

# Aircraft Fuel Efficiency Optimization: A Statistical Analysis of Cruise Phase Operations for Commercial Aviation

**Duy Nguyen**

Seattle University

DATA 5100: Foundation of Data Science

December 2025

## Abstract

In this study, we investigate the determinants of fuel consumption during cruise-phase operations in commercial aviation using 1.88 million measurements from 312 flights of a single aircraft. By employing basic data analysis, analysis of variance, sequential regression modeling, and variance decomposition techniques, we quantify the relative importance of altitude selection, cruise speed, engine performance, meteorological conditions, and aircraft weight in determining fuel efficiency. The analysis reveals that engine fan speed accounts for 64.4 percent of explainable variance in fuel consumption, substantially exceeding the combined 29.7 percent contribution from altitude and Mach number. One-way ANOVA tests demonstrate that altitude band selection explains 9.7 percent of total variance, aircraft weight explains 7.7 percent, and wind conditions contribute 2.5 percent. Sequential regression models progressing from a null model through increasingly complex specifications achieved a final adjusted R-squared of 0.959, though nested F-tests applying practical significance criteria indicate that interaction terms provide negligible operational benefit despite statistical significance. These findings suggest that airlines may benefit engine health monitoring and predictive maintenance programs over sophisticated flight planning optimization systems, as engine fan speed accounts for 2.2 times more variance in fuel consumption (61.8% vs. 28.5%), suggesting that airlines may achieve disproportionately greater returns from engine health monitoring and predictive maintenance programs. However, the fraction of this variance attributable to correctable degradation versus necessary operational variation requires validation through controlled intervention studies such that it is out of the scope and reach of this project.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Problem Context

In airline industry, fuel costs represent approximately thirty percent of total operating expenses for commercial airlines, translating to approximately fifteen thousand to twenty thousand dollars

per flight (this is a hypothetical approximation for educational purposes, in practice, it is statistically varied). Across a fleet conducting ten thousand flights annually, even a modest five percent reduction in fuel consumption would generate savings exceeding fifteen million dollars while simultaneously reducing carbon dioxide emissions by thousands of tons. These economic and environmental stakes were our motivation to continuous investigation into operational strategies that enhance fuel efficiency without compromising safety or service quality.

We believe that pilots and flight planners make numerous decisions affecting fuel consumption, but two parameters dominate cruise-phase efficiency: cruise altitude and cruise speed. Conventional wisdom suggests that higher altitudes generally improve efficiency by reducing parasitic drag in thinner air, while moderate cruise speeds balance time costs against fuel costs. However, the optimal combination may depend on additional factors including aircraft weight, engine condition, and meteorological conditions.

## 1.2 Data Source and Characteristics

This investigation analyzes flight recorder data from Aircraft Tail 687, made publicly available through NASA's aviation safety reporting system. The original dataset comprised 651 flights with complete instrumentation records. Following rigorous quality control procedures, we retained 312 flights meeting all inclusion criteria for cruise-phase analysis. The final analytical dataset contains 1,878,441 individual measurements representing approximately 130 hours of cruise flight operations.

Each observation includes total fuel flow measured in pounds per hour, barometric altitude in feet, Mach number, fan speed from all four engines expressed as percentage of maximum rated speed, true airspeed in knots, wind direction and speed. We constructed derived variables including total fuel flow aggregated across all engines, average fan speed, headwind component calculated from wind vector decomposition, and cumulative fuel burned serving as a proxy for decreasing aircraft weight during flight.

## 1.3 Scientific Aim

Our primary scientific aim of this study is to quantify the relative importance of operational parameters under pilot and airline control. Particular, we focus on altitude selection and cruise speed in determining fuel consumption efficiency during cruise flight, while controlling for exogenous factors including meteorological conditions and aircraft weight. We seek to decompose total variance in fuel consumption into components attributable to each predictor, enabling airlines to prioritize improvement initiatives based on empirical evidence of actual impact magnitude.

Moreover, our secondary aims include testing whether the relationship between altitude and fuel consumption depends on cruise speed or aircraft weight through formal evaluation of interaction effects, and establishing whether simplified operational guidelines treating predictors as independent factors can achieve predictive accuracy comparable to complex models incorporating interaction terms.

## **2. Theoretical Background**

### **2.1 Aerodynamic Principles**

In aeronautical engineering, aircraft cruise fuel consumption depends on thrust required to overcome aerodynamic drag, which comprises parasitic drag (increasing with airspeed squared) and induced drag (decreasing with airspeed squared). Altitude affects fuel consumption through competing mechanisms. Higher altitudes reduce parasitic drag through lower air density but require higher true airspeeds to maintain constant Mach numbers, partially offsetting this benefit. Engine efficiency also varies with altitude as air density affects compressor performance. The net effect typically favors higher cruise altitudes, though benefits diminish as altitude increases.

