

Plotting the Differences Between Data and Expectation

Georgios Choudalakis*

*University of Chicago, Enrico Fermi Institute,
5640 South Ellis Avenue,
Chicago, IL 60637, USA
CERN office: B40-R C32.*

Diego Casadei†

*Department of Physics, New York University,
4 Washington Place,
NY-10003 New York, USA
CERN office: 32-S-A19.*

November 9, 2022

Abstract

This article proposes a way to improve the presentation of histograms where data are compared to expectation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	What is “significance”?	2
2	Some ways to present deviations in Poisson distributed data	4
2.1	The D/B ratio	4
2.2	The $(D - B)/\sqrt{B}$ approximation	5
2.3	Plotting z -values	6
2.4	Signed z -values	7
3	Final Proposal	7
4	Including systematic uncertainty	9
4.1	Poisson model with uncertain parameter	9
4.2	Binomial model with uncertain parameter	10
5	Summary	11

*gchouda@alum.mit.edu

†diego.casadei@cern.ch




Figure 1: Relationship between p -value and z -value.

1 Introduction

Most analyses compare the observed data to the expectation resulting from the Standard Model (SM) or some other hypothesis. Usually a figure shows the two spectra in the upper part (often using logarithmic scale), and at the bottom there is an *inset* showing, in detail, the comparison between the two. This document focuses on the content of the inset and provides suggestions to improve the way the differences with respect to the reference model are shown.

If possible, the inset should be intuitive and accurate.

Intuitive: It should make obvious which bins have an excess of data, and which have a deficit; it should be easy to read, without too many colors or complicated conventions; significant deviations should look bigger than insignificant.

Accurate: It should represent the actual significance of the deviation in each bin. All bins should be treated on an equal footing.

Section 2 shows several options that could be used, evolving from worse to better, until the ultimate proposal which is in Section 3. To make clear the advantages of the final proposal, it is recommended to read the progression of options of Section 2.

1.1 What is “significance”?

Before we can represent it in a plot, we need a precise definition of statistical *significance*. The significance is the probability of seeing a deviation at least as big as the observed one. This probability is often called “the p -value”. Because it usually changes by several orders of magnitude with relatively small difference in the observed data, people find it comfortable to change its scale in such a way that it can be converted in the equivalent Gaussian deviation measured in units of the Gaussian standard deviation. The result, which we call “ z -value” in the following, is defined by the following 1:1 mapping:

$$p\text{-value} = \int_{z\text{-value}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx, \quad (1)$$

which is shown in Fig. 1. In ROOT [3], the z -value can be computed in one line of code, using the inverse error function:

```
sqrt(2.) * TMath::ErfInverse(1. - 2. * pvalue)
```

For example, it is common to refer to a $p\text{-value} = 2.87 \times 10^{-7}$ as a “ 5σ effect”, meaning that the corresponding z -value is 5. Though it is not common, it would also be correct to say that a $p\text{-value} = 1 - 2.87 \times 10^{-7}$ corresponds to a -5σ effect; negative z -values imply p -values greater than 0.5, thus really insignificant discrepancies.

The definition of p -value depends on the statistical distribution that the data are supposed to follow. (This is called “probability model”.) The following cases are most common, and are addressed in this note.

Poisson: This is the most common case, where event counts are plotted in each bin. Event counts follow Poisson statistics. If $B \in \mathbb{R}$ events are expected in a bin, the probability of observing $D \in \mathbb{N}$ events is $P(D|B) = \text{Poi}(D|B) = e^{-B} B^D / D!$. The Poisson p -value is

$$p\text{-value} = \begin{cases} \sum_{n=D}^{\infty} \frac{B^n}{n!} e^{-B} = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{D-1} \frac{B^n}{n!} e^{-B} & , D > B \\ \sum_{n=0}^D \frac{B^n}{n!} e^{-B} & , D \leq B \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The above sums are simplified thanks to the identity:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{D-1} \frac{B^n}{n!} e^{-B} = \frac{\Gamma(D, B)}{\Gamma(D)}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\Gamma(D, B) = \int_B^{\infty} t^{D-1} e^{-t} dt, \quad (4)$$

$$\Gamma(D) = \int_0^{\infty} t^{D-1} e^{-t} dt. \quad (5)$$

The ratio between the upper incomplete Gamma function $\Gamma(s, x)$ and the Gamma function $\Gamma(s)$ in the previous equation is known as the upper regularized Gamma function

$$Q(s, x) = \frac{\Gamma(s, x)}{\Gamma(s)} = 1 - P(s, x) \quad (6)$$

where $P(s, x)$ is the cumulative distribution function for Gamma random variables with shape parameter s and scale parameter 1 [2]. In ROOT this function is available as

