Evaluation of the uncertainty type A of the random stationary signal component from its autocorrelated observations

Abstract

A proposal of evaluation of the uncertainty type A of the stationary random component of measured signal from its regularly sampled observations when they are auto-correlated is described. In the first step the regularly variable components of the signal are identified and removed from the raw sample data. Then upgraded formulas for standard uncertainty type A of the sample and of the mean value are expressed with use the correction coefficients or the so-called “effective number” of observations. These equations depend on number of observations and on the autocorrelation function of the sample cleaned from regular components. Two methods of finding and estimating the autocorrelation function for the sample data are also described. Some numerical examples are included.
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1. Introduction

Most of measured signals have regular and random components. Because of influence of environment and internal sources the randomness may exist in the measured object and in the measurement system. If only some regular components of the signal have to be measured then random component can be considered as the random error and evaluated by the uncertainty type A. This component has the form of random process and can be treated as the stationary one in some period of time of considering as the random error and evaluated by the uncertainty type A. The international guide GUM [1], gives recommendations how to evaluate in measurement the standard and expanded uncertainties with the known relation \( \sigma(\bar{x}) = \sigma / \sqrt{n} \). In opposite, when the observations are fully correlated (closely linked), i.e. \( \rho \rightarrow 1 \), with (3a) it results

\[
D_\rho \rightarrow \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k) \rho^k = n-1
\]

Then the standard deviation of the mean is the same as for a single observation because in the limit \( \rho \rightarrow 1 \) all subsequently repeated observations will be the same.

The value of \( n_{\text{eff}} \) is needed to properly estimate the standard deviations \( s(x_i), s(\bar{x}) \) for sample of autocorrelated observations [4-6]. Their relations to GUM parameters \( s(x_i), s(\bar{x}) \) are given in the Table 1.

Autocorrelation data have the effective number degrees of freedom \( v_{\text{eff}} \). Defined approximately value of \( v_{\text{eff}} \) [4-6] is given in Table 1 by eq. (8). In this case \( v_{\text{eff}} \neq n_{\text{eff}} - 1 \) [4, 5]. The relative dispersion of the standard deviation of autocorrelated observation depends on \( v_{\text{eff}} \). It is also given in the Table 1 - eq. (9). Formulas for calculation expanded uncertainties of non-correlated and correlated data are given in the last row of Tab. 1.

3. Estimator of the autocorrelation function of measurement data sample

The autocorrelation function is usually not known and needs to be estimated from the measurement data. The most commonly used has form

\[
r_k = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=k}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})(x_{i+k} - \bar{x})
\]

where:

\[
n_{\text{eff}} = \frac{n}{1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (1-k/n) \rho^k}
\]

For the statistically independent observations \( \rho_k \rightarrow 0 \) (for \( k \geq 0 \)), consequently \( D_\rho = 0 \) and formula (2) passes to the commonly known relation \( \sigma(\bar{x}) = \sigma / \sqrt{n} \). In opposite, when the observations are fully correlated (closely linked), i.e. \( \rho \rightarrow 1 \), with (3a) it results

\[
D_\rho \rightarrow \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k) \rho^k = n-1
\]
Tab. 1. Standard deviation and uncertainty of the sample of non correlated and autocorrelated data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Non autocorrelated data (GUM)</th>
<th>Autocorrelated data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective number of observations</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n_{eff} = \frac{n}{1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \rho_k} ) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation of single observation</td>
<td>( s(x) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2 )</td>
<td>( s(x) = k_x \bar{x} ) (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>( v = n-1 )</td>
<td>( v_{eff} = \frac{n}{1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \rho_k} - 1 ) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related standard dispersion of standard deviation</td>
<td>( \rho(x) = \frac{n(n-1)}{\chi^2} )</td>
<td>( \rho(x) = \frac{n(n-1)}{\chi^2_{eff}} ) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded uncertainty for probability ( p ) (coefficient ( k_p ))</td>
<td>( U = k_p u = k_p \sqrt{u_A^2 + u_B^2} )</td>
<td>( U = k_p u = k_p \sqrt{u_A^2 + u_B^2} ) (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimate \( r_k \) (Fig. 1a) has two qualitatively different parts. For small \( k \) there is the falling edge, in which real information about the autocorrelation function is contained. The remainder tail is the image of a rather large fluctuations of the correlated noise.

