One-Sided Tolerance Limits for the Normal Distribution,

$P = 0.80, \gamma = 0.80$

Roy H. Wampler

Institute for Basic Standards, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234

(June 24, 1976)

A table is given of factors k used in constructing one-sided tolerance limits for a normal distribution. This table was obtained by interpolation in an existing table of percentage points of the noncentral *t*-distribution. The accuracy of the table is estimated, and a comparison is made of the presently computed factors with a previously published approximation.

Key words: Noncentral *t*-distribution; normal distribution; statistics; tolerance limits.

1. Introduction

Let X be a normal random variable with mean μ and standard deviation σ . If μ and σ are known, we can say that exactly a proportion P of the population is below $\mu + K_p \sigma$, where K_p is a normal deviate defined by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{K_p} \exp\left(-t^2/2\right) dt = P.$$
 (1)

If μ and σ are unknown, one can estimate these quantities from a random sample of n observations: x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n . The mean μ is estimated by

$$\overline{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i,$$

and the standard deviation σ is estimated by

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \overline{x})^2}.$$

The problem is now to find k such that the probability is γ that at least a proportion P of the population is below $\overline{x} + ks$. Mathematically, the problem is to find k such that

$$Pr\{Pr(X \le \bar{x} + ks) \ge P\} = \gamma \tag{2}$$

where X has a normal distribution with mean μ and standard deviation σ , and P and γ are specified probabilities. As is indicated in Owen [10], eq (2) can be written as

$$Pr\{T_{f} \leq k \sqrt{n} \mid \delta = K_{p} \sqrt{n}\} = \gamma$$

where T_f denotes the noncentral t-distribution with f=n-1 degrees of freedom and with noncentrality parameter

 $\delta = K_p \sqrt{n}.$

2. Existing Tables

For many specified values of P and γ , tables of factors k for one-sided tolerance limits as defined in (2) above have been published. References to these tables are listed in Owen [10] and Johnson and Kotz [4], chapter 31. Since none of the tables cited in these references gives exact values of k in the case where P=0.80 and $\gamma=0.80$, the present table has been prepared to fill this gap. Approximations to the factors k for this case were included in table III of Owen [8].

3. Computing Method for the Present Table

Exact values of k can be computed from the appropriate percentage points of the noncentral t-distribution. Table III (pp. 214–237) of Locks, Alexander, and Byars [7] gives 3-decimal percentage points of the noncentral t for:

 $f=n-1=1(1)20, 25, 30, 35, 40; K_{\nu}=0.00(0.25)3.00; \epsilon=1-\gamma=0.01, 0.05(0.05)0.95, 0.99, 0.995.$

By interpolating on the values in this table for $\epsilon = 0.20$, one can obtain the factors k corresponding to P = 0.80, $\gamma = 0.80$.

Table 1 presented here gives one-sided tolerance factors k, Owen's approximate values of k and the relative error in the approximate values, for n=2(1)21, 26, 31, 36, 41. The values of k were obtained from the 3-decimal percentage points of the noncentral t-distribution given by Locks et al. [7], using five-point Lagrangian interpolation. Four-point Lagrangian interpolation yields the same values of k (to 3 decimals) as does five-point interpolation. These computations were done through the use of OMNITAB (Hogben et al. [2]). For n=4(1)12, the values of k were also computed using the first five terms of Stirling's interpolation formula as given on page 71 of Kunz [6]; again the same values of k (to 3 decimals) were obtained. For all these calculations the value of $K_p=K_{0.80}=0.84162123$ was taken from a table of the inverse normal probability distribution (Kelley [5]).

Values of k such that $Pr \{Pr (X \le \bar{x} + ks) \ge P\} = \gamma$ for $P=0.80, \gamma=0.80$					
n	k	Approx. k	Rel. error		
2 3 4 5	$\begin{array}{c} 3.\ 420\\ 2.\ 016\\ 1.\ 675^-\\ 1.\ 514 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2. \ 37544 \\ 1. \ 70985 \\ 1. \ 50952 \\ 1. \ 40392 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.\ 305 \\ .\ 152 \\ .\ 099 \\ .\ 073 \end{array}$		
$ \begin{array}{c} 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 417\\ 1.\ 352\\ 1.\ 304\\ 1.\ 266\\ 1.\ 237 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 33609\\ 1.\ 28781\\ 1.\ 25119\\ 1.\ 22219\\ 1.\ 19849 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} . \ 057 \\ . \ 047 \\ . \ 040 \\ . \ 035 \\ . \ 031 \end{array}$		
$ \begin{array}{c} 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 212\\ 1.\ 192\\ 1.\ 174\\ 1.\ 159\\ 1.\ 145^+ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 17866\\ 1.\ 16175\\ 1.\ 14711\\ 1.\ 13427\\ 1.\ 12290 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} . \ 028 \\ . \ 025 \\ . \ 023 \\ . \ 021 \\ . \ 019 \end{array}$		
$ \begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 133\\ 1.\ 123\\ 1.\ 113\\ 1.\ 104\\ 1.\ 096 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 11274\\ 1.\ 10358\\ 1.\ 09528\\ 1.\ 08771\\ 1.\ 08076 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} . \ 018 \\ . \ 017 \\ . \ 016 \\ . \ 015 \\ . \ 014 \end{array}$		
$21 \\ 26 \\ 31 \\ 36 \\ 41$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.\ 089\\ 1.\ 060\\ 1.\ 039\\ 1.\ 023\\ 1.\ 010 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1. \ 07436 \\ 1. \ 04855 \\ 1. \ 02968 \\ 1. \ 01512 \\ 1. \ 00346 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} . \ 013 \\ . \ 011 \\ . \ 009 \\ . \ 008 \\ . \ 007 \end{array}$		

TABLE 1. One-sided tolerance limit factors for the normal distribution Values of k such that $Pr\left\{Pr\left(X \leq \bar{x} + ks\right) > P\right\} = \gamma$ for $P=0.80, \gamma=0.80$

4. Estimated Accuracy

Locks et al. [7] reported that numerous checks were made of their tables against previously published tables, and "in no case where comparison was made . . . is the disagreement more than one unit in the last decimal place."

In order to assess the accuracy of the k's given here in table 1 for P=0.80, $\gamma=0.80$, the following checks were made. Starting with the 3-decimal percentage points in table III of Locks for $\gamma=0.75$ and 0.90, values of k for all possible combinations of $\gamma=0.75$, $\gamma=0.90$, P