

Confidence Intervals for the Savitzky-Golay Filter with an Application to the Keeling Data for Atmospheric CO₂

Paul W. Oxby

December 23, 2024

Abstract

The Savitzky-Golay FIR digital filter is based on a least-squares polynomial fit to a sample of equally spaced data. The polynomial fit gives the filter the ability to preserve moments of features in the data like peak width. However the S-G filter is not generally regarded as having a sound statistical basis. This puts the filter in the category of smoothing filters where the degree of smoothing depends on the somewhat arbitrary choice of the filter parameters. This arbitrariness makes the variance of the residuals between the filter input and output an unreliable estimate of the variance of the noise in the filter input. And without a reliable estimate of the input noise variance there is no basis for determining statistically meaningful confidence intervals on the filter output.

This paper proposes a method of using the S-G filter to determine a reliable estimate of the variance of the noise in the data. This estimate is then used as the basis for selecting appropriate filter parameters and determining statistically meaningful confidence intervals on the filter output. To illustrate the proposed method an analysis of the Keeling measurements of atmospheric CO₂ concentration is presented.

1 Introduction

In a 1964 paper Savitzky and Golay [1] showed how a least-squares polynomial fit to a sample of equally spaced data could be used as the basis of an FIR digital filter to smooth noisy data. This filter is popular because it is better at preserving data features like peak width than a simple moving average. Despite the popularity of the Savitzky-Golay (S-G) filter it is not generally regarded as a rigorous statistical method. For example, Press, et al. [2] write of the S-G filter: “the smoothing of data lies in a murky area, beyond the fringe of some better posed, and therefore more highly recommended [statistical] techniques.” One desirable characteristic of a rigorous statistical technique is that it provides an estimate of the uncertainty in the results. This estimate is often expressed in terms of a confidence interval. In their paper Savitzky and Golay do not consider confidence intervals and neither do some textbooks [2] [3] which provide an otherwise detailed description of the S-G filter.

In least-squares parameter estimation confidence intervals are based on an estimate of the uncertainty in the data. Subject to standard assumptions regarding the nature of the uncertainty, this estimate of the uncertainty is based on the minimized sum of squares of residuals. This poses a problem with a nonparametric smoothing filter. In the case of the S-G filter both the size of the sample interval and the degree of the fitting polynomial can be adjusted to give various degrees of smoothing. Various degrees of smoothing give inconsistent estimates of the uncertainty in the data. And these inconsistent estimates are unsuitable for determining confidence intervals. This is what places the S-G filter “in a murky area, beyond the fringe of some better posed ... techniques.”

This paper describes a heuristic method for using the S-G filter to produce a reasonably consistent estimate of the uncertainty in the data. This estimate then serves as a guide to selecting appropriate filter parameters. And with appropriate S-G filter parameters reliable confidence intervals on the filter output can be determined thereby rescuing the S-G filter from “a murky area, beyond the fringe.” To illustrate this method it is applied to an analysis of the Keeling data for atmospheric CO₂ concentration measured over a 67 year period [4].

2 The Savitzky-Golay Smoothing Filter

This section shows how the Savitzky-Golay (S-G) filter is derived from the statistical theory of the optimal polynomial fit to a sample of measurements corrupted by random noise. The signal processing terms 'signal' and 'noise' are used here because they are more general than the customary statistical terms 'true value' and 'measurement error'. The values of a hypothetical dependent variable, y , are associated with $2m + 1$ equally spaced values of an independent variable, x . Without loss of generality the values of x are scaled to the interval $[-1, 1]$. Therefore the spacing between the values of x is $1/m$:

$$x_i = \frac{i - 1 - m}{m} \quad (\text{for } i = 1 \dots 2m + 1) \quad (2.1)$$

It is further assumed that the signal can be well represented by a polynomial with n terms (i.e., degree $n - 1$) over the range of the $2m + 1$ samples. To illustrate, if a quadratic equation in x with three unknown coefficients, a_1 , a_2 , and a_3 is to be fit to five corresponding measurements of y then this can be expressed by the following set of five equations in three unknowns:

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= a_1 + a_2 x_1 + a_3 x_1^2 \\ y_2 &= a_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_2^2 \\ y_3 &= a_1 + a_2 x_3 + a_3 x_3^2 \\ y_4 &= a_1 + a_2 x_4 + a_3 x_4^2 \\ y_5 &= a_1 + a_2 x_5 + a_3 x_5^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

So in this case $m = 2$ and $n = 3$. Equations 2.2 are more compactly expressed in matrix notation as:

$$y = Xa \quad (2.3)$$

where the elements of the matrix X are given by:

$$X_{i,j} = x_i^{j-1} \quad (\text{for } i = 1 \dots 2m + 1, j = 1 \dots n) \quad (2.4)$$

Because there are more equations for the elements of vector a than there are elements of a there won't be a solution for a that exactly satisfies all of the equations if there is random noise associated with the dependent variable, y . The system of equations is said to be over-determined. For a given set of values of the vector a the residual vector, r , is defined as:

$$r = y - Xa \quad (2.5)$$

This optimal values of the elements of vector a are obtained by minimizing the weighted sum of squares of the residuals, $r^T W r$, with respect to the elements of a where the matrix W is a $2m + 1$ by $2m + 1$ diagonal matrix of weights. Premultiplying both sides of Equation 2.3 by $X^T W$ gives a set of linear equations that are not over-determined and whose solution for a minimizes the weighted sum of squares of the residuals, $r^T W r$:

$$a = (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W y \quad (2.6)$$

The values of the polynomial fit are given by the vector \hat{y} whose elements are the best estimates of the values of the signal:

$$\hat{y} = Xa = X (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W y \quad (2.7)$$

If a particular element of the \hat{y} vector is of interest, say the j th element, then that element can be isolated from \hat{y} by a simple matrix operation. The vector u is constructed with $2m + 1$ elements all of which are set to zero except for the j th element which is set to one:

$$u_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \neq j \\ 1 & \text{for } i = j \end{cases} \quad (\text{for } i = 1 \dots 2m + 1) \quad (2.8)$$

The j th element of \hat{y} is now given by:

$$\hat{y}_j = u^T \hat{y} = u^T X (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W y \quad (2.9)$$

The transpose of $u^T X (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W$ is a vector of $2m + 1$ filter coefficients. These coefficients will be denoted by $c(j)$ to emphasize that the values of the filter coefficients, c , depend on which of the $2m + 1$ elements of the \hat{y} vector is of interest.

$$c(j)^T = u^T X (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W \quad (\text{for } u_j = 1) \quad (2.10)$$

Therefore the filtering operation is simply the dot product or convolution of the filter coefficients, c , with the measurements, y :

$$\hat{y}_j = c(j)^T y \quad (2.11)$$

For the purpose of filtering, the optimal value of j corresponds to the middle element of \hat{y} with index $m + 1$ and for which $u_{m+1} = 1$. When $j = m + 1$ then $c(j)$ is a symmetric vector and the filter is linear phase. However for the m values of y at the beginning and end of the data set to be filtered the sample interval cannot extend past the range of the data. For these m values the sample interval is fixed at the first and last $2m + 1$ values of y and the value of j ranges from one to m for the first m values of y and from $m + 2$ to $2m + 1$ for the last m values of y .

Equations 2.10 and 2.11 define the Savitzky-Golay smoothing filter. The S-G filter can also be used to estimate the derivatives of the signal. In particular, the estimate of the first derivative of the signal is given by:

$$\frac{d\hat{y}}{dx} = X D a = X D (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W y \quad (2.12)$$

where D is an n by n matrix whose $n - 1$ nonzero elements are based on the relation $dx^k/dx = k x^{k-1}$:

$$D_{k,k+1} = k/m \quad (\text{for } k = 1 \dots n - 1) \quad (2.13)$$

Note that the independent variable, x , is scaled to a spacing of $1/m$ in Equation 2.1. It is convenient to make the derivative independent of the sample size by dividing k by m in this equation. So for the purpose of the derivative the effective spacing of x is one. From Equation 2.12 the vector of filter coefficients, cd , giving the first derivative of \hat{y}_j is given by:

$$cd(j)^T = u^T X D (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W \quad (\text{for } u_j = 1) \quad (2.14)$$

$$\frac{d\hat{y}_j}{dx} = cd(j)^T y \quad (2.15)$$

Descriptions of the S-G filter often implicitly assign equal weights to the residuals, r , in minimizing the weighted sum of squares of the residuals. In this case W is an identity matrix. However giving equal weights to the residuals does not optimize the smoothness of the filter output. It has been shown [5] that, for a particular measure of the smoothness of the filter output, the optimal weights are given by a quadratic function of the weight indices or of x as defined by Equation 2.1:

$$W_{i,i} = \frac{3i}{2m+3} \left(2 - \frac{i}{m+1} \right) = \frac{(m+1)^2 - (m x_i)^2}{(m+1)(2m+3)} \quad (\text{for } i = 1 \dots 2m+1) \quad (2.16)$$

The mean of these weights is one and their value one sample interval beyond the sample indices $[1, 2m + 1]$ is zero, i.e.:

$$W_{0,0} = W_{2m+2,2m+2} = 0 \quad (2.17)$$

It is this particular smooth transition of the weights from zero to their maximum value at the midpoint of the sample interval and back to zero that optimizes the smoothness of the filter output.

3 Confidence Intervals for the S-G Filter

The output of a FIR filter, \hat{y} , with $2m + 1$ coefficients is a convolution of the filter coefficients and the filter input (Equation 2.11):

$$\hat{y} = c_1 y_1 + c_2 y_2 + \cdots + c_{2m+1} y_{2m+1} \quad (3.1)$$

It is assumed that the noise in the filter input, e , is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variable with zero mean and variance σ_e^2 . In least-squares parameter estimation there is often a priori knowledge that a specific parametric model accurately represents the signal in the data. In this case there is little scope for over-fitting or under-fitting the data and the following equation gives an estimate of the input noise variance:

$$\sigma_e^2 = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 \quad (3.2)$$

With the S-G smoothing filter, on the other hand, the estimates of the signal, \hat{y}_i , are obtained from local models with little or no a priori knowledge to inform the selection of the parameters of the local model. For a given number of polynomial coefficients, n , a sample size that is too small will result in over-fitting and a noise variance estimate from Equation 3.2 that is too small while a sample size that is too large will result in under-fitting and a noise variance estimate that is too large. To address this problem the following equation for estimating the input noise variance is proposed:

$$\sigma_e^2 = \frac{1}{2(q-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} [(y_{i+1} - y_i) - (\hat{y}_{i+1} - \hat{y}_i)]^2 \quad (3.3)$$

The filter input, y_i , has two additive components, signal and noise. The differencing of the filter input, $(y_{i+1} - y_i)$, gives the noise plus the trend in the signal. The trend in the signal is estimated by differencing the filter output, $(\hat{y}_{i+1} - \hat{y}_i)$. If the estimate of the trend in the signal is reliable then subtracting the trend in the signal from the noise plus the trend in the signal leaves mostly noise with very little signal. The expression in square brackets can be rearranged as $(y_{i+1} - \hat{y}_{i+1}) - (y_i - \hat{y}_i)$. For uncorrelated noise the variance of this quantity is twice the noise variance hence the compensating factor of two in Equation 3.3.

