

13. The Cochran-Satterthwaite Approximation for Linear Combinations of Mean Squares

Suppose M_1, \dots, M_k are independent mean squares and that

$$\left(\frac{d_i M_i}{E(M_i)} \right) \sim \chi_{d_i}^2 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k.$$

It follows that

$$E \left[\frac{d_i M_i}{E(M_i)} \right] = d_i, \quad \text{Var} \left[\frac{d_i M_i}{E(M_i)} \right] = 2d_i, \quad \text{and} \quad M_i \sim \boxed{\frac{E(M_i)}{d_i}} \chi_{d_i}^2$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

scaled $\chi_{d_i}^2$

Consider the random variable

Chapt 12 : $1.5 \text{ hS}(X_k \text{ (Art)}) - 0.5 \text{ hSE}$

$$M = a_1 M_1 + a_2 M_2 + \cdots + a_k M_k, \quad (1)$$

where a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k are known constants in \mathbb{R} .

Note that M is a linear combination of scaled χ^2 random variables.

The Cochran-Satterthwaite approximation works by assuming that M is approximately distributed as a scaled χ^2 , just like each of the variables in the linear combination.

On slide 2 we state that $\frac{d_i M_i}{E(M_i)} \sim \chi^2_{d_i}$

$$\frac{dM}{E(M)} \stackrel{\text{approx.}}{\sim} \chi^2_d \iff M \stackrel{\text{approx.}}{\sim} \frac{E(M)}{d} \chi^2_d. \quad (2)$$

While we now switch to approx

Why? d_i on slide 2 are integer values. They have to be integer values by definition of a χ^2 -random variable.

The a_i in $M = a_1 M_1 + \dots + a_k M_k$ are typically not integers \Rightarrow hence, we only have an approx χ^2 -r.v.

What choice for d makes the approximation most reasonable?

The Cochran-Satterthwaite formula for the approximate degrees of freedom associated with the linear combination of mean squares defined by M is

$$d = \frac{M^2}{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i M_i\right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i}.$$

Why?

Consider the definition/approximation of M in (1) and (2):

- $M = \underbrace{a_1 M_1 + a_2 M_2 + \cdots + a_k M_k}$ and

(1)

- $\underbrace{M} \stackrel{approx.}{\sim} \frac{E(M)}{d} \chi_d^2.$

(2)

- Calculate $\text{Var}(M)$ using M as defined in (1) and also using its approximation given in (2)
- Both variances are functions of d . We equate both variances and solve for d .
- The details are shown on the next two slides.

from (2) on slide 5

see comment added on slide 3

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(M) &\approx \left(\frac{E(M)}{d}\right)^2 \text{Var}(\chi_d^2) \\ &= \left(\frac{E(M)}{d}\right)^2 \underline{(2d)} \\ &= \frac{2[E(M)]^2}{d} \\ &\approx \underline{\underline{\frac{2M^2}{d}}}.\end{aligned}$$

slide 2

* Technically, the last line is "=", however, the overall result is approximate because that is how we started out in line 1.


And

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\text{Var}(M)} &= \underline{a_1^2 \text{Var}(M_1)} + \cdots + \underline{a_k^2 \text{Var}(M_K)} \\&= a_1^2 \left[\frac{\text{E}(M_1)}{d_1} \right]^2 \underline{2d_1} + \cdots + a_k^2 \left[\frac{\text{E}(M_k)}{d_k} \right]^2 \underline{2d_k} \\&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i^2 [\text{E}(M_i)]^2}{d_i} \\&\approx 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i.\end{aligned}$$

Equating these two variance approximations yields

$$\frac{2M^2}{d} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i$$

and solving for d yields

$$d = \frac{M^2}{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i M_i\right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 M_i^2 / d_i}.$$


Recall the first example from the last slide set.

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{111} \\ y_{121} \\ y_{211} \\ y_{212} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Handwritten annotations: "account for" above \mathbf{X} , "tr 2" below it, "exp. unit 1" above \mathbf{Z} with a downward arrow, "exp. unit 3" above \mathbf{Z} with a checkmark, "exp. unit 2" below \mathbf{Z} . The vector \mathbf{y} has a blue underline under the first two elements and "tr 1" next to y_{111} and "tr 2" next to y_{212} .

$$\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{X}, \quad \mathbf{X}_3 = \mathbf{Z}$$

$$\mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{P}_2 - \mathbf{P}_1) \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{P}_3 - \mathbf{P}_2) \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_3) \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_1) \mathbf{y}$$

Expected Mean Squares

SOURCE	EMS
<i>trt</i>	$1.5\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_e^2 + (\tau_1 - \tau_2)^2$
$xu(trt)$	$\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_e^2$
$ou(xu, trt)$	σ_e^2

$$\begin{aligned} E(1.5MS_{xu(trt)} - 0.5MS_{ou(xu, trt)}) &= 1.5(\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_e^2) - 0.5\sigma_e^2 \\ &= 1.5\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_e^2 \end{aligned}$$

