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/

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?

^{*}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)

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

^{*}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)

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
- Q: Are the variances between two of my sets of points different? (a.k.a. Q: Is my data homoscedastic?)

^{*}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)

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
- 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)

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),

- you have exactly two distributions of data (sets of points),
- and they are normally distributed

- you have exactly two distributions of data (sets of points),
- and they are normally distributed
- and your observations are independent

- 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)

 \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

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.

 \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 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)
- and your question is "Q: do these samples come from distributions with the same mean?"

then

Statistics: ANOVA

 \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 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)
- and your question is "Q: do these samples come from distributions with the same mean?"

then

you can use ANOVA (Analysis Of VARiance)

but

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)
- and your question is "Q: do these samples come from distributions with the same mean?"

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.

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)
- and your question is "Q: do these samples come from distributions with the same mean?"

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.

- 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

- 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

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
- and your question is "Q: do the differences described by these pairs have a non-zero mean?" (i.e.; "Q: ls there a difference between these paired values?)

then

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
- and your question is "Q: do the differences described by these pairs have a non-zero mean?" (i.e.; "Q: ls there a difference between these paired values?)

then

• you can use the (paired) *t*-test to answer your question.

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
- and your question is "Q: do the differences described by these pairs have a non-zero mean?" (i.e.; "Q: ls there a difference between these paired values?)

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.

If you have point sets A, B, C, and want to make **multiple comparisons**, such as A:B and B: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")

If you have point sets A, B, C, and want to make **multiple comparisons**, such as A:B and B: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

If you have point sets A, B, C, and want to make **multiple comparisons**, such as A:B and B: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).

If you have point sets A, B, C, and want to make **multiple comparisons**, such as A:B and B: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.

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 variance does not conform to your constraints
- but your observations are **independent** then you can use:

†

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 variance does 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),

†

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 variance does 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

[†]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).

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 variance does 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.

[†]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).

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 variance does 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).

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

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

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

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.

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

Independence	Normality	N dist.	\rightarrow	Use	
	Yes	2			
Yes	ies	3 or more			
165	No	2			‡
	INO	3 or more			

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

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

Independence	Normality	N dist.	\rightarrow	Use	
	Yes	2 t-	t- test		
Yes	ies	3 or more			
165	No	2			‡
	INO	3 or more			

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

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

Independence	Normality	N dist.	\rightarrow	Use	
	Yes	2		t- test	
Yes	ies	3 or more		ANOVA	
163	No	2			‡
	INO	3 or more			

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

 \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
		2	t-test
Yes	Yes	3 or more	ANOVA
162	No	2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	INO	3 or more	

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
	Yes	2	t-test
Yes		3 or more	ANOVA
162	No	2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	INO	3 or more	

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

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
	Yes	2	t- test
Yes		3 or more	ANOVA
162	No	2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	INO	3 or more	Kruskal-Wallis

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

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
	Vac	2	t- test
Yes	Yes	3 or more	ANOVA
ies	No	No. 2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	No	3 or more	Kruskal-Wallis
No	2/2	2	
	n/a	3 or more	

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

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
	Vac	2	t- test
Yes	Yes	3 or more	ANOVA
ies	No	No. 2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	No	3 or more	Kruskal-Wallis
No	2/2	2	
	n/a	3 or more	

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

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

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

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

⁴Of differences only. See note on page 22.

Independence	Normality	N dist.	ightarrow Use
	Yes	2	t- test
Yes	ies	3 or more	ANOVA
ies	No	2	Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon [‡]
	INO	3 or more	Kruskal-Wallis
No	n/a	2	Wilcoxon signed-rank
	11/ d	3 or more	Friedman
Yes	Yes⁴	Pairs	paired <i>t</i> -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 22.