Equations 3.2 and 3.3 give biased estimates of the input noise variance. For the purpose of calculating confidence intervals it is better to use unbiased estimates. The following equation, derived in Appendix A, corrects for the degrees of freedom, $2m + 1 - n$, associated with the polynomial fits to give unbiased estimates:

$$\sigma_{\text{unbiased}}^2 = \frac{2m + 1}{2m + 1 - n} \sigma_{\text{biased}}^2 \quad (3.4)$$

Because the filter is linear and if the filter parameters are selected to minimize distortion of the signal, the filter's action on the noise can be analysed independently of the signal. The noise component of the filter output, \hat{e} , is given by \hat{e} :

$$\hat{e} = c_1 e_1 + c_2 e_2 + \cdots + c_{2m+1} e_{2m+1} \quad (3.5)$$

If the filter input noise, e , is of constant variance, σ_e^2 , then the variance of the filter output noise, $\sigma_{\hat{e}}^2$, is given by:

$$\sigma_{\hat{e}}^2 = \sigma_e^2 \sum_{i=1}^{2m+1} c_i^2 \quad (3.6)$$


If the input noise, e , is normally distributed then the 95% confidence intervals for the values of the filter output are $[\hat{y}_i - 1.96 \sigma_{\hat{e}}, \hat{y}_i + 1.96 \sigma_{\hat{e}}]$. Note that Equation 3.6 also applies more generally for any statistic that is a linear combination of the filter inputs. Therefore it applies to the derivatives of the filter output (Equation 2.15) giving estimates of the variance of the derivatives and the associated confidence intervals.

An analysis of the properties of the S-G filter shows that the number of polynomial parameters, n , should be an odd number. If n is an odd number then using $n + 1$ will give the same values of \hat{y}_i between the tails of the data set but give larger confidence intervals for the values of \hat{y}_i in the tails. Furthermore using $n + 1$ will give larger confidence intervals for the derivatives, $d\hat{y}_i/dx$ for the entire data set and significantly larger confidence intervals in the tails.

Applying Equation 3.3 is complicated by the fact that the trend in the signal, $(\hat{y}_{i+1} - \hat{y}_i)$, depends on the filter parameters and the values of these parameters that give a reliable estimate of the trend in the signal are a priori unknown. The resolution of this complication will be demonstrated in the next section with a statistical analysis of the Keeling data for atmospheric CO₂ concentrations measured over the last 67 years.

4 An Analysis of the Keeling Data for Atmospheric CO₂ Levels


Charles Keeling, a scientist at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, started taking continuous measurements of atmospheric CO₂ concentration at Hawaii’s Mauna Loa Observatory in 1958. This effort has been continued by others to the present day giving a continuous record of atmospheric CO₂ concentration spanning 67 years [4]. Figure 1a, the so-called Keeling curve, shows the annual average measured CO₂ concentration in parts per million (ppm), y_i , and Figure 1b shows the annual change in the average measured CO₂ concentration in ppm, $y_{i+1} - y_i$ or Δy . This rate of change in CO₂ concentration is of particular interest to climatologists. The trend in the rate of change is roughly linear as shown by the red line but finer features in the trend are somewhat obscured by noise.



Because the Savitzky-Golay filter can preserve higher moments in the data it is well suited for filtering noise without filtering finer features of the signal. The S-G filter was applied to the data of Figure 1a for values of the filter parameter n of 3, 5 and 7 and values of m ranging up to 25. The standard deviations of the S-G filter residuals using Equation 3.2 are plotted in Figure 2a. This figure shows that the estimate of the noise variance given by the variance of the filter residuals using Equation 3.2 can be quite sensitive to the values of these parameters. And without a reliable estimate of the noise variance there is no basis for determining confidence intervals on the filter output. A clue to solving this problem is given in Figure 1b showing the annual change in the average measured CO₂ concentration, Δy . The effect of differencing the measurements is to amplify the noise to signal ratio making it easier to estimate the noise variance. The linear trend in the noise can be taken to be signal so the noise to signal ratio is further amplified by subtracting the linear trend. This leaves mostly noise and very little signal. The standard deviation of this noise after most of the signal has been removed is 0.32 ppm.

The general idea behind this procedure is formalized in Equation 3.3. The term $(y_{i+1} - y_i)$ is the difference in the measurements and the term $(\hat{y}_{i+1} - \hat{y}_i)$ is the corresponding estimate of the difference in the signal. When the estimated difference in the signal is subtracted from the difference in the measurements the result is an estimate of the noise.

