

Experimental Errors

- All measurements have errors
- (1) Precision-Uncertainty
- Reproducibility (Closeness of each test)
- (2) Accuracy
- Nearness to the "truth"
- (3) Our goals are to
- minimize errors and to calculate the size of the errors.

















 $N\Sigma x_i^2 - (\Sigma x_i)^2$ $\Sigma x_i^2 - (\Sigma x_i)^2 / N$ $\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \bar{x})^2$ s =s =N-1N(N-1)(N - 1)EXAMPLE 6-1 The following results were obtained in the replicate determination of the lead content of a blood sample: 0.752, 0.750, 0.752, 0.751, and 0.760 ppm Pb. Calculate the mean and the standard eviation of this set of data. To apply Equation 6-5, we calculate Σx_1^2 and $(\Sigma x_0^2/N)$. Substituting into Equation 6-5 leads $s = \sqrt{\frac{2.844145 - 2.8440882}{\epsilon}}$ 5 - 1 x_i^2 x_i 0.752 0.756 0.752 0.751 0.565504 0.571536 0.565504 0.564001 to $\frac{0.760}{\Sigma_{X_1}} = 3.771$ $\frac{0.577600}{\Sigma x_i^2 = 2.844145}$ $\sqrt{\frac{0.0000568}{4}} = 0.00377 \approx 0.004 \text{ ppm Pb}$ 4 $\vec{x} = \frac{\Sigma x_i}{N} = \frac{3.771}{5} = 0.7542 \approx 0.754$ ppm Pb $\frac{(\Sigma x_i)^2}{N} = \frac{(3.771)^2}{5} = \frac{14.220441}{5} = 2.8440882$ See Excel example





Relative standard deviation (RSD) RSD = $s_r = \frac{s}{\bar{x}}$ Coefficient of variation (CV)-RSD expressed as % $CV = \frac{s}{\bar{x}} \times 100\%$ RSD can be also expressed in parts per thousand ("ppt", ‰) RSD in ppt = $\frac{s}{\bar{x}} \times 1000\%$ • RSD and CV usually give a clear picture of data quality • Large RSD or CV implies poor quality/precision

10

Standard deviation of the mean (s_m) $s_m = s/\sqrt{N}$ Variance (s^2) $s^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{N-1}$ Spread or range (w) Another way to describe the precision of a set of replicate results.

 $w = x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}}$

XAMPLE 6-3		
For the set of data in Example 6-1, calculate (a) th standard deviation in parts per thousand, (c) the coef the spread.	e variance, (t ficient of vari	b) the relative ation, and (d
x = 0.754 ppm Pb and $s = 0.051$	0038 ppm Pb	
(a) $s^2 = (0.0038)^2 = 1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	1	0.752
(b) RSD = $\frac{0.0038}{0.754} \times 1000 \text{ ppt} = 5.0 \text{ ppt}$	2	0.756
0.0038	3	0.752
(c) $CV = \frac{100\%}{0.754} \times 100\% = 0.50\%$	4	0.751
(d) $w = 0.760 - 0.751 = 0.009$ ppm Pb	5	0.76



Accuracy versus precision

1. Accuracy is the closeness of a measurement to the true (or accepted) value (μ or x_t). 2. Accuracy is expressed by the *absolute error* or the *relative error*:

Absolute Error $E = x_i - x_i$

where x_i is the true or acepted value of the quantity

Relative Error: $E_r = \frac{x_i - x_t}{x_t} \times 100\%$ Relative Error: $E_r = \frac{x_i - x_t}{x_t} \times 1000\%$ Parts per thousand

13



14

2. Random Error--changes in signal for replicate measurements:

- always present
- unpredictable
- non-correctable (equal probability of being + or -)
- can be reduced by averaging multiple measurements
- can be treated mathematically (with statistical methods)





Kjeldahl method (N% determination)

1. Degradation: Sample + H₂SO₄ \rightarrow (NH₄)₂SO₄(aq) + CO₂(g) + SO₂(g) + H₂O(g)

2. Liberation of ammonia: $(\rm NH_4)_2SO_4(aq) + 2NaOH \rightarrow Na_2SO_4(aq) + 2H_2O(l) + 2NH_3(g)$

3. Capture of ammonia: B(OH)₃ + H₂O + NH₃ \rightarrow NH₄⁺ + B(OH)₄⁻

4. Back-titration: B(OH)_3 + H_2O + Na_2CO_3 \rightarrow NaHCO_3(aq) + NaB(OH)_4(aq) + CO_2(g) + H_2O

17

3. Gross Error—(Human) silly mistakes:

- occur only occasionally
- often large (+ or -)
- undetected mistakes <u>during the experiment</u>
- can be verify by "Q-test"

Examples:

0.1000 recorded as 0.0100 1.00 g as 1.00 mg Wrong connection of electrode wires

Comparison of Random and Systematic Errors

Random Error (affect measurement precision)

- · Usually small in values, and not avoidable;
- Equal distributed (+/-) around the mean value;
- Can be treated easily by statistics, normally can be removed by average: (may be quantified by statistical parameters)
- average; (may be quantified by statistical parameters)Related to the precision of measurement.

