

# When Outliers Are Different

J. I. Katz,<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and McDonnell Center for the Space Sciences, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130 USA*

2 May 2022

## ABSTRACT

When does the presence of an outlier in some measured property indicate that the outlying object differs qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, from other members of its apparent class? Historical examples include the many types of supernovæ and short *vs.* long Gamma Ray Bursts. There may be only one parameter and one outlier, so that principal component analyses are inapplicable. A qualitative difference implies that some parameter has a characteristic scale, and hence its distribution cannot be a power law (that can have no such scale). If the distribution is a power law the objects differ only quantitatively. The applicability of a power law to an empirical distribution may be tested by comparing the most extreme member to its next-most extreme. The probability distribution of their ratio is calculated, and compared to data for stars, radio and X-ray sources, and the fluxes, fluences and rotation measures of Fast Radio Bursts.

**Key words:** radio continuum, transients: fast radio bursts, methods: statistical

## 1 INTRODUCTION

A question often asked in astronomy is whether a group of objects, similar in some ways, may be subdivided into qualitatively distinct subclasses. For example, novæ, originally considered a single class of events, were first subdivided into Galactic novæ and supernovæ (not observed in our Galaxy since 1604, but recognized in the Andromeda Galaxy in 1885). Subsequently, supernovæ have been divided into an ever-multiplying botanic garden of types and subtypes. Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRB) were divided into (Galactic and Magellanic Cloud) Soft Gamma Repeaters and (extragalactic) GRB, and then GRB into short and long GRB that were found to differ not only in duration but in physical origin. Qualitative divisions have been essential to understanding these phenomena, because no physical models have been capable of explaining them all as single classes of events differing only quantitatively.

Similar questions have arisen with regard to Fast Radio Bursts (FRB). If they are all manifestations of the same processes, then any proposed mechanism must be consistent with every FRB observed (allowing for quantitative differences in parameters and viewing geometry), while if there are two or more qualitatively different mechanisms or source objects producing FRB this constraint is relaxed. An apparent excess of bright bursts over the power law distribution of sources uniformly but randomly distributed in space (the familiar  $N \propto S^{-3/2}$  relation of extragalactic radio astronomy, where  $N$  is the cumulative number with flux greater than  $S$ ) has been used (Katz 2017) to challenge the assumption of a statistically uniform spatial distribution, but this has been dis-

puted (Macquart & Ekers 2018) on the grounds of possible discovery bias of the very bright FRB 010724.

More recently, the fluxes and fluences of many additional FRB, including homogeneous data sets from Parkes, UTMOST, ASKAP and CHIME/FRB, have been measured and the rotation measures (RM) of a number of FRB have also been obtained. Some of these datasets include outliers, and again raise the question of whether the outliers indicate the presence of two (or more) qualitatively different events classified as FRB, or of two qualitatively different environments of FRB (possibly, but not necessarily, related to different models of the FRB themselves).

In the simplest possible case, which arises with some extant data sets, there is a single outlier. When can we infer that it represents a different class of object? Because there is only one outlier, cluster analysis is not required. Because the distribution of brightnesses of astronomical objects is a convolution of their intrinsic strengths (luminosities or energies) with their spatial distribution, which is often distributed over a very large range of distances, objects of distinct luminosity do not form distinct clusters of apparent brightness (for example, there are bright nearby dwarf stars and dim distant giant stars); cluster analysis is not applicable to brightness distributions of objects statistically uniformly distributed in space. Each interval of intrinsic strength has a  $N \propto S^{-3/2}$  distribution of observed flux or fluence, as must the integral over their luminosity distribution. This only breaks down when a characteristic scale enters, such as the characteristic distance to the nearest member of the population (the  $-1/3$  power of its density) or when the statistically homogeneous Euclidean distribution is cut off by the size of the Galaxy, the Local Group, other cosmic structure, or the Hubble distance.

How extreme must an outlier be quantitatively, in order that we may confidently conclude that it is qualitatively dif-

\* E-mail katz@wuphys.wustl.edu

ferent from objects or events it otherwise resembles? This question arises even when only one parameter is studied and when as few as two objects have been observed.

## 2 POWER LAWS

It is a trivial observation, known at least since Kolmogorov's work on turbulence in the 1940's, and discussed by Katz (1986) in the context of the model now called Self-Organized Criticality, that a power law distribution of a parameter as a function of an independent variable is inconsistent with the existence of a characteristic scale of that variable: A power law is a straight line on a log-log plot, any portion of which may be transposed to any other portion by scaling factors. Any deviation from a power law defines a characteristic scale, the value of the independent variable at which the actual distribution deviates, such as changing the exponent in the power law.