$$Q(s, x) = \text{ROOT::Math::inc_gamma_c}(s, x),$$

such that

$$p\text{-value} = \begin{cases} 1 - Q(D, B) = \text{ROOT::Math::inc_gamma_c}(D, B) & , D > B \\ Q(D + 1, B) = \text{ROOT::Math::inc_gamma_c}(D+1, B) & , D \leq B \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Binomial: If the quantity plotted is a Bernoulli success rate, e.g., an efficiency, or the fraction of events which satisfy some criteria, this success rate follows Binomial statistics. An example is $F_{\chi}(m_{jj})$ [1].

Let us use the following notation:

$n \in \mathbb{N}$: the number of events initially observed in a bin, a subset of which will survive the selection

$k_{\text{obs}} \in \mathbb{N}$: the observed number of selected events. Obviously k_{obs} can only assume the values $0, \dots, n$.

$\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$: the expected success rate, i.e. the selection efficiency, to which we compare the observed rate k_{obs}/n .

The binomial distribution gives the probability of observing k events passing the selection out of the initial n events:

$$P(k|n, \varepsilon) = \text{Bi}(k|n, \varepsilon) = \binom{n}{k} \varepsilon^k (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-k} \quad (8)$$

and the expected number of surviving events is $E[k|n, \varepsilon] = n\varepsilon$.

The Binomial p -value is defined as

$$p\text{-value} = \begin{cases} \sum_{n=k_{\text{obs}}}^n \binom{n}{k} \varepsilon^k (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-k} & , k_{\text{obs}} \geq \varepsilon \cdot n \\ \sum_{n=0}^{k_{\text{obs}}} \binom{n}{k} \varepsilon^k (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-k} & , k_{\text{obs}} < \varepsilon \cdot n \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Unfolded: If the “data” are the product of some unfolding procedure, things are much less clear, because the product of unfolding does not follow a well-known and generally applicable probability distribution. It is unclear even if one should try to compute, bin by bin, the significance of the difference between unfolded data and expectation. This could mislead one to think that the bins are independent, which is not true. For this reason, this document does not deal further with unfolded spectra.

2 Some ways to present deviations in Poisson distributed data

The goal of this section is to present a logical progression of plotting options, which will justify the final proposal, in Section 3.

Focussing on the case of Poisson-distributed data, we use as an example the (fake) observed and expected event counts of Table 1. Two significant discrepancies have been introduced, an excess and a deficit, to make the demonstration more interesting.

Although the following examples use Poisson distributed data, the Binomial case would be treated similarly, except for the different p -value computation.

2.1 The D/B ratio

A simple, and quite common practice, is to plot the ratio of data over expectation (D/B), or subtract 1 to plot $(D - B)/B$, i.e. their relative difference. The result is in Fig. 2.

Arguably this is the worst way to compare two histograms, especially when the bin contents span several orders of magnitude. It is impossible to see that significant discrepancies exit, as will become obvious later.

Bin number	Observed	Expected	Bin number	Observed	Expected
1	121687	121688	21	233	226.509
2	222014	221422	22	129	144.086
3	223741	223832	23	90	91.4576
4	189486	190065	24	51	57.9372
5	148673	148218	25	53	36.6361
6	109932	109876	26	20	23.1279
7	79553	78760.1	27	15	14.5779
8	56420	55119.7	28	13	9.17558
9	38771	37889.4	29	3	5.76764
10	25628	25684.7	30	4	3.621
11	17309	17218.4	31	4	2.2707
12	11553	11438.1	32	0	1.4224
13	7573	7540.84	33	1	0.890119
14	5024	4939.65	34	0	0.556496
15	3221	3217.98	35	2	0.347608
16	1828	2086.41	36	0	0.216946
17	1213	1347.11	37	0	0.135291
18	788	866.585	38	0	0.0843062
19	572	555.646	39	0	0.0524979
20	362	355.233	40	0	0.0326686

Table 1: Observed events (D) and expected events (B), used for demonstration.

The biggest disadvantage of this method is that It does not present significance. It gives the impression that low-population bins are fluctuating more than high-population bins, which is not true in this case. The last non-empty bin is off scale, and if we un-zoom the vertical axis to include it, then other features will be even harder to see. The relative difference cannot be smaller than -1 (for $D = 0$), but it has no upper limit, so, negative and positive values have different meanings. Bins with $D = 0$ would all be at relative difference -1, regardless of B , and are typically not shown.

One advantage of this method is that excesses of data appear above 0, and deficits below, which is intuitive.

