

Analysis of variance

Citation: *Anal. Methods*, 2013, 5, 5373

Analytical Methods Committee, AMCTB No 57

Received: 4 September 2013

DOI: 10.1039/c3a90070c

View Article Online

Non-parametric statistical methods, which make few assumptions about the underlying distribution, have often been neglected in the analytical sciences. A major advantage of them is that they can be used "at the bench."

Parametric vs. non-parametric?

Analytical scientists generally make replicate measurements and treat them as a random sample, from which estimates are made of the properties of the (hypothetically infinite) population of measurements. The population mean, confidence limits, etc. are usually calculated using the assumption that the underlying distribution is normal (Gaussian), with mean μ and variance σ^2 , etc. It can be summarised as $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. The terms μ and σ are the parameters of the distribution. Similarly a binomial distribution is described as $B(n, p)$, where the parameters n and p are respectively the total number of measurements and the probability of one of the two possible outcomes.

This parameter-based approach to data handling is not essential, and may not always be appropriate. Some times it is known that a population distribution is not normal or even close to it, so deductions made on the assumption of normality might be unreliable. This is particularly true in cases where the same measurements are made on similar but non-identical sample materials of natural origin. The antibody levels in blood plasma samples from different human subjects are roughly log-normal distributed, with the addition of some subjects with exceptionally high levels in various diseases as examples. Methods that do not make assumptions about the form of the population distribution are called non-parametric or distribution-free methods. In applying them the familiar approach to

significance testing is still used. We set up a null hypothesis H_0 and find the probability of obtaining the actual or more extreme results if H_0 is true: if this probability is smaller than H_0 is rejected. But their simplicity makes non-parametric methods attractive even in situations where more familiar tests such as the t -test might otherwise be applied, as the examples below will show.

Some simple examples

Suppose that an analytical reagent is suspected of having a purity of 99.5%, and that successive batches are found to have purities of 99.2%, 99.8%, 98.9%, 99.4%, 99.1%, 99.3%, and 99.0%. Is there evidence that the purity of the material is lower than it should be? Such results are unlikely to come from a normal population (after all, the maximum possible purity is 100%) so a t -test or other parametric approach could well be unsafe. A key statistic here is the median: the null hypothesis is that the data come from a population with a median purity level of 99.5%. To carry out the test simply subtract this median from each of the experimental results, and note the sign of the result. This gives six minus signs and one positive sign, i.e. six of the seven results lie below the median. (An result that equals the hypothetical median is ignored completely). The probability of getting six (or more) minus signs out of seven is provided by the binomial theorem, but the values are provided in statistical tables, and can be memorised if the analyst always makes the same number of measurements. Here the probability of getting 6 or more minus signs is 0.0625, a little higher than the probability level commonly used in significance testing ($\alpha = 0.05$), so we retain the null hypothesis that the results could come from a population with a median purity of 99.5%. As always we have to be prepared that they do come from such a population: we have

failed to disprove H_0 . Note that this is a one-tailed test, as the question is whether the proportion is lower than it should be. With a significance level of 0.05, the test would only be rejected if all seven results give minimum signs when compared with the median value: this outcome has a probability of only $(1/2)^7 = 1/128$. This method is called the sign test, and it can be extended to other situations, such as comparing two sets of paired results, or studying a possible trend in a sequence of results.

Another simple test in many applications is called the Quick Test (after John W. Tukey, a major figure in non-parametric statistics and initial data analysis) or the Tail Count Test, the latter being a good description of its operation. It is used to compare two independent data sets, which need not be of the same size. Suppose the observations of the level of a atmospheric NO ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) at a roadside site: 128, 121, 117, 125, 131 and 119. At a nearby off-road site we make six more measurements using the same analytical method, obtaining the results 120, 108, 109, 112, 114 and 110 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Is there any evidence that the NO level is lower at the second site than at the first? These two sets of results could be compared using a one-tailed test, but the Tukey approach is simpler. We simply count the number of results in the first data set that are higher than all the values in the second set (here are 4 of them), and the number of values in the second set that are lower than all those in the first set (5 of them). If either of these counts is zero, the test ends at once with the null hypothesis (here, that moving away from the road does not affect the NO level) being accepted. Otherwise the two counts are added together to provide the test statistic T ($= 9$ here), and this is compared with the critical value. For a one-tailed test at $\alpha = 0.05$, T must be greater than or equal to 6 if H_0 is to be rejected. So H_0 can be rejected here; the NO level at the off-road site does seem to be lower. The merit of the Tukey method is that if the total number of measurements is no more than ~ 20 , and if the two sample sizes are not greatly different (conditions often met in analytical practice), the critical T values are independent of sample size! For the rejection of the null hypothesis in a one-tailed test the value of T must be $\geq 6, 7, 10$ and 14 at $\alpha = 0.05, 0.025, 0.005,$ and 0.0005 respectively. For a two-tailed test the corresponding critical values of T are 7, 8, 11 and 15 respectively. This remarkable feature of the method means that it can be carried out using mental arithmetic only.

What is it like?

Many non-parametric methods have been developed, including ones analogous to the familiar t - and F -tests, analysis of variance, and calibration and regression methods, but despite their practical merits only a few have found favour in the analytical sciences. One possible reason for this is that most non-parametric methods need a sample of at least 6 measurements. Another reason is the growing popularity of robust methods (AMCTB 6, 50), which are well suited to the common situation where the error distribution is bimodal but not very different from Gaussian. Furthermore it is evident that in the case of

examples above the fundamental conceptual content of the data is not used. In the sign test only the signs of the differences are considered, not their magnitude; and in the Tukey method the test statistic is again a count rather than an accurate reflection of the numerical results. We might therefore expect that non-parametric methods would be poorer than methods using