Systematic Error (affect the accuracy of results)

- Due to poor technique or false calibration, sometimes large in values;
- Always in same direction (+ or -), can be detected with calibration or comparison with standard reference samples.
- Difficult to deal with statistically;
- Related to accuracy of measurement.

19

Sources of Systematic (Determinate) Errors

- *Instrumental errors*--caused by nonideal instrument behavior, by fault calibration, or by use under inappropriate conditions.
- *Method errors*—arise from nonideal chemical or physical behavior of analytical systems.
- *Personal errors*—result from e.g., personal limitations of the experimenter.

20

Instrumental Errors

- "Drift" in electronic circuits (e.g., inproper zero)—lamp warm-up
- Temperature controls—PMT sensitivity
- Poor power supply—High voltage supply for PMT
- Instruments calibrations—pipets, burets and volumetric flasks volumes, pH meter with standard pH buffers, Reference electrode potentials

Method Errors

- Instability of the reagent
- Slowness of some reactions
- Loss of solution by evaporation
- Interferences (pH measurements at high/low pHs)
- Contaminants

22





- analysis of standard samples
- independent analysis
- blank determinations
- variation in sample size

Random (Indeterminate) Errors Affect precision but not accuracy Follows a Gaussian or normal distribution Most values fall close to the mean, with values farther away becoming less likely. The width of the distribution

tells us something about the precision of our measurement.













- a. The mean (or average) is the central point of maximum frequency (i.e., the top of the bell curve).
- b. The curve is symmetric on both sides of the mean (i.e., 50% per side).
- c. There is an exponential decrease in resulting frequency as you move away from the mean.
- d. If time and expense permit, you need to perform more than 20 replicates when possible to be sure that the sample mean and standard deviation are sufficiently close to the population mean and standard deviation.







	$N \ge 20$	N < 20
statistic	population	sample
mean	μ	\overline{x}
st. dev.	σ	S
variance	σ^2	s^2













The error bar (uncertainty) depends on:

- Number of measurements (N) (smaller at larger N)
- Confidence % (smaller at less confidence)
- Standard deviations (σ,s) (smaller at smaller $\sigma,s)$

Two cases:

- When σ is known \rightarrow Z table
- When σ is unknown $\rightarrow s$ value to replace $\sigma \rightarrow t$ table

Single vs replicate measurements ($N \ge 1$)

34

Number of measurements (N)	Confidence Intervals [CI, CL, or µ]
Single	$\mu = \mathbf{x} \pm \frac{\mathbf{z}\sigma}{\sqrt{\mathbf{l}}}$
Replicate	$\mu = \overline{\mathbf{x}} \pm \frac{\mathbf{z}\sigma}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}}$

	Confidence Levels for Various Values of z	
	Confidence Level, %	z
	50	0.67
\wedge	68	1.00
	80	1.28
1	90	1.64
1	95	1.96
1	95.4	2.00
5	99	2.58
	99.7	3.00
	99.9	3.29









Calc	ulation of CI (µ) when σ is unknow	'n
1	Number of measurements (N)	Confidence Intervals [CI, CL, or µ]	
	Single	$\mu = x \pm \frac{ts}{\sqrt{1}}$	
	Replicate	$\mu = \overline{x} \pm \frac{ts}{\sqrt{N}}$	



Degrees of No1					
Freedom 111	80%	90%	95%	99%	99.9%
1	3.08	6.31	12.7	63.7	637
2	1.89	2.92	4.30	9.92	31.6
3	1.64	2.35	3.18	5.84	12.9
4	1.53	2.13	2.78	4.60	8.61
5	1.48	2.02	2.57	4.03	6.87
6	1.44	1.94	2.45	3.71	5.96
7	1.42	1.90	2.36	3.50	5.41
8	1.40	1.86	2.31	3.36	5.04
9	1.38	1.83	2.26	3.25	4.78
10	1.37	1.81	2.23	3.17	4.59
15	1.34	1.75	2.13	2.95	4.07
20	1.32	1.73	2.09	2.84	3.85
40	1.30	1.68	2.02	2.70	3.55
60	1.30	1.67	2.00	2.62	3.46
00	1.28	1.64	1.96	2.58	3.29

