Statistical Analysis of the Similarity of Environmental Data Populations in the Aleutian Islands

Performed by: Lynetta Campbell, B.S. Chemical Engineering, M.S. Management Science, M.S. Mathematics with Certification in Statistical Analytics

Executive Summary:

This report addresses the question of whether or not the environmental data sets (drawn from four buoys and three airport) assembled for the Aleutian Islands Risk Assessment appear to be drawing from the same population of weather. A Nuka statistician performed a comparison of the data sets. It was determined that statistically significant differences exist between all data sets, making the practice of using the data from one source to make inferences about another inadvisable.

Review of Theory:

When one is studying a continuous variable drawn from different populations, the test of whether or not the populations are actually the same involves comparing the means and the variances of the samples. If both of these are the same, then the populations are judged to be the same.

In the situation where there are only two populations, then an independent samples t-test can be used to address the null hypothesis that the means for a given variable drawn from each group are equal, and a test such as Levene's or Bartlett's test can answer the question about whether or not the variances are equal. Bartlett's test is generally held to be better if the variables are normally distributed, while Levene's test is more robust against non-normality. If there are more than two populations, then an ANOVA F-test must be used to test the equivalent means hypothesis. Of course, the ANOVA F-test can also be used to test the similarity of two populations, providing the same results as the t-test.

The multivariate analogs of the above are a Hotelling's T-square test of the hypothesis that the mean vectors for multiple variables from two populations are equal or a Wilk's Lambda statistic from a MANOVA type regression if two or more mean vectors are being compared. Box's M test is used to address the question of whether or not the variance-covariance structures of the populations are the same. As in the univariate case, these tests are much more reliable when the distribution of the variables is multivariate normal.

Data Exploration and Analysis

Buoy Data

The entire data set has missing values in it as detailed in Nuka's report *Characterizing Environmental Conditions in the Aleutian Islands*. For the purposes of this study, only observations that were complete (i.e. no missing information) were included. The first point considered involved balance of the samples. It was important to know how often each buoy was sampled.Table 1, below, shows how many times each buoy was sampled with a complete record during each month and year.

Obviously, the buoys were not sampled with complete records at the same frequency. Therefore, a series of analyses were decided upon in which only short periods that were populated with data from all buoys were considered.

January 2008

Consider the month of January, 2008, a month for which some data is available from all buoys. Table 2 displays the mean vectors for each buoy. The analysis will focus on the first ten variables.

The means for the various buoys don't look to be the same, but before testing the hypothesis, a bit more data exploration is warranted. To facilitate this, the dimensionality of the dataset was first reduced using principal components analysis. A PCA based on the correlation matrix (i.e. on standardized values of the data) revealed that 80% of the variation contained in this data set can be captured by the first three principal components (see Figure 1, below).

Figure 1: Scree Plot and Variance Explained for the first three Prinicipal Components

Figure 2: Scatter Plot for the first two Principal Components

Figure 2, with its highly defined clusters, visually suggests significant differences in the buoys. When only the first buoy is examined, it is seen that there are even distinct clusters within this subgroup indicating that weather varies appreciably over the course of a month. The portion of the data for which the values of the first principal component are the most negative correspond to a period from January 7 through January 9 that is categorized by much lower wind speeds and smaller wave heights than during the rest of the month.

Figure 3: Biplot of the first two Principal Component Scores

Having briefly explored the data graphically, I next ran the statistical tests of interest. Box's M test was run to test the null hypothesis that the data from all of the buoys had an equal variancecovariance structure. With a $\chi^2(165) = 3502.83$, p <0.001, the null hypothesis is rejected. These buoys do not give rise to data with the same variance structure. In other words, data from some buoys is significantly more variable than from others.

A manova test of whether or not the mean vectors were equal was run. Additionally, contrast tests of whether any two buoys had equivalent mean vectors were also run. The results are presented below, in Table 3.

It is concluded that none of the mean buoys have the same mean vector. Since neither the mean vectors nor the variance-covariance matrices are equal it must be concluded that the buoys were not sampling the same population in January of 2008.

Focus on a smaller time frame

Given that the weather is highly variable across a month, consider just one day. Below is quick look at January 1, 2008. The database only contains data from two buoys on that day.

Figure 4: Scatter Plot of the first two Principal Components, by buoy, January 1, 2008.

In Figure 4, the two buoys continue to look distinctly different.

