avoid inflation of the subscript \(\theta \in (0, \infty)^N\) in the notation, we will suppress denoting the dependence on \(\theta\) when this leads to no confusion.

Let \((\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})\) denote a probability space and assume that all random variables introduced are defined on this probability space. We say that every \(F\)-failure causes a maintenance action and the \(F\)-failure epochs are called maintenance action epochs. We introduce the following variables:

- \(A(j, m)\), the age of component \(j\) right after the \(m\)th maintenance action epoch;
- \(\tau(m)\), the time at which the \(m\)th maintenance action takes place; with \(\tau(0) = 0\);
- \(T(m)\), the time elapsed between the \((m-1)\)st and the \(m\)th maintenance action; more specifically, \(T(m) = \tau(m) - \tau(m - 1)\) for \(m \geq 1\);
- \(\mathcal{J}(m)\), the set of components that have failed during time \(T(m)\);
- \(R(m)\), the set of components that have been preventively replaced at the \(m\)th maintenance epoch; note that \(R(m) \subseteq (\mathcal{J}(m))'\).

The system evolves as follows. The system starts at time zero with \(J\) components new. After \(\tau(k)\) time-units, the \(k\)th maintenance action occurs. Upon the \(k\)th maintenance action, the \(F\) failed components, given by set \(\mathcal{J}(k)\), are replaced and, due to our replacement policy, we preventively replace all components \(j \in R(k)\). More specifically, component \(j\) of type \([j]\) is preventively replaced if \(A(j, k - 1) + T(k) > \theta_{[j]}\). All replaced components are of age \(A(j, k) = 0\), and the nonreplaced components are of age \(A(j, k) = A(j, k - 1) + T(k)\).

We describe the system by a Markov chain
\[
X_0 \equiv \{X_0(m) : (\tau(m), T(m), A(1, m), \ldots, A(J, m)) : m \in \mathbb{N}\},
\]
and denote its state space by \(S \equiv [0, \infty)^{J+2}\). We assume that the system starts at time 0 with all components new and set \(X_0(0) = 0^{J+2}\), where \(0^{J+2}\) denotes the zero vector of length \(J + 2\). A given state \(s \in S\) is denoted by \(s = (\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_J)\), where \(\tau\) denotes the current time, \(t\) denotes the holding time, and \(a_j\) denotes the age of component \(j\). The transition kernel of this Markov chain is denoted by \(Q_\theta\); we will give the explicit form of \(Q_\theta\) in §5.1.

With each maintenance action, there is cost associated. Let \(g_c : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)\) be the cost function. For example, if the replacement of one component causes cost \(C_R > 0\) and the cost incurred for an intervention is \(C_I > 0\), then we obtain the classical cost function for \((\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_J) = s \in S\),
\[
g_c(s) \triangleq C_I + n(s)C_R.
\] (4)

where \(n(s) = \sum_{j=1}^J 1[a_j = 0]\) is the number of components replaced.

For \(s \in S\), we introduce the stopping time \(M(T, \theta) = \inf\{k \geq 1 : \tau(k) \geq T\}\) as the index of the first maintenance action after \(T\) provided that all components are initially new. The performance measure over a fixed time horizon \(C(T, \theta)\) can be written as
\[
C(T, \theta) = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M(T, \theta) - 1} g_c(X_\theta(i)) \right].
\] (5)

Differentiating the expression in (5) with respect to \(\theta_n\) yields
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} C(T, \theta) = \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M(T, \theta) - 1} g_c(X_\theta(i)) \right].
\] (6)

In what follows we will use MVD to establish unbiased estimators for the above expression.

### 3. Review of Literature

Optimization of a multicomponent maintenance system with age-replacement policy has been studied by L’Ecuyer et al. (1999) using a “split-and-merge” approach. This approach has been developed by Vázquez-Abad et al. (1996) and L’Ecuyer and Vázquez-Abad (1997). The key idea of this method is that different values of \(\theta\) only lead to finitely many different outcomes of the cycle costs; i.e., the sample cost is a piecewise constant function in \(\theta\). Simulating all possible alternatives in parallel, the method is capable of estimating the entire performance function within one experiment. For a single type \(J\)-out-of-\(J\) system (i.e., \(N = 1, F = 1\)), the authors proved that the expected growth rate of the tree is bounded linearly in the total number of simulated regenerative cycles and quadratic in the number of the components in the system. It is worth noting that the actual optimization based on the split-and-merge approach for threshold-type parameters (such as \(\theta\) defining our age-replacement policy) is still an open question; see L’Ecuyer (1993).

An importance-sampling-based approach to gradient estimation is the score-function (SF) method; see Rubinstein (1998). SF yields an unbiased gradient estimator through rescaling the observed sample-path performance by appropriate weights. SF is designed for sensitivity analysis w.r.t. distributional parameters and cannot be applied to our maintenance problem in a straightforward way. As pointed out in Rubinstein (1992), it is sometimes possible to translate the dependence of the sample performance on \(\theta\) into a
Consider the case of a single-type $J$-out-of-$J$ system (i.e., a single-type $J$-out-of-$J$ system) is analyzed. The estimator presented in Heidergott (2001) involves the computation of a polynomial that can only be solved explicitly in special cases. The estimator presented in our paper will not require computation of the polynomial as described in Heidergott (2001).

A weak derivative approach to optimization of the threshold parameters in a multicomponent maintenance system is given in Heidergott (2001). Therein, a maintenance system with identical components (i.e., a single-type $J$-out-of-$J$ system) is analyzed. The estimator presented in Heidergott (2001) involves the computation of a polynomial that can only be solved explicitly in special cases. The estimator presented in our paper will not require computation of the polynomial as described in Heidergott (2001).

