Summarizing Measured Data - Means, Variability, Distributions

## Major Properties of Numerical Data

a Central Tendency: arithmetic mean, geometric mean, harmonic mean, median, mode.
$\square$ Variability: range, inter-quartile range, variance, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, mean absolute deviation
$\square$ Distribution: type of distribution

## Why mean values?

Desire to reduce performance to a single number
> Makes comparisons easy - Mine Apple is faster than your Cray!
> People like a measure of "typical" performance

- Leads to all sorts of crazy ways for summarizing data
> $X=f(10$ parts $A, 25$ parts $B, 13$ parts $C, \ldots)$
$>X$ then represents "typical" performance?!


## The Problem

$\square$ Performance is multidimensional
> CPU time
> I/O time
> Network time
> Interactions of various components
> Etc, etc

## The Problem

$\square$ Systems are often specialized
> Performs great on application type $X$
> Performs lousy on anything else
$\square$ Potentially a wide range of execution times on one system using different benchmark programs

## The Problem

$\square$ Nevertheless, people still want a single number answer!

- How to (correctly) summarize a wide range of measurements with a single value?


## Index of Central Tendency

$\square$ Tries to capture "center" of a distribution of values

- Use this "center" to summarize overall behavior
$\square$ Not recommended for real information, but
> You will be pressured to provide mean values
o Understand how to choose the best type for the circumstance
- Be able to detect bad results from others


## Indices of Central Tendency

$\square$ Sample mean
> Common "average"
$\square$ Sample median
$>\frac{1}{2}$ of the values are above, $\frac{1}{2}$ below
$\square$ Mode
> Most common

## Indices of Central Tendency

-"Sample" implies that
> Values are measured from a random process on discrete random variable $X$
$\square$ Value computed is only an approximation of true mean value of underlying process

- True mean value cannot actually be known
> Would require infinite number of measurements


## Sample mean

- Expected value of $X=E[X]$
> "First moment" of $X$
> $x_{i}=$ values measured
$>p_{i}=\operatorname{Pr}\left(X=x_{i}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ we measure $\left.x_{i}\right)$

$$
E[X]=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} p_{i}
$$

## Sample mean

$\square$ Without additional information, assume
> $p_{i}=$ constant $=1 / n$
> $n=$ number of measurements
Arithmetic mean
> Common "average"

$$
\bar{x}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}
$$

## Potential Problem with Means

- Sample mean gives equal weight to all measurements
- Outliers can have a large influence on the computed mean value
- Distorts our intuition about the central tendency of the measured values


## Potential Problem with Means



## Median

$\square$ Index of central tendency with
$>\frac{1}{2}$ of the values larger, $\frac{1}{2}$ smaller
$\square$ Sort $n$ measurements
$\square$ If $n$ is odd
> Median = middle value
> Else, median = mean of two middle values

- Reduces skewing effect of outliers on the value of the index


## Example

$\square$ Measured values: $10,20,15,18,16$
$\rightarrow$ Mean $=15.8$
> Median $=16$

- Obtain one more measurement: 200
> Mean $=46.5$
> Median $=\frac{1}{2}(16+18)=17$
Median give more intuitive sense of central tendency


## Potential Problem with Means



## Mode

$\square$ Value that occurs most often

- May not exist
$\square$ May not be unique
> E.g. "bi-modal" distribution
- Two values occur with same frequency

Mean, Median, or Mode?

- Mean
> If the sum of all values is meaningful
> Incorporates all available information
$\square$ Median
> Intuitive sense of central tendency with outliers
, What is "typical" of a set of values?
$\square$ Mode
> When data can be grouped into distinct types, categories (categorical data)


## Mean, Median, or Mode?

- Size of messages sent on a network
$\square$ Number of cache hits
- Execution time
- MFLOPS, MIPS
- Bandwidth
$\square$ Speedup
$\square$ Cos $\dagger$


## Yet Even More Means!

- Arithmetic
- Harmonic?

Geometric?
Which one should be used when?
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## Arithmetic mean

$$
\overline{x_{A}}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}
$$

Harmonic mean

$$
\overline{x_{H}}=\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{x_{i}}}
$$

## Geometric mean

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{x_{G}} & =\sqrt[n]{x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{i} \cdots x_{n}} \\
& =\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}\right)^{1 / n}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Which mean to use?