Although this method is inappropriate to convey the statistical significance of deviations, it is appropriate when statistical comparison is not intended. For example, one may wish to show simply that the data lie within 5% from the expectation, even if this 5% deviation is hugely significant when it concerns large numbers of events.

2.2 The $(D - B)/\sqrt{B}$ approximation

It is well-known that, for large B , the Poisson distribution with parameter B is well-approximated by a Gaussian of mean B and standard deviation $\sqrt{B}$. This leads to the approximation of the Poisson z -value with $\frac{D-B}{\sqrt{B}}$, which is plotted in Fig. 3.

An advantage of this approach is that we see clearly two significant features: an excess around 200 and a deficit around 400. Intuitively, excesses point “up” and deficits “down”. The quantity shown, in bins with large expectation, is a good approximation of the actual Poisson z -value.

The main disadvantage is that, in low-population bins, $\frac{D-B}{\sqrt{B}}$ is not a good approximation of the true z -value. We will see soon that the last bin with $D = 2$ is not as significant as it appears in Fig. 3. Similarly, the empty bins in the end of the spectrum don’t actually have




Figure 2: The relative difference between data (D) and expectation (B): $(D - B)/B$.




Figure 3: Showing $(D - B)/\sqrt{B}$.

deficits of z -value between 0 and 1, as is indicated by the small negative bars. Such z -values would correspond to p -values < 0.5 , but, as we are about to show, these bins contain deficits of p -value > 0.5 , which the approximation in Fig. 3 fails to describe.

2.3 Plotting z -values

Instead of approximating the z -value with $(D - B)/\sqrt{B}$, it would be better to plot the exact z -value in each bin. This is shown in Fig. 4.

Large z -value means small p -value and significant discrepancy; small z -value means large p -value and insignificant discrepancy. More specifically,

$$z\text{-value} > 0 \Leftrightarrow p\text{-value} < 0.5,$$

$$z\text{-value} < 0 \Leftrightarrow p\text{-value} > 0.5.$$

Even very mild discrepancies (both excesses and deficits), give $p\text{-value} < 0.5 \Rightarrow z\text{-value} > 0$. However, when B is small, and $D \simeq B$, it can happen to obtain $p\text{-value} > 0.5$, which makes $z\text{-value} < 0$. This effect is unrelated to having an excess or a deficit (it can happen in both cases), and is a consequence of the asymmetry of the Poisson distribution. Such cases are bins with low statistics with nearly perfect agreement, which present no interest, but can obscure the figure, as we will see.

Fig. 4 shows accurately which discrepancies are significant (large z -value > 0) and which are insignificant (small z -value > 0), and which are very insignificant and occurring at low statistics ($z\text{-value} < 0$). But it does not capture which discrepancies are excesses and which deficits of data. So, both features, at 200 and 400, are significant and appear with large positive z -values, even though the latter is a deficit. The last few bins, which have $D = 0$, have negative z -value, indicating that they are very uninteresting and with low B . The more negative the z -value, the larger the p -value, the less interesting the deficit in these bins. There is also a case of a very uninteresting excess, in bin 33 with $D = 1$ and $B = 0.89$, which has a slightly negative z -value indicating a p -value slightly larger than 0.5.




Figure 4: Showing the z -value corresponding to the Poisson p -value in each bin.




Figure 5: Showing the z -value corresponding to the Poisson p -value in each bin, after flipping the sign of z -values where there is a deficit of data ($D < B$).

2.4 Signed z -values

The z -value gives accurately the significance of each discrepancy, but it is also necessary to distinguish excesses from deficits. This can be done by flipping the sign of z -values in the case of $D < B$, which results in Fig. 5.

The good result of this sign flipping is that the nature of large discrepancies is clear; the one at 200 is an excess and the one at 400 is a deficit.

However, there is still something confusing in bins with low statistics. We know that the last few bins contain deficits ($D = 0$), however, they appear with z -values above 0, giving the impression of excesses. This happens because they originally had negative z -values, indicating very insignificant deficits, and with the sign-flipping they appear as if they were excesses. And it is even worse that, the more uninteresting the deficit, the larger the $|z\text{-value}|$, so, it gives the impression of an even larger excess after sign flipping. A similar problem is observed in the very insignificant excess of bin 33, around 800. It contains an excess with $z\text{-value} < 0$, and since it is an excess the sign does not change. This results in an entry that points “down”, which gives the impression of a deficit.