### **2.2 Statistical Framework**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) partitions total variance in an outcome into components attributable to different sources. The F-statistic compares between-group to within-group variance, while eta-squared quantifies the proportion of variance explained, providing a standardized effect size measure.

Sequential regression adds predictors in predetermined order, quantifying incremental variance explained at each step. This separates each predictor's unique contribution from shared variance with correlated predictors. Nested F-tests compare successive models to assess whether added complexity improves prediction beyond parsimony costs.

With samples exceeding one million observations, conventional hypothesis tests detect virtually any non-zero effect as statistically significant regardless of magnitude. We therefore distinguish statistical from practical significance using threshold criteria: R-squared increases below 0.01% are trivial, 0.01-0.1% marginal, 0.1-1% moderate, and above 1% substantial.

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1 Data Cleaning and Preprocessing**

To us, this is our most important part of the study and quite frankly, the most excited findings throughout this project. During the data cleaning process, we first proceeded through multiple stages designed to ensure measurement quality and analytical validity while revealing fundamental insights about cruise flight dynamics. We focused exclusively on the cruise phase because it represents the operational regime where pilots exercise the greatest discretion over altitude and speed decisions, typically accounting for the majority of total flight time and fuel consumption. Understanding cruise efficiency therefore offers the highest potential return for operational optimization efforts.

We first excluded all observations outside cruise flight by removing measurements where vertical velocity exceeded 500 feet per minute, indicating climb or descent rather than level flight.

However, this filtering process itself yielded an important discovery. Even within segments we initially classified as cruise, we observed substantial variation in flight conditions. Using interquartile range analysis on Mach number distribution, we identified 101,779 observations (5.4% of cruise data) exhibiting what we term slow cruise operations, characterized by Mach numbers below 0.646—substantially slower than the normal cruise range. Our analysis revealed that slow cruise segments serve a distinct operational purpose rather than representing anomalous flight conditions. These slower cruise segments occur predominantly early in flights when aircraft operate at higher weight with full fuel loads. Slow cruise observations averaged 28,739 feet altitude (610 feet lower than normal cruise at 29,349 feet), Mach 0.627 (0.080 slower than normal cruise), and consumed 4,519 pounds per hour fuel (401 pounds per hour less than normal cruise at 4,920 pounds per hour). Engine power settings during slow cruise averaged 89.5% N1, approximately 2.1 percentage points lower than the 91.6% typical of normal cruise operations. This pattern reveals that pilots and flight management systems actively employ slow cruise as a fuel-optimization strategy under heavy weight conditions. When aircraft carry full fuel loads early in flight, climbing to optimal high-altitude cruise requires excessive thrust, partially negating the aerodynamic efficiency gains from reduced air density. The slow cruise regime represents a tactical compromise: operating at moderate altitudes and reduced speeds minimizes fuel consumption until sufficient fuel burn reduces aircraft weight, enabling more efficient transition to higher altitudes and faster speeds later in the flight segment. This observation revealed that cruise flight operates not as a single static condition but as a spectrum of dynamic operational states where optimal parameters continuously evolve throughout the flight segment.

We then established physically realistic bounds for all variables based on aircraft performance specifications and operational procedures. Specifically, we retained only observations with total fuel flow between 2,000 and 8,000 pounds per hour, altitude between 20,000 and 40,000 feet, and Mach number between 0.45 and 0.85. Critically, we preserved both slow cruise and normal cruise segments within these bounds rather than treating slow cruise as outliers requiring removal. These criteria removed approximately 0.4 percent of observations representing clear instrument malfunctions or data recording errors while maintaining the full operational spectrum from slow cruise to fast cruise. This decision proved analytically valuable, as the 401-pound-per-hour fuel flow difference between cruise regimes demonstrates that speed-regime selection constitutes a meaningful operational lever for fuel efficiency optimization. We constructed the headwind component variable by decomposing the wind vector into components parallel and perpendicular to the aircraft's ground track. The headwind component equals wind speed multiplied by the cosine of the angle between wind direction and aircraft heading, taking positive values when the aircraft faces headwinds and negative values with tailwinds. This variable captures the relevant meteorological effect on fuel consumption more precisely than wind speed alone, which includes crosswind components that do not directly affect thrust requirements.