- Mean value must still conform to characteristics of a good performance metric
- Linear
- Reliable
- Repeatable
- Easy to use
- Consistent
- Independent
$\square$ Best measure of performance still is execution time


## What makes a good mean?

- Time-based mean (e.g. seconds)
> Should be directly proportional to total weighted time
> If time doubles, mean value should double
Rate-based mean (e.g. operations/sec)
> Should be inversely proportional to total weighted time
> If time doubles, mean value should reduce by half
$\square$ Which means satisfy these criteria?


## Assumptions

$\square$ Measured execution times of $n$ benchmark programs
> $T_{i}, i=1,2, \ldots, n$
$\square$ Total work performed by each benchmark is constant
> F = \# operations performed
> Relax this assumption later
$\square$ Execution rate $=M_{i}=F / T_{i}$

## Arithmetic mean for times

- Produces a mean value that is directly proportional to total time
$\rightarrow$ Correct mean to

$$
\overline{T_{A}}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_{i}
$$

summarize execution
time

## Arithmetic mean for rates

- Produces a mean value that is proportional to sum of inverse of times
- But we want inversely proportional to sum of times

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{M_{A}} & =\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} M_{i} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{F / T_{i}}{n} \\
& =\frac{F}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{T_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Arithmetic mean for rates

- Produces a mean value that is proportional to sum of inverse of times
- But we want inversely proportional to sum of times
$\rightarrow$ Arithmetic mean is not appropriate for summarizing rates



## Harmonic mean for times

- Not directly
proportional to sum of times

$$
\overline{T_{H}}=\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{T_{i}}}
$$

## Harmonic mean for times

a Not directly proportional to sum of times
$\rightarrow$ Harmonic mean is not appropriate for summarizing times


## Harmonic mean for rates

$\square$ Produces
(total number of ops)
$\div$ (sum execution times)
$\square$ Inversely proportional to total execution time
$\rightarrow$ Harmonic mean is appropriate to summarize rates

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{M_{H}} & =\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{M_{i}}} \\
& =\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{T_{i}}{F}} \\
& =\frac{F n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Harmonic mean for rates

| Sec | $\begin{gathered} 10^{9} \\ \text { FLOPs } \end{gathered}$ | MFLOPS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 321 | 130 | 405 | $\begin{aligned} \overline{M_{H}} & =\frac{5}{\left(\frac{1}{405}+\frac{1}{367}+\frac{1}{405}+\frac{1}{419}+\frac{1}{388}\right)} \\ & =396 \\ \overline{M_{H}} & =\frac{844 \times 10^{9}}{2124}=396 \end{aligned}$ |
| 436 | 160 | 367 |  |
| 284 | 115 | 405 |  |
| 601 | 252 | 419 |  |
| 482 | 187 | 388 |  |

## Geometric mean

- Claim: Correct mean for averaging normalized values
> Used to compute SPECmark
-Claim: Good when averaging measurements with wide range of values
Maintains consistent relationships when comparing normalized values
> Independent of basis used to normalize


## Geometric mean with times

|  | System 1 | System 2 | System 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 417 | 244 | 134 |
|  | 83 | 70 | 70 |
|  | 66 | 153 | 135 |
|  | 39,449 | 33,527 | 66,000 |
| Geo mean | 772 | 368 | 369 |
| Rank | 587 | 503 | 499 |


| Geometric mean normalized to System 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | System 1 | System 2 | System 3 |
|  | 1.0 | 0.59 | 0.32 |
|  | 1.0 | 0.84 | 0.85 |
|  | 1.0 | 2.32 | 2.05 |
|  | 1.0 | 0.85 | 1.67 |
| Geo mean | 1.0 | 0.48 | 0.45 |
| Rank | 1.0 | 0.86 | 0.84 |
|  |  |  |  |

Geometric mean normalized to System 2

|  | System 1 | System 2 | System 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1.71 | 1.0 | 0.55 |
|  | 1.19 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
|  | 0.43 | 1.0 | 0.88 |
|  | 1.18 | 1.0 | 1.97 |
|  | 2.10 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Geo mean | 1.17 | 1.0 | 0.99 |
| Rank | 3 | 2 | 1 |