The above sophisticated methods either do not apply to the cost optimization problem considered in this paper or are numerically inefficient. For this reason, we will resort to the general purpose methods such as FD, two-sided FD, and SP as benchmarks in our numerical experiments.

4. The Measure-Valued Differentiation Approach

4.1. Basic Definition

MVD is an extension of the concept of weak differentiation. For details on weak differentiation see Pflug (1996) and Heidergott et al. (2010b). The key step for the MVD approach is computing $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_n$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, i.e., the $n$th partial derivative of the Markov kernel of $X_\theta$. We refer to Heidergott and Vázquez-Abad (2008) for introductory examples of the MVD method. It is easily shown that $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_n$ fails to be a Markov kernel. Fortunately, one can represent $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_n$ by the rescaled difference between two Markov kernels $Q_\theta^{++}$ and $Q_\theta^{--}$. More specifically, let $Q_\theta$ be a Markov kernel on state-space $S$ and let $C^b$ denote the set of continuous bounded mappings from $S$ to $\mathbb{R}$. If for $n$, with $1 \leq n \leq N$, and $\forall \in S$,

$$\forall g \in C^b:\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} \int g(u)Q_\theta(s, du) = e_n^\circ(s)\left(\int g(u)Q_\theta^{++}(s, du) - \int g(u)Q_\theta^{--}(s, du)\right),$$

then $(e_n^\circ, Q_\theta^{++}, Q_\theta^{--})$ is called a partial weak derivative of $Q_\theta$ with respect to $\theta_n$; see Heidergott and Vázquez-Abad (2008). In shorthand notation, $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_n = c_n^\circ(Q_\theta^{++} - Q_\theta^{--})$. It can be shown that the fact that (7) holds for all $g \in C^b$ implies that $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_n$ is uniquely defined; see Billingsley (1966). Under quite general conditions, the existence of weak derivatives follows from a Hahn-Jordan-type decomposition for Markov kernels; see Heidergott et al. (2008). Note that $g_c$ defined in (4) is an element of $C^b$.

For the reader less acquainted with MVD, it is worth noting that (7) often can be checked in a simple way. Provided that $\theta$ is a distributional parameter (e.g., the mean of the distribution), MVD enjoys a modular structure: weak differentiability of the input distributions of a discrete event system imply, under quite general conditions, weak differentiability of the Markov kernel modeling the system process. For example, if the service time distribution in a $G/G/1$ queue is weakly differentiable with respect to $\theta$, then, under some mild integrability conditions, weak differentiability of the Markov kernel of the waiting times with respect to $\theta$ follows; see Heidergott et al. (2010a). Once weak differentiability of the Markov kernel of the system process is established, under appropriate stability conditions, weak differentiability of the Markov kernel of the system dynamic implies weak differentiability of the performance over a cycle or the stationary performance; see Heidergott and Vázquez-Abad (2006) and Heidergott et al. (2006). In case $\theta$ is a threshold parameter, as in the maintenance model under consideration, the analysis is more challenging because for this problem the Markov kernel has to be analyzed directly (i.e., the modular structure is lost). However, as we will show in this paper, for our maintenance problem the validity of (7) follows from two simple
assumptions, (A1) and (A2) (the latter being introduced in §5).

MVD for Markov chains is an operator approach to calculating derivatives of $k$-fold convolutions of Markov kernels such as $Q_\theta$. If $Q_\theta$ has partial weak derivative $(c^\theta, \alpha^\theta, Q^\theta_\alpha, Q^\theta_\alpha^-)$ with respect to $\theta_\alpha$, then in Heidergott and Vázquez-Abad (2008) it is shown that under quite general conditions

$$\frac{\partial Q^n_\theta}{\partial \theta_\alpha} = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j^\theta (Q_\theta^{k-j} Q_\alpha^\theta_\alpha Q_\theta^{j-1} - Q_\theta^{k-j} Q_\alpha^- Q_\theta^{j-1}). \quad (8)$$

Hence, $\partial Q_\theta/\partial \theta_\alpha$ and consequently the derivative of $\mathbb{E}[g(X_\theta(k+1)) \mid X_\theta(0) = s]$ with respect to $\theta_\alpha$, for $g \in C^b$, can be expressed by the sum over $k$ differences evaluated for appropriately defined Markov chains. More specifically, the transition kernel of these Markov chains is $Q_\theta$ except for one transition (indexed by $j$ in (8)) for which the transition kernel is replaced by either $Q_\alpha^\theta_\alpha$ or $Q^-_\alpha$, respectively. These versions of the nominal Markov chain $X_\theta$ are called "phantoms" and will be formally introduced in the next section (for an early reference on the use phantoms in gradient estimation, see Brémaud and Vázquez-Abad 1992). The formula for the derivative of cost accumulated over a fixed number of transitions can be easily derived from (8).

