# Advanced Statistics Part one: Parametrical Statistics

M. Pérez-Casany

Dept. of Statistics and Operations Research and DAMA-UPC Technical University of Catalunya

First Semester: Third Session



Assume that one is interested in quantifying the influence of

- 2 CPU schedulling algorithms,
- 3 CPU types and
- 3 types of workloads in a given metric

Those variables are called *factors* and each one takes an small number of cathegories also known as *levels*.

The objective of the ANOVA is to quantify the impact of each factor in the response variable, and to determine if there exists significative differences between the levels of a given factor.



The simplest model is the **One factor ANOVA**.

Example: We want to compare the *Execution Time* (Y) based on a different *workload types* (X)

Factor has a levels, and from i-thm level one has  $n_i$  observations

Level	Observations	
1	$y_{11}, y_{12}, \cdots, y_{1n_1}$	$\overline{y}_{1.}$
2	$y_{21}, y_{22}, \cdots, y_{2n_2}$	$\overline{y}_{2.}$
į		
a	$y_{a1}, y_{a2}, \cdots, y_{an_a}$	$\overline{y}_{a}$ .

Where 
$$\overline{y}_{i.}=1/n_i\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}y_{ij}$$
,  $\overline{y}_{..}=1/N\sum_{i=1}^a\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}y_{ij}=1/N\sum_{i=1}^an_i\overline{y}_{i.}$  and  $N=\sum_{i=1}^an_i$ .

If  $n_i = n \ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, a\}$  the experiment is said to be **balanced**.

The appropiate model is:

$$y_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i + e_{ij}, \ i = 1, \dots, a \ j = 1, \dots, n_i$$

#### where

- $\mu_i = \mu + \tau_i$  is the expected response under level i, and
- $e_{ij}$ , the errors, are indep. and Normal $(0, \sigma^2)$  distributed.



**Goal**: To see if there exists significative differences between the levels of the Factor.

That is to test

$$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \cdots = \mu_a \ vs \ H_1: \exists (i,j) \ \mu_i \neq \mu_j,$$

at a given significance level  $\alpha$ . Which is equivalen to:

$$H_0: \tau_i = 0 \,\forall i \ vs \ H_1: \exists i \ \tau_i \neq 0,$$

**Observation:** The decision rule *not to reject*  $H_0$  *when the null hyp. of all the 2 by 2 comparisons has not been rejected* is not appropriate. Since, in that case,

$$P(\text{reject } H_0|H_0 \text{ is true}) = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{a(a-1)/2} \ge \alpha$$



The total variability in the data must be partitioned in two parts, the one caused by the different levels of the factor, and the one due to error.

Denoting by  $\overline{y}_{..}$  the total sample mean,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \overline{y}_{..})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{a} n_i (\overline{y}_{i.} - \overline{y}_{..})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \overline{y}_{i.})^2$$

Which is usually denoted by:

$$SS_T = SS_A + SS_E$$

These sums of squares have, respectively  $N-1,\,a-1$  and N-a degrees of freedom



The one-way ANOVA table is equal to:

	SE	d. f.	MSE	F
Factor A	$SS_A$	a-1	$\frac{SS_A}{a-1}$	$F_0 = \frac{SS_A/(a-1)}{SS_E/(N-a)}$
Error	$SS_E$	N-a	$\frac{SS_E}{N-a}$	
Total	$SS_T$	N-1	$\frac{SS_T}{N-1}$	

Given that  $SS_A$  and  $SS_E$  are indep., and that under  $H_0$   $(a-1)SS_A/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{a-1}$  we have the following decision rule:

reject 
$$H_0$$
 when  $F_0 \ge F_{\alpha,a-1,N-a}$ 

**Important**: This rule generalizes the comparation of two means under normality and homocedasticity.

Parameter estimation: applying MLE method, we want to minimize:

$$f(\mu, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_a) = \sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \hat{y}_{ij})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - (\hat{\mu} + \hat{\tau}_i))^2$$

Differenciating one has that:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} = (-2) \sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \hat{\mu} - \hat{\tau}_i) = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau_i} = (-2) \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \hat{\mu} - \hat{\tau}_i) = 0 \ \forall i = 1..a$$

a+1 parameters, a equations because  $\sum_{i=1}^a \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau_i} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu}$ 



To solve the system, some parameter restrictions (constraints) must be assumed.

#### The most common are:

- Corner point restrictions, usually  $\tau_1 = 0$  or  $\tau_a = 0$ .
- Add up to zero  $\sum_{i=1}^{a} \tau_i = 0$

#### IMPORTANT:

- Parameter estimations will change depending on the constraints. Its interpretation also changes.
- Predicted values  $(\hat{y}_{ij} = \hat{\mu}_i = \hat{\mu} + \hat{\tau}_i)$  will be the same indep. on the constraints.
- In the one way anova  $\hat{\mu}_i \hat{\mu}_j$  is also uniquely estimated regardless of the constraint.



