

STA2005S - Experimental Design Assignment

Jing Yeh

yxjin001@myuct.ac.za

Saurav Sathnarayan

sthsau01001@myuct.ac.za

2024-09-15

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Compiled vs Interpreted Languages	4
1.2	Distribution of Execution Times:	5
2	Methods	6
2.1	Setting	6
2.2	Approximation of π	6
2.3	Sampling Procedure	6
2.4	Sources of Variation	7
2.5	Experimental Units:	7
2.6	Randomisation Procedure	7
2.7	Planned Comparisons	7
2.8	Pilot Experiment	8
2.9	Design	8
3	Results	10
3.1	Verifying Model	10
3.2	Pairwise Comparisons	11
3.3	Compiled vs Interpreted	12
4	Discussion	14
5	Conclusion	14
6	Appendix	15
	References	16

List of Figures

1	Runtimes of Programming Languages of Interest When Applying Leibniz's Formula up to 100 million terms	5
2	Interaction Graph of Programming Languages and Blocks	8
3	Diagram of the Design	9
4	The ANOVA table and Relavent Plots	10
5	Results of Tukey's Honestly Significance Difference Test. Values Greater than HSD are Highlighted in Blue	11

List of Tables

3	Table of Pcs used and their respective specifications	15
4	Table of data used for analysis	15

1 Introduction

Computation has played a major role in human history ever since people began living in cities. The need to calculate taxes motivated the invention of various computing devices that aided such computations, such as the Sumerian abacus, invented in Babylon at around 2500BC [7]. In the 21st century, the capability of our digital computing devices have vastly surpassed the capacity of those proto-computers, but so has our need for computational power. Everything in our daily life requires some form of computers: from our phones, cars, to even our refrigerators (side note: initially, Java was invented for refrigerators).

However, with large computation capability comes complexity in the design of these devices: to speak plainly, they are damn difficult to use. Computer scientists have therefore invented numerous *programming languages* that allow us to harness the power of these devices more easily.

Nowadays, programming languages have become the primary medium for instructing computers to perform our increasingly complex tasks. Understanding which programming languages offer superior execution speed is therefore crucial for developers, especially in domains requiring real-time processing, large-scale data analysis, and other resource-intensive computations. The goal of this experiment is to identify such languages that deliver the fastest execution time.

1.1 Compiled vs Interpreted Languages

In a compiled language, the source code is translated into machine code by a compiler before execution. In an interpreted language, however, the source code is executed line-by-line by an interpreter at runtime. The interpreter reads the code, translates it into machine code, and executes it all at once. This machine code, often called an executable, can be run directly by the computer's hardware. Compiled languages tend to have better performance due to the pre-compiled nature of the code, whereas interpreted languages are more flexible but slower due to the runtime translation.

Examples: C, C++, Rust, and Java are examples of compiled languages. Python, JavaScript, Ruby, and R are examples of interpreted languages.

Key Differences: Compiled languages require a compilation step that produces an executable, while interpreted languages are executed directly by an interpreter.

1.2 Distribution of Execution Times:

Since existing literature on the execution times of programming languages when applying Leibniz's formula is limited, we performed an a priori test to gauge the execution time for the programming languages we planned on experimenting with. We performed 500 approximations using the algorithm for each programming language and obtained the following jittered graph.




Figure 1: Runtimes of Programming Languages of Interest When Applying Leibniz's Formula up to 100 million terms

We can observe that C and C++ seem to be the fastest languages, though further analyses are needed. We can also see from the Quantile-Quantile(Q-Q) plots that the execution times are clearly not normally distributed.

2 Methods

2.1 Setting

This study was mostly conducted at the University of Cape Town, utilising the computers available on campus. We found that there are only 5 different hardware setups available. Thus, to supplement the range of our hardware setups, we also borrowed machines of 2 more hardware setups from our friends.

2.2 Approximation of π

The number π , the ubiquitous and equally mysterious irrational number, has been fascinating the humankind since time immemorial. Mathematicians from 4000 years ago to the present day have devised various methods to get closer to the true value of π . One such method is using Leibniz's formula:

$$4 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{9} \dots \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{2k+1}$$

Leibniz, whom the formula is named after, proved that the series above eventually converges to π . That is:

$$\pi = 4 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{9} \dots \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{2k+1}.$$

We applied this algorithm in 6 programming languages, including 3 compiled languages: C, C++, Java, and 3 interpreted languages: Python, R, Ruby, up to a 100×10^6 terms.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

