



Standard Practice for Statistical Assessment and Improvement of Expected Agreement Between Two Test Methods that Purport to Measure the Same Property of a Material¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D 6708; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice covers statistical methodology for assessing the expected agreement between two standard test methods that purport to measure the same property of a material, and deciding if a simple linear bias correction can further improve the expected agreement. It is intended for use with results collected from an interlaboratory study meeting the requirement of Practice D 6300 or equivalent (for example, ISO 4259). The interlaboratory study must be conducted on at least ten materials that span the intersecting scopes of the test methods, and results must be obtained from at least six laboratories using each method.

NOTE 1—Examples of standard test methods are those developed by voluntary consensus standards bodies such as ASTM, IP/BSI, DIN, AFNOR, CGSB.

1.2 The statistical methodology is based on the premise that a bias correction will not be needed. In the absence of strong statistical evidence that a bias correction would result in better agreement between the two methods, a bias correction is not made. If a bias correction is required, then the *parsimony principle* is followed whereby a simple correction is to be favored over a more complex one.

NOTE 2—Failure to adhere to the parsimony principle generally results in models that are over-fitted and do not perform well in practice.

1.3 The bias corrections of this practice are limited to a constant correction, proportional correction or a linear (proportional + constant) correction.

1.4 The bias-correction methods of this practice are method symmetric, in the sense that equivalent corrections are obtained regardless of which method is bias-corrected to match the other.

1.5 A methodology is presented for establishing the 95 % confidence limit (designated by this practice as the *between methods reproducibility*) for the difference between two results where each result is obtained by a different operator using different apparatus and each applying one of the two methods *X* and *Y* on identical material, where one of the methods has been appropriately bias-corrected in accordance with this practice.

NOTE 3—In earlier versions of this standard practice, the term “cross-method reproducibility” was used in place of the term “between methods reproducibility.” The change was made because the “between methods reproducibility” term is more intuitive and less confusing. It is important to note that these two terms are synonymous and interchangeable with one another, especially in cases where the “cross-method reproducibility” term was subsequently referenced by name in methods where a D 6708 assessment was performed, before the change in terminology in this standard practice was adopted.

NOTE 4—Users are cautioned against applying the between methods reproducibility as calculated from this practice to materials that are significantly different in composition from those actually studied, as the ability of this practice to detect and address sample-specific biases (see 6.8) is dependent on the materials selected for the interlaboratory study. When sample-specific biases are present, the types and ranges of samples may need to be expanded significantly from the minimum of ten as specified in this practice in order to obtain a more comprehensive and reliable 95 % confidence limits for between methods reproducibility that adequately cover the range of sample specific biases for different types of materials.

1.6 This practice is intended for test methods which measure quantitative (numerical) properties of petroleum or petroleum products.

1.7 The statistical methodology outlined in this practice is also applicable for assessing the expected agreement between any two test methods that purport to measure the same property of a material, provided the results are obtained on the same comparison sample set, the standard error associated with each test result is known, the sample set design meets the requirement of this practice, and the statistical degree of freedom of the data set exceeds 30.

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D02 on Petroleum Products and Lubricants and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D02.94 on Coordinating Subcommittee on Quality Assurance and Statistics.

Current edition approved Nov. 15, 2007. Published January 2008. Originally approved in 2001. Last previous edition approved in 2006 as D 6708–06.

1.8 Software program CompTM Version 1.0.21 (ADJD6708) performs the necessary computations prescribed by this practice.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:²

D 5580 Test Method for Determination of Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, *p/m*-Xylene, *o*-Xylene, C₉ and Heavier Aromatics, and Total Aromatics in Finished Gasoline by Gas Chromatography

D 5769 Test Method for Determination of Benzene, Toluene, and Total Aromatics in Finished Gasolines by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry

D 6299 Practice for Applying Statistical Quality Assurance Techniques to Evaluate Analytical Measurement System Performance

D 6300 Practice for Determination of Precision and Bias Data for Use in Test Methods for Petroleum Products and Lubricants

2.2 ISO Standard³

ISO 4259 Petroleum Products—Determination and application of precision data in relation to methods of test.