4.2. Phantom Processes for the $n$th Partial Derivative

The definition in (7) can be expressed in terms of random variables $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s)$ as

$$\forall g \in C^b: \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \mathbb{E}[g(X_\theta(k+1)) \mid X_\theta(0) = s] = \mathbb{E}_\theta [c^n_\theta(g(X^{n+}_\theta(s)) - g(X^{n-}_\theta(s)))] \quad (9)$$

for all $s \in S$, where $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s)$ are appropriately defined random variables such that for all $g \in C^b$ and all $s \in S$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta[g(X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s))] = \int g(u) Q^n_\theta(s, du). \quad (10)$$

We introduce the “plus” and “minus” processes $\{X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s, k) : k \geq 1\}$, called phantoms for the $n$th partial derivative, as follows. At a particular state $s$, the nominal process “splits” in three different trajectories. Suppose that the phantoms are generated from the $k$th state of $X_\theta$: that is, $s = X_\theta(k)$. The transition from $s$ to $X^{n+}_\theta(s, 1)$ is governed by $Q^{n+}_\theta$ and that from $s$ to $X^{n-}_\theta(s, 1)$ by $Q^{n-}_\theta$ respectively. That is, $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s, 1) = X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s)$, where $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s)$ satisfies expression (10). For $k > 1$, the transition from $X^{n+}_\theta(s, k-1)$ to $X^{n+}_\theta(s, k)$ is governed by $Q_\theta$. That is, after the splitting, the transition kernels are equal for the three processes. Consequently, for $k \geq 1$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s, k) \in A \mid X_\theta(k) = s) = (Q^{k-1}_\theta Q^{\pm}_\theta)(s; A)$$

for any $s \in S$ and any measurable $A \subset S$. In §5.2, we will show how to obtain $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s, 1)$ for our maintenance system. With the help of the phantom processes, operator Equation (8) now reads

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \mathbb{E}[g(X_\theta(k+1)) \mid X_\theta(0) = s] = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}[c_j^\theta (g(X^{n+}_\theta(X_\theta(j), k-j+1)) - g(X^{n-}_\theta(X_\theta(j), k-j+1))) \mid X_\theta(0) = s] \quad (11)$$

for all $g \in C^b$ and all $s \in S$.

Gradient estimation for the case that $X_\theta$ is evaluated over a random horizon is discussed in the following section.

4.3. Phantom Estimators

For $g \in C^b$ and $X_\theta(m) = s \in S$, $m \geq 1$, the scaled difference between the cumulative costs over the plus and minus phantoms for the $n$th partial derivative is given by

$$D^n(s,g) \triangleq c^n_\theta(s) \sum_{k=1}^{M(X^{n+}_\theta(s,1),T,\theta)-1} g(X^{n+}_\theta(s,k)) - \sum_{k=1}^{M(X^{n-}_\theta(s,1),T,\theta)-1} g(X^{n-}_\theta(s,k))). \quad (12)$$

where $M(s, T, \theta) = \inf\{k \geq 1 : X_\theta(k) \in [T, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{j+1}$ and $X_\theta(0) = s\}$. Note that with this definition it holds that $M(T, \theta) = M(0^{j+1}, T, \theta)$. In §5, we will derive the initial state of the plus and minus processes, i.e., $X^{\pm,n}_\theta(s,1)$, for maintenance systems. The computational burden for evaluating (12) can be reduced by coupling the phantoms; for details see §EC.1 in the electronic companion.

An electronic companion to this paper is available as part of the online version that can be found at http://or.journal.informs.org/.

For $g \in C^b$, the phantom estimator (PhE) for the $n$th partial derivative is given by

$$\text{PhE}^n(g) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{M(T, \theta)-1} D^n(s, X_\theta(k)). \quad (13)$$

PhE$^n(g)$ can be phrased as follows: at each state of the nominal processes a plus and a minus phantom for the $n$th partial derivative is generated and the derivative is estimated by the scaled difference between the cumulative costs over the plus and minus phantoms.

Alternatively, we may obtain the derivative by the so-called randomized phantom estimator (RPhE) for the $n$th derivative. It works as follows: (i) we first choose an integer $\sigma$ independent of everything else and uniformly distributed over $\{1, \ldots, M(T, \theta)-1\}$; (ii) we generate a plus and minus phantom at state $X_\theta(\sigma)$; and (iii) we evaluate the difference between the cumulative costs of the plus and the minus
phantom and rescale this difference by $M(T, \theta) - 1$. For all $g \in C^b$, the resulting estimator becomes

$$RPhE^z(g) \triangleq (M(T, \theta) - 1)D^z(g, X_\theta(\sigma)).$$

To the best of our knowledge, the idea of replacing the sum of $M(T, \theta) - 1$ by uniformly choosing one particular transition between 1 and $M(T, \theta) - 1$ for phantom generation first appeared in Vázquez-Abad and Davis (1995).

We conclude this section with a discussion of RPhE and PhE. The essential difference between these two estimators is that PhE generates, from each state of a simulation run, two phantoms (namely, the plus and minus phantoms, respectively), whereas RPhE generates phantoms only at one randomly chosen state. This essential difference is illustrated in Figure 1, which depicts the situation for a simulation run, two phantoms per cycle to be simulated (those generated at states $X_\theta(1)$ to $X_\theta(M(T, \theta) - 1)$), whereas RPhE only requires two phantoms per cycle to be simulated (those generated at $X_\theta(\sigma)$, with $\sigma$ uniformly distributed over $\{1, \ldots, M(T, \theta) - 1\}$). Numerical examples will illustrate the performance of these estimators in §6.