Figures 2a & 2b: Standard deviations of S-G filter residuals for $n = 3, 5, 7$ (ppm)




For the same values of the S-G filter parameters as in Figure 2a the standard deviation of the S-G filter residuals using Equation 3.3 are plotted in Figure 2b. The contrast between the results in these two figures is significant. The rationale for using Equation 3.3 is based on the observation that the estimate of the trend in the signal, the equation term $(\hat{y}_{i+1} - \hat{y}_i)$, is relatively insensitive to moderate amounts of under-fitting associated with larger values of the S-G filter parameter m . This rationale is clearly supported by the results shown in Figure 2b where a reliable (but biased) estimate of the standard deviation of the noise in the Keeling data is indicated by the horizontal black line at 0.30 ppm. The dropoffs in the standard deviations for small values of the parameter m are an indication that the data is being over-fitted and the premise supporting Equation 3.3 does not hold.

For a given value of n the appropriate value of m would ideally yield filter residuals with a standard deviation equal to the estimate of the standard deviation of the noise. Given the discrete nature of the filter parameters, a reasonable choice for m would correspond to the value of the filter residual standard deviation that is closest to the estimated noise standard deviation. So for the values of n of 3, 5 and 7 the respective choices of m would be 6, 9 and 13. The use of biased estimates of the standard deviations in Figures 2a and 2b make it easier to identify the appropriate value of m . And because the corresponding values in the plots of Figures 2a and 2b are biased by the same factor no error in the determination of the value of m is introduced by the use of biased estimates.

The effectiveness of the S-G filter to separate the signal from the noise increases with the value of n . So a value of n as low as 3 might distort the signal because a quadratic polynomial is not good at fitting features like the inflection points seen in Figure 5 near the year 1988. However there is also a problem with choosing a large value of n . The uncertainty in the estimate of the derivative of the signal in the tails of a data set increases rapidly with increasing values of n . As a practical matter, a value of n of 5 (or maybe 7 if there are sharp peaks in the data) is a good compromise.


With S-G filter parameters of 5 for n and 9 for m the biased standard deviation of the filter residuals is 0.301 ppm, very close to the biased estimate of the standard deviation of the noise, 0.300 ppm from Figure 2b. The unbiased estimate of the residual standard deviation from Equation 3.4 is 0.351 ppm.

The CO₂ data with the filtered values is given in Figure 3a and the normalized filter residuals are plotted in Figure 3b. The variable name 'yf' (for y filtered) in the figures is \hat{y} in the text.




For the purpose of estimating confidence intervals it is assumed that the noise is normally distributed with zero mean and constant variance. The assumption of constant variance is checked by comparing the residual variance for the first half of the data and the second half of the data. With two sample sizes of 34 the variance ratio of 0.64 is within the 95% confidence interval for the F test, supporting the assumption of constant variance.

A graphical test for normality is given by the normal probability plot of Figure 4a. This plot doesn't indicate a significant departure from a normal distribution. Polynomials with degrees ranging from 2 to 20 were fit to the 67 values of the Keeling data. The unbiased standard deviations of the residuals for these fits are plotted in Figure 4b where the minimum value is 0.358 ppm. This close agreement with the unbiased estimate of 0.351 ppm calculated using the S-G filter with Equations 3.3 and 3.4 and indicated by the black line lends support to the methods proposed in this study.




Climatologists are particularly interested in the rate of change of the accumulation of CO₂ in the atmosphere. The estimated derivative of a signal is given by Equations 2.14 and 2.15 and confidence intervals on the estimated derivative are based on Equation 3.6. The plot of the estimated derivative with 95% confidence intervals is shown in Figure 5 where the variable dyf (i.e., $d\hat{y}/dx$) denotes the filtered annual change in ppm/year. The widely scattered points, Δy , are the estimates of annual change from simple differencing of the annual values as plotted in Figure 1b.