The cumulative fuel burned variable serves as a proxy for aircraft weight throughout the flight, and its construction illuminated why altitude and speed optimization cannot be treated as a static problem. Since the flight recorder does not capture total fuel quantity with sufficient accuracy to estimate gross weight directly, we calculated the cumulative sum of fuel flow measurements from the beginning of each flight. Our slow cruise analysis validated this proxy's effectiveness: slow cruise operations concentrate in early flight segments (low cumulative fuel burned, indicating high weight), while normal cruise dominates later segments (high cumulative fuel

burned, indicating reduced weight). Early in cruise when cumulative fuel burned remains low, the aircraft operates at higher weight with full fuel tanks, often necessitating slow cruise at moderate altitudes around 28,700 feet with reduced Mach numbers near 0.63. Late in cruise after substantial fuel consumption, the aircraft operates at reduced weight, enabling more efficient flight at higher altitudes exceeding 29,000 feet and faster speeds approaching Mach 0.71. This continuous weight reduction means that theoretically optimal altitude increases as the flight progresses, since lighter aircraft can sustain level flight at higher altitudes with lower induced drag. Similarly, the fuel efficiency penalty associated with transitioning from slow cruise to fast cruise diminishes as weight decreases—the 401-pound-per-hour fuel flow advantage of slow cruise early in flight may reverse to favor faster cruise speeds later in flight as weight reduces. This realization fundamentally shaped our analytical approach, demonstrating that optimal flight parameters represent moving targets rather than fixed values, and that any practical optimization strategy must account for the temporal evolution of aircraft state throughout the cruise segment. The presence of 5.4% slow cruise operations in our dataset confirms that pilots and flight management computers actively adapt cruise parameters to changing weight conditions, validating our decision to treat weight variation as a critical predictor in subsequent regression analyses.

### **3.2 Categorical Variable Construction**

Additionally, we created three categorical variables to enable stratified analysis and assessment of nonlinear relationships. The altitude band variable divides observations into low altitude (25,000 to 29,000 feet), medium altitude (29,000 to 33,000 feet), and high altitude (above 33,000 feet). These boundaries align with typical air traffic control altitude assignments in the North American airspace system and capture the functional altitude regions where aircraft performance characteristics differ qualitatively.

The wind category variable classifies observations as strong tailwind (headwind component less than negative 20 knots), neutral (headwind component between negative 20 and positive 20 knots), or strong headwind (headwind component exceeding positive 20 knots). These thresholds separate meteorological conditions with negligible wind effects from conditions where wind substantially affects fuel consumption and may warrant operational response through altitude or speed adjustment.

Furthermore, for the weight category, we divided observations into tertiles based on cumulative fuel burned, creating heavy (first tertile), medium (second tertile), and light (third tertile) weight categories. We made sure that the equal-frequency binning, ensuring the adequate sample size in each category while capturing the full range of weight variation encountered across the dataset.

### **3.3 Statistical Analysis Procedures**

The analysis proceeded through three phases. In the descriptive phase, we calculated summary statistics for fuel consumption within each level of the categorical variables and examined scatterplots revealing relationships between continuous predictors and the outcome. In the inferential phase, we conducted one-way analysis of variance tests for each categorical predictor separately and performed two-way ANOVA incorporating the altitude band by wind category

interaction. For each ANOVA, we report the F-statistic, degrees of freedom, p-value, and eta-squared effect size.

In the modeling phase, we estimated a sequence of six ordinary least squares regression models with progressively increasing complexity. Model 1 included all main effects plus three two-way interaction terms. Model 2 removed the altitude by Mach interaction. Model 3 removed all remaining interactions. Model 4 removed average fan speed. Model 5 removed headwind component and cumulative fuel burned. Model 6 included only the intercept term. For each model, we report the R-squared, adjusted R-squared, and F-statistic. We performed nested F-tests comparing each successive pair of models and conducted variance decomposition by calculating the unique variance contribution of each predictor set.

### **3.4 Diagnostic Procedures**

Ensuring robustness to our result, we evaluated regression model assumptions through examination of residual distributions. We calculated residual summary statistics including mean, standard deviation, skewness, and excess kurtosis. We performed the D'Agostino-Pearson omnibus test for normality and the Breusch-Pagan test for heteroskedasticity. Despite the materials not covered in the course, we specifically wanted to extend to these advanced statistical model because we acknowledged that with a sample size approaching two million observations, these tests necessary because it possess extreme statistical power and will detect trivial deviations from ideal assumptions. It is critical that we, thereby emphasize the magnitude of deviations rather than formal test results when assessing whether assumption violations threaten inferential validity.

## **4. Computational Results**

### **4.1 Descriptive Statistics by Category**


Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for total fuel flow stratified by altitude band. Mean fuel consumption decreases systematically with increasing altitude, from 5,005 pounds per hour at low altitude to 4,799 pounds per hour at medium altitude to 4,511 pounds per hour at high altitude. This pattern confirms the expected aerodynamic benefit of higher-altitude cruise operations. However, note that the sample sizes differ substantially across altitude bands, with low altitude containing 1,030,698 observations, medium altitude containing 758,950 observations, and high altitude containing only 88,793 observations. This distribution reflects operational practices where air traffic control typically assigns altitudes based on flight direction and traffic density, with higher altitudes reserved for longer flights that have sufficient fuel to reach and maintain those flight levels.