5. The Phantom Estimator for Multicomponent Maintenance Systems

5.1. The Markov Kernel

In this section, we provide a discrete-time Markov chain description of an $N$-type $F$-group failure multicomponent maintenance system such that its associate transition kernel is differentiable as a function in $\theta$. Note that the previously mentioned kernel $Q_\theta$ is being explicitly defined here. For $m \geq 0$, let

$$X_\theta(m + 1) = \phi(f(m + 1), R(m + 1), T(m + 1), X_\theta(m))$$

$$= (\tau(m) + T(m + 1), T(m + 1),$$

$$A(1, m + 1), \ldots, A(J, m + 1))$$

(15)

denote the state mapping function. The transition from $X_\theta(m)$ to $X_\theta(m + 1)$ as formalized in (15) can be phrased as follows: the transition from $X_\theta(m)$ to $X_\theta(m + 1)$ is triggered by the $F$-group failure of components $f(m + 1)$, the holding time of $X_\theta(m)$ is $T(m + 1)$, and the components out of $R(m + 1)$ are preventively replaced upon this failure. Moreover, the age of a component is updated as follows:

$$A(j, m + 1) = \begin{cases} 0, & j \in f(m + 1) \cup R(m + 1), \\ A(j, m) + T(m + 1), & j \in f(m + 1) \cup R(m + 1)^c. \end{cases}$$

(16)

The key idea for deriving the transition kernel $Q_\theta$ is as follows. Given the components which constitute the next $F$-group failure (i.e., $f(m + 1)$), the time to the next failure (i.e., $T(m + 1)$) can be determined. On the basis of the $F$-group failure and the holding time, the components which are preventively replaced (i.e., $R(m + 1)$) can be determined.

From (3), the transition out of $X_\theta(m) = s = (\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_J) \in S$ is triggered by a failure of component set $f(m + 1)$ with probability

$$P(f(m + 1) = f | X_\theta(m) = s)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in f} \int_0^\infty \left( \prod_{i \in f \setminus (j)} \int_0^u h_i(r | a_i) \, dr \right) \cdot \prod_{i \in f} \int_0^u h_i(r | a_i) \, dr h_j(u | a_j) \, du,$$

$s \in S$. Provided that components in $f(m + 1) = f$ trigger the transition out of state $X_\theta(m)$, the holding time
\[ T(m + 1) = T(\bar{f}) \text{ has distribution} \]
\[ \mathbb{P}(T(m + 1) \leq t, \bar{f}(m + 1) = \bar{f} | X_0(m) = s) \]
\[ = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left( \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} \int_0^t h_i(r | a_i) dr \right) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} \int_0^\infty h_i(r | a_i) dr \cdot h_j(u | a_j) du, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (17) \]

for \( s = (\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_j) \in S \). Thus, the density of \( T(\bar{f}) \), denoted by \( h(\bar{f}, t) \), can be calculated as follows:

\[ h(\bar{f}, t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} h_j(t | a_j) \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} \int_0^t h_i(r | a_i) dr \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} \int_0^\infty h_i(r | a_i) dr \]
\[ = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{f_j(t+a_j)}{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} (1-F_i(a_i))} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} (F_i(t+a_i)-F_i(a_i)) \]
\[ \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j\}} (1-F_i(t+a_i)). \quad (18) \]

Then, Equation (17) can be written as

\[ \mathbb{P}(T(m + 1) \leq t, \bar{f}(m + 1) = \bar{f} | X_0(m) = s) \]
\[ = \int_0^t h(\bar{f}, u) du, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (19) \]

We have explained at the beginning of this section that conditioning the holding time on the triggering \( F \)-group failure and the preventive replacements group is crucial for our analysis. However, in Equation (17), we only use the conditioning on the \( F \)-group failure. In what follows, we will present the conditioning on the preventive replacements group.

Given state \( s = (\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_j) \) and the set of components \( \mathcal{J} \) that triggers the transition out of state \( s \), the set of preventively replaced components is determined through the holding time \( T(\bar{f}) \). Indeed, component \( j \in \mathcal{J} \) is preventively replaced if and only if \( a_j + T(\bar{f}) > \theta_j \Leftrightarrow T(\bar{f}) > \theta_j - a_j \). Hence, there exists a partitioning of \([0, \infty]\) into a finite number of disjoint intervals \( \mathcal{J}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{J}_{N_0}(\bar{f}) \), along with a corresponding collection of distinct subsets \( \mathcal{R}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_{N_0}(\bar{f}) \subseteq \mathcal{J} \) such that the set of preventively replaced components is \( \mathcal{R}_i(\bar{f}) \) if and only if \( T(\bar{f}) \in \mathcal{J}_i \). In the following, we will construct this partitioning. This construction will depend on \( s \). However, to avoid a notational overflow, we will suppress the dependence on \( s \) in the notation.

For \( 1 \leq n \leq N \), we introduce the set of the critical holding times

\[ V_0(n, \bar{f}) = \{ \theta_n - a_i, i \in \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{J}_n \}, \quad (20) \]

which is the set of mutually different critical holding times of type \( n \) components. Let \( V_0(\bar{f}) := \bigcup_{n=1}^N V_0(n, \bar{f}) \) denote the set of all critical holding times, which is the basis for generating the partition of interval \([0, \infty]\). More specifically, if \( N_0(\bar{f}) \) denotes the number of elements of \( V_0(\bar{f}) \), then \( N_0(\bar{f}) + 1 \) is the number of partitions.

We now construct an ascending ordered vector of critical holding times \( U(\bar{f}) \) with \( U_0(\bar{f}) = 0, U_i(\bar{f}) < U_{i+1}(\bar{f}) \), and \( U_{N_0(\bar{f})+1}(\bar{f}) = \infty \) such that \( \mathcal{J}_i = (U_i(\bar{f}), U_{i+1}(\bar{f})) \), where \( U_i(\bar{f}) \) is defined as

\[ U_i(\bar{f}) = \min\{ t \in V_0(\bar{f}) : t > U_{i-1}(\bar{f}) \} \quad (21) \]

for \( 1 \leq i \leq N_0(\bar{f}) \). Consequently, if \( T(\bar{f}) \in \mathcal{J}_i \), then component \( j \) is preventively replaced if \( \theta_j - a_j < U_{i+1}(\bar{f}) \). Note that \( \mathcal{R}_i(\bar{f}) \) as a mapping of \( T(\bar{f}) \) is constant on \( \mathcal{J}_i \), and it holds that

\[ \mathcal{R}_i(\bar{f}) = \bigcup_{n=1}^N \{ j \in (\mathcal{J}_i \cap \mathcal{J}_n) : \theta_n - a_j < U_{i+1}(\bar{f}) \}. \quad (22) \]

Denote \( R(\bar{f}) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{N_0(\bar{f})} \mathcal{R}_i(\bar{f}) \) the set of all components that are potentially preventively replaced upon failure of the components in \( \bar{f} \).