2.3 ASTM Adjuncts:

ADJD6708 CompTM Version 1.0.21⁴

3. Terminology

3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 *closeness sum of squares (CSS)*, *n*—a statistic used to quantify the degree of agreement between the results from two test methods after bias-correction using the methodology of this practice.

3.1.2 *between methods reproducibility (R_{XY})*, *n*—a quantitative expression of the random error associated with the difference between two results obtained by different operators using different apparatus and applying the two methods *X* and *Y*, respectively, each obtaining a single result on an identical test sample, when the methods have been assessed and an appropriate bias-correction has been applied in accordance with this practice; it is defined as the 95 % confidence limit for the difference between two such single and independent results.

3.1.2.1 *Discussion*—A statement of between methods reproducibility must include a description of any bias correction used in accordance with this practice.

3.1.2.2 *Discussion*—Between methods reproducibility is a meaningful concept only if there are no statistically observable sample-specific relative biases between the two methods, or if

such biases vary from one sample to another in such a way that they may be considered random effects. (see 6.7.)

3.1.3 *total sum of squares (TSS)*, *n*—a statistic used to quantify the information content from the inter-laboratory study in terms of total variation of sample means relative to the standard error of each sample mean.

3.2 Symbols:

X, Y	= single X-method and Y-method results, respectively
X_{ijk}, Y_{ijk}	= single results from the X-method and Y-method round robins, respectively
$X_{i\bar{p}}, Y_i$	= means of results on the i^{th} round robin sample
S	= the number of samples in the round robin
$L_{X\bar{p}}, L_{Y\bar{i}}$	= the numbers of laboratories that returned results on the i^{th} round robin sample
R_X, R_Y	= the reproducibilities of the X- and Y- methods, respectively
$s_{RX\bar{p}}, s_{RY\bar{i}}$	= the reproducibility standard deviations, evaluated at the means of the i^{th} round robin sample
$s_{rX\bar{p}}, s_{rY\bar{i}}$	= the repeatability standard deviations, evaluated at the means of the i^{th} round robin sample
$s_{X\bar{p}}, s_{Y\bar{i}}$	= standard errors of the means i^{th} round robin sample
\bar{X}, \bar{Y}	= the weighted means of round robins (across samples)
$x_{i\bar{p}}, y_i$	= deviations of the means of the i^{th} round robin sample results from \bar{X} and \bar{Y} , respectively.
TSS_X, TSS_Y	= total sums of squares, around \bar{X} and \bar{Y}
F	= a ratio for comparing variances; not unique—more than one use
v_X, v_Y	= the degrees of freedom for reproducibility variances from the round robins
w_i	= weight associated with the difference between mean results (or corrected mean results) from the i^{th} round robin sample
CSS	= weighted sum of squared differences between (possibly corrected) mean results from the round robin
a, b	= parameters of a linear correction: $\hat{Y} = a + bX$
t_1, t_2	= ratios for assessing reductions in sums of squares
R_{XY}	= estimate of between methods reproducibility
\hat{Y}	= Y-method value predicted from X-method result
\hat{Y}_i	= i^{th} round robin sample Y-method mean, predicted from corresponding X-method mean
ϵ_i	= standardized difference between Y_i and \hat{Y}_i .

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

³ Available from American National Standards Institute (ANSI), 25 W. 43rd St., 4th Floor, New York, NY 10036.

⁴ Available from ASTM International Headquarters. Order Adjunct No. ADJD6708.

L_X, L_Y = harmonic mean numbers of laboratories submitting results on round robin samples, by X- and Y- methods, respectively

$R_{X \hat{Y}}$ = estimate of between methods reproducibility, computed from an X-method result only

4. Summary of Practice

4.1 Precisions of the two methods are quantified using inter-laboratory studies meeting the requirements of Practice **D 6300** or equivalent, using at least ten samples in common that span the intersecting scopes of the methods. The arithmetic means of the results for each common sample obtained by each method are calculated. Estimates of the standard errors of these means are computed.

NOTE 5—For established standard test methods, new precision studies generally will be required in order to meet the common sample requirement.