Since existing literature tend to suggest that execution times of programming languages are not normally distributed, we perform a priori tests to confirm that none of our languages has normally distributed runtime. This is an issue as it prevented us to apply anova models. To address this, we applied the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) to obtain a normal distribution for the average execution times. We ran the program 15 times per sample for each programming language, and repeated the process 30 times. Applying CLT, it is relatively safe to assume the distribution of sample means is approximately normal [2]. If we assume sample means to be normally distributed, the mean of the distribution of sample means is then an unbiased estimator for the true run time of each programming language [2], which we will take as a single observation. (Note: We arrived at the number 15 through trial and error, and 30 from [8])

2.4 Sources of Variation

Treatments: We have 6 treatment factors, which are the programming languages we applied the algorithm to. Each treatment has one level (applying the formula up to 100×10^6 terms). We selected this particular level because it is the largest, practical number of terms we could apply with our hardware setups (For some setups, it may take up to 4 hours to arrive at a single observation), and fewer terms imply larger relative measurement error [7]. We cannot include more levels because in the existing literature, most studies of such kind choose to run all languages on the same machine. However, since we would like to avoid pseudo replication as much as possible we used one machine per observation. The downside of this approach is that we do not have sufficient machines to perform more than one level.

Blocks: We know that the hardware setup of a computer can significantly affect its speed, and therefore the execution time of our algorithm. We also know that, two computers with the same hardware setup should have relatively the speed, provided that they run on the same operating system, and no major damage has been done to either of them. This motivated us to block for the hardware setup of computers, our experimental units.

2.5 Experimental Units:

As mentioned earlier, we would like to avoid pseudo replication as much as possible. Therefore, we deviated from the tradition of running all programming languages on the same machine, and test only one language per machine. Our experimental units are therefore the individual machines we ran each test on.

2.6 Randomisation Procedure

We first ordered the computers belonging to each block from 1 to 6. We then used the random number generator from Python's *random* module to randomly shuffle, and thus producing a permutation of the list, [C, C++, Java, Python, Ruby, R]. The index of each programming language in the permutation would then be paired to the computer with the same assigned number.

2.7 Planned Comparisons

We planned to conduct pairwise comparisons on all treatments. That is, a total of $\binom{6}{2} = 15$ comparisons. It would also serve our objective by comparing the efficiency of compiled languages (C, C++, Java) and interpreted languages (Python, Ruby, R), as the latter are oftentimes easier to program with. This allows us to better assess the time-cost trade off of these programming languages.

2.8 Pilot Experiment

We followed this direction and performed an pilot study to obtain the following execution times of programming languages on 4 hardware setups




Figure 2: Interaction Graph of Programming Languages and Blocks

From the data collected, we observed that the results collected from Ishango do not follow the general trends established by the other three setups. Firstly, the hardware setup in Ishango lab is significantly less advance than MiddleTRNew. Yet, most programming languages tend to perform better on the Ishango machine. Secondly, to add to the first observation, not all programming languages perform better on the Ishango machine.

After further investigation, we learned that programming languages perform differently on various operating systems [4]. We hypothesised that this is likely the reason for the deviation, though further studies are needed to confirm this (we lack access to machines with the same hardware setup but run on different operating system).

Therefore, we added another constraint for selecting suitable machines: the machines must all run on Windows 10, as these machines are the most widely available.

2.9 Design

We assume that:

$$e_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

We use the following anova model for our response variables:

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + e_{ij}$$

$$i = 1 \dots a$$

$$j = 1 \dots b$$

With the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i=1}^a \alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^b \beta_j = 0$$

Where:

μ	overall mean
α_i	effect of i^{th} treatment
β_j	effect of j^{th} block
e_{ij}	random error of the observation

We also assume that each e_{ij} is independent to each other, which allows us to assume that each Y_{ij} is also independent to each other, and are normally distributed. If there are no blocking and treatment effects, then:

$$Y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

Otherwise, if there are blocking and treatment effects, then:

$$Y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j, \sigma^2)$$

Below is the layout of the design

PC Spec	Treatment					
Ishango	Java	C	Python	Ruby	C++	R
MiddleTROld	R	C++	Python	C	Ruby	Java
MiddleTRNew	Python	R	Java	C	C++	Ruby
ScilabB	Python	Java	Ruby	R	C	C++
ASUS (i7-5500u)	C	C++	R	Ruby	Python	Java
ScilabD	C	Python	Java	R	Ruby	C++
LT	C	Java	R	C++	Ruby	Python
HP (i5-7200)	R	Python	Ruby	C++	Java	C

Figure 3: Diagram of the Design

3 Results

We performed the experiment described above on 7 different hardware setups and applied all 6 treatments. Detailed tables for data and for hardware setups can be found in the appendix. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) table is shown below:

	Df	Sum sq	Mean sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Language	5	65.2112	13.0422	285.9459	< 0.0001
Hardware	6	6.5717	1.0953	24.0136	< 0.0001
Residuals	30	1.3683	0.0456		




Figure 4: The ANOVA table and Relavent Plots

3.1 Verifying Model

We verified our model by observing the Fitted vs Residuals graph: the residuals seem to be randomly spread, with no obvious patterns to be discerned. This shows evidence for homoscedasticity (equal variance) [7]. Also, the Quantile-Quantile graph offers a fairly good fit, providing evidence for residuals being normally distributed.