To illustrate the relationship between the holding time \( T(\bar{f}) \) and the preventive replacement set \( R(\bar{f}) \), we give an example in §EC.2 in the electronic companion.

Based on Equations (19) and (22), we obtain

\[ \mathbb{P}(U_i(\bar{f}) < T(m + 1) \leq U_{i+1}(\bar{f}), R(m + 1) = \mathcal{R}_i(\bar{f}), \)
\[ \bar{f}(m + 1) = \bar{f} | X_0(m) = s) = \int_{U_i(\bar{f})}^{U_{i+1}(\bar{f})} h(\bar{f}, t) dt. \quad (23) \]

The transition dynamic of \( X_0 \) is completely described by (15) together with (23), and we denote the corresponding transition kernel of \( X_0 \) by \( Q_{\bar{f}} : Q_{\bar{f}}(s; A) = \mathbb{P}(X_0(m + 1) \in A | X_0(m) = s) \) for all \( s \in S \) and any measurable \( A \subseteq S \). Let \( \mathcal{J}' = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{J}_i \). For any \( g \in C_{\mathcal{J}'} \) and any \( s \in S \), we obtain

\[ \int g(u)Q_{\bar{f}}(s; du) = \int g(u)\mathbb{P}(X_0(m + 1) \in du | X_0(m) = s) \]
\[ = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}'} \sum_{i=0}^{N_0(\bar{f})} \int_{U_i(\bar{f})}^{U_{i+1}(\bar{f})} g(\theta, \mathcal{R}(\bar{f}, t), t, s) \]
\[ \cdot h(\theta, t)(dt). \quad (24) \]

Equation (24) concludes the construction of the Markov kernel \( Q_{\bar{f}} \). We introduce the following assumption.

**Assumption 2 (A2).** The components of \((\theta_n, 1 \leq n \leq N)\) are mutually distinct, that is, \( \theta_i \neq \theta_j \) for \( i, j \in [1, N] \) with \( i \neq j \).

Note that (A2) imposes no severe restriction to our maintenance system because different types of components have different distributions, i.e., different failure rates which leads to different age thresholds per type.

**Lemma 1.** Assume that (A2) holds for \((\theta_n, 1 \leq n \leq N)\). Then, there exists an open neighborhood \( \mathcal{O}_\theta \) of \( \theta \), such that \( N_0(\bar{f}) \) and \( R_i(\bar{f}), 0 \leq i \leq N_0(\bar{f}) \), are constant on \( \mathcal{O}_\theta \) as a mapping of \( \theta \). Moreover, \( U_i(\bar{f}) \) is differentiable for \( 0 \leq i \leq N_0(\bar{f}) \) and it holds:

\[ \frac{d}{d \theta_n} U_i(\bar{f}) = \begin{cases} 0, & U_i(\bar{f}) \notin V_0(n, \bar{f}), \\ 1, & U_i(\bar{f}) \in V_0(n, \bar{f}). \end{cases} \quad (25) \]
The proof of this lemma is presented in §EC.4 in the electronic companion. Note that in case (A2) fails, a result similar to that in Lemma 1 holds for one-sided derivatives.

5.2. The Phantom Estimator

So far, we have developed a transition kernel for \( X_\theta \) such that the kernel is differentiable with respect to \( \theta_n \) for \( 1 \leq n \leq N \); see Lemma 1. In what follows, we will calculate the partial derivatives and represent them as the difference of two suitable transition kernels. Let \( \mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J}) \) denote the essential-time index set, which indicates where the partial derivative with respect to \( \theta_n \) has nonzero value,

\[
\mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J}) = \{ 1 \leq i \leq N_\theta(\mathcal{J}) : U_i(\mathcal{J}) \in V(n, \mathcal{J}) \}.
\]

A simple example illustrating the construction of \( \mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J}) \) is given in §EC.3 in the electronic companion. For \( s = (\tau, t, a_1, \ldots, a_j) \in S \), set

\[
c^n(s) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J})} h(\mathcal{J}, U_i(\mathcal{J})).
\]

By construction, \( \mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J}) \) and \( U_i(\mathcal{J}) \) are measurable mappings in \( s \) (see (26), and (20) together with (21)), and \( c^n(\cdot) \) is thus measurable. We now introduce discrete probabilities on \( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}(n, \mathcal{J})}(\mathcal{J}, i) \), by

\[
p^n(\mathcal{J}, i) = \frac{h(\mathcal{J}, U_i(\mathcal{J}))}{c^n(s)}.
\]

We define \( X^n_\theta(\tau) \) and \( X^n_-\theta(\tau) \) as follows. With probability \( p^n(\mathcal{J}, i) \), we let

\[
X^n_\theta(\tau) = \phi(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R}_{i-1}(\mathcal{J}), U_i(\mathcal{J}), s) \quad \text{and} \quad X^n_-\theta(\tau) = \phi(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R}_i(\mathcal{J}), U_i(\mathcal{J}), s).
\]