NOTE 6—Both test methods do not need to be run by the same laboratory. If they are, care should be taken to ensure the independent test result requirement of Practice **D 6300** is met (for example, by double-blind testing of samples in random order).

4.2 Weighted sums of squares are computed for the total variation of the mean results across all common samples for each method. These sums of squares are assessed against the standard errors of the mean results for each method to ensure that the samples are sufficiently varied before continuing with the practice.

4.3 The closeness of agreement of the mean results by each method is evaluated using appropriate weighted sums of squared differences. Such sums of squares are computed from the data first with no bias correction, then with a constant bias correction, then, when appropriate, with a proportional correction, and finally with a linear (proportional + constant) correction.

4.4 The weighted sums of squared differences for the linear correction is assessed against the total variation in the mean results for both methods to ensure that there is sufficient correlation between the two methods.

4.5 The most parsimonious bias correction is selected.

4.6 The weighted sum of squares of differences, after applying the selected bias correction, is assessed to determine whether additional unexplained sources of variation remain in the residual (that is, the individual Y_i minus bias-corrected X_i) data. Any remaining, unexplained variation is attributed to sample-specific biases (also known as method-material interactions, or matrix effects). In the absence of sample-specific biases, the between methods reproducibility is estimated.

4.7 If sample-specific biases are present, the residuals (that is, the individual Y_i minus *bias-corrected* X_i) are tested for randomness. If they are found to be consistent with a random-effects model, then their contribution to the between methods reproducibility is estimated, and accumulated into an all-encompassing between methods reproducibility estimate.

4.8 Refer to **Fig. 1** for a simplified flow diagram of the process described in this practice.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 This practice can be used to determine if a constant, proportional, or linear bias correction can improve the degree of agreement between two methods that purport to measure the same property of a material.

5.2 The bias correction developed in this practice can be applied to a single result (X) obtained from one test method (method X) to obtain a *predicted* result (\hat{Y}) for the other test method (method Y).

NOTE 7—Users are cautioned to ensure that \hat{Y} is within the scope of method Y before its use.

5.3 The between methods reproducibility established by this practice can be used to construct an interval around \hat{Y} that would contain the result of test method Y, if it were conducted, with about 95 % confidence.

5.4 This practice can be used to guide commercial agreements and product disposition decisions involving test methods that have been evaluated relative to each other in accordance with this practice.

6. Procedure

NOTE 8—For an in-depth statistical discussion of the methodology used in this section, see **Appendix X1**. For a worked example, see **Appendix X2**.

6.1 Calculate sample means and standard errors from Practice **D 6300** results.

6.1.1 The process of applying Practice **D 6300** to the data may involve elimination of some results as outliers, and it may also involve applying a transformation to the data. For this practice, compute the mean results from data that have not been transformed, but with outliers removed in accordance with Practice **D 6300**. The precision estimates from Practice **D 6300** are used to estimate the standard errors of these means.

6.1.2 Compute the means as follows:

6.1.2.1 Let X_{ijk} represent the k^{th} result on the i^{th} common material by the j^{th} lab in the round robin for method X. Similarly for Y_{ijk} . (The i^{th} material is the same for both round robins, but the j^{th} lab in one round robin is not necessarily the same lab as the j^{th} lab in the other round robin.) Let n_{Xij} be the number of results on the i^{th} material from the j^{th} X-method lab, after removing outliers that is, the number of results in *cell* (i, j). Let L_{Xi} be the number of laboratories in the X-method round robin that have at least one result on the i^{th} material remaining in the data set, after removal of outliers. Let S be the total number of materials common to both round robins.

6.1.2.2 The mean X-method result for the i^{th} material is:

$$X_i = \frac{1}{L_{Xi}} \sum_j \frac{\sum_k X_{ijk}}{n_{Xij}} \quad (1)$$

where, X_i is the average of the cell averages on the i^{th} material by method X.

6.1.2.3 Similarly, the mean Y-method result for the i^{th} material is:

$$Y_i = \frac{1}{L_{Yi}} \sum_j \frac{\sum_k Y_{ijk}}{n_{Yij}} \quad (2)$$