If there is no characteristic scale, so that all objects in the class are qualitatively similar although quantitatively different, the observed distribution must be a power law. Hence consistency of the distribution with a power law is a test of the hypothesis that the objects cannot be divided into qualitatively different subclasses. Inconsistency with a power law demonstrates the existence of a qualitative distinction. An outlier, by definition, is inconsistent with the distribution observed of the other objects. The probability of this occurring by chance may be calculated as a function of the power law slope of the other elements of the class and of the degree to which the outlier is beyond the extrapolation of the observed distribution of the other objects. This is most simply quantified by comparing the value of the observed parameter of the most extreme (outlying) element to that of the second-most extreme. If there are multiple outliers it will generally be evident that there are two distinct subclasses of objects, that can be separated by cluster analysis, but in some cases of interest there is only one outlier.

## 3 SINGLE OUTLIERS AND FIRST/SECOND RATIO

All power law distributions must have at least one cutoff or break in order that the total number of objects be finite. When the independent variable is flux, fluence, luminosity, or an analogous energetic parameter, the break must be sharp (between two power laws, their exponents must differ by  $> 1$ ) in order that both the number of objects and their integrated radiated power or energy be finite. The question is not whether the power law is broken but whether the break occurs within the observed range of the independent variable. If it does, then the break divides the observed objects into two qualitatively different classes. If not, then all the observed objects *may* be qualitatively similar, though quantitatively differing. Even so, they may not be qualitatively similar, as shown by the examples of dwarf and giant stars, or main sequence and white dwarf stars, all of whose flux distributions are described by a  $N \propto S^{-3/2}$  law because they are homogeneously distributed in a Euclidean space (up to cutoffs at the thickness of the Galactic disc and the distance of nearest neighbors).

If there are many outliers, by definition of "outlier" a break

divides them from the remainder of the objects. It will generally be evident that they form a distinct distribution, often with other evidence of their difference (for example, supernovæ and novæ have very different spectra and temporal behavior, while long and short GRB differ in duration).

The problem addressed here is that of a single outlier. When can we say that there must be a break in the distribution between it and the object with the second-most extreme value of the independent variable, that observation of the outlier is inconsistent with a power law that describes the distribution of the independent variable over less extreme objects?

Suppose a power law differential number distribution as a function of an independent variable  $x$

$$\frac{dN}{dx} = Cx^{-\gamma}. \quad (1)$$

By definition, there is one object with  $x > x_2$ , where  $x_2$  is the second-highest value of  $x$ . Then

$$1 = \int_{x_2}^{\infty} \frac{dN}{dx} dx = \frac{C}{\gamma - 1} x_2^{-\gamma+1} \quad (2)$$

and

$$C = (\gamma - 1)x_2^{1-\gamma}. \quad (3)$$

The requirement that the total number of objects be finite, integrating as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  implies  $\gamma > 1$ . If  $x$  represents an energy-like quantity (flux, fluence, luminosity, *etc.*), finiteness of the integral implies  $\gamma > 2$ . In homogeneously filled three dimensional Euclidean space in the limit  $x \rightarrow \infty$   $\gamma = 5/2$ . The divergence

$$\int S dN = \int S \frac{dN}{dS} dS \propto \int S^{-3/2} dS \propto S^{-1/2} \quad (4)$$

as  $S \rightarrow 0$  describes Olber's Paradox, resolved by a cutoff at large distance (Hubble radius, or size of the Galaxy) and small  $S$ . In two dimensional space, such as the Galactic disc,  $\gamma = 2$ . In practice,  $\gamma$  is found by fitting to the observed distribution for  $x < x_2$ .

The probability that the highest value of  $x$  is as large or larger than the extreme outlier  $x_1$  is


$$P(x_1) = \int_{x_1}^{\infty} \frac{dN}{dx} dx = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right)^{1-\gamma}. \quad (5)$$

An observed  $x_1$  is inconsistent with an extrapolation of the power law at a confidence level  $1 - P$  if

$$\frac{x_1}{x_2} > P^{1/(1-\gamma)}. \quad (6)$$

If  $\gamma$  is known, inverting this expression shows the minimum value of  $x_1/x_2$  required to reject, at a confidence level  $1 - P$ , the hypothesis that the power law is unbroken between  $x_2$  and  $x_1$ . Rejection implies that the outlier differs qualitatively from the remainder of the objects. If, as is often the case,  $\gamma$  is not accurately determined, an observed value of  $x_1/x_2$  sets a coupled constraint on the value of  $\gamma$  and the confidence with which an unbroken power law can be rejected.