In matrix form, the LM for the one way anova may be written as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_{11} \\ \vdots \\ Y_{ij} \\ \vdots \\ Y_{an_a} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu \\ \tau_1 \\ \tau_2 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_a \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ \vdots \\ e_{ij} \\ \vdots \\ e_{an_a} \end{pmatrix}$$

Observation: We have what is called a collinearity problem.

A corner point restriction is equivalent to supress one of the a last columns and solve the problem. Parameters may also be estimated assuming an add to zero constraint.



Assuming  $\sum_{i=1}^{a} \tau_i = 0$ ,

$$\hat{\mu} = \overline{y}_{..}, \quad \hat{\tau}_i = \overline{y}_{i.} - \overline{y}_{..}$$

#### Parameter interpretation:

- $\mu$  is interpreted as the overall mean, the mean if one doesn't know from which level the observation comes from.
- $\tau_i$  is the deviation from the overall mean if one knows that the observtion belongs to level i.

Predicted value for level i,  $\hat{y}_{ij} = \hat{\mu}_i = \hat{\mu} + \hat{\tau}_i = \overline{y}_i$ .

Predicted difference of two levels  $\hat{\mu}_i - \hat{\mu}_j = \hat{\tau}_i - \hat{\tau}_j = \overline{y}_{i.} - \overline{y}_{j.}$ 



Assuming  $\tau_1 = 0$ ,

$$\hat{\mu} = \overline{y}_1$$
,  $\hat{\tau}_1 = 0$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_i = \overline{y}_i - \overline{y}_1$ 

#### Parameter interpretation:

- ullet  $\mu$  is interpreted as the mean response at the first level.
- $\tau_i$  is the deviation with respect to the first level obtained at the i-thm level.

Predicted value for level i,  $\hat{y}_{ij} = \hat{\mu}_i = \hat{\mu} + \hat{\tau}_i = \overline{y}_i$ .

Predicted difference of two levels  $\hat{\mu}_i - \hat{\mu}_j = \hat{\tau}_i - \hat{\tau}_j = \overline{y}_{i.} - \overline{y}_{j.}$ 



Estimation of the variance parameter:

It is verified that

$$\frac{SSE}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \hat{y}_{i.})^2}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} e_{ij}^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{N-a}^2$$

Applyint the moment estimation method, one has that:

$$E\left(\frac{SSE}{\sigma^2}\right) = N - a \implies \hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{SSE}{N - a}} = \sqrt{MSE}$$

known as square root of the mean square error



In the case where  $H_0$  is rejected, we can go further to determine where does the true differences really exist.

There are methods that allow:

1) to perform two by two comparaisons

$$H_0: \mu_i = \mu_j \ vs \ H_1: \mu_i \neq \mu_j$$

The most important ones are: Newman-Kéuls, Duncan Tukey and LSD,

2) two compare

$$H_0: \sum_{i=1}^{a} c_i \, \mu_i = 0 \ vs \ H_1: \sum_{i=1}^{a} c_i \, \mu_i \neq 0$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^{a} c_i = 0$ , which is known as a **contrast**.



Visual diagnosis test of the model assumptions

To visualy check the model assumptions:

- Perform a normal quantile-quantile plot for the residuals, to check normality. It should be linear.
- Perform an scatter plot of residuals versus predicted, to check that tere is no trend in the residuals or their spread.
- Perform the scatter plot of predicted versus le covariate levels. Again no trends in the spread must be observed.

Comment: If the relative magnitude of errors is smaller than the response by an order of magnitude or more, the trends may be ignored.



#### The Two factor ANOVA with crossed Factors.

Example: We want to compare the *Execution Time* (Y) based on a different *workload types*  $(X_1)$  and b different  $CPU(X_2)$ .

Factors A and B have a and b levels respect. and for each combination (i,j) one has  $n_{ij}$  observations.

Balanced case  $n_{ij} = n \ \forall (i,j)$ 

A B	1	2		b	
1	$y_{111}\cdots y_{11n}$	$y_{121}\cdots y_{12n}$		$y_{1b1}\cdots y_{1bn}$	$\overline{y}_{1}$
2	$y_{211}\cdots y_{21n}$	$y_{221}\cdots y_{22n}$	• • •	$y_{2b1}\cdots y_{2bn}$	$\overline{y}_{2}$
÷					
a	$y_{a11}\cdots y_{a1n}$	$y_{a21}\cdots y_{a2n}$	• • •	$y_{ab1}\cdots y_{abn}$	$\overline{y}_{a}$
	$\overline{y}_{.1.}$	$\overline{y}_{.2.}$		$\overline{y}_{.b.}$	$\overline{y}_{}$

#### The two-way ANOVA:

#### **Additive** model

$$y_{ijk} = \mu + \tau_i + \beta_j + e_{ijk}$$

#### assumptions:

- $e_{ijk} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,
- indep. of errors
- $\bullet \ \sum_i \tau_i = 0 \ \sum_j \beta_j = 0.$

Observation 1: It is possible to have n = 1.