Figure 5: Derivative of filter output with 95% confidence intervals (ppm/year)



A Monte Carlo simulation was conducted to verify that the confidence intervals are realistic. The filter input, y , was taken as the signal. Noise was added to this signal where the noise was randomly sampled from a normal distribution with a standard deviation of 0.351 ppm. The S-G filter with filter parameters $n = 5$ and $m = 9$ was then applied to the noisy data. The differences between the derivatives of the signal and the derivatives of the filtered output (Equation 2.15) for the 67 data points were then calculated. This was repeated 1000 times and the standard deviations of the calculated differences are plotted in Figure 6 in red along with the estimated standard deviations from Equation 3.6 in blue. The close agreement suggests that confidence intervals derived from Equation 3.6 are realistic.

Figure 6: Standard deviations of dyf from Equation 3.6 in blue and the Monte Carlo simulation in red



5 A Further Analysis of the Keeling Data for Atmospheric CO₂ Levels

Climatologists have determined that the preindustrial value of atmospheric CO₂ concentration was about 280 ppm and that the value has not exceeded 300 ppm in the last 800,000 years [6]. So values in excess of 280 ppm can be attributed to human activity, especially the combustion of fossil fuels. Figure 7 shows the logarithm base 2 of the CO₂ concentration in excess of 280 ppm for the Keeling data (red) and the S-G filtered data (blue). The trend is roughly linear and the average doubling period is 33 years.

Figure 7: Base 2 logarithm of anthropogenic CO₂ concentration





Figure 8 shows the annual fractional rate of change in the anthropogenic component of the CO₂ concentration. The average fractional rate of change over the range of the data is 0.021 per year or 2.1% per cent per year.


Figure 8: Fractional rate of change in anthropogenic CO₂ concentration



The fractional rate of change in anthropogenic CO₂ concentration peaked at about 2.6% per year around 1980 with a statistically significant overall downward trend since then. As indicated by the confidence intervals there is a good deal of uncertainty at the beginning and end of the data. One factor that is influencing the

overall downward trend in Figure 8 is illustrated in Figure 9. The red curve is the filtered fractional rate of change in anthropogenic CO₂ concentration as in Figure 8. The blue curve is the filtered fractional rate of change in world population over the same time period [7].

Figure 9: Fractional rate of change in anthropogenic CO₂ concentration (in red) compared with fractional rate of change in world population (in blue)



The thin lines are representations of the overall trends in the fractional rates of change since 1958. Two trends are influencing the trend in the fractional rate of change in anthropogenic CO₂ concentration. The predominant trend, shown in Figure 9, is the decrease in the fractional rate of change in world population. If the linear trend is extrapolated it reaches a value of zero world population growth in 2080. The other trend that has offset the influence of the trend in world population has been an increase in the per capita consumption of fossil fuels in countries with rapid industrial growth over the last few decades.

6 Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to challenge the view that “the smoothing of data lies in a murky area, beyond the fringe of some better posed, and therefore more highly recommended [statistical] techniques”. Towards this end it has been shown how the Savitzky-Golay filter can be used to calculate a useful estimate of the noise variance in a data set. It is then shown how this estimate can be used to determine filter parameters that generate a filter output that neither under-fits nor over-fits the data. This, in turn, permits the calculation of reliable confidence intervals on the filter output and its derivative. It is this last feature in particular that puts the S-G filter on a statistically sound foundation.

References

- [1] Savitzky, A. and Golay M.J.E. “Smoothing and differentiation of data by simplified least-squares procedures” *Anal. Chem.* 36 (1964) 1627-39
- [2] Press, W.H et. al. “Numerical Recipes, 2nd Ed.” Cambridge University Press, 2007, page 644
- [3] Orfanidis, S.J. “Applied Optimal Signal Processing” McGraw-Hill, 2018, Chapter 3
- [4] National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Link
- [5] Oxby, P.W. “An Optimal Weighting Function for the Savitzky-Golay Filter” (2021) Link
- [6] Lindsey, R. et al. “Climate Change: Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide” NOAA publication Link
- [7] Wikipedia “World Population” Link