The phantom processes are now constructed as described in §4.2, where the initial state of the phantom is given by \( X^n_\theta(\tau, 1) = X^n_\theta(\tau) \). With this notation at hand (as shown in §EC.5 in the electronic companion), it holds for any \( s \in S \) and \( g \in C^b \) that

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} \mathbb{E}_\theta[g(X_\theta(k + 1)) | X_\theta(k) = s] = \mathbb{E}_\theta[g(X^n_\theta(s)) - g(X^n_-\theta(s))].
\]

Thus, we have obtained an explicit representation of \( (\partial/\partial \theta_n) \int g(u)Q_\theta(s; du) \); compare (30) with (9). Introducing the phantom processes for the \( n \)th partial derivative \( \{X^n_\theta(\tau, k) : k \geq 1 \} \), as described in §4.2, the phantom estimators for \( \partial C(T, \theta)/\partial \theta_n \) can be obtained from Equation (13).

We summarize the analysis in the following theorem (for a proof, see §EC.6 in the electronic companion).

Theorem 1. Let conditions (A1) and (A2) be satisfied. Then, it holds for all \( g \in C^b \) that

\[
\frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M(T, \theta) - 1} g(X_\theta(i)) \right] = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_\theta[PhE^n(g)]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_\theta[RPhE^n(g)].
\]

5.3. Extension of the Phantom Estimator

As explained in §4, we have proposed two gradient estimators: the phantom estimator (PhE) and the randomized phantom estimator (RPhE). PhE uses formula (6) together with (13) and RPhE uses formula (6) together with (14) to calculate the gradient of \( C(T, \theta) \). For these estimators, the gradient information is obtained from the scaled difference between the cumulative costs over the plus and minus phantoms. Therefore, for each sample path, PhE needs \( 2(M(T, \theta) - 1) \) phantoms per simulation run. Simulating the phantoms can be stopped either when the phantoms couple or when the time horizon \( T \) is reached. The coupling is achieved if the plus and minus phantom simultaneously hit the set \( [0, \infty]^2 \times \{ 0 \} \) and the time to this event is denoted by \( \gamma^n(\tau) \); see §EC.1 in the electronic companion for details. If the probability that the plus and minus phantom simultaneously hit the set \( [0, \infty]^2 \times \{ 0 \} \) decreases, \( \gamma^n(\tau) \) will increase, which implies that many phantoms need to be simultaneously simulated. In such a situation PhE will have a "phantom overflow" problem, leading to a heavy storage and computational burden. In contrast, RPhE only generates two phantoms each run, but at the price of higher variance.

To control the number of phantoms that have to be simulated simultaneously, we combine PhE and RPhE in the following way. For each sample path, we only generate \( N_{Ph} \) phantoms, where the number \( N_{Ph} \) is predefined by the user. That means we generate two phantoms (plus and minus phantom) per batch of \( ([M(T, \theta) - 1]/N_{Ph}) \) failures. Within each batch of failures, we apply the randomized phantom method. Therefore, we will simulate in total \( 2N_{Ph} \) phantoms instead of \( 2(M(T, \theta) - 1) \). This allows control of the computational burden and the variance through \( N_{Ph} \).

We call this the combined phantom estimator (CPhE), which can be written as follows:

\[
\text{CPhE}^n(g) \triangleq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_{Ph} - 1} C_1 D^n(g, X_\theta(\sigma_1(k))) \right) + C_2 D^n(g, X_\theta(\sigma_2))
\]

(31)

where \( C_1 = ([M(T, \theta) - 1]/N_{Ph}) \), \( C_2 = M(T, \theta) - 1 - C_1(N_{Ph} - 1) \), \( \sigma_1(k) \) is an integer uniformly distributed on \( \{ 1 + (k - 1)C_1, \ldots, kC_1 \} \), and \( \sigma_2 \) is an integer uniformly distributed on \( \{ 1 + (N_{Ph} - 1)C_1, \ldots, C_2 + (N_{Ph} - 1)C_1 \} \). The following theorem provides sufficient conditions for unbiasedness of \( \text{CPhE}^n(g) \) (for a proof, see §EC.7 in the electronic companion).

Theorem 2. Let conditions (A1) and (A2) be satisfied. Then, it holds for all \( g \in C^b \) that

\[
\frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_n} \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M(T, \theta) - 1} g(X_\theta(i)) \right] = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_\theta[\text{CPhE}^n(g)].
\]


6. Numerical Results

6.1. General Experiment Settings

In the previous section, we have analyzed a general \((J - F + 1)\)-out-of-\(J\) maintenance system with \(N\)-types of components. In this section, we will perform experiments on a system with two types of components. We assume that both types of components have a Weibull-\((\alpha, \beta)\) distribution, i.e., \(F_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = 1 - \exp(-(\alpha x)^{\beta})\). We choose the Weibull parameter for both types as \(\alpha_1 = 0.8930, \beta_1 = 3\) and \(\alpha_2 = 0.8862, \beta_2 = 2\). That is, the lifetime distributions have a long right tail and first moment equal to one. However, type 1 components have higher failure rate than type 2 components. Because the cost incurred for failure intervention \(C_i\) is usually higher than the replacement cost per component \(C_K\), we set \(C_i = 4\) and \(C_K = 1\).

As discussed in §3, we apply the finite difference (FD) method. This leads to the “twin numerical evils” of approximation error (approximating the slope of a curve by its secant) and numerical noise (dividing by small \(\Delta \theta\)); see Strickland (1993). Any application of the FD method involves a trade-off between these two effects. Thus, we first perform a series of numerical experiments to identify a good setting for the FD estimator.

