## Applied Statistics Mean and Width



## Mean \& Width



## Defining the mean

There are several ways of defining "a typical" value from a dataset:
a) Arithmetic mean
b) Mode (most probably)
c) Median (half below, half above)
d) Geometric mean
e) Harmonic mean
f) Truncated mean (robustness)


## Mean and Width

It turns out, that the best estimator for the mean is (as you all know):


The second (central) moment of the data is called the variance, defined as:

$$
\hat{V}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}\left(x_{i}-\mu\right)^{2}
$$

Note the "hat", which means "estimator". It is sometimes dropped...

## Mean and Width

It turns out, that the best estimator for the mean is (as you all know):


For the standard deviation (SD), a.k.a. width or RMSE, it is:

$$
\hat{\sigma}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}\left(x_{i}-\mu\right)^{2}}
$$

Note the "hat", which means "estimator". It is sometimes dropped...

## Mean and Width

It turns out, that the best estimator for the mean is (as you all know):


For the standard deviation (SD), a.k.a. width or RMSE, it is:

$$
\hat{s}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}}
$$

Note the "hat", which means "estimator". It is sometimes dropped...

## Why not "just" the naive SD?

Imagine taking 3 independent measurements, and then the mean and SD:


Above, all went well, because measurements were nicely distributed on both sides of the mean, and spread out according to SD.

## Why not "just" the naive SD?

Imagine taking 3 independent measurements, and then the mean and RMSE:


Above, all went well, because measurements were nicely distributed on both sides of the mean, and spread out according to SD.


However, now the mean is off (not terribly so) and the SD way off (terribly so!). If we had used the true mean in the formula, it would not have been a problem.

## How incorrect is the naive SD?

Such questions can most easily be answered by a small simulation...
Produce N=3 numbers from a unit Gaussian, and calculate the SD estimate:
Distribution of RMS estimates on three unit Gaussian numbers


So, the "naive" SD underestimates the uncertainty significantly...

## How incorrect is the naive SD?

Such questions can most easily be answered by a small simulation...
Produce $\mathrm{N}=5$ numbers from a unit Gaussian, and calculate the SD estimate:


Here, the "naive" SD underestimates the uncertainty a bit...

## SD and Gaussian $\sigma$ relation

When a distribution is Gaussian, the SD corresponds to the Gaussian width $\sigma$ :


## Mean and Width

What is the uncertainty on the mean? And how quickly does it improve with more data?

## Mean and Width

What is the uncertainty on the mean? And how quickly does it improve with more data?

$$
\hat{\sigma}_{\mu}=\hat{\sigma} / \sqrt{N}
$$

## Mean and Width

What is the uncertainty on the mean? And how quickly does it improve with more data?


$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Example: } \\
\text { Cavendish Experiment } \\
\text { (measurement of Earth's density) } \\
\mathrm{N}=29 \\
\mathrm{mu}=5.42 \\
\operatorname{sigma}=0.333 \\
\operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{mu})=0.06 \\
\text { Earth density }=5.42 \pm \mathbf{0 . 0 6}
\end{gathered}
$$



## Mean and Width

What is the uncertainty on the mean? And how quicklo it move with more data?

$$
\mathrm{N}=29
$$

$$
\mathrm{mu}=5.42
$$

$$
\text { sigma }=0.333
$$

$$
\operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{mu})=0.06
$$

Earth density $=5.42 \pm 0.06$


## Weighted Mean

What if we are given data, which has different uncertainties?
How to average these, and what is the uncertainty on the average?


For measurements with varying uncertainty, there is no meaningful SD! The uncertainty on the mean is:


Can be understood intuitively, if two persons combine 1 vs. 4 measurements

## Weighted Mean

What if we are given data, which has different uncertainties?
How to average these, and what is the uncertainty on the average?


Note that when doing a weighted mean, one should check if the measurements agree with each other!
For measur This can be done with a ChiSquare test. The uncerta


Can be understood intuitively, if two persons combine 1 vs. 4 measurements

## Resolution using InterQuantile Range

A useful measure of resolution is the InterQuantile Range (IQR), as this is not affected by long tails.

IQR measures statistical dispersion, calculated as the difference

$$
I Q R=Q_{3}-Q_{1}
$$

The InterQuantile Efficiency (IQE) is defined as:

## IQE = IQR / 1.349

The factor $1.349=2 \Phi^{-1}(0.75)$ ensures that $\mathrm{IQR}=1$ for a unit
 Gaussian.

## Skewness and Kurtosis

Higher moments reveal something about a distributions asymmetry and tails:


Negative Skew

Positive Skew

$$
\kappa=\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{4}}{\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}\right)^{2}}-3
$$

MESOKURTIC
(normal tails)

PLATYKURTIC
(thinner tails)