Fig. 1 shows  $P$  as a function of  $x_1/x_2$  for several values of  $\gamma$ . Fig. 2 shows  $\gamma$  as a function of  $x_1/x_2$  for several values of statistical significance  $1 - P$ .



**Figure 1.** The probability that  $x_1/x_2$  exceeds  $X$  for several values of  $\gamma$ . Levels of statistical significance are indicated.  $x_1/x_2 = 200$  is the first/second ratio of FRB Rotation Measure.


#### 4 APPLICATIONS

The Table shows most extreme/second most extreme ratios for several astronomical datasets.

#### 5 DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows a number of significant outliers, of which the most extreme is FRB 200428. This is explained by its presence in the Galaxy whose density (of mass, and likely of whatever astronomical objects make FRB) is orders of magnitude greater than the mean density of the local Universe. The extragalactic  $\gamma = 5/2$  does not allow for the Galactic density concentration. Because we are also located in the Galaxy, it is unsurprising that the one Galactic FRB should be an outlier in flux and fluence. This is not news, but confirms that the method finds the obvious.

More interesting are the facts that the AGN 3C273 is a significant outlier in the visible-light AGN population, Cyg A is a significant outlier in the 3CR extragalactic (radio galaxy) distribution and Sco X-1 is a significant outlier in the 4U Galactic 2–6 keV X-ray source distribution. Perhaps these objects are fundamentally different from other members of their classes. The extragalactic FRB distributions contain no



**Figure 2.** The the minimum value of  $\gamma$  as a function of  $X$  for which  $x_1/x_2 > X$  indicates that the outlier is inconsistent with an extrapolation of the power law, for the indicated levels of statistical confidence.  $x_1/x_2 = 200$  is the first/second ration of FRB Rotation Measure.

such outliers, attesting to the homogeneity of their populations; even the discovery FRB 010724 is not a significant outlier compared to FRB 110214. It is no surprise that this analysis confirms that the giant December 27, 2004 outburst of SGR 1806-20 (Hurley *et al.* 2005; Palmer *et al.* 2005) is a significant outlier, inconsistent with extrapolation of its lesser flares. Such giant outbursts are naturally explained as a global reordering of a magnetic field much greater than those of radio pulsars, as suggested for the March 5, 1979 outburst of SGR 0525-66 (Katz 1982) while less energetic outbursts may be analogous to Solar flares; this is now known as the “magnetar” model.

The distribution of FRB RM, with  $x_1/x_2 \approx 200$ , presents a different problem because there is no *a priori* expectation of its  $\gamma$ . Eq. 6 indicates that  $\gamma > 1.43$  can be excluded with 90% confidence,  $\gamma > 1.57$  with 95% confidence and  $\gamma > 1.87$  with 99% confidence. In one simple model the rotation measure is predicted to arise from an expanding SNR. In such an object the magnetic field would be expected to scale  $B \propto R^{-2} \propto t^{-2}$ , the electron density to scale  $n_e \propto R^{-3} \propto t^{-3}$  and  $\text{RM} \propto B n_e R \propto R^{-4} \propto t^{-4}$ , where  $t$  is the age. The irregular fluctuations of the observed RM of FRB 121102 (Hilmarsson *et al.* 2021) are inconsistent with such a simple model, but it might approximately describe the scaling.

Parameter	$x_1/x_2$	$\gamma$	Significance
Stars (V-band)	1.94	5/2	63%
AGN (V-band)	10	5/2	97%
3CR (extragalactic)	8	5/2	96%
3CR (Galactic)	8	2	87%
4U (Galactic)	18	2	94%
4U (transients)	3.5	2	72%
SGR 1806–20 fluence	$7 \times 10^4$	1.7	99.96%
Crab Giant Pulses	1.25	2.8	33%
FRB Fluxes (Parkes)	4.3	5/2	89%
FRB Fluxes (UTMOST)	1.37	5/2	38%
FRB Fluxes (ASKAP)	1.15	5/2	19%
FRB Fluxes (CHIME)	1.33	2.4	33%
FRB Fluences (Parkes)	1.1	5/2	17%
FRB Fluences (UTMOST)	1.71	5/2	55%
FRB Fluences (ASKAP)	2.1	5/2	67%
FRB Fluences (CHIME)	1.0	2.4	0%
FRB 200428 flux	$1.7 \times 10^4$	5/2	>99.9999%
FRB 200428 fluence	$3.6 \times 10^3$	5/2	>99.999%
FRB RM	200	1.25	73%