According Zieba [4, 5], the replacement of the function \( \rho_k \) in (3) by its estimate \( r_k \) leads to the not satisfied estimate of the effective number of observations \( n_{eff} \). The reason is the influence of the tail of autocorrelation function. Zieba proposed to reduce summation in (11) to a few initial estimates of \( r_k \) elements, i.e.

\[ \tilde{n}_{eff} = \frac{n}{1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} (1 - \frac{k}{n})^2} \] (12)

The border value \( n_v \) is determined by the last non-zero element of the \( r_k \) estimate before its first passage through zero (FTZ method – the first transit through zero). For example, this value for the curve given in Figure 1a is \( n_v = 3 \). FTZ method is valid only for positive correlations.

Fig. 1b [6], [4] shows two examples of probability distributions of the estimators obtained by Monte Carlo method. The distribution marked as “teor” in Figure 1b is calculated from the formula for uncovared observations of the standard deviation resulting from the distribution of \( \chi^2 \), where \( v \) was substituted by the effective number of degrees of freedom \( \chi^2_{eff} = n_{eff}-1 \). The model AR (1) there is an autoregressive time series of the first order, for which \( r_k = a^1 \) [4].

Example

Let us find the standard deviation of single measurement \( s_a(q_i) \) and of the mean value \( s_{\bar{q}}(\bar{q}) \) of 120 data of simulated observations \( q_i \) taken from [7] and given in Figure 2.

After withdrawal trend the estimator \( r_k \) of their autocorrelation function is taken for \( n_v = 3 \) according to Figure 1a. The large obtained value of \( r_k = 0.81 \) confirms the autocorrelation of these data. Standard deviation without considering the autocorrelation is \( s_a(q_i) = 0.0241 \). At this value of \( r_k \) the formula (12) implies the estimate \( n_{eff} = 32.1 \) and from (6a) and (7a) the coefficient \( k_u = 1.012 \) and \( k_x = 1.96 \). Correlation do not affects significantly the \( s_a(q_i) = 0.0244 \), and much more the \( u_A \), which increases about 2 times from \( s_a(q) = 0.00219 \) to \( s_{\bar{q}}(\bar{q}) = 0.00472 \). From (9) and (10) is \( u_A \approx 22.7 \).
4. Using F-test for the indirect detecting of the autocorrelation

Test proposed in [8] is realized by the separation of \( n \) registered observations into \( k \) shorter series containing \( m \) observations \((n = m \cdot k)\), and estimation and comparing the variance of the mean values of these series with an average of their variances. If the ratio of these variance estimators after normalization by the number of degrees of freedom \( k - 1 \) and \( n - k \) is greater than the critical value \( F_{1,\alpha}(k-1, n - k) \) from the \( F \)-distribution \((\alpha \) is a significance level) then it testifies to the autocorrelation of observations.

In order to carry out the indirect identification of autocorrelation the \( n \) registered observations are separated into \( k \) shorter series of \( m \) observations and registered in a matrix of the size \( n \times k \).

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_1 & x_{m+1} & \cdots & x_{(j-1)m+1} & \cdots & x_{(k-1)m+1} \\
  x_2 & x_{m+2} & \cdots & x_{(j-1)m+2} & \cdots & x_{(k-1)m+2} \\
  \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
  x_1 & x_{2m} & \cdots & x_{(j-1)m+j} & \cdots & x_{(k-1)m+j} \\
  \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
  \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
  x_n & x_{2n} & \cdots & x_{j.m} & \cdots & x_{k.m}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(13)

Mean values \( \overline{x}_{m,j} \) for groups of observations of each \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, k \) column and \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, m \) row of matrix (13) and the global mean \( \overline{x} \) are given as (13a). They shall be calculated as

\[
\overline{x}_{m,j} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} x_{(j-1)m+l}, \quad \overline{x} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \overline{x}_{m,j}
\]

(14)

The estimators of particular variations of column \( s_{m,j}^2 \) and the global variation \( s_n^2 \) can be calculated as:

\[
s_{m,j}^2 = \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{l=1}^{m} (x_{(j-1)m+l} - \overline{x}_{m,j})^2, \quad s_n^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^{n} (x_l - \overline{x})^2
\]

(15)

The estimator of the variations of column means \( s_{x,m}^2 \) can be determined as:

\[
s_{x,m}^2 = s_n^2 - s_{col}^2
\]

(16)

where \( s_{col}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{m,j}^2 \) is a mean of column variations.