We further verified our assumptions by performing Shapiro Wilk test to test against the normality assumption of residuals. We obtained a fairly large p-value of 0.7521,

indicating that we have little evidence to suggest otherwise. Further, we also got that the mean of the residuals is approximately zero ($< 10^{-15}$), indicating that it is sensible to assume $e_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

3.2 Pairwise Comparisons

C	CPP	Java	Python	Ruby	R
2.6786	2.6586	3.0568	3.7041	4.1582	3.3732

Given that we know our response variables are normally distributed, we used Tukey's Method to construct 95% confidence intervals that compare the execution time of every possible pair of our 6 programming languages. Since we know the estimate of the standard deviation of residuals, we can estimate the standard error (SE) of our treatment means, and then use it to deduce Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference(HSD):

$$SE = \frac{s}{\sqrt{b}}$$

$$= \frac{0.0456}{\sqrt{13}}$$

$$HSD = q_{6,30}^{0.05} \frac{s}{\sqrt{b}}$$

$$= 4.3015 \times \frac{\sqrt{0.0456}}{\sqrt{13}}$$

$$= 0.2535$$

DIFFERENCE	C	CPP	Java	Python	Ruby	R
C		0.0182	0.3799	0.9891	1.4598	0.6719
CPP			0.3981	1.0073	1.4780	0.6901
Java				0.6092	1.0799	0.2921
Python					0.4707	-0.3172
Ruby						-0.7879
R						

Figure 5: Results of Tukey's Honestly Significance Difference Test. Values Greater than HSD are Highlighted in Blue

We can see from the table of Tukey's HSD tests at 95% confidence level, that C and C++ have the fastest execution times than others when performing the algorithm up to 100×10^6 terms. The results can be summarised as follows:

$$t(C) \approx t(C++) < t(Java) < t(R) < t(Python) < t(Ruby)$$

The p-values for comparatively more significant results (p-value > 0.005) are given below:

- R vs Python: 0.0173
- R vs Java: 0.0080

3.3 Compiled vs Interpreted

We were also interested in comparing the execution times of compiled languages and interpreted languages. The contrast, L , can be stated as follows:

$$L = \frac{1}{3}(\mu_C + \mu_{C++} + \mu_{Java}) - \frac{1}{3}(\mu_{Python} + \mu_{Ruby} + \mu_R)$$

We can estimate the values relevant to the contrast as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L} &= \frac{1}{3}(\bar{y}_C + \bar{y}_{C++} + \bar{y}_{Java}) - \frac{1}{3}(\bar{y}_{Python} + \bar{y}_{Ruby} + \bar{y}_R) \\ &= -0.9198 \\ \widehat{Var}(\hat{L}) &= s^2 \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{h_i^2}{n} \\ &= 0.0456 \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{1}{7} \\ &= 0.004343 \\ SE(\hat{L}) &= \sqrt{\widehat{Var}(\hat{L})} \\ &= \sqrt{0.004343} \\ &= 0.0659 \end{aligned}$$

We first note that $t_{0.025}^{30} = 2.0422$. We will then construct a 95% confidence interval as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{L} \pm SE(\hat{L}) \times t_{0.025}^{30} \\ &-0.9198 \pm 0.0659 \times 2.0422 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the 95% Confidence interval is as follows:

$$95\%C.I. = (-1.0544, -0.7852)$$

The mean log execution time of compiled languages is estimated to be -1.05 log(ms) to -0.79 log(ms) shorter than the mean log execution time of interpreted languages at 95% confidence level. We therefore have strong evidence to suggest that compiled languages have shorter execution times when applying Leibniz's formula up to a very large term.

4 Discussion

The experiment aimed to analyze the execution time of different programming languages when applying Leibniz’s formula across 7 hardware setups and 6 treatments. The ANOVA results indicate significant differences amongst the execution times of various languages. The p value for hardware is also very low (< 0.0001) which indicates that hardware setup does have an effect on the execution time of different programming languages.

From the Tukey’s HSD post-hoc tests, it is clear that C and C++ have the fastest execution times, as reflected by their significantly lower mean execution times compared to other languages. The compiled languages (C, C++) outperformed Java, R, Python, and Ruby, suggesting a performance gap that favors compiled over interpreted languages. Java, a semi-compiled language, performed moderately well, trailing behind C and C++ but significantly ahead of interpreted languages like Python and Ruby.