For \(N > 1\), the control threshold parameter \(\theta\) is an \(N\)-dimensional vector, and we need to solve a multivariate optimization problem. In this case, the standard FD approach perturbs each component \(\theta_i\) of \(\theta\) one at a time and the two-sided FD approximation of \(\nabla C(T, \theta)\) is given by

\[
\nabla C(T, \theta) \approx \left( \frac{C(T, \theta + c e_i) - C(T, \theta - c e_i)}{2c} \right)
\]

\[
\ldots \frac{C(T, \theta + c e_n) - C(T, \theta - c e_n)}{2c} \right),
\]

where \(e_i\) denotes a vector with a one in the \(i\)th place and zeros elsewhere. FD requires \(2N\) measurements, which is usually not very efficient. The SP method, as introduced by Spall (1987) and more fully analyzed in Spall (1992), overcomes this drawback. The essential feature of SP is its underlying gradient approximation that requires only two measurements per iteration independent of the dimension \(N\). SP has all elements of \(\theta\) randomly perturbed together (simultaneously) to obtain two measurements \(C(T, \cdot)\), but each component of \(\nabla C(T, \theta)\) is formed from a ratio involving the difference in the two corresponding measurements and the individual components in the perturbation vector. For two-sided SP, we have

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} C(T, \theta) \approx \frac{C(T, \theta + c \Delta) - C(T, \theta - c \Delta)}{2c \Delta_i}
\]

for \(1 \leq i \leq n\),

where \(\Delta_i\) is the \(i\)th component of the \(\Delta\) vector (which may be \(\pm 1\) random variables). Note that the common numerator in all \(N\) components of \(\nabla C(T, \theta)\) reflects the simultaneous perturbation of all components in \(\theta\). This provides the potential for large savings in the overall cost of optimization.

6.2. Gradient (Sensitivity) Estimation

As presented in §4.3, if both phantom processes simultaneously hit set \([0, \infty)^2 \times 0^J\), we can terminate simulating the phantoms. That is, simulating the phantoms can be stopped either after \(\gamma(s)\) transitions or when the time horizon \(T\) is reached. We mentioned in §5.3 that PhE will have a “phantom overflow” problem. In the following example, we show how this effects the simulation time of PhE.

**Example 1.** We perform an experiment on a small system, with \(N = 2, F = 2, J_1 = 3, J_2 = 3\), and let \(T = 14,000\) time units. We fix \(\theta_2 = 0.6\), and the number of replications is 20. The computation time of PhE as a function of \(\theta_1\) is depicted in Figure 2. Note that the computation time increases exponentially as \(\theta\) increases. The main reason for this increase is that the probability decreases that, upon the failure of in total two components (\(F = 2\)), the ages of all \(J - F = 4\) operational components are larger than \(\theta\). The phantoms, therefore, couple too slowly. The phantom estimator requires simulating approximately \(N \times \min(\gamma(X_0(k)), M(T, \theta - k + 1) + 1)\) additional failures; see Figure 1. As a result, if \(\theta\) increases, the computational burden (i.e., the number of phantoms) also increases which leads to higher simulation time.

As presented in §5.3, PhE has large computational burden while RPhE has high variance. Because these two estimators require different computational efforts, which leads to different variance, it is important to reflect effort appropriately. A standard measure, dating at least to Hammerley and Handscomb (1964) and formalized in a general framework by Glynn and Whitt (1992), compares estimators based on the product of variance and expected effort per run. This is the work-normalized variance (WNV).

For the set-up in Example 1, we compare the half confidence interval width, the computation time, the variance, and the WNV of these two estimators in Table 1. PhE has much smaller variance than RPhE, but it takes PhE much more time than RPhE. Nevertheless, PhE has smaller work-normalized variance than RPhE. This indicates that, if PhE is applicable, PhE has better performance than RPhE.

**Figure 2.** The computation time of PhE for a 2-type 5-out-of-6 system.
For the model in Example 1, RPhE suffers from a high variance and the number of simulation runs has to be increased to obtain a relatively accurate gradient estimation. PhE, on the other hand, has a high computational burden due to the fact that there are too many parallel phantoms needed to be simulated. To control the number of phantoms that have to be simulated simultaneously, we use CPhE; see §5.3. We illustrate the influence of \( N_{ph} \) on the performance of this estimator in the following example.

**Example 2.** In this experiment, a two-type component maintenance system is studied, with \( J_1 = 4, J_2 = 6, F = 2 \), and the time horizon is set to \( T = 14,000 \) time units. Numerical experiments for different values of \( N_{ph} \) for CPhE show that with increasing \( N_{ph} \) the WNV of the combined phantom estimator is decreasing. (The detailed results are presented in tabular form in §EC.8 of the electronic companion.) Therefore, in practice there is a trade-off between low variance and short computation time for large maintenance systems. The choice of the value of \( N_{ph} \) is up to the user.

Example 2 suggests the following rule of thumb. If the computation time underlies no restriction, one can choose a large value for \( N_{ph} \) to obtain a small variance of the gradient estimator. On the other hand, if the computational burden becomes an issue, one can decrease the value of \( N_{ph} \) to obtain the best gradient estimation within a given restriction of computation time and storage limitation. Determining a priori the optimal setting of \( N_{ph} \) is a topic of further research.

For the setup of Example 2, we compare the WNV of CPhE, SP, and FD in Figure 3. To apply FD and SP, we have first performed a series of experiments and determined \( c = 0.001 \) as an appropriate choice in (32) and (33). For CPhE, we choose \( N_{ph} = 200 \), which has relatively low computational burden while the WNV is relatively high. As can be seen from the figure, even for such a setting, the CPhE estimator outperforms the other methods. On average, the WNV of FD, two-sided FD, and SP is, respectively, 10, 6, and 7 times that of CPhE with \( N_{ph} = 200 \).