**Table 1: Fuel Consumption by Altitude Band**

Altitude Band	Sample Size	Mean Fuel Flow (lbs/hr)	Std Dev	Mach Correlation
Low (25K-29K ft)	1,030,698	5,005	418	0.270
Medium (29K-33K ft)	758,950	4,799	459	0.322
High (33K+ ft)	88,793	4,511	382	0.155

The correlation between Mach number and fuel flow varies across altitude bands, reaching its maximum value of 0.322 at medium altitude and declining to 0.155 at high altitude. We were suspecting that this nonlinear pattern suggests complex interactions between speed, altitude, and fuel consumption that warrant investigation through formal interaction testing in the regression framework.


While Table 1 quantifies the altitude-fuel relationship numerically, examining the underlying data distribution provides additional insight into the strength and consistency of this relationship. Figure 3 displays the complete scatter of all 1.88 million observations, revealing whether the mean differences reflect a consistent trend or merely statistical artifacts of the large sample size.



*[Figure 1: Altitude vs. Total Fuel Flow]*

*Strong positive correlation ( $r=0.979$ ) between engine fan speed and fuel consumption, accounting for 64.4% of explainable variance. Each point represents one measurement; tight clustering demonstrates the dominant relationship.*

The scatter plot confirms that the inverse relationship between altitude and fuel consumption is both consistent and substantial across the entire operating range. The downward slope persists even when accounting for the considerable vertical spread in fuel flow at each altitude, which indicates that factors beyond altitude selection exert significant influence on fuel consumption. This observation raises an important analytical question: among the multiple factors affecting fuel efficiency, which variables contribute most to the vertical spread visible in Figure 1? The correlation between Mach number and fuel flow varies across altitude bands, reaching its maximum value of 0.322 at medium altitude and declining to 0.155 at high altitude. To understand whether this variation represents merely statistical noise or a meaningful operational pattern, we stratify the Mach-fuel relationship by altitude band in Figure 2.




[Figure 2: Mach-Fuel Relationship Across Altitude Bands - Three-Panel Plot]

*Speed-fuel relationship varies substantially across altitude bands. Slope is steepest at medium altitude (5,111 lbs/hr per 0.01 Mach) and flattest at high altitude (1,155 lbs/hr per 0.01 Mach), indicating that speed penalties are context-dependent.*

Figure 2 reveals a striking pattern: the slope relating cruise speed to fuel consumption differs dramatically across altitude bands. At medium altitude, each 0.01 increase in Mach number associates with 5,111 pounds per hour additional fuel consumption. At high altitude, the same speed increase requires only 1,155 pounds per hour additional fuel. This substantial difference suggests that the fuel penalty for flying faster depends heavily on operating altitude—a finding with direct implications for schedule recovery decisions where pilots must choose whether to increase cruise speed. However, before concluding that altitude-speed optimization should constitute the primary focus of fuel efficiency programs, we must evaluate these effects relative to other operational parameters. Figure 1 examines the relationship between engine fan speed and fuel consumption, representing the most direct measure of engine power setting available in the flight recorder data.

### Engine Power (N1) vs. Fuel Flow - STRONGEST RELATIONSHIP



[Figure 3: Average Engine Fan Speed (N1) vs. Total Fuel Flow]

*Inverse relationship between cruise altitude and fuel consumption. Mean fuel flow decreases from 5,005 lbs/hr at low altitude to 4,511 lbs/hr at high altitude, confirming aerodynamic benefits of high-altitude cruise operations.*

Figure 1 fundamentally reframes the fuel efficiency discussion. The exceptionally tight clustering around the regression line, with correlation  $r = 0.979$ , demonstrates that engine fan speed alone predicts fuel consumption with far greater accuracy than altitude or speed. The contrast between Figure 1 and Figure 3 is striking: while altitude shows clear relationship to fuel flow, the vertical spread at each altitude level (visible in Figure 3) is almost entirely explained by variation in engine fan speed (visible in Figure 1). This finding suggests that engine performance management may warrant higher priority than flight planning optimization in airline fuel efficiency programs—a hypothesis we test formally through variance decomposition analysis in subsequent sections. Weight category analysis showed the expected relationship where heavier aircraft consume more fuel. The heavy weight category averaged 5,124 pounds per hour, the medium weight category averaged 4,901 pounds per hour, and the light weight category averaged 4,671 pounds per hour.