For the normally distributed uncorrelated observations of the variance \( \sigma^2 \) according to the estimated by formulas (15) and (16) variances are characterized by the number of degrees of freedom:

\[
s_{m,j}^2 \Rightarrow n - 1, \quad s_n^2 \Rightarrow k - 1, \quad s_{col}^2 \Rightarrow n - k.
\]

Therefore the random ratio:

\[
F_{col} = \frac{s_n^2}{s_{col}^2} \Rightarrow \frac{k-1}{n-k} \left( \frac{s_n^2}{s_{col}^2} - 1 \right) = \frac{n-k}{k-1}(\frac{1}{s_n^2} - \frac{1}{s_{col}^2})
\]

(17)

are described by the \( F \)-distribution with \((n - k, k - 1)\) degrees of freedom [15]. The expected value and variation of this random ratio accordingly [15] are equals:

\[
E[F_{col}] = \frac{n-k}{n-k-2} = 1 + \frac{2}{n-k-2}, \quad \text{var}[F_{col}] = \left( E[F_{col}] \right)^2 \frac{2(n-3)}{(k-1)(n-k-4)}
\]

(18)

Because \( n \) registered observations are located in the natural order in the columns of the matrix (13), the positive autocorrelation of observation causes an increase value of the random ratio of variances \( F_{col} \) (17).

For the autocorrelated observations the expectation value of \( F_{col} \) depends on two values of indicator \( R_j(m) \) and \( R_j(n) \) (4), and also from the number of \( m \) observations in \( k \) series and it can be calculated by formula:

\[
E[F_{col}(\rho)] = \frac{n-k}{n-k-2} 1 + \frac{k \cdot D_j(m) - D_j(n)}{k-1 - \frac{D_j(m)}{m-1}}
\]

(19)

Therefore the value of \( F_{col} \) can be used for testing the observation autocorrelation. Testing of the absence or presence of the autocorrelation of observation bases on accept or reject the null hypothesis of insignificant or significant variations of mean values across \( k \) series (in column) observations. The null hypothesis test conclusion at the specified level of significance \( \alpha \) after comparing the observed value \( F_{col} \) (17) with the critical value \( F_{crit}(1 - \alpha, k - 1, n - k) \):

\[
F_{col} \leq F_{crit}(1 - \alpha, k - 1, n - k).
\]

(20)

Test results:

If \( F_{col} \leq F_{crit}(1 - \alpha, k - 1, n - k) \) then the null hypothesis that variance across \( k \) groups of observations is insignificant (autocorrelation is insignificant) is accepted;

If \( F_{col} > F_{crit}(1 - \alpha, k - 1, n - k) \) then the null hypothesis that variance across \( k \) groups observations is insignificant (autocorrelation is significant) is rejected.

The effectiveness of the proposed indirect method for testing autocorrelation of the observation carried out by Monte-Carlo method and conclusions are given in [10]. Obtained from Monte-Carlo simulation the probability of the correct identification of correlation versus value of indicator \( D_j(m) \) is presented in Figure 3.

![Fig. 3. Estimated probabilities \( P_j(\%) \) of the correct identification of correlation versus value of indicator \( D_j(m) \) of autocorrelation \( \rho > \rho^* \) for \( M = 10^5 \) Monte-Carlo simulations and \( n = 100 \) observations](image-url)

The maximal probability of the correct identification of correlation can be obtained for \( m = 2 \) (the shortest series of observations), that is consistent with the theoretical relationship (18) because the maximum value of \( E[F_{col}] \) in (18) is obtained for \( m = 2 \).
If the autocorrelation of observations is relatively significant, where $D\rho(n) \approx 2$ for example for the autocorrelation, then in more than 93% and if $D\rho(n) \approx 3$ then in more than 99% the hypothesis that autocorrelation is insignificant is rejected (the result of test is correct) the hypothesis that autocorrelation is insignificant is rejected (the result of test is correct) (Fig. 3).

Presented methods allows to upgrade the GUM recommendations by include the proper calculation of the standard and expanded uncertainty for measurand with the stationary random component of their signal.
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