Testing for Significant Differences Between Distributions

A Crib Sheet

Dr. Andrew Hamilton-Wright

School of Computer Science University of Guelph

2021-04-03

The overall question

If you have done an experiment and collected some sets of measures from two or more experimental setups, a common question is:

Q: Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

This set of slides gives you some advice on how to proceed to answer this question.

More detailed answers can be found in excellent online sources. My two favourites are these - they both give excellent explanations:

McDonald, J.H. (2014): Handbook of Biological Statistics (3rd ed.).

Sparky House Publishing, Baltimore, Maryland.

http://www.biostathandbook.com/index.html

NIST/SEMATECH (2013): e-Handbook of Statistical Methods,

http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/

Preliminary Tools

Some questions will depend on the answers to one or both of these questions, as applied to each of your sets of points:

- Q: Is this set of points normally distributed?
 - Shapiro-Wilk (the most sensitive)*
 - Anderson-Darling,
 - Kolmogorov-Smirnov
 - a Q-Q plot (quartile-quartile plot)
- Q: Are the variances between two of my sets of points different? (a.k.a. Q: Is my data homoscedastic?)
 - F-test (of equality of variances)

^{*}Razali & Wah (2011): Power comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Lilliefors and Anderson-Darling Tests Journal of Statistical Modelling and Analytics 2(1):21–33. ISBN: 978-967-363-157-5 Link via ResearchGate (Apr 2021)

Statistics: Independent two-sample *t*-test

 \mathcal{Q} : Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

If all of the following are true:

- you have exactly two distributions of data (sets of points),
- and they are normally distributed
- and your observations are independent
- and your variances are equal (a.k.a. homoscedasticity)

then

 you can use the (independent two-sample) t-test to answer your question.

Statistics: ANOVA

Q: Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

If all of the following are true:

- you have more than two distributions of data (sets of points),
- and they are normally distributed
- and your observations are independent
- and your variances are equal (a.k.a. homoscedasticity)

then

you can use ANOVA (Analysis Of VARiance)

but

- this only tells you that <u>one or more</u> of the means of your distributions is different from the others, and doesn't tell you which one.
- You run a post hoc test to determine that.

Statistics: Paired sample *t*-test

Q: Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets? If all of the following are true:

- you collected your points in paired observations from a set of subjects or entities, so that you have two measures from the same subject under two conditions, and you want to know whether the change in condition produced a change in measurement between the paired measures
- and these differences are normally distributed
- and your observations between subjects are independent then
 - you can use the **(paired)** *t*-**test** to answer your question.

Statistics: Paired sample *t*-test

Here is something that people frequently get mixed up for the paired t-test ...

The Normality requirement only applies to the differences

Note that only the **differences** calculated between the pairs need to be normally distributed – the distributions of the unpaired points does not matter at all.

This is because the paired *t*-test **converts the set of differences into a single distribution**, and uses a *t*-test to determine if **this distribution** is non-zero.

Bonferroni correction

If you have point sets \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{C} (and maybe more) and want to make **multiple comparisons**, such as \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{C} , then use a correction such as the **Bonferroni correction**:

- used to correct the estimation done when multiple inferences are made on the same data (a.k.a. the "multiple comparisons problem")
- built into most statistical packages, but math is trivial
- we just:
 - ullet divide our lpha by the number of tests we are doing (making it lower), or equivalently
 - multiply our *p* by the number of tests we are doing (making them higher).

Why do we do this?

This decreases our likelihood of saying that any test has produced a statistically significant result — because we are attempting to control for the likelihood of finding such a result by random chance.

Statistics: Non-parametric tests

Q: Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

- If your data are NOT normally distributed
 - or your variances do not conform to your constraints
- but your observations are independent

then you can use:

- Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW)[†] if there are two distributions (analogue of the t-test, but with no model), or
- Kruskal-Wallis (KW) if there are more than two.

Note that KW test functions like a **one-way ANOVA**, and to determine which pairs differ, you can use MWW <u>without</u> the **Bonferroni correction**.

[†]This is also called the "Mann-Whitney U test" or "Wilcoxon-rank-sum" — but note that the "Wilcoxon signed-rank" test is a different beastie (more on next slide).

Non-independent tests

Q: Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

If your data are NOT independent then

- if you have two distributions (and ... would have considered Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon) then use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and
- if you have more than two distributions (and would have considered Kruskal-Wallis), then use the Friedman test instead.

Summary: Which test to use?

 \mathcal{Q} : Is there a significant difference between the distributions represented by the points making up my data sets?

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
Yes	Yes	2	t-test
		3 or more	ANOVA
	No	2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
		3 or more	Kruskal-Wallis
No	n/a	2	Wilcoxon signed-rank
		3 or more	Friedman
Yes	Yes⁴	Pairs	paired t-test

 $^{^{\}ddagger}$ a.k.a. Mann-Whitney U test or Wilcoxon rank sum – Wilcoxon was a very busy person

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 7.