Conversely, descriptive statistics stratified by wind category revealed a counterintuitive pattern. With a strong headwind conditions that exhibited lower mean fuel consumption (4,829 pounds per hour) compared to neutral conditions (4,946 pounds per hour) and strong tailwind conditions (4,975 pounds per hour). This result contradicts the direct physical effect where headwinds should increase fuel requirements (in theory). The pattern likely reflects operational responses where flight crews and dispatchers optimize altitude and speed more aggressively when facing adverse winds, partially offsetting the headwind penalty through superior parameter selection.

Moreover, weight category analysis showed the expected relationship where heavier aircraft consume more fuel. The heavy weight category averaged 5,124 pounds per hour, the medium weight category averaged 4,901 pounds per hour, and the light weight category averaged 4,671 pounds per hour. This systematic decrease confirms what we had expected that the cumulative fuel burned variable successfully captures weight effects despite its status as a proxy rather than a direct weight measurement.

## 4.2 Analysis of Variance Results

The one-way ANOVA testing altitude band effects produced an F-statistic of 100,273 with 2 and 1,878,438 degrees of freedom and a p-value indistinguishable from zero. The effect size eta-squared ( $\eta^2$ ) equals 0.0965, indicating that altitude band membership explains 9.7 percent of total variance in fuel consumption. This means that if you observe differences in fuel burn across flights, roughly 10% of that variation is due to altitude choices, while 90% stems from other operational factors. Put another way, altitude selection is a meaningful but not dominant driver of fuel efficiency, the fact that it is important enough to optimize, but not the primary lever for achieving major fuel savings. The one-way ANOVA testing wind category effects yielded an F-statistic of 24,343 with effect size eta-squared of only 0.0253, indicating that wind conditions account for merely 2.5 percent of total variance. The one-way ANOVA testing weight category effects produced an F-statistic of 78,581 with effect size eta-squared of 0.0772 (same interpretation as previous explained), indicating that weight explains 7.7 percent of total variance.

The two-way ANOVA incorporating altitude band, wind category, and their interaction revealed that all three terms achieve statistical significance with p-values effectively zero. The altitude by wind interaction F-statistic of 5,478 indicates that the relationship between altitude and fuel consumption depends on wind conditions. However, the interaction contributes only an additional 1.0 percent of explained variance beyond the main effects. Figure 3 visualizes how altitude-fuel relationships differ across the three wind categories (tailwind, neutral, headwind), demonstrating this interaction effect though its practical magnitude remains modest despite statistical significance.



[Figure 4: Average Engine Fan Speed (N1) vs. Total Fuel Flow]

Two-way interaction between altitude band and wind category. While statistically significant ( $F=5,478, p<0.001$ ), the interaction contributes only 1.0% additional explained variance beyond main effects, suggesting limited practical importance

### 4.3 Sequential Regression Model Results

Table 2 summarizes the six regression models estimated in the sequential analysis. Model 1, the full model incorporating all main effects and three interaction terms, achieves an R-squared of 0.9586. All eight coefficients achieve statistical significance with p-values below 0.001.

**Table 2: Sequential Regression Model Comparison**

Model	Variables	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	F-statistic
Model 1 (Full)	8	0.9586	0.9586	5.435×10 <sup>6</sup>
Model 2 (-alt×mach)	7	0.9585	0.9585	6.205×10 <sup>6</sup>
Model 3 (Main effects)	5	0.9581	0.9581	8.584×10 <sup>6</sup>
Model 4 (-N1)	4	0.3404	0.3404	2.423×10 <sup>5</sup>
Model 5 (Core)	2	0.2850	0.2850	3.744×10 <sup>5</sup>
Model 6 (Null)	0	0.0000	0.0000	—

Our Model 2 removes the altitude by Mach interaction, resulting in negligible change to R-squared. With Model 3 removes all remaining interaction terms, achieving R-squared of 0.9581. The minimal degradation from Model 1 to Model 3 indicates that interaction effects contribute little practical value despite their statistical significance. The critical transition occurs between Model 3 and Model 4. Removing average fan speed from the model causes R-squared to plummet from 0.9581 to 0.3404, a decrease of 0.6177 representing 61.8 percentage points of explained variance. This dramatic decline establishes engine fan speed as the dominant predictor of fuel consumption.

The critical transition occurs between Model 3 and Model 4. Removing average fan speed from the model causes R-squared to plummet from 0.9581 to 0.3404, a decrease of 0.6177 representing 61.8 percentage points of explained variance. This dramatic decline, visible as the stark drop in Table 2, establishes engine fan speed as the dominant predictor of fuel consumption. Further removing headwind and cumulative fuel (Model 4 to Model 5) reduces R-squared by an additional 5.5 percentage points, while the final step to the null model (Model 5 to Model 6) removes the remaining 28.5 percentage points attributable to altitude and Mach.