Box's M test indicates that the data from the two buoys does not have the same variancecovariance structure, $\chi^2(55) = 174.40$, p < 0.001. Furthermore, a manova test of the equivalence of the mean vectors indicates that the two buoys are significantly different, $F(4,39)=25.27$, p < 0.001.

The conclusion is that on January 1, 2008 the weather conditions were not the same at buoys 46070 and 46072.

July 2008

The process was repeated for July 1, 2008, another day for which there was data from the same two buoys (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Scatter Plot of the first two Principal Components, by buoy, July 1, 2008.

Box's M test indicates that the data from the two buoys does not have the same variancecovariance structure, $\chi^2(55) = 270.28$, p < 0.001. Furthermore, a manova test of the equivalence of the mean vectors indicates that the two buoys are significantly different, $F(4,43)=24.81$, p < 0.001. These two buoys do not appear to have the same weather measurements on July 1, 2008.

Consider January 1, 2011, a date for which there is data from the other two buoys, 46073 and 46075.Figure 6 shows scatter plots for the first two principal components of the dimensionally reduced data. It suggests two very distinct populations.

Figure 6: Scatter Plot of the first two Principal Components, by buoy, January 1, 2011.

Box's M test confirms that the variance-covariance structure is not the same for the two buoys, $\chi^2(55) = 188.34, p < 0.001$, and the manova test indicates that the mean vectors for the two buoys are significantly different, $F(4, 41) = 31.61$, $p < 0.001$.

The data appears to be conclusive that different buoys give different readings on the weather even on the same day. Assuming each buoy is reporting accurately, this indicates that inferences drawn about one location based upon data received from another would be unreliable.

Airports

A similar analysis was performed comparing the airports. Table 4, which summarizes the sampling frequency at each airport, reveals that, unlike buoys, there are not large gaps in airport data. Therefore, it is easier to compare all three airports over a similar time period.

Because there aren't significant gaps in which data from one or more airports is not available, we can look at summary statistics for the entire data set as a first look for similarities and differences. This summary is presented in Table 5 below. A cursory look at the means suggests the airports are different.

As with the buoy data, a principal components analysis was performed to reduce the dimensionality of the data, so as to capture the information in fewer variables. Graphical exploration of the principal components provides a quick look at whether or not the different populations cluster or not. Figure 7 shows a plot of the first two principal components for all three airports for the date 1/1/2011.

Figure 7: Scatter Plot of the first two Principal Components, by airport, January 1, 2011.

There is clear evidence of clustering within this data, a strong indication that the three airport populations are not equivalent.

The original variable vectors were tested for equivalence using the statistics discussed above. The test of the null hypothesis that the variance-covariance matrices for the three airports is the same must be rejected, $\chi^2(56) = 516.55$, p < 0.001, and the manova test of equal mean vectors for the airports also finds significant differences (see Table 6, below).

It must be concluded that on January 1, 2011 the weather readings for the three airports did not come from equal populations.

For good measure another date, July 1, 2009, was also studied. Once again a graphical scatterplot presentation of the first two principal component variables is shown below. It indicates distinct differences in the data from the three airports.

Figure 8: Scatter Plot of the first two Principal Components, by airport, July 1, 2009.

The statistical tests for equivalence were repeated. A test of homogeneity of covariance matrices rejected the null hypothesis that they were equal, $\chi^2(56) = 2594.75$, p < 0.001. The manova test results shown in Table 7 confirm that the mean vectors are not equal for any combination of the three airports on the July date studied.

There is no evidence that the reported weather at the three airports is from the same population, and inferences about one airport based upon data from another are not warranted.

Conclusions:

This work was motivated by the suggestion that missing information from various weather collection points could be filled in using information from surrounding data collection points. Inherent in this proposal is the assumption that the collection points are actually sampling the same weather populations. If that were so, the vectors containing the mean values for the variables of interest would be expected to be statistically equivalent as would their variancecovariance structures. To test this, subsets of the entire data set representing short time periods for which data from all sources was available were tested for equivalence. Manova regression was used to test for equivalence of the mean vectors, and Box's M test was used to test for equivalent variance-covariance structures.

The tests were repeated for multiple summer and winter periods. In all periods studied, it was concluded that the mean vectors for the four buoy populations and the mean vectors for the three airport populations were significantly different. Furthermore, the variance-covariance matrices for the various data collection sites were also found to be significantly different.

Scatter plots created after reducing the dimensionality of the problem through the use of principal components analysis graphically confirmed the observation that the data populations were statistically unique. Based on these findings, imputation for missing values pertaining to one data collection point using data