3 Final Proposal

The final proposal is this:

1. Compute the p -value and z -value in each bin.
2. If ($D < B$), multiply the z -value by -1, namely, flip the sign.
3. If $p\text{-value} > 0.5$ in some bin, don't show the corresponding z -value. Skip this bin, or set the z -value to 0, so as to not appear in the plot.




Figure 6: The final proposal. Plotting the z -value only for bins with p -value < 0.5 (which are the bins worth talking about), and if $D < B$ then flip the sign of z -value to make its sign distinguish excesses from deficits.

The result is Fig. 6.

The justification for not showing the significance in bins of p -value > 0.5 is simply that these bins are totally uninteresting. Trying to include their z -values in the picture would be confusing, as in Fig. 5. This trick makes all shown z -values be positive before sign flipping, so, after flipping the signs of those corresponding to $D < B$, the resulting sign of each z -value indicates unambiguously the type of discrepancy (excess or deficit).

The hope is that this presentation will allow the reader to grasp immediately the real significance of deviations, without long-winded explanations necessary. He/she will see a bar that says “significance = $+5\sigma$, so there is a 5σ excess.” Or, “significance = -4σ , so this is a 4σ deficit.”. In bins with low B , when the significance is shown (like in the last bin with $D = 2$), it means that it is worth showing (because it gives p -value < 0.5), and furthermore, the number given is accurate (unlike the $(D - B)/\sqrt{B}$ approximation). If a bin significance is not shown, it is not worth mentioning, so, it is omitted to not clutter the picture, and to allow the sign of z -values to indicate unambiguously the kind of discrepancy.

One may counter-propose not to omit reporting p -values larger than 0.5, but to omit reporting on bins with $D = 0$. This, however, wouldn’t be a solution, because there can be empty bins with noteworthy deficits. For example, bin 32 (just before 800) contains ($D = 0, B = 1.42$), which, as we see in Fig. 6, constitutes an almost 1σ deficit. If we omitted bins with $D = 0$ we would have missed this information, and we would still have trouble with bin 33, which wouldn’t be omitted (because $D \neq 0$), and would appear with a negative indication, as if it were a deficit, although it is an excess. So, not reporting on empty bins is not the solution to the problem. The proposed solution is to omit uninteresting bins, i.e. bins of p -value > 0.5 , which may or may not be also empty.

4 Including systematic uncertainty

Any systematic uncertainty in the reference value will affect the significance of the observation. For example, in case of a Poisson process with parameter B , a non-zero uncertainty on B will decrease the significance of the difference between D and B . Because realistic use cases always involve some (perhaps small) systematic uncertainty, it is important to study its effects on our estimate of the significance of the result. A full treatment would require to solve an inference problem. Here we limit ourselves to the aspects which are relevant when making plots.

In some cases it may be decided to not show the effect of systematics. For example, if systematic uncertainty is negligible compared to statistical, or if the deviations without systematic uncertainty are already not significant enough to warrant reduction by inclusion of extra uncertainty.

A simple procedure to warn the reader about the effects of the systematic uncertainty on B would seem to plot the significance shown in Fig. 6 with “error bars”. The upper and lower deviations with respect to the significance computed above could correspond to the result of recomputing the significance with the parameter B shifted by ± 1 standard deviation (assuming symmetric uncertainty). An example of this is in Fig. 7, where the relative uncertainty in bin i has been set to $10^{-5} \cdot i^3$. The problem with this approach is that it misses the fundamental point: *any additional uncertainty will decrease the significance of the observed deviation*.

This can be shown with a formal approach, which would correspond to a Bayesian treatment of the uncertainties. It consists of computing the p -value with the marginal model obtained after integration over the parameter, whose prior describes the experimenter’s degree of belief on the allowed range of values. This is explained in detail in the next two sections for the Poisson and binomial models, and it is illustrated by Fig. 8, which should be compared to Fig. 7.

4.1 Poisson model with uncertain parameter

In any bin the probability of observing n events is given by the Poisson distribution with parameter $Y > 0$ (the expected number of events), which is not certain. One assumes to know its best estimate (which we take to be the expectation E of Y) and “uncertainty” (which we take to be the square root S of the variance of Y). In most cases E and S are the result of some auxiliary measurement. A unique Gamma density corresponds to the pair (E, S) . If we write the Gamma density as

$$\text{Ga}(x|a, b) = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} x^{a-1} e^{-bx} \quad (10)$$

the expectation and variance are

$$E = \frac{a}{b} \quad \text{and} \quad S^2 = \frac{a}{b^2}$$

from which we obtain the Gamma parameters

$$a = \frac{E^2}{S^2} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{E}{S^2} .$$

In order to evaluate the probability of observing n events, when the expected yield is described by the Gamma density above, we make use of the marginal model which is




Figure 7: The error bars in the inset indicate the range by which the significance varies when recomputed after shifting the expectation by ± 1 standard deviation, corresponding to the error boxes shown in the main plot.




