



Designation: ~~D6708—21~~ D6708 – 24

An American National Standard

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 D6708; 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 different standard test methods that purport to measure the same property of a material, and for the purpose of deciding if a simple linear bias correction can further improve the expected agreement. It is intended for use with results obtained from interlaboratory studies meeting the requirement of Practice **D6300** or equivalent (for example, ISO 4259). The interlaboratory studies shall be conducted on at least ten materials in common that among them span the intersecting scopes of the test methods, and results shall be obtained from at least six laboratories using each method. Requirements in this practice shall be met in order for the assessment to be considered suitable for publication in either method, if such publication includes claim to have been carried out in compliance with this practice. Any such publication shall include mandatory information regarding certain details of the assessment outcome as specified in the Report section of this practice.

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 1—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 numerical limit (designated by this practice as the *between methods reproducibility*) that would be exceeded about 5 % of the time (one case in 20 in the long run) for the difference between two results where each result is obtained by a different operator in a different laboratory 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, in the normal and correct operation of both test methods.

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

Current edition approved ~~May 1, 2021~~ March 1, 2024. Published ~~May 2021~~ March 2024. Originally approved in 2001. Last previous edition approved in ~~2019~~ 2021 as ~~D6708—19~~ D6708 – 21.¹ DOI: ~~10.1520/D6708-21~~ 10.1520/D6708-24.

*A Summary of Changes section appears at the end of this standard

NOTE 2—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 D6708 assessment was performed, before the change in terminology in this standard practice was adopted.

NOTE 3—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 6.7) 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 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 calculations of this practice are also applicable for assessing the expected agreement between two different test methods that purport to measure the same property of a material using results that are not as described in 1.1, provided the results and associated statistics from each test method are obtained from a specifically designed multi-lab study or from a proficiency testing program (e.g.: ILCP) where for each sample a single result is provided by each lab for each test method. The comparison sample set shall comprise at least ten different materials that span the intersecting scopes of the test methods with no material exceeding the leverage requirement in Practice D6300. Results and statistics shall meet requirements in 1.7.1. Requirements in this practice shall be met in order for the assessment to be considered suitable for publication in either method, if such publication includes claim to have been carried out in compliance with this practice. Any such publication shall include mandatory information regarding certain details of the assessment as specified in the Report section of this practice. R_{XY} shall be based on the published reproducibility of the methods.

1.7.1 For each test method and sample, results and statistics used to perform the assessment in 1.7 shall meet the following requirements:

- (1) No. of results (N) ≥ 10 ,
- (2) Anderson Darling statistic ≤ 1.12 (based on Normal Distribution),
- (3) Standard Error (se_{sample}) is calculated using published reproducibility evaluated at the sample mean, N , and the factor 2.8 as follows:

$$se_{\text{sample}} = [R_{\text{pub}} / (2.8 \sqrt{N})] \quad (1)$$

- (4) se_{sample} is numerically less than $[R_{\text{pub}} / (2.8 \sqrt{10})]$, and
- (5) Sample standard deviation (s_{sample}) per root-mean-square technique is not statistically greater than $R_{\text{pub}} / 2.8$ for at least 80 % of the samples in the comparison data set based on an F-test using 30 as the assumed degrees of freedom for R_{pub} , and $(N - 1)$ for s_{sample} at the 0.05 significance level.

1.8 The methodology in this practice can also be used to perform linear regression analysis between two variables (X , Y) where there is known uncertainty in both variables that may or may not be constant over the regression range. The common acronym used to describe this type of linear regression is ReXY (Regression with errors in X and Y). The ReXY technique for assessing the correlation between two variables as described in this practice can be used for investigative applications where the strict data input requirement may not be met, but the outcome can still be useful for the intended application. Use of this practice for ReXY should be conducted under the tutelage of subject matter experts familiar with the statistical theory and techniques described in this practice, the methodologies associated with the production and collection of the results to be used for the regression analysis, and interpretation of assessment outcome relative to the intended application.

1.9 *This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:²

D5580 Test Method for Determination of Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, *p/m*-Xylene, *o*-Xylene, C_9 , and Heavier Aromatics, and Total Aromatics in Finished Gasoline by Gas Chromatography

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.