Contact

The author can be contacted at pwoxby@telus.net

Appendix A - The Rationale in Support of Equation 3.4

For a least-squares fit of a polynomial with n parameters to a data set with p values of a variable y and assuming that the noise in the data is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), a biased estimate of the variance σ^2 of the noise in the data is given by:

$$\sigma_{\text{biased}}^2 = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^q (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

where \hat{y}_i is the estimate of the signal in the data obtained from the polynomial fit. An unbiased estimate of the variance of the noise in the data is given by:

$$\sigma_{\text{unbiased}}^2 = \frac{1}{p-n} \sum_{i=1}^q (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

This can be rewritten as:

$$\sigma_{\text{unbiased}}^2 = \frac{p}{p-n} \sigma_{\text{biased}}^2$$

For the S-G filter polynomials with n parameters are fitted to data segments with $2m + 1$ values of the variable y . Substituting $2m + 1$ for p gives Equation 3.4:

$$\sigma_{\text{unbiased}}^2 = \frac{2m+1}{2m+1-n} \sigma_{\text{biased}}^2$$

Appendix B - Computer Programs

The programs in this appendix are written in Mathcad code which, by design, resembles pseudocode. They take as input the number of parameters, n , in the fitting polynomial, the number of data samples, $2m + 1$, to which the polynomial fit is applied, and the filter input data, a vector y of q values evenly spaced on the x -axis.

The following two programs, XMA(n,m), both calculate the matrix $X(X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W$ of Equation 2.10 and the matrix $X D (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W$ of Equation 2.14. The only difference between the two programs is that one program explicitly subscripts all vectors and matrices whereas the other program uses a compact matrix notation where appropriate. The 'M' in XMA represents either the identity matrix I implicit in Equation 2.10 or the matrix D in Equation 2.14.

<pre> XMA(n,m) := for i ∈ 1.. 2·m + 1 x ← $\frac{i - 1 - m}{m}$ $w_i \leftarrow \frac{(m + 1)^2 - (m \cdot x)^2}{(m + 1) \cdot (2 \cdot m + 3)}$ t ← 1 for j ∈ 1.. n $X_{i,j} \leftarrow t$ t ← t·x for i ∈ 1.. n for j ∈ 1.. n $XTWX_{i,j} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^{2 \cdot m + 1} (X_{k,j} \cdot w_k \cdot X_{k,i})$ XTWXI ← $XTWX^{-1}$ for i ∈ 1.. n for j ∈ 1.. 2·m + 1 $A_{i,j} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^n (XTWXI_{i,k} \cdot X_{j,k} \cdot w_j)$ for i ∈ 1.. 2·m + 1 for j ∈ 1.. 2·m + 1 $XA_{i,j} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{i,k} \cdot A_{k,j})$ $XDA_{i,j} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(X_{i,k} \cdot \frac{k}{m} \cdot A_{k+1,j} \right)$ return (XA XDA) </pre>	<pre> XMA(n,m) := for i ∈ 1.. 2·m + 1 x ← $\frac{i - 1 - m}{m}$ $w_{i,i} \leftarrow \frac{(m + 1)^2 - (m \cdot x)^2}{(m + 1) \cdot (2 \cdot m + 3)}$ t ← 1 for j ∈ 1.. n $X_{i,j} \leftarrow t$ t ← t·x for k ∈ 1.. n - 1 $D_{k,k+1} \leftarrow \frac{k}{m}$ $D_{n,n} \leftarrow 0$ A ← $(X^T \cdot W \cdot X)^{-1} \cdot X^T \cdot W$ XA ← X·A XDA ← X·D·A return (XA XDA) </pre>
---	--

The program $SG(n,m,q,y)$ takes as input the S-G filter parameters, n and m , and the number of elements, q , in the vector of data values, y , to be filtered. The filter coefficients are contained in the rows of the matrices XA and XDA calculated by the program $XMA(n,m)$. Equation 2.11 is used to calculate the vector yf (i.e., \hat{y}) of filtered values and Equation 2.15 is used to calculate the vector dyf (i.e., $d\hat{y}/dx$) of the first derivatives of the filtered values. Then Equation 3.6 is used to calculate the standard deviations, syf , of the filtered values and the standard deviations, $sdyf$, of the derivatives of the filtered values. The confidence intervals are based on the standard deviations and are approximately plus or minus twice the standard deviations for 95% confidence intervals.