Figure 8: The inset shows the significance computed by neglecting the systematic uncertainty on the expectation (red histogram) and by including it (green histogram). Including additional sources of uncertainty always decreases the significance.

obtained by integrating over all possible values of Y :

$$P(n|a, b) = \int_0^\infty \text{Poi}(n|Y) \text{Ga}(Y|a, b) dY = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} \frac{\Gamma(n+a)}{n! (1+b)^{n+a}} \quad (11)$$

The Gamma function is available in ROOT as $\Gamma(x) = \text{ROOT::Math::tgamma}(x)$. We now proceed as above, by defining the p -value and z -value¹ in terms of the marginal model (11):

$$p\text{-value} = \begin{cases} P(n \geq n_{\text{obs}}) = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{n_{\text{obs}}-1} P(n|a, b) = \int_{z\text{-value}}^\infty \mathcal{N}(x; 0, 1) dx & , n_{\text{obs}} > E \\ P(n \leq n_{\text{obs}}) = \sum_{n=0}^{n_{\text{obs}}} P(n|a, b) = \int_{-\infty}^{z\text{-value}} \mathcal{N}(x; 0, 1) dx & , n_{\text{obs}} \leq E \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

(some care needs to be taken when summing over the marginal model (11): it is recommended to make use of the recursive relations which allow to compute the n -th term starting from the term $n-1$). Finally, we plot the z -value only if $p \leq 0.5$ as explained above.

4.2 Binomial model with uncertain parameter

Let the observed ratio be k_{obs}/n in a bin for which we expect a binomial distribution with parameter $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ which follows a Beta distribution with known parameters a, b (which can be found with the method of moments or numerically, and are the result of some auxiliary

¹With this bifurcated definition of z -value, the sign flipping described in previous sections is included from the beginning.

measurement [4]). Then the probability of observing k events passing the selection out of the initial n events is given by the marginal model

$$P(k|n, a, b) = \int_0^1 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} \frac{x^{a-1} (1-x)^{b-1}}{B(a, b)} dx = \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{B(a, b)} \int_0^1 x^{k+a-1} (1-x)^{n-k+b-1} dx$$

where the last integral is the definition of the Euler's Beta function $B(k+a, n-k+b)$. Hence

$$P(k|n, a, b) = \binom{n}{k} \frac{B(k+a, n-k+b)}{B(a, b)} \quad (13)$$

In ROOT, the Beta function $B(x, y) = \Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)/\Gamma(x+y)$ is available:

$$B(x, y) = \text{ROOT::Math::beta}(x, y)$$

which makes the marginal model (13) easy to compute.

The p -value and z -value are then defined in terms of the marginal model (13) as

$$p\text{-value} = \begin{cases} P(k \geq k_{\text{obs}}) = \sum_{k=k_{\text{obs}}}^n P(k|n, a, b) = \int_{z\text{-value}}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}(x; 0, 1) dx & , k_{\text{obs}} \geq n\varepsilon \\ P(k \leq k_{\text{obs}}) = \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\text{obs}}} P(k|n, a, b) = \int_{-\infty}^{z\text{-value}} \mathcal{N}(x; 0, 1) dx & , k_{\text{obs}} < n\varepsilon \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Finally, one plots only the z -values which correspond to $p \geq 0.5$ as explained in the previous sections.

5 Summary

In this article, we propose an improved way of plotting the difference between data and expectation, based on the significance of the difference in each bin.

Section 1.1 gives the definition of statistical significance in the case of Poisson- and Binomial-distributed data.

In Section 2 a sequence of improvements is shown, to motivate the final proposal, which is given in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 proposes ways to visualize systematic uncertainty.

Acknowledgements

We thank Alex Read and Glen Cowan for their feedback.

References

- [1] Georges Aad et al. Search for New Physics in Dijet Mass and Angular Distributions in pp Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV Measured with the ATLAS Detector. *New J.Phys.*, 13:053044, 2011.
- [2] Milton Abramowitz and Irene A. Stegun, editors. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. Dover, New York, 1965.

- [3] I. Antcheva, M. Ballintijn, B. Bellenot, M. Biskup, R. Brun, et al. ROOT: A C++ framework for petabyte data storage, statistical analysis and visualization. *Comput.Phys.Commun.*, 180:2499–2512, 2009.
- [4] Diego Casadei. Efficiency measurement: a bayesian approach. arXiv:0908.0130, 2010.