While Table 2's R-squared values quantify model performance, they do not directly answer the key question for operational decision-making: are the improvements from adding complexity statistically justified, or do they represent mere overfitting to sample-specific noise? Nested model comparisons provide the formal statistical framework to address this question.

## 4.4 Nested Model F-Test Results

Each step in the model sequence represents a hypothesis test: does the more complex model explain significantly more variance than the simpler model? The nested F-test comparing Model 1 to Model 2 yielded an F-statistic of 2,085 with p-value near zero, confirming statistical significance. However, statistical significance does not equal practical importance. The R-squared increase of 0.000046 represents only 0.0046 percent improvement, classifying this effect as trivial according to our practical significance criteria established in Section 3.

Similarly, the nested F-test comparing Model 2 to Model 3 produced an F-statistic of 10,766 with R-squared increase of 0.000475. Despite the enormous F-statistic—a consequence of the massive sample size exceeding 1.8 million observations—this marginal improvement suggests that interaction terms provide negligible practical benefit. These results justify preferring Model 3's simpler main-effects specification over the complexity of interaction terms.

In stark contrast, the nested F-test comparing Model 3 to Model 4 generated an F-statistic of 27.7 million with R-squared increase of 0.6177. This massive effect confirms that engine fan speed represents the dominant factor in fuel consumption determination. The F-statistic magnitude reflects both the large sample size and the genuinely enormous effect size—the combination of statistical and practical significance that characterizes findings of operational importance.

The nested F-test comparing Model 4 to Model 5 yielded an F-statistic of 78,806 with R-squared increase of 0.0553, indicating that headwind component and cumulative fuel burned contribute meaningful explanatory power beyond engine fan speed alone. The final nested F-test comparing Model 5 to Model 6 produced an F-statistic of 374,399 with R-squared increase of 0.2850, confirming the fundamental importance of altitude and speed as baseline predictors.

These nested F-tests establish the statistical significance of each predictor set, but they examine effects sequentially rather than isolating unique contributions. A predictor added early in the sequence receives credit for variance it shares with variables added later, while a predictor added late receives credit only for variance unexplained by earlier predictors. To overcome this limitation and quantify the independent contribution of each factor, we perform variance decomposition analysis.


## 4.5 Variance Decomposition Results

Variance decomposition addresses the fundamental question driving this investigation: among the multiple operational parameters affecting fuel consumption, which factors contribute most to observed variation? Unlike sequential R-squared differences that depend on model-building order, variance decomposition isolates the unique contribution of each predictor set—the variance it explains that no other predictor can explain.

The decomposition quantifies the unique contribution of each predictor set to total variance. Altitude and Mach together contribute 28.5 percent of total variance, equivalent to 29.7 percent of the variance explained by the full model. Headwind component and cumulative fuel burned add 5.5 percent of total variance. Engine fan speed contributes 61.8 percent of total variance,

representing 64.4 percent of explained variance. Interaction terms add 0.05 percent of total variance, less than 0.1 percent of explained variance. The full model leaves 4.1 percent of variance unexplained.

Figure 5 illustrates this hierarchy visually, revealing the stark disparity in predictive importance across operational categories.



*[Figure 5: Variance Decomposition - Pie Chart or Stacked Bar Chart]*

*Decomposition of fuel consumption variance into unique contributions from each predictor set. Engine fan speed (61.8%) dominates all flight planning parameters combined (altitude + Mach: 28.5%; wind + weight: 5.5%). Interaction effects (0.05%) provide negligible explanatory value, justifying the simplified main-effects specification.*

Figure 5 translates the numerical results into actionable insight: engine performance management offers approximately 2.2 times the fuel savings potential of altitude-speed optimization ( $61.8\% \div 28.5\% = 2.17$ ). This finding challenges conventional airline fuel efficiency programs that emphasize sophisticated flight planning systems over engine health monitoring. The trivial 0.05 percent contribution from interaction terms, barely visible in Figure 5, confirms that operational guidelines can treat altitude and speed as independent factors without meaningful accuracy loss.

This decomposition establishes a clear hierarchy of importance among operational factors affecting fuel efficiency, providing empirical evidence to guide resource allocation decisions in airline fuel conservation programs.

## 4.6 Residual Diagnostic Results

The regression models in Table 2 rest on several mathematical assumptions: that residuals are normally distributed, exhibit constant variance across all fitted values, and contain no systematic patterns indicating model misspecification. While violations of these assumptions do not


necessarily invalidate results—particularly with sample sizes approaching two million observations where the Central Limit Theorem provides robustness—responsible statistical practice requires verification that departures from ideal conditions remain within acceptable bounds.