41



A chemist obtained the following data for the alcohol content of a sample of blood: % C₃H₅OH: 0.084, 0.089, and 0.079. Calcutate the 95% confidence interval for the mean assuming (a) the three results obtained are the only indication of the precision of the method and (b) from previous experience on hundreds of samples, we know that the standard deviation of the method s = 0.005% C₂H₅OH and is a good estimate of σ . (a) $\Sigma x_i = 0.084 + 0.089 + 0.079 = 0.252$

 $\Sigma x_i^2 = 0.007 + 0.007 + 0.007 = 0.0021 = 0.021218$ $\Sigma x_i^2 = 0.007056 + 0.007921 + 0.006241 = 0.021218$ $3 = \sqrt{\frac{0.021218 - (0.252)^2/3}{3 - 1}} = 0.0050\% C_2H_3OH$ Here, $\bar{x} = 0.25274 = 0.084$. Table 7-3 indicates that t = 4.30 for two degrees of freedom and the 95% confidence level. Thus, 95% CI = $\bar{x} \pm \frac{ts}{\sqrt{N}} = 0.084 \pm \frac{4.30 \times 0.0050}{\sqrt{3}}$ = 0.084 ± 0.012\% C_2H_3OH













Error Propagation

$$y = a \times b / c$$
or $y = (a \pm s_a) \times (b \pm s_b) / (c \pm s_c)$

$$y = a \times b / c \pm s_y$$

$$\frac{s_y}{y} = \sqrt{(\frac{s_a}{a})^2 + (\frac{s_b}{b})^2 + (\frac{s_c}{c})^2}$$

e.g., $a = 10.05 \pm 0.050$ $b = 1005.0 \pm 5.000$ $y = a/b = ? = \frac{10.05 \pm 0.050}{1005.0 \pm 5.000} = \frac{10.05}{1005.0} \pm s_y = 0.01000 \pm s_y$ $\frac{s_y}{y} = \sqrt{(\frac{s_a}{a})^2 + (\frac{s_b}{b})^2} = \sqrt{(\frac{0.05}{10.05})^2 + (\frac{5.000}{1005.0})^2} = 7.03 \times 10^{-3}$ $s_y = y \times 7.03 \times 10^{-3} = 0.01000 \times 7.03 \times 10^{-3} = 7.03 \times 10^{-5}$ $y = 0.01000 \pm 7.03 \times 10^{-5} = 0.01000 \pm 0.00007$







Type of Calculation	Example*	Standard Deviation of y ⁺	
Addition or subtraction	y = a + b - c	$s_y = \sqrt{s_a^2 + s_b^2 + s_c^2}$	(1
Multiplication or division	$y = a \times b/c$	$\frac{s_y}{y} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{s_e}{a}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{s_b}{b}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{s_c}{c}\right)^2}$	(2
Exponentiation	$y = a^x$	$\frac{s_y}{y} = x \left(\frac{s_a}{a} \right)$	(3
ogarithm	$y = \log_{10} a$	$s_y = 0.434 \frac{s_a}{a}$	(4
Antilogarithm	$y = \operatorname{antilog}_{10} a$	$\frac{s_y}{y} = 2.303 s_a$	(5

50



- On occasion, a set of data may contain a result that appears to be an *outlier* (*i.e.* outside of the range of that accounted for by random error).
- Inappropriate or unethical to discard data without a reason.
- The criterion used to decide whether or not to remove the potential *outlier* from the data set is the *Q* Test.





Critical Values	for the Rejection Qu	otient, Q*	
		Q_{crit} (Reject if $Q > Q_{\text{crit}}$)	
Number of Observations	90% Confidence	95% Confidence	99% Confidence
3	0.941	0.970	0.994
4	0.765	0.829	0.926
5	0.642	0.710	0.821
6	0.560	0.625	0.740
7	0.507	0.568	0.680
8	0.468	0.526	0.634
9	0.437	0.493	0.598
10	0.412	0.466	0.568

American Chemical Society.