D5769 Test Method for Determination of Benzene, Toluene, and Total Aromatics in Finished Gasolines by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry

D6299 Practice for Applying Statistical Quality Assurance and Control Charting Techniques to Evaluate Analytical Measurement System Performance

D6300 Practice for Determination of Precision and Bias Data for Use in Test Methods for Petroleum Products, Liquid Fuels, and Lubricants

D7372 Guide for Analysis and Interpretation of Proficiency Test Program Results

2.2 ISO Standard:³

ISO 4259 Petroleum Products—Determination and Application of Precision Data in Relation to Methods of Test

3. Terminology

3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 *between ILCP method-averages reproducibility* ($R_{ILCP_X, ILCP_Y}$), n —a quantitative expression of the random error associated with the difference between the bias-corrected ILCP average of method X versus the ILCP average of method Y from a Proficiency Testing program, when the method X has been assessed versus method Y, and an appropriate bias-correction has been applied to all method X results in accordance with this practice; it is defined as the numerical limit for the difference between two such averages that would be exceeded about 5 % of the time (one case in 20 in the long run).

3.1.2 *between-method bias*, n —a quantitative expression for the mathematical correction that can statistically improve the degree of agreement between the expected values of two test methods which purport to measure the same property.

3.1.3 *between methods reproducibility* (R_{XY}), n —a quantitative expression of the random error associated with the difference between two results obtained by different operators in different laboratories 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 numerical limit for the difference between two such single and independent results that would be exceeded about 5 % of the time (one case in 20 in the long run) in the normal and correct operation of both test methods.

3.1.3.1 Discussion—

A statement of between methods reproducibility shall include a description of any bias correction used in accordance with this practice.

3.1.3.2 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.)

3.1.4 *centered 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.

3.1.5 *Interlaboratory Crosscheck Program (ILCP)*, n —ASTM International Proficiency Test Program sponsored by Committee D02 on Petroleum Products, Liquid Fuels, and Lubricants; see ASTM website for current details. **D7372**

3.1.6 *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
\bar{X}_i, \bar{Y}_i	= means of results on the i^{th} round robin sample
S	= the number of samples in the round robin
L_{Xi}, L_{Yi}	= 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

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

$R_{X\bar{i}}, R_{Y\bar{i}}$	= the reproducibility of method X and Y, evaluated at the method X and Y means of the i^{th} round robin sample, respectively
$R_{ILCP_X}, ILCP_Y$	= estimate of between ILCP method-averages reproducibility
$s_{RX\bar{i}}, s_{RY\bar{i}}$	= the reproducibility standard deviations, evaluated at the method X and Y means of the i^{th} round robin sample
$s_{rX\bar{i}}, s_{rY\bar{i}}$	= the repeatability standard deviations, evaluated at the method X and Y means of the i^{th} round robin sample
$s_{X\bar{i}}, s_{Y\bar{i}}$	= standard errors of the means i^{th} round robin sample
X^-, Y^-	= the weighted means of round robins (across samples)
$x_{\bar{i}}, y_{\bar{i}}$	= deviations of the means of the i^{th} round robin sample results from X^- and Y^- , respectively.
TSS_X, TSS_Y	= total sums of squares, around X^- and 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	= centered sum of squares, weighted sum of squared differences between (possibly corrected) mean results from the round robin
a, b	= parameters of a linear correction: $Y^{\wedge} = a + bX$
t_1, t_2	= ratios for assessing reductions in sums of squares
R_{XY}	= estimate of between methods reproducibility
Y^{\wedge}	= predicted Y-method value for a sample by applying the bias correction established from this practice to an actual X-method result for the same sample
Y^{\wedge}_i	= predicted i^{th} round robin sample Y-method mean, by applying the bias correction established from this practice to its corresponding X-method mean
ε_i	= standardized difference between Y_i and Y^{\wedge}_i .
L_X, L_Y	= harmonic mean numbers of laboratories submitting results on round robin samples, by X- and Y- methods, respectively
$R_{X^{\wedge}Y}$	= 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 **D6300** 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 4—For established standard test methods, new precision studies generally will be required in order to meet the common sample requirement.

NOTE 5—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 **D6300** 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.




FIG. 1 Simplified Flow Diagram for this Practice

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 (Y^{\wedge}) for the other test method (method Y).

NOTE 5—Users are cautioned to ensure that Y^{\wedge} 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 Y^{\wedge} that would contain the result of test method Y , if it were conducted, with approximately 95 % probability.

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.