We begin with numerical summaries of the residual distribution. The residual distribution from Model 1 exhibits mean of 0.0000, confirming unbiasedness—the model shows no systematic tendency to over-predict or under-predict fuel consumption. Standard deviation equals 86.6 pounds per hour, representing less than two percent of mean fuel consumption of approximately 4,900 pounds per hour. This small residual spread indicates that the model captures the vast majority of systematic variation, leaving only minor unexplained fluctuations.

Skewness equals 0.0141, indicating nearly symmetric distribution. Excess kurtosis equals 0.9040, suggesting slightly heavier tails than the normal distribution but not extreme departure. However, formal hypothesis tests designed to detect even minor deviations from ideal assumptions tell a different story. The D'Agostino-Pearson normality test and Breusch-Pagan heteroskedasticity test both produce p-values near zero, formally rejecting the null hypotheses of perfect normality and constant variance.

These test results require careful interpretation. With 1.88 million observations, hypothesis tests possess extreme statistical power to detect arbitrarily small departures from theoretical distributions. A p-value near zero indicates that residuals deviate from perfect normality and perfect homoskedasticity, however, it does not indicate whether those deviations are large enough to matter. To assess practical importance of assumption violations, we must examine the residual patterns visually rather than relying solely on yes-or-no hypothesis tests.

Figure 6 presents four diagnostic plots that reveal the nature and magnitude of assumption departures.



[Figure 6: Residual Diagnostic Panel]

Panel A on the left (Residuals vs. Fitted Values): This plot assesses whether residual variance remains constant across the range of predicted fuel consumption values (homoskedasticity) and whether systematic patterns suggest model misspecification. Ideally, residuals should scatter randomly around the horizontal zero line with constant spread. The plot shows slight fanning, with marginally wider spread at higher fitted values, confirming the heteroskedasticity detected by the Breusch-Pagan test. However, the magnitude of spread variation remains modest—the residual standard deviation increases from approximately 75 lbs/hr at low fitted values to approximately 95 lbs/hr at high fitted values, a range of only 20 lbs/hr across the entire prediction spectrum. No systematic curved patterns appear, indicating that the linear functional form adequately captures the relationships.

Panel B on the right (Q-Q Plot): This plot compares the residual distribution to the theoretical normal distribution. Points falling along the diagonal line indicate agreement with normality. The plot shows excellent agreement throughout the central range, with slight departures in the extreme tails where residuals extend slightly beyond what a perfect normal distribution would predict. This pattern confirms the excess kurtosis of 0.9040 noted in the numerical summary—the distribution has slightly heavier tails than the normal. However, the departures affect less than one percent of observations at the extremes, leaving the central 98 percent of the distribution well-approximated by normality.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Interpretation of Primary Findings

The variance decomposition results fundamentally reframe conventional understanding of fuel efficiency optimization in commercial aviation. The finding that engine fan speed accounts for 64.4 percent of explainable variance while altitude and Mach number together contribute only 29.7 percent challenges the typical emphasis on flight planning optimization over engine performance management in airline efficiency programs. This result suggests that many carriers may be over-investing in sophisticated flight management systems that optimize altitude-speed profiles while underinvesting in engine condition monitoring and predictive maintenance programs that address the dominant source of fuel consumption variation.

The magnitude of the engine effect merits careful consideration. Engine fan speed serves as a proxy for multiple underlying factors including engine health, power setting, throttle response characteristics, and combustion efficiency. The 61.8 percentage point contribution to explained variance encompasses both the direct effect of power setting choices and the indirect effect of engine condition on the power required to maintain cruise flight at specified altitude and speed. Decomposing these components would require additional data on engine condition indicators and maintenance history beyond what the flight recorder captures, ideally paired with a precise interventional study utilizing causal inference methodologies to isolate health-related degradation from operational power settings. Nevertheless, the combined effect provided strong evidence that engine-related factors dominate fuel consumption determination.

The altitude and speed effects, while secondary to engine factors, remain substantial in absolute terms. The 28.5 percent variance contribution from these two pilot-controlled parameters indicates genuine opportunity for efficiency gains through optimized flight planning. However, the absence of meaningful interaction effects simplifies operational implementation. The negligible altitude by Mach interaction suggests that optimal altitude does not depend strongly on cruise speed, enabling airlines to maintain straightforward altitude selection policies without complex conditional logic.

The modest 2.5 percent variance contribution from wind conditions reflects the limited control airlines possess over meteorological factors. While route planning systems account for forecast winds when selecting tracks, the analysis suggests that wind optimization provides relatively small benefits compared to altitude-speed optimization and far smaller benefits compared to engine performance optimization.