© 2004 Thomson - Brooks/Cole





Procedures for Q-test

- Re-arrange the set of data from small to large or large to small
- Identify the smallest and largest questionable data values
- Calculate the Q values for both of the above isolated values
- Compare calculated Q values with the Q values obtained from the Q table at certain confidence levels
- Discard the experimental value if the calculated Q > table Q and keep the value if the calculated Q < table Q

55

atong acid was used to determine the re
Volume of Titrant (mL)
25.30
25.35
25.37
25.88
cted with 90% confidence?
$\frac{015}{012} = 0.87$

Data Point May Be Discarded Since $Q_{Exp} > Q_{Theorem}$

56

EXAMPLE 7-11

The analysis of a calcite sample yielded CaO percentages of 55.95, 56.00, 56.04, 56.08, and 56.23. The last value appears anomalous; should it be retained or rejected at the 95% confidence level?

The difference between 56.23 and 56.08 is 0.15%. The spread (56.23 - 55.95) is 0.28%. Thus,

$$Q = \frac{0.15}{0.28} = 0.54$$

For five measurements, Q_{crit} at the 95% confidence level is 0.71. Because 0.54 < 0.71, we must retain the outlier at the 95% confidence level.



Comparison of Two Experimental Means --the *t* test for differences in means

Ex: The homogeneity of the chloride level in a water sample from a lake was tested by analyzing portions drawn from the top and from near the bottom of the lake, with the following results in ppm Cl: <u>Question:</u>

Apply the *t*-test at the 95% confidence level to determine if the means are different?

11	
Тор	Bottom
26.30	26.22
26.43	26.32
26.28	26.20
26.19	26.11
26.48	26.42

$$t = \frac{\overline{x_1 - x_2}}{s_{\text{pooled}} \sqrt{\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2}}} \quad \text{Eqs (7-7) (p155) and (6-7) (p124)}$$

$$s_{\text{pooled}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} (x_i - \overline{x_1})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (x_j - \overline{x_2})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} (x_k - \overline{x_3})^2 + \dots}{N_1 + N_2 + N_3 + \dots - N_t}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (N_2 - 1)s_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}} \quad (\text{when comparing 2 sets of data})$$

$$\overline{x_1}, \ \overline{x_2} - \text{mean of the 1st and 2nd set data}$$

$$N_1, N_2 - \text{number of the 1st and 2nd set tests}$$

$$s_{\text{pooled}} - \text{pooled standard deviation}$$

$$N_t - \text{total number of data sets that are pooled}$$



Calculated t vs. critical (theoretical) t

(from Table 7-3, where degrees of freedom: N_1+N_2-2) (Page 147)

If $t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical,}}$ NO significant difference between two sets of data

If $t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical,}}$ Significant difference between the means

61

One Sample <i>t</i> -test		
Number of measurements (N)	t	
Single	$t = \frac{x - \mu}{s}$	
Replicate	$t = \frac{\overline{x} - \mu}{s / \sqrt{N}}$	
<i>t</i> depends on the desired confidence level and is used to determine if the difference between the experimental mean and the accepted value is due to random error or a		

62

systematic error.

Calculated *t* vs. critical (theoretical) *t* (from Table 7-3, where degrees of freedom: *N*-1) (Page 147)

If $t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical,}}$ Measured average agrees with the "true value"

> If $t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$, Significant difference between the measured average and the "true value"; systematic error exists.

Solution to the Ex.

For the Top data set:	$\bar{x} = 26.338$
For the Bottom data set:	$\bar{x} = 26.254$
$s_{\text{pooled}} = 0.1199$	
degrees of freedom $= 5 + $	5-2 = 8
For 8 degrees of freedom at 95	5% confidence $t = 2.31$ (Table 7-3)
$t = \frac{26.338 - 26.254}{0.1199\sqrt{\frac{5+5}{5\times5}}} = 1.11 \text{Sin}$	ce 1.11 < 2.31, <u>no significant</u> ference exists at 95% confidence



Critical value	es of Fa	at the s	o% Pro	bability	Lever	95% 0	onnaen	ce leve	J
Degrees of Freedom (Denominator)	Degrees of Freedom (Numerator)								
	2	3	4	5	6	10	12	20	00
2	19.00	19.16	19.25	19.30	19.33	19.40	19.41	19.45	19.50
3	9.55	9.28	9.12	9.01	8.94	8.79	8.74	8.66	8.53
4	6.94	6.59	6.39	6.26	6.16	5.96	5.91	5.80	5.63
5	5.79	5.41	5.19	5.05	4.95	4.74	4.68	4.56	4.36
6	5.14	4.76	4.53	4.39	4.28	4.06	4.00	3.87	3.67
10	4.10	3.71	3.48	3.33	3.22	2.98	2.91	2.77	2.54
12	3.89	3.49	3.26	3.11	3.00	2.75	2.69	2.54	2.30
20	3.49	3.10	2.87	2.71	2.60	2.35	2.28	2.12	1.84
00	3.00	2.60	2.37	2.21	2.10	1.83	1.75	1.57	1.00



and for

A standard method for the determination of the carbon monoxide (CO) level in gaseous mixtures is known from many hundreds of measurements to have a standard deviation of 0.21 ppm CO. A modification of the method yields a value for *s* of 0.15 ppm CO for a pooled data set with 12 degrees of freedom. A second modification, also based on 12 degrees of freedom, has a standard deviation of 0.12 ppm CO. Is either modification significantly more precise than the original?