The program $SD(n,p,q,y)$ calculates the standard deviations, sd , of the filter residuals used to create the plots as illustrated in Figures 2a and 2b. The program takes as input the filter parameter n and the maximum value, p , of the filter parameter m that is to be plotted on the x-axis of the figures. The minimum value of m is constrained by the inequality $2m + 1 > n$. The last two program inputs are the number of elements, q , in the vector of data values, y , to be filtered. The program outputs the vectors of values of m , the residual standard deviations, sda , using Equation 3.2 and the residual standard deviations, sdb , using Equation 3.3. The plot of sdb vs m (Figure 2b) is used to estimate the standard deviation of the noise in the filter input, y . The plot of sda vs m (Figure 2a) is then used to determine the value of m whose corresponding value of the residual standard deviation, sda , comes closest to the estimated standard deviation of the noise. Note that n is a scalar so $SD(n,p,q,y)$ has to be called for each of the chosen values of n which are 3, 5 and 7 in Figures 2a and 2b. Note also that the correction for degrees of freedom, Equation 3.4, is not used to calculate the residual standard deviations. The use of biased estimates makes it easier to identify the appropriate value of m . And because the corresponding values in the plots of sda and sdb are biased by the same factor no error in the determination of the value of m is introduced by the use of biased estimates.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 SG(n, m, q, y) := \\
 \quad (XA \ XDA) \leftarrow XMA(n, m) \\
 \quad \text{for } k \in 1..q \\
 \quad \quad i \leftarrow m + 1 \\
 \quad \quad i \leftarrow k \text{ if } k < m + 1 \\
 \quad \quad i \leftarrow k + 2 \cdot m + 1 - q \text{ if } k > q - m \\
 \quad \quad \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2 \cdot m + 1} (XA_{i,j} \cdot y_{j-i+k}) \\
 \quad \quad yf_k \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2 \cdot m + 1} (XDA_{i,j} \cdot y_{j-i+k}) \\
 \quad \quad dyf_k \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2 \cdot m + 1} (XA_{i,j})^2 \\
 \quad \quad tyf_k \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2 \cdot m + 1} (XDA_{i,j})^2 \\
 \quad \quad tdyf_k \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \sum_{k=1}^q (y_k - yf_k)^2 \\
 \quad \quad s2y \leftarrow \frac{2 \cdot m + 1}{2 \cdot m + 1 - n} \cdot \frac{1}{q} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^q (y_k - yf_k)^2 \\
 \quad \quad \text{for } k \in 1..q \\
 \quad \quad \quad syf_k \leftarrow \sqrt{tyf_k \cdot s2y} \\
 \quad \quad \quad sdyf_k \leftarrow \sqrt{tdyf_k \cdot s2y} \\
 \quad \quad \text{return } (yf \ syf \ dyf \ sdyf)
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{l}
 SD(n, p, q, y) := \\
 \quad m0 \leftarrow \frac{n-1}{2} \\
 \quad \text{for } i \in 1..p - m0 \\
 \quad \quad m_i \leftarrow m0 + i \\
 \quad \quad (yf \ syf \ dyf \ sdyf) \leftarrow SG(n, m_i, q, y) \\
 \quad \quad \text{for } j \in 1..q \\
 \quad \quad \quad rsqa_j \leftarrow (yf_j - y_j)^2 \\
 \quad \quad \text{for } j \in 1..q - 1 \\
 \quad \quad \quad \quad \left[\frac{(y_{j+1} - y_j) - (yf_{j+1} - yf_j)}{2} \right]^2 \\
 \quad \quad \quad rsqb_j \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \quad \sqrt{\frac{1}{q} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^q rsqa_i} \\
 \quad \quad \quad sda_i \leftarrow \\
 \quad \quad \quad \quad \sqrt{\frac{1}{q-1} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} rsqb_j} \\
 \quad \quad \text{return } (m \ sda \ sdb)
 \end{array}$$