Observation 2: In the case where the factor effects may be multiplicative, it is necessary to consider  $\log(Y)$  as a response r.v.

$$\mu_{ijk} = \mu \cdot \tau_i \cdot \beta_j \iff \log(\mu_{ijk}) = \log(\mu) + \log(\tau_i) + \log(\beta_j)$$

**Goal**: To see if there exists significative differences between the levels of each one of the factors.

That is to test, for a fixed value of  $\alpha$ ,

$$H_0^1: \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \dots = \tau_a = 0 \ vs \ H_1^1: \exists i \ \tau_i \neq 0,$$

and

$$H_0^2: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_b = 0 \ vs \ H_1^2: \exists i \ \beta_i \neq 0,$$



The **two-way ANOVA table** without interaction is equal to:

	SE	d. f.	MSE	F
Factor A	$SS_A$	a-1	$\frac{SS_A}{a-1}$	$F_0^1 = \frac{SS_A/(a-1)}{SS_E/(N-(a+b-1))}$
Factor B	$SS_B$	b-1	$\frac{SS_B}{b-1}$	$F_0^2 = \frac{SS_B/(b-1)}{SS_E/(N-(a+b-1))}$
Error	$SS_E$	N-a-b+1	$\frac{SS_E}{N-a-b+1}$	
Total	$SS_T$	N-1	$\frac{SS_T}{N-1}$	

Decision rules:

reject 
$$H^1_0$$
 if  $F^1_0 \geq F_{\alpha,a-1,N-a}$  reject  $H^2_0$  if  $F^2_0 \geq F_{\alpha,b-1,N-a}$ 

In the case where one thinks that the effect of a level of one factor depends on the level of the other factor with which it is combined, one has to consider the model with **interaction** term. That is:

$$y_{ijk} = \mu + \tau_i + \beta_j + (\gamma)_{ij} + e_{ijk}$$

with assumptions:

- $e_{ijk} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,
- indep. of errors
- $\sum_{i} \tau_{i} = 0$ ,  $\sum_{j} \beta_{j} = 0$ ,  $\forall i$ ,  $\sum_{j} \gamma_{ij} = 0$ ,  $\forall j$ ,  $\sum_{i} \gamma_{ij} = 0$ ,

Graphically, interaction is observed in the lak of parallelism in the poligonal plots corresponding to the mean cells.



In interaction model we also want to test if:

$$H_0^3: \gamma_{ij} = 0, \ \forall (i,j) \ vs \ H_1^3: \exists (i,j) \ \gamma_{ij} \neq 0,$$

If the interaction is significative, it means that the two factors do not act independently.

Observation: The interaction model requires that  $n \geq 2$ , otherwise we do not have degrees of freedom for the error term.



The **two-way ANOVA table** with interaction is equal to:

	SE	d. f.	MSE	F
Factor A	$SS_A$	a-1	$\frac{SS_A}{a-1}$	$F_0^1 = \frac{SS_A/(a-1)}{SS_E/(ab(n-1)))}$
Factor B	$SS_B$	b-1	$\frac{SS_B}{b-1}$	$F_0^2 = \frac{SS_B/(b-1)}{SS_E/(ab(n-1)))}$
AB	$SS_{AB}$	(a-1)(b-1)	$\begin{array}{ c c }\hline SS_{AB}\\\hline (a-1)(b-1)\end{array}$	$F_0^3 = \frac{SS_{AB}/(a-1)(b-1)}{SS_E/(ab(n-1))}$
Error	$SS_E$	ab(n-1)	$\begin{array}{ c c }\hline SS_E\\ ab(n-1) \\\hline \end{array}$	
Total	$SS_T$	N-1	$\frac{SS_T}{N-1}$	

Similar decision rules



If the interaction is statistically different from zero, the same tools used to compare the levels of a factor may be used, once the level of the other factor has been fixed.

This means that, for instance, the two by two mean comparaisons for Factor A may be perform when j takes a fixed value, and the other way around.



#### Two way ANOVA with nested factors

Factor B is *nested* in Factor A, when the levels of B change by changing the level of A.

EXAMPLE: We want to compare several computers in terms of execution times of several benchmarks (Y). One has a total number of six different computers (FACTOR A), and for each computer 4 different benchmarks (FACTOR B) are tested.

If the 4 benchmarks are the same for all the computers, the two factors are crossed. Otherwise, FACTOR B is nested in FACTOR A.

Observation 1: It exists the corresponding ANOVA table for nested factors.

Observation 2: Interaction has no sense with nested factors.



In general,

The amount of variability in the data explained by the assumed model is computed as:

$$R^2 = \frac{SS_{model}}{SS_T}\%$$

where  $SS_{model}$  contains the sums of squares of all the terms in the total variability descomposition, with the exception of the error sum of squares.

As larger is  $R^2$  better the model explains the data.

There also exists the *adjunted-* $R^2$  that penalize models with more parameters.

$$R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \frac{(1 - R^2)(N - 1)}{N - p - 1}$$



Other type of sums of squares in ANOVA

There exists several types of sums of squares.

- Type I sums of squares: they add the total sum of squares.
   Its value depend on the order in which the factors are introduced. Also called sequential sums of squares.
- Type II Computed for main effects in all different possible permutations of them, assuming no interaction.
- Type III Test one main effect after the other and the interaction being included.
- Sums of squares arising out of mutually orthogonal sets of functions.