It is worth noting that for estimating a single partial derivative, the phantom estimator is more efficient than the SP method, but as the dimension of \( \theta \) increases, this advantage will be compromised. The reason is that the phantom estimator requires \( N \) estimates for the gradient, whereas SP only requires one simulation for all the gradient estimations. However, phantom estimators provide the possibility for parallel computing because the plus and minus phantoms can be simulated independently from the nominal phantom. To explore the speed-up factor by using parallel computing in gradient estimation is a topic of further research.

### 6.3. Optimization

In this section, we perform a few simulation experiments illustrating the use of the phantom estimator(s) for optimization in the case of a 10-component maintenance system. We use the SA iteration algorithm in Equation (2). For SA, the parameter \( c \) in Equations (32) and (33) needs to be updated per iteration, and the value of \( c \) will be denoted by \( c_k \) for the \( k \)th iteration. The choice of the gain sequences (\( a_k \) in Equation (2) and \( c_k \)) is critical to the performance, and we follow the practical suggestions for choosing these parameters as proposed by Spall (1998).

**Example 3.** We first perform an optimization for a single-type 10-out-of-10 maintenance system; i.e., \( N = 1, F = 1 \),
and the horizon $T = 20,000$. Because $N = 1$, one can just use FD to approximate the gradient information rather than SP. The number of simulation runs in each iteration is chosen as 20. By following the suggestions presented in Spall (1998), we choose $a = 0.02$ and $a_k = a/(k + 1)$. We terminate the algorithm when the difference between two successive iterations is smaller than 0.005 in three successive iterates; i.e., $|C(T, \theta_{k+1}) - C(T, \theta_k)| < 0.005$. We use CPhE with $N_{ph} = 1,000$ to estimate the gradient information. The iteration traces of both methods during the SA optimization of a 10-component system are shown in Figure 4.

The best solutions of both methods are shown in Table 2. FD takes 10 iterations to obtain the optimal result of $C(T, \theta^*) = 37.130482$ with $\theta^* = 0.455579$, whereas CPhE only needs 5 iterations to obtain the optimal result of $C(T, \theta^*) = 37.130362$ with $\theta^* = 0.444829$. Note that the fitted curve of $C(T, \theta)$ as a function of $\theta$ is rather flat on $[0.4, 0.5]$; see Figure 4. This explains why FD and CPhE yield similar values for $C(T, \theta^*)$ with different values for $\theta^*$. The algorithm using CPhE converges around 2 times as fast as the one using the FD estimator.

Next, we optimize 2-type maintenance systems. In these cases, we use the SP method to approximate the gradient.

Example 4. We test a 2-type 9-out-of-10 maintenance system. We use CPhE with $N_{ph} = 100$ to estimate the gradient information, and the number of runs per iteration is 20. The value of parameters are chosen as $a = 0.165, A = 2, \alpha = 0.602, c = 0.001, \b = 0.101$. The algorithm evolves as shown in Figure 5. The best solutions of both methods are shown in Table 3. The SA algorithm using SP takes 17 iterations converging to the optimal value, whereas the one using CPhE only takes 9 iterations. Furthermore, SP consumes almost twice the CPU time as CPhE to reach the best solution.

7. Conclusion and Further Work

In this paper, we have established unbiased gradient estimators based on measure-valued differentiation for the derivative of the average cost for a multicomponent system with a general lifetime distribution with respect to the parameter of an age-replacement policy. On a theoretical level, the paper presents the first gradient estimator for a multicomponent system with modified $F$-group failure replacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta^*$</th>
<th>$C(T, \theta^*)$</th>
<th>No. of iterations</th>
<th>Computation time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>0.455579</td>
<td>37.130482</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPhE</td>
<td>0.444829</td>
<td>37.130362</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The optimization performance comparison between FD and CPhE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(\theta_1^<em>, \theta_2^</em>)$</th>
<th>$C(T, \theta^*)$</th>
<th>No. of iterations</th>
<th>Computation time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>(0.547110, 0.674446)</td>
<td>23.818845</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPhE</td>
<td>(0.536216, 0.687814)</td>
<td>23.816568</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The optimization performance comparison between SP and CPhE.

Figure 5. The SA iteration trace in the optimization of a 2-type 9-out-of-10 maintenance system.
On a practical level, we derive gradient estimators tailored to situations typically encountered in practice, where the best gradient estimation has to be found within a fixed simulation budget.

On a more general note, the study of this paper exemplifies the difficulty of comparison between different methods. We believe that our study highlights the need for a framework for comparing gradient-based and gradient-free methods as initiated by Pasupathy and Henderson (2006).

The study of maintenance systems with highly reliable components has not been addressed in this paper. Simulations of highly reliable systems take a long time to execute because failures happen so rarely that gathering sufficient failure statistics is extremely slow. For such highly reliable systems, rare-event simulation techniques (e.g., importance sampling) need to be applied. By following the analysis presented in §5.1, one can derive a differential Markov kernel for such a system and then obtain the phantom estimator. However, a detailed analysis is a topic of further research.

Phantom estimators obtain gradient information from the difference between phantom processes. The shorter the phantom processes need to be simulated, the more efficient the phantom estimator becomes. How to find an efficient coupling for the phantoms to improve the performance is a topic of further research.

8. Electronic Companion

An electronic companion to this paper is available as part of the online version that can be found at http://or.journal.informs.org/.
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