## 5.2 Operational Implications

These findings support a three-tier strategy for airline fuel efficiency programs. The first priority must be comprehensive engine performance management encompassing real-time monitoring of fan speed and exhaust gas temperature, predictive maintenance scheduling that addresses degradation before significant efficiency losses accumulate, and operational protocols ensuring engines operate within optimal power bands. The dominance of engine effects indicates that even modest improvements in engine efficiency explain 2.2x more variance, suggesting fuel savings exceeding what perfect flight planning can achieve.

The second priority involves maintaining simplified flight planning guidelines that capture the substantial 29.7 percent variance contribution from altitude and speed without requiring complex implementation. The absence of meaningful interaction effects supports treating these factors as independent. Airlines should favor higher cruise altitudes when operationally feasible while recognizing diminishing returns above 33,000 feet. Speed policies should acknowledge the proportional relationship between cruise Mach and fuel consumption while balancing fuel costs against schedule reliability.

The third priority addresses the 5.8 percent variance contribution from wind and weight through standard operational practices. Route planning should account for forecast winds through existing meteorological optimization. Airlines experiencing budget constraints should defer investments in advanced wind optimization or weight-specific flight profiles in favor of high-impact engine management initiatives.

## Limitations and Caveats

**Measurement Limitations:** The cumulative fuel burned variable serves as an imperfect proxy for aircraft weight due to limitations in the flight recorder's fuel quantity measurement system. This measurement error likely attenuates the estimated weight effect, suggesting the true impact may exceed the 7.7 percent identified here. Additionally, residual diagnostics detected statistically significant violations of normality and homoskedasticity assumptions, though practical

implications remain minimal given the modest magnitude of departures and the robustness of ordinary least squares regression in large samples.

**Operational Scope:** The cruise-only focus excludes climb and descent phases where different operational considerations dominate. Extending the analysis to encompass complete flight profiles would enable total mission fuel optimization and might alter the relative importance of predictive factors.

**Causal Inference:** This observational study identifies associations, not causal effects. The recommendations, particularly the 2.2 $\times$  engine advantage over flight planning, require validation through prospective intervention studies that experimentally manipulate engine maintenance schedules and flight planning parameters to measure actual fuel savings rather than variance explained.

## 6. Conclusions

This investigation employed rigorous statistical methods to decompose variance in cruise-phase fuel consumption into components attributable to different operational factors. The analysis of 1.88 million measurements from 312 flights establishes that engine performance accounts for approximately two-thirds of explainable variance while altitude and speed contribute less than one-third. This finding challenges conventional priorities in airline fuel efficiency programs and suggests that many carriers over invest in flight planning optimization relative to engine health management.

The research directly addresses its stated aim of quantifying the relative importance of operational parameters under pilot and airline control. The variance decomposition provides empirical evidence establishing a clear hierarchy where engine-related interventions deliver approximately 2.2 times the fuel savings potential of altitude-speed optimization strategies. Airlines seeking five to ten percent fuel consumption reductions should prioritize investments in engine condition monitoring, predictive maintenance, and power management training over sophisticated flight planning systems promising marginal improvements.

The absence of meaningful interaction effects simplifies operational implementation by supporting treatment of altitude and speed as independent factors. Flight planning systems need not incorporate complex conditional logic that adjusts altitude recommendations based on speed, as such sophistication provides negligible accuracy improvement despite substantial implementation complexity. This result enables airlines to maintain straightforward operational guidelines accessible to flight crews without extensive training requirements.

The methodological framework demonstrated here provides a template for analyzing operational flight data to guide efficiency improvement initiatives with rigorous empirical evidence. As flight data recorder systems become increasingly comprehensive and airlines accumulate larger historical databases, these analytical approaches enable extraction of actionable insights that translate research findings into measurable operational improvements. Future research should extend this work to heterogeneous fleets, incorporate climb and descent phases, and develop predictive maintenance models linking engine condition indicators to fuel consumption.

## References

Boeing. (2024). *ecoDemonstrator Program*. Boeing Sustainability. <https://www.boeing.com/sustainability/ecodemonstrator>

Boeing Commercial Airplanes. (2024). *The Boeing ecoDemonstrator Program [Backgrounder]*. [https://www.boeing.com/content/dam/boeing/boeingdotcom/principles/environment/pdf/BKG-ecodemonstrator\\_2024\\_Oct.pdf](https://www.boeing.com/content/dam/boeing/boeingdotcom/principles/environment/pdf/BKG-ecodemonstrator_2024_Oct.pdf)

Matthews, B. (2012). *Flight Data for Tail 687*. NASA DASHlink. <https://c3.ndc.nasa.gov/dashlink/resources/664/>