## Total execution times

|  | System 1 | System 2 | System 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 417 | 244 | 134 |
|  | 83 | 70 | 70 |
|  | 66 | 153 | 135 |
|  | 39,449 | 33,527 | 66,000 |
| Total | 772 | 368 | 369 |
| Arith mean | 40,787 | 34,362 | 66,798 |
| Rank | 8157 | 6872 | 13,342 |

## What's going on here?!

|  | System 1 | System 2 | System 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Geo mean wrt 1 | 1.0 | 0.86 | 0.84 |
| Rank | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Geo mean wrt 2 | 1.17 | 1.0 | 0.99 |
| Rank | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 13,342 |
| Arith mean | 8157 | 6872 | 3 |
| Rank | 2 | 1 |  |

## Geometric mean for times

a Not directly proportional to sum of times

$$
\overline{T_{G}}=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} T_{i}\right)^{1 / n}
$$

## Geometric mean for times

- Not directly proportional to sum of times
$\rightarrow$ Geometric mean is not appropriate for summarizing times



## Geometric mean for rates

- Not inversely proportional to sum of times

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{T_{G}} & =\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}\right)^{1 / n} \\
& =\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{F}{T_{i}}\right)^{1 / n}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Geometric mean for rates

- Not inversely proportional to sum of times
$\rightarrow$ Geometric mean is not appropriate for summarizing rates



## Geometric mean

$\square$ Does provide consistent rankings
> Independent of basis for normalization

- But can be consistently wrong!
$\square$ Value can be computed
> But has no physical meaning


## Other uses of Geometric Mean

- Used when the product of the observations is of interest.
- Important when multiplicative effects are at play:
> Cache hit ratios at several levels of cache
> Percentage performance improvements between successive versions.
> Performance improvements across protocol layers.


## Example of Geometric Mean

|  | Performance Improvement |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Test Number | Operating <br> System | Middleware | Application | Avg. Performance Improvement per Layer |
| 1 | 1.18 | 1.23 | 1.10 | 1.17 |
| 2 | 1.25 | 1.19 | 1.25 | 1.23 |
| 3 | 1.20 | 1.12 | 1.20 | 1.17 |
| 4 | 1.21 | 1.18 | 1.12 | 1.17 |
| 5 | 1.30 | 1.23 | 1.15 | 1.23 |
| 6 | 1.24 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 7 | 1.22 | 1.18 | 1.14 | 1.18 |
| 8 | 1.29 | 1.19 | 1.13 | 1.20 |
| 9 | 1.30 | 1.21 | 1.15 | 1.22 |
| 10 | 1.22 | 1.15 | 1.18 | 1.18 |
| Averag | ge Performance | Improvemen | t per Layer | 1.20 |

## Summary of Means

$\square$ Avoid means if possible
> Loses information
$\square$ Arithmetic
> When sum of raw values has physical meaning
> Use for summarizing times (not rates)

- Harmonic
> Use for summarizing rates (not times)
$\square$ Geometric mean
> Not useful when time is best measure of perf
> Useful when multiplicative effects are in play


## Normalization

$\square$ Averaging normalized values doesn' $\dagger$ make sense mathematically
> Gives a number
> But the number has no physical meaning
$\square$ First compute the mean
> Then normalize

## Weighted means

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}=1 & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Standard definition of } \\
\text { mean assumes all } \\
\text { measurements are } \\
\text { equally important }
\end{array} \\
\bar{x}_{A}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} x_{i} & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Instead, choose } \\
\text { weights to represent } \\
\text { relative importance of } \\
\text { measurement } i
\end{array} \\
\bar{x}_{H}=\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{w_{i}}{x_{i}}} &
\end{array}
$$

## Summarizing Variability

## Quantifying variability

- Means hide information about variability - How "spread out" are the values?
- How much spread relative to the mean?
$\square$ What is the shape of the distribution of values?


## Quantifying variability

$\square$ Indices of dispersion
> Range
> Variance or standard deviation
> 10- and 90-percentiles
> Semi-interquartile range
> Mean absolute deviation

## Histograms



$\square$ Similar mean values

- Widely different distributions
- How to capture this variability in one number?