**Table 1.** Ratios of most extreme to second most-extreme members of various astronomical datasets, with significance of their deviation from a single power law where the exponent is known, either theoretically or empirically from a fit to the distribution of less extreme members. Most of these objects are variable. Catalogue entries are shown, as distinct from the varying physical parameters of the object. This introduces additional uncertainty because there may be biases resulting from differences in observing methodology: for example, stronger variable sources may be observed more frequently, biasing their catalogued strength upward and maximum observed fluxes reported for transients. Galactic disc objects, such as most entries in X-ray catalogues, are expected to have  $\gamma = 2$  because of the geometry of a disc. Direct comparison of the flux and fluence of FRB 200428 are not quantitative because FRB 200428 does not come from a homogeneous catalogue, but its extreme outlying position is explained by its Galactic location to which  $\gamma = 3/2$  cannot be extrapolated from extragalactic distances; the quoted significance levels exclude  $\gamma = 3/2$  with very high confidence. The value of  $\gamma$  for FRB RM is for the SNR model described in the text. 3CR objects are assigned as Galactic and extragalactic by identifications, 4U assigned as Galactic if  $b \leq 20^\circ$ . Sources: FRB from homogeneous catalogues in HeRTA/FRBSTATS (2021) except CHIME from CHIME/FRB Collaboration (2021), FRB 200428 from Bochenek *et al.* (2020), RM from Petroff *et al.* (2016) and Hilmarsson *et al.* (2021); 3CR Bennett (1962); 4U Forman *et al.* (1978); SGR 1806–20 fluences ( $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are not from a homogeneous catalogue, introducing additional uncertainty) from Hurley *et al.* (2005); Palmer *et al.* (2005); Golenetskii *et al.* (2007) with  $\gamma$  from Göğüş *et al.* (2000); Götz *et al.* (2006); Crab Giant Pulses from Bera & Chengalur (2019).

If the likelihood of detection does not vary rapidly with time, then the cumulative number  $N$  of FRB with ages  $\leq t$  is proportional to  $t$  and  $\gamma = 1.25$ . Surprisingly, there is not strong statistical evidence that FRB 121102 is an outlier from this model. It would be an outlier from models that indicate a steeper dependence of  $N$  on RM.

## REFERENCES

- Bera, A. & Chengalur, J. N. 2019 MNRAS 490, L12.  
 Bennett, A. S. 1962 Mem. RAS 68, 163 [vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR-4](http://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR-4) accessed May 25, 2021.  
 Bochenek, C. D., Ravi, V., Belov, K. V. *et al.* 2020 Nature 587, 59.  
 CHIME/FRB Collaboration 2021 arXiv:2106.04352.  
 Forman, W., Jones, C., Cominsky, L. *et al.* 1978 ApJS 38, 357.  
 Göğüş, E., Woods, P. M., Kouveliotou, C. *et al.* 2000 ApJ 532, L121.  
 Golenetskii, S., Apetkar, R., Mazetx, E. *et al.* 2007 GCN 6775.  
 Götz, D., Mereghetti, S., Molkov, S. *et al.* 2006 A&A 445, 313.  
 Herta/FRBSTATS 2021 [github.com/HeRTA/FRBSTATS](https://github.com/HeRTA/FRBSTATS) accessed May 25, 2021.  
 Hilmarsson, G. H., Michilli, D., Spitler, L. G. *et al.* 2021 ApJ 908, L10.  
 Hurley, K., Boggs, S. E., Smith, S. M. *et al.* 2005 Nature 434, 1098.  
 Katz, J. I. 1982 ApJ 260, 371.  
 Katz, J. I. 1986 J. Geophys. Res. 91, 10412.  
 Katz, J. I. 2017 MNRAS 472, L85.  
 Macquart, J.-P. & Ekers, R. D. 2018 MNRAS 474, 1900.  
 Palmer, D. M., Barthelmy, S., Gehrels, N. *et al.* 2005 Nature 434, 1107.  
 Petroff, E., Barr, E. D., Jameson, A. *et al.* 2016 Pub. Ast. Soc. Australia 33, 45 [frbcat.org](http://frbcat.org) accessed May 31, 2021.