5.5 The magnitude of a statistically detectable bias is directly related to the uncertainties of the statistics from the experimental study. These uncertainties are related to both the size of the data set and the precision of the processes being studied. A large data set, or, highly precise test method(s), or both, can reduce the uncertainties of experimental statistics to the point where the “statistically detectable” bias can become “trivially small,” or be considered of no practical consequence in the intended use of the test method under study. Therefore, users of this practice are advised to determine in advance as to the magnitude of bias correction below which they would consider it to be unnecessary, or, of no practical concern for the intended application prior to execution of this practice.

NOTE 6—It should be noted that the determination of this minimum bias of no practical concern is not a statistical decision, but rather, a subjective decision that is directly dependent on the application requirements of the users.

6. Procedure

NOTE 7—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 [D6300](#) results.

6.1.1 The process of applying Practice [D6300](#) 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 [D6300](#). The precision estimates from Practice [D6300](#) 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:

$$X_i = \frac{1}{L_{Xi}} \sum_j \frac{\sum_k X_{ijk}}{n_{Xij}} \quad (2)$$

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:

$$Y_i = \frac{1}{L_{Yi}} \sum_j \frac{\sum_k Y_{ijk}}{n_{Yij}} \quad (3)$$

6.1.3 The standard errors (standard deviations of the means of the results) are computed as follows:

6.1.3.1 If s_{RXi} is the estimated reproducibility standard deviation from the X-method round robin, and s_{rXi} is the estimated repeatability standard deviation, then an estimate of the standard error for X_i is given by:

$$s_{Xi} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L_{Xi}} \left[s_{RXi}^2 - s_{rXi}^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{L_{Xi}} \sum_j \frac{1}{n_{Xij}} \right) \right]} \quad (4)$$

NOTE 8—Since repeatability and reproducibility may vary with X , even if the L_{Xi} were the same for all materials and the n_{Xij} were the same for all laboratories and all materials, the $\{s_{Xi}\}$ might still differ from one material to the next.

6.1.3.2 s_{Yi} , the estimated standard error for Y_i , is given by an analogous formula.

6.2 Calculate the total variation sum of squares for each method, and determine whether the samples can be distinguished from each other by both methods.

6.2.1 The total sums of squares (TSS) are given by:

$$TSS_x = \sum_i \left(\frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{s_{Xi}} \right)^2 \text{ and } TSS_y = \sum_i \left(\frac{Y_i - \bar{Y}}{s_{Yi}} \right)^2 \quad (5)$$

where:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum_i \left(\frac{X_i}{s_{Xi}^2} \right)}{\sum_i \left(\frac{1}{s_{Xi}^2} \right)} \text{ and } \bar{Y} = \frac{\sum_i \left(\frac{Y_i}{s_{Yi}^2} \right)}{\sum_i \left(\frac{1}{s_{Yi}^2} \right)} \quad (6)$$

are weighted averages of all X_i 's and Y_i 's respectively.

6.2.2 Compare $F = TSS_x/(S-1)$ to the 95th percentile of Fisher's F distribution with $(S-1)$ and ν_x degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator, respectively, where ν_x is the degrees of freedom for the reproducibility variance (Practice D6300, paragraph 8.3.3.3) for the X-method round robin. If F does not exceed the 95th percentile, then the X-method is not sufficiently precise to distinguish among the S samples. Do not proceed with this practice, as meaningful results cannot be produced.

6.2.3 In a similar manner, compare $F = TSS_y/(S-1)$ to the 95th percentile of Fisher's F distribution, using the degrees of freedom of the reproducibility variance of the Y-method, ν_y , in place of ν_x . Similarly, do not proceed with this practice if F does not exceed the 95th percentile.

NOTE 9—If one or both of the conditions of 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 are satisfied only marginally, it is unlikely that this practice will produce a meaningful outcome. The test in the next subsection will almost certainly fail.

6.3 Test whether the methods are sufficiently correlated.

6.3.1 Using the weights $\{w_i\}$ as computed in 6.4.1.1, Eq 6, calculate the weighted *correlation coefficient* r :

$$r = \frac{\sum w_i (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum w_i (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \sum w_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}} \quad (7)$$

where \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are $\sum w_i X_i / \sum w_i$ and $\sum w_i Y_i / \sum w_i$, respectively.

6.3.2 Use r to calculate the F -statistic:

$$F = \frac{(S - 2)r^2}{1 - r^2} \quad (8)$$

6.3.3 Compare F to the 99th percentile of Fisher's F distribution with 1 and $S-2$ degrees of freedom in the numerator and denominator, respectively.

6.3.3.1 If F is less than the 99th percentile value, then this practice concludes that the methods are too discordant to permit use of the results from one method to predict those of the other.