An Approximate F Test

The statistic

$$F = \frac{MS_{trt}}{1.5MS_{xu(trt)} - 0.5MS_{ou(xu, trt)}}$$

is approximately F distributed with 1 numerator degree of freedom and denominator degrees of freedom approximated by the Cochran-Satterthwaite Method:

from SAS, R,

$$d = \frac{(1.5MS_{xu(trt)} - 0.5MS_{ou(xu, trt)})^2}{(1.5)^2 [MS_{xu(trt)}] \cancel{2} + (-0.5)^2 [MS_{ou(xu, trt)}] \cancel{2} \cdot 1}$$

df are 1 here due instead of $2 = tu - t$
because the data are not balanced

SAS Code for Example

Secondly, we only have 4 data points, allowing for "only" $df=3$ that we can use for testing in the ANOVA table; see table on slide 16

```
data d;  
  input trt xu y;  
  cards;  
1 1 6.4  
1 2 4.2  
2 1 1.5  
2 1 0.9  
;  
run;
```

two distinct exp. units

tell SAS by properly setting up
the random statement

SAS Code for Example

Proc Glimmix or Proc Mixed

Random int / Subject = xu

does the same

Methods of Moments

```
proc mixed method=type1;  
  class trt xu;  
  model y=trt / ddfm=satterthwaite;  
  random xu(trt);  
run;
```

tells SAS that xu are nested within treatment

random effects

The Mixed Procedure

Model Information

Data Set	WORK.D
Dependent Variable	y
Covariance Structure	Variance Components
<u>Estimation Method</u>	Type 1
Residual Variance Method	Factor
Fixed Effects SE Method	Model-Based
<u>Degrees of Freedom Method</u>	<u>Satterthwaite</u>

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
trt	2	1 2
xu	2	1 2

Dimensions

Covariance Parameters

Columns in X

Columns in Z

Subjects

Max Obs Per Subject

2

3

3

1

4

σ_u^2 σ_e^2

SAS recognizes the
3 distinct exp.
units

Number of Observations

Number of Observations Read

4

Number of Observations Used

4

Number of Observations Not Used

0

Type 1 Analysis of Variance

$$\hat{\sigma}_u^2 = 2.42 - 0.18$$

$$= 2.24$$

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
trt	1	16.810000	16.810000
xu(trt)	1	2.420000	2.420000
Residual	1	0.180000	0.180000

We only have
3 degrees
of freedom

to use \Rightarrow 1 df
for each Source

$$= \hat{\sigma}_e^2 + \hat{\sigma}_u^2$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$$

Source	Expected Mean Square	Error Term
trt	$\text{Var}(\text{Residual}) + 1.5$ $\text{Var}(\text{xu}(\text{trt})) + 0(\text{trt})$	$1.5 \text{ MS}(\text{xu}(\text{trt}))$ $- 0.5 \text{ MS}(\text{Residual})$
xu(trt)	$\text{Var}(\text{Residual}) + \text{Var}(\text{xu}(\text{trt}))$ $(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2)^2$ $\hat{\sigma}_e^2 + \hat{\sigma}_u^2$	MS(Residual)
Residual	Var(Residual)	

$$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$$

Degrees of Freedom for Satterthwaite Approximation

$$\begin{aligned}d &= \frac{(1.5MS_{xu(trt)} - 0.5MS_{ou(xu, trt)})^2}{(1.5)^2 [MS_{xu(trt)}]^2 + (-0.5)^2 [MS_{ou(xu, trt)}]^2} \\&= \frac{(1.5 \times 2.42 - 0.5 \times 0.18)^2}{(1.5)^2 [2.42]^2 + (-0.5)^2 [0.18]^2} \\&= 0.9504437\end{aligned}$$

Type 1 Analysis of Variance

Source	Error DF	F Value	Pr > F
trt	0.9504	4.75	0.2840
xu(trt)	1	13.44	0.1695
Residual	.	.	.

d using the CS approximat.

Covariance Parameter Estimates

Cov Parm	Estimate
xu(trt)	2.2400
Residual	0.1800

$\hat{\sigma}_u^2$

$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$

Concluding Remarks

This example was chosen to be small so that we could write out all the data and see how each observation was involved in the analysis.

Because of the very low sample size, it would be surprising if the approximate F test worked well for this example.

It would be difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions with 4 observations of the response on 3 experimental units.

We will see more practically relevant examples where the samples sizes are larger and the approximate F -based inferences may be reasonable.

Concluding Remarks

In more complicated examples, there may be more than one linear combination of mean squares with the desired expectation.

In such cases, linear combinations with non-negative coefficients are recommended over those with a mix of positive and negative coefficients.