We also collected strong evidence to suggest differences in the performance of compiled and interpreted languages. The estimated log execution times show a distinct advantage for compiled languages, with a difference of $-1.05 \log(\text{ms})$ to $-0.79 \log(\text{ms})$, further validating that compiled languages tend to be faster.

The ANOVA diagnostic plots (quantile-quantile and residuals vs. fitted) indicate a well-fitted model, with residuals demonstrating no major deviations from normality and homoscedasticity, supporting the robustness of the analysis.

5 Conclusion

The results of this experiment confirm that compiled languages (C and C++) exhibit significantly faster execution times compared to both semi-compiled (Java) and interpreted languages (R, Python, Ruby). The performance gap between compiled and interpreted languages becomes particularly evident with large-scale computations, such as Leibniz’s formula for a billion terms. Based on the ANOVA and post-hoc analysis, we can conclude with 95% confidence that compiled languages provide a substantial performance advantage over interpreted languages for this computational task. These findings can be useful for developers when choosing a programming language for performance-critical applications, especially those involving large iterative computations.

6 Appendix

PC Specifications

% latex table generated in R 4.3.1 by xtable 1.8-4 package % Sun Sep 15 21:11:05
2024

	PC	CPU	RAM	OS
1	Ishango PC	9th Gen Intel® Core™ i3-9100	8.0 GB	Ubuntu 22.04
2	MiddleTROld	9th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-9500 CPU	8.0 GB	Windows 10
3	MiddleTRNew	12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-13400	16.0 GB	Windows 10
4	ScilabB	12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-12400	16.0 GB	Windows 10
5	Surface	9th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-8250 CPU	16.0 GB	Windows 10
6	ASUS (i7-5500u)	5th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-5500U CPU	6.0 GB	Windows 10
7	ScilabD	10th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-10500	16.0 GB	Windows 10
8	LT	9th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-9400f	8.0 GB	Windows 10
9	HP (i5-7200)	7th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-7200	8.0 GB	Windows 10

Table 3: Table of Pcs used and their respective specifications

% latex table generated in R 4.3.1 by xtable 1.8-4 package % Sun Sep 15 21:11:05
2024

	Hardware	C	CPP	Java	Python	Ruby	R
1	MiddleTROld	3.13	3.13	3.53	3.90	4.42	3.75
2	MiddleTRNew	2.40	2.41	2.88	3.50	3.91	3.26
3	ScilabB	2.61	2.57	2.86	3.51	3.93	3.25
4	ASUS(i5)	2.61	2.61	3.09	3.82	4.35	3.30
5	HP(i5-7200)	2.56	2.56	3.07	3.82	4.30	3.29
6	ScilabD	2.68	2.66	2.96	3.66	4.08	3.37
7	LT	2.76	2.68	3.01	3.71	4.12	3.40

Table 4: Table of data used for analysis

References

- Braun, Javen. 2022. “Is Linux Faster Than Windows? Speed Comparison & Analysis.” Linux JournalDigital. <https://www.linuxjournaldigital.com/is-linux-faster-than-windows/>.
- “Chapter 16 - Anova.” 2018. University of South Carolina. <https://www.biostat.jhsph.edu/~iruczins/teaching/jf/ch16.pdf>.
- Dean, Angela M, and Daniel Voss. 2006. *Design and Analysis of Experiments*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fourment, Mathieu, and Michael R Gillings. 2008. “A Comparison of Common Programming Languages Used in Bioinformatics.” *BMC Bioinformatics* 9 (February). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-9-82>.
- Greenwood, Mark C. 2021. *Intermediate Statistics with r*.
- Juritz, J, F Little, and B Erni. 2023. *Design of Experiment: Course Notes for STA2005S*. University of Cape Town.
- Matheus, and Adriano Kamimura Suzuki. 2021. “Determining the Probability Distribution of Execution Times.” *2021 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, September. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iscc53001.2021.9631411>.
- Mavuso, Melusi, and Yuri Robbertze. 2019. *Order Out of Chaos i and II: STA2004F Notes*. University of Cape Town.
- “Residuals Vs. Fits Plot | STAT 501.” n.d. PennState: Statistics Online Courses; University of Pennsylvania. <https://online.stat.psu.edu/stat501/lesson/4/4.2>.
- Rhodes, Benjamin. 2020. “Computing Is Born: The Sumerian Abacus.” #TechIsATool. <https://medium.com/tech-is-a-tool/the-dawn-of-computing-sumerian-abacus-83bdefb697ba>.
- Underhill, L G, and Dave Bradfield. 2007. *Introstat*. University of Cape Town.