6.3.3.2 If F is greater than the tabled value, proceed to 6.5.

6.4 Calculate the centered sum of squares (CSS) statistic for each of the following classes of bias-correction methodology.

NOTE 10—The revised algorithms presented in this version of D6708 were developed in order to correct very rare cases in which the algorithms of previous versions do not converge to the optimal linear models. The rare cases generally involved data sets with poor correlations between the two methods. In the vast majority of data sets, including worked example of this practice, the old and the new algorithms converge to exactly the same optimal models. Continuing to use the old algorithms is a reasonable option provided the user verifies that the computed value of CSS1b is never larger than CSS0, and that the computed value of CSS2 is never larger than either CSS1a or CSS1b. If the aforementioned situation is detected using the old algorithms, then the outcome from this version is deemed to be the correct outcome.

6.4.1 *Class 0*—No bias correction.

6.4.1.1 Compute the weights (w_i) for each sample i :

$$w_i = \frac{1}{s_{Y_i}^2 + s_{X_i}^2} \quad (9)$$

6.4.1.2 Compute CSS:

$$CSS_0 = \sum w_i (X_i - Y_i)^2 \quad (10)$$

6.4.2 *Class 1a*—Constant bias correction.

6.4.2.1 Using the weights (w_i) from 6.4.1.1, compute the constant bias correction (a):

$$a = \frac{\sum w_i (Y_i - X_i)}{\sum w_i} = \frac{\sum w_i Y_i}{\sum w_i} - \frac{\sum w_i X_i}{\sum w_i} \quad (11)$$

6.4.2.2 Compute CSS: [iteh.ai/catalog/standards/astm/ae529a23-d44b-4458-aa6f-77a5724fddfe/astm-d6708-24](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/astm/ae529a23-d44b-4458-aa6f-77a5724fddfe/astm-d6708-24)

$$CSS_{1a} = \sum w_i (Y_i - (X_i + a))^2 \quad (12)$$

6.4.3 *Class 1b*—Proportional bias correction.

6.4.3.1 The computations of this subsection (6.4.3) are appropriate only if both of the following conditions apply: (1) the measured property assumes only non-negative values, and (2) a property value of zero has a physical significance (for example, concentrations of specific constituents). In addition, it is not mandatory but highly recommended that $\max(Y_i) \geq 2 \min(Y_i)$.

6.4.3.2 The computations involve iterative calculation of the weights $\{w_i\}$ and the proportional correction b .

6.4.3.3 Set $b = 1$.

6.4.3.4 Compute the weight w_i for each sample i :

$$w_i = \frac{1}{s_{Y_i}^2 + b^2 s_{X_i}^2} \quad (13)$$

6.4.3.5 Calculate the following three sums:

$$A = \sum w_i^2 X_i Y_i s_{X_i}^2 \quad (14)$$

$$B = \sum w_i^2 (X_i^2 s_{Y_i}^2 - Y_i^2 s_{X_i}^2) \quad (15)$$

$$C = -\sum w_i^2 X_i Y_i s_{Y_i}^2 \quad (16)$$

6.4.3.6 Calculate b_0 :

$$b_0 = \frac{-B + \sqrt{B^2 - 4AC}}{2A} \quad (17)$$

6.4.3.7 If $|b - b_0| > .001 b$, replace b with b_0 and go back to 6.4.3.4. Otherwise, the iteration can be stopped, as further iteration will not produce meaningful improvement. Replace b with b_0 and go on to 6.4.3.8.

6.4.3.8 Calculate the final weights $\{w_i\}$ as in 6.4.3.4.

6.4.3.9 Calculate CSS_{1b} :

$$CSS_{1b} = \sum w_i (Y_i - bX_i)^2 \quad (18)$$

6.4.4 *Class 2*—Linear (proportional + constant) bias correction.

6.4.4.1 This involves iterative calculation of the weights $\{w_i\}$, the weighted means of X_i 's and Y_i 's, and the proportional term b .