$$F_1 = \frac{s_{sad}^2}{s_1^2} = \frac{(0.21)^2}{(0.15)^2} = 1.96$$
 the second,
$$F_2 = \frac{(0.21)^2}{(0.12)^2} = 3.06$$

67

For the standard procedure, s_{std} is a good estimate of σ , and the number of degrees of freedom from the numerator can be taken as infinite. From Table 7-4, the critical value of *F* at the 95% confidence level is $F_{crit} = 2.30$.

Since F_1 is less than 2.30, we cannot reject the null hypothesis for the first modification. We conclude that there is no improvement in precision. For the second modification, however, $F_2 > 2.30$. Here, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the second modification does appear to give better precision at the 95% confidence level. (continued)

It is interesting to note that if we ask whether the precision of the second modification is significantly better than that of the first, the F test dictates that we must accept the null hypothesis. That is,

$$F = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} = \frac{(0.15)^2}{(0.12)^2} = 1.56$$

In this case, $F_{crit} = 2.69$. Since F < 2.69, we must accept H_0 and conclude that the two methods give equivalent precision.

68

The t-test versus the *F*-test

- *t* test is valid for comparison of different sets of data obtained with <u>the same</u> experimental methodology
- *F* test is used to compare precisions obtained with <u>different analytical</u> <u>techniques</u>, e.g., spectroscopic vs electrochemical method





71

RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT FIGURES

- All nonzero digits are significant.
 - 3.51 has 3 sig figs
- The number of significant digits is <u>independent</u> of the position of the decimal point
- Zeros located between nonzero digits are significant
 - 4055 has 4 sig figs

- Zeros at the end of a number (trailing zeros) are significant *if the number contains a decimal point.*
 - 5.7000 has 5 sig figs
- Trailing zeros are ambiguous if the number does not contain a decimal point
 - 2000. versus 2000
- Leading zeros are not significant.
 - 0.00045 (note: 4.5 x 10⁻⁴)



6	2.30900
2	0.00040
4	30.07
1,2,or 3	300
2	0.033



- Often used to clarify the number of significant figures in a number.
- Example:

 $4,300 = 4.3 \text{ x } 1,000 = \underline{4.3} \text{ x } 10^3$

 $0.070 = 7.0 \ge 0.01 = 7.0 \ge 10^{-2}$

76



77

Class Practice: 2.0118 + 0.009567 = 2.021367? $\mu = 2.0123 \pm 0.008167 = ?$

II. Rules for Multiplication and Division

• the result should have as many significant figures as the **measured** number with the smallest number of significant figures.

 $\frac{(4.2 \times 10^{3})(15.94)}{2.255 \times 10^{-4}} = 2.9688692 \times 10^{-8}$ (on calculator)

Which number has the fewest sig figs? The answer is therefore, $3.0 \ge 10^{-8}$

79

For example, if you measured the length, width, and height of a block you could calculate the volume of a block:

Length: 0.11 cm
Width: 3.47 cm
Height: 22.70 cm

Volume = 0.11 cm x 3.47 cm x 22.70 cm

= 8.66459 cm³
Where do you round off?
= 8.66? = 8.7? 8.66459?

80

III. <u>Rules for Logarithms and Antilogarithms</u>
 In a logarithm of a number, keep as many digits to the right of the decimal point as there are significant figures in the original number.
 In an antilogarithm of a number, keep as many digits as there are digits to the right of the decimal point in the original number.
 In an antilogarithm of a number, keep as many digits as there are digits to the right of the decimal point in the original number.

(b) Following rule 2, we may retain only 1 digit

antilog $12.5 = 3 \times 10^{12}$

Rules for Rounding Off Numbers

- When the number to be dropped is less than 5 the preceding number is not changed.
- When the number to be dropped is 5 or larger, the preceding number is increased by one unit.
- Round the following number to 3 sig figs: <u>3.34966 x 10⁴</u>

 $=3.35 \times 10^4$

82