## Index of Dispersion

- Quantifies how "spread out" measurements are
$\square$ Range
$>$ (max value) - (min value)
$\square$ Maximum distance from the mean
$>$ Max of $\mid x_{i}$-mean $\mid$
$\square$ Neither efficiently incorporates all available information


## Sample Variance

- Second moment of random variable $X$
$s^{2}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}}{n-1}$
$=\frac{n \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{2}-\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}\right)^{2}}{n(n-1)}$

Second form good for calculating "on-thefly"
> One pass through data
$\square(n-1)$ degrees of freedom

## Sample Variance

-Gives "units-squared"

- Hard to compare to mean
$\square$ Use standard deviation, s
$>s=$ square root of variance
> Units = same as mean


## Coefficient of Variation (COV)

- Dimensionless
- Compares relative size of variation to mean
COV $=\frac{s}{\bar{x}}$ value
- Not meaningful for distributions with negative or zero mean


## Quantiles (quartiles, percentiles) and midhinge

- Quartiles: split the data into quarters.
- First quartile (Q1): value of Xi such that $25 \%$ of the observations are smaller than Xi .
> Second quartile (Q2): value of Xi such that $50 \%$ of the observations are smaller than Xi.
> Third quartile (Q3): value of Xi such that $75 \%$ of the observations are smaller than Xi .
$\square$ Percentiles: split the data into hundredths.
$\square$ Midhinge:

$$
\text { Midhinge }=\frac{Q_{3}+Q_{1}}{2}
$$



## Example of Percentile

| 1.05 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1.06 |
| 1.09 |
| 1.19 |
| 1.21 |
| 1.28 |
| 1.34 |
| 1.34 |
| 1.77 |
| 1.80 |
| 1.83 |
| 2.15 |
| 2.21 |
| 2.27 |
| 2.61 |
| 2.67 |
| 2.77 |
| 2.83 |
| 3.51 |
| 3.77 |
| 5.76 |
| 5.78 |
| 32.07 |
| 144.91 |


\section*{| 80 -percentile | 3.613002 |
| :--- | :--- |}

1.06
.19
.21
1.28
1.34

In Excel:
p-th percentile=PERCENTILE $(<$ array $>$,p $)$ ( $0 \leq \mathrm{p} \leq 1$ )

## Interquartile Range

- Interquartile Range: $Q_{3}-Q_{1}$
> not affected by extreme values.
$\square$ Semi-Interquartile Range (SIQR)

$$
S I Q R=\left(Q_{3}-Q_{1}\right) / 2
$$

$\square$ If the distribution is highly skewed, SIQR is preferred to the standard deviation for the same reason that median is preferred to mean

## Coefficient of Skewness

$\square$ Coefficient of skewness: $\frac{1}{n s^{3}} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}\right)^{3}$

|  | $(\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Xi})^{\wedge} 3$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1.05 | -606.1 |
| 1.06 | -602.9 |
| 1.09 | -596.1 |
| 1.19 | -575.2 |
| 1.21 | -571.8 |
| 1.28 | -557.9 |
| 1.34 | -546.4 |
| 1.34 | -544.8 |
| 1.77 | -464.5 |
| 1.80 | -458.1 |
| 1.83 | -453.1 |
| 2.15 | -398.9 |
| 2.21 | -388.8 |
| 2.27 | -379.0 |
| 2.61 | -328.5 |
| 2.67 | -320.5 |
| 2.77 | -306.6 |
| 2.83 | -298.7 |
| 3.51 | -215.9 |
| 3.77 | -189.6 |
| 5.76 | -52.9 |
| 5.78 | -52.1 |
| 32.07 | 11476.6 |
| 144.91 | 2482007.1 |

## Mean Absolute Deviation

- Mean absolute deviation: $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|X_{i}-\bar{X}\right|$

|  | abs(Xi-Xbar) |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1.05 | 8.46 |
| 1.06 | 8.45 |
| 1.09 | 8.42 |
| 1.19 | 8.32 |
| 1.21 | 8.30 |
| 1.28 | 8.23 |
| 1.34 | 8.18 |
| 1.34 | 8.17 |
| 1.77 | 7.74 |
| 1.80 | 7.71 |
| 1.83 | 7.68 |
| 2.15 | 7.36 |
| 2.21 | 7.30 |
| 2.27 | 7.24 |
| 2.61 | 6.90 |
| 2.67 | 6.84 |
| 2.77 | 6.74 |
| 2.83 | 6.68 |
| 3.51 | 6.00 |
| 3.77 | 5.74 |
| 5.76 | 3.75 |
| 5.78 | 3.73 |
| 32.07 | 22.56 |
| 144.91 | 135.39 |
|  | 315.90 |


| Average | 9.51 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean absolute deviation | 13.16 |

## Shapes of Distributions



Right-skewed distribution


Symmetric distribution

mode median

Left-skewed distribution

## Selecting the index of dispersion

Numerical data
> If the distribution is bounded, use the range
> For unbounded distributions that are unimodal and symmetric, use C.O.V.
> O/w use percentiles or SIQR

## Box-and-Whisker Plot

Graphical representation of data through a five-number summary.

| I/OTime <br> (msec) |
| ---: |
| 8.04 |
| 9.96 |
| 5.68 |
| 6.95 |
| 8.81 |
| 10.84 |
| 4.26 |
| 4.82 |
| 8.33 |
| 7.58 |
| 7.24 |
| 7.46 |
| 8.84 |
| 5.73 |
| 6.77 |
| 7.11 |
| 8.15 |
| 5.39 |
| 6.42 |
| 7.81 |
| 12.74 |
| 6.08 |


| Five-number Summary |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Minimum | 4.26 |
| First Quartile | 6.08 |
| Median | 7.35 |
| Third Quartile | 8.33 |
| Maximum | 12.74 |

## Determining Distributions

## Determining the Distributions of a Data Set

$\square$ A measured data set can be summarized by stating its average and variability

- If we can say something about the distribution of the data, that would provide all the information about the data
> Distribution information is required if the summarized mean and variability have to be used in simulations or analytical models
$\square$ To determine the distribution of a data set, we compare the data set to a theoretical distribution
> Heuristic techniques (Graphical/Visual): Histograms, Q-Q plots
> Statistical goodness-of-fit tests: Chi-square test, Kolmogrov-Smirnov test
- Will discuss this topic in detail later this semester


## Comparing Data Sets

- Problem: given two data sets D1 and D2 determine if the data points come from the same distribution.
- Simple approach: draw a histogram for each data set and visually compare them.
- To study relationships between two variables use a scatter plot.
- To compare two distributions use a quantilequantile (Q-Q) plot.


## Histogram

- Divide the range (max value - min value) into equalsized cells or bins.
- Count the number of data points that fall in each cell.
$\square$ Plot on the $y$-axis the relative frequency, i.e., number of point in each cell divided by the total number of points and the cells on the $x$-axis.
- Cell size is critical!
> Sturge's rule of thumb
Given $n$ data points, number of bins $k=\left\lfloor 1+\log _{2} n\right\rfloor$


## Histogram

| Data |
| :---: |
| -3.0 |
| 0.8 |
| 1.2 |
| 1.5 |
| 2.0 |
| 2.3 |
| 2.4 |
| 3.3 |
| 3.5 |
| 4.0 |
| 4.5 |
| 5.5 |


| Bin | Frequency | Relative <br> Frequency |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $<=0$ | 1 | $8.3 \%$ |
| $0<x<=1$ | 1 | $8.3 \%$ |
| $1<x<=2$ | 3 | $25.0 \%$ |
| $2<x<=3$ | 2 | $16.7 \%$ |
| $3<x<=4$ | 3 | $25.0 \%$ |
| $4<x<=5$ | 1 | $8.3 \%$ |
| $>5$ | 1 | $8.3 \%$ |

In Excel:
Tools -> Data Analysis -> Histogram


## Histogram



## Scatter Plot

-Plot a data set against each other to visualize potential relationships between the data sets.

- Example: CPU time vs. I/O Time
-In Excel: XY (Scatter) Chart Type.



## Plots Based on Quantiles

- Consider an ordered data set with $n$ values $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$.
$\square$ If $p=(i-0.5) / n$ for $i \leq n$, then the $p$ quantile $Q(p)$ of the data set is defined as $Q(p)=Q([i-0.5] / n)=x_{i}$
$\square Q(p)$ for other values of $p$ is computed by linear interpolation.
$\square$ A quantile plot is a plot of $\mathrm{Q}(p)$ vs. $p$.



## Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q plots)

$\square$ Used to compare distributions.
$\square$ "Equal shape" is equivalent to "linearly related quantile functions."
$\square A$ Q-Q plot is a plot of the type $\left(Q_{1}(p), Q_{2}(p)\right.$ ) where $Q_{1}(p)$ is the quantile function of data set 1 and $Q_{2}(p)$ is the quantile function of data set 2 . The values of $p$ are $(i-0.5) / n$ where $n$ is the size of the smaller data set.

## Q-QPlot Example

| $i$ | $p=(i-0.5) / n$ | Data 1 | Data 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 0.033 | 0.2861 | 0.5640 |
| 2 | 0.100 | 0.3056 | 0.8657 |
| 3 | 0.167 | 0.5315 | 0.9120 |
| 4 | 0.233 | 0.5465 | 1.0539 |
| 5 | 0.300 | 0.5584 | 1.1729 |
| 6 | 0.367 | 0.7613 | 1.2753 |
| 7 | 0.433 | 0.8251 | 1.3033 |
| 8 | 0.500 | 0.9014 | 1.3102 |
| 9 | 0.567 | 0.9740 | 1.6678 |
| 10 | 0.633 | 1.0436 | 1.7126 |
| 11 | 0.700 | 1.1250 | 1.9289 |
| 12 | 0.767 | 1.1437 | 1.9495 |
| 13 | 0.833 | 1.4778 | 2.1845 |
| 14 | 0.900 | 1.8377 | 2.3623 |
| 15 | 0.967 | 2.1074 | 2.6104 |



A Q-Q plot that is reasonably linear indicates that the two data sets have distributions with similar shapes.

## Theoretical Q-Q Plot

- Compare one empirical data set with a theoretical distribution.
$\square \operatorname{Plot}\left(x_{i}, \mathrm{Q}_{2}([i-0.5] / n)\right)$ where $x_{i}$ is the [ $i-0.5] / n$ quantile of a theoretical distribution $\left(\mathrm{F}^{-1}([i-0.5] / n)\right.$ ) and $\mathrm{Q}_{2}([i-$ $0.5] / n$ ) is the $i$-th ordered data point.
$\square$ If the Q-Q plot is reasonably linear the data set is distributed as the theoretical distribution.


## Examples of CDFs and Their Inverse

## Functions

Exponential

$$
F(x)=1-e^{-x / a}
$$

$$
-a \operatorname{Ln}(1-u)
$$

Pareto

$$
F(x)=1-x^{-a}
$$

$$
\frac{1}{(1-u)^{1 / a}}
$$

Geometric

$$
F(x)=1-(1-p)^{x} \quad\left\lceil\frac{\operatorname{Ln}(u)}{\operatorname{Ln}(1-p)}\right\rceil
$$

## Example of a Quantile-Quantile

 Plot- One thousand values are suspected of coming from an exponential distribution (see histogram in the next slide). The quantile-quantile plot is pretty much linear, which confirms the conjecture.



## Data for Quantile-Quantile Plot

| $\mathbf{q i}$ | $\mathbf{y i}$ | $\mathbf{x i}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.100 | 0.22 | 0.21 |
| 0.200 | 0.49 | 0.45 |
| 0.300 | 0.74 | 0.71 |
| 0.400 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 0.500 | 1.41 | 1.39 |
| 0.600 | 1.84 | 1.83 |
| 0.700 | 2.49 | 2.41 |
| 0.800 | 3.26 | 3.22 |
| 0.900 | 4.31 | 4.61 |
| 0.930 | 4.98 | 5.32 |
| 0.950 | 5.49 | 5.99 |
| 0.970 | 6.53 | 7.01 |
| 0.980 | 7.84 | 7.82 |
| 0.985 | 8.12 | 8.40 |
| 0.990 | 8.82 | 9.21 |
| 1.000 | 17.91 | 18.42 |



## What if the Inverse of the CDF Cannot be Found?

- Use approximations or use statistical tables
> Quantile tables have been computed and published for many important distributions
$\square$ For example, approximation for $N(0,1)$ :

$$
x_{i}=4.91\left[q_{i}^{0.14}-\left(1-q_{i}\right)^{0.14}\right]
$$

$\square$ For $N(\mu, \sigma)$ the $x_{i}$ values are scaled as $\mu+\sigma x_{i}$ before plotting.