6.4.4.2 Set $b = 1$.

6.4.4.3 Compute the weight w_i for each sample i :

$$w_i = \frac{1}{s_{yi}^2 + b^2 s_{xi}^2} \quad (19)$$

6.4.4.4 Calculate the weighted means of $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ respectively:

$$\bar{Y} = \frac{\sum w_i Y_i}{\sum w_i} \quad (20)$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum w_i X_i}{\sum w_i}$$

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/astm/ae529a23-d44b-4458-aa6f-77a5724fddfe/astm-d6708-24>

6.4.4.5 Calculate the deviations from the weighted means:

$$x_i = X_i - \bar{X} \quad (21)$$

$$y_i = Y_i - \bar{Y}$$

6.4.4.6 Calculate the three sums:

$$A = \sum w_i^2 x_i y_i s_{xi}^2 \quad (22)$$

$$B = \sum w_i^2 (x_i^2 s_{yi}^2 - y_i^2 s_{xi}^2) \quad (23)$$

$$C = -\sum w_i^2 x_i y_i s_{yi}^2 \quad (24)$$

6.4.4.7 Calculate b_0 :

$$b_0 = \frac{-B + \sqrt{B^2 - 4AC}}{2A} \quad (25)$$

6.4.4.8 If $|b - b_0| > .001 b$, replace b with b_0 and go back to 6.4.4.3, computing new values for the weights $\{w_i\}$, \bar{X} , \bar{Y} , $\{x_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$, and b_0 . Otherwise, the iteration can be stopped, as further iteration will not produce meaningful improvement. Replace b with b_0 and go to 6.4.4.9.

6.4.4.9 Calculate the final weights $\{w_i\}$ as in 6.4.4.3.

6.4.4.10 Calculate CSS_2 and a :

$$CSS_2 = \sum w_i (y_i - bx_i)^2 \quad (26)$$

$$a = \bar{Y} - b \bar{X} \quad (27)$$

6.5 Conduct tests to select the most parsimonious bias correction class needed.

6.5.1 The centered sum of squares for differences from each class of bias correction are used to select the most parsimonious bias correction class that can improve the expected degree of agreement between the \hat{Y} (the predicted Y-method result using X-method result) and the actual Y-method result on the same material. The classes of bias correction and the associated CSS as calculated earlier are repeated in the following table.

Bias Correction Class	CSS
<i>Class 0</i> —no correction	CSS_0
<i>Class 1a</i> —constant bias correction	CSS_{1a}
<i>Class 1b</i> —proportional bias correction (when appropriate)	CSS_{1b}
<i>Class 2</i> —linear (proportional + constant bias correction)	CSS_2

6.5.2 To determine whether *any* bias correction (*Class 1a, 1b, or 2* above) can significantly improve the expected agreement between the two methods, calculate the following ratio:

$$F = \frac{(CSS_0 - CSS_2)/2}{CSS_2/(S-2)} \quad (28)$$

6.5.2.1 Compare F to the upper 95th percentile of the F distribution with 2 and $S-2$ degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator, respectively.

6.5.2.2 If the calculated F is smaller, conclude that a bias correction of *Class 1a, 1b, or 2* does not sufficiently improve the expected agreement between the two methods, relative to *Class 0* (no bias correction). Proceed to 6.6.

6.5.2.3 If the calculated F is larger, conclude that a correction can improve the expected agreement between the two methods, and continue in 6.5.3.

6.5.3 If the F -value calculated in 6.5.2 is larger than the 95th percentile of F , compute the following t -ratios:

$$t_1 = \sqrt{\frac{CSS_0 - CSS_1}{CSS_2/(S-2)}} \quad (29)$$

$$t_2 = \sqrt{\frac{CSS_1 - CSS_2}{CSS_2/(S-2)}}$$

where, CSS_1 is the lesser of CSS_{1a} or CSS_{1b} , provided the latter is appropriate and has been calculated.

6.5.3.1 Compare t_2 to the upper 97.5th percentile of the t distribution with $S-2$ degrees of freedom.

6.5.3.2 If t_2 is larger, conclude that a bias correction of *Class 2* (proportional + constant correction) can improve the expected agreement over that of a single term (constant or proportional) correction alone (*Class 1*). Proceed to 6.6.

6.5.3.3 If t_2 is smaller than the t -percentile, compare t_1 to the same upper 97.5th percentile of the t distribution with $(S-2)$ degrees of freedom.

6.5.3.4 If t_1 is larger, conclude that a single term bias correction of *Class 1* is preferred to a bias correction of *Class 2*. Use the constant correction unless CSS_{1b} is appropriate and is smaller than CSS_{1a} . Proceed to 6.6.

6.5.3.5 If t_1 is smaller, then neither t_1 nor t_2 is statistically significant. A bias correction of *Class 2* is preferred over single-term (constant or proportional) correction of *Class 1*.

6.6 Test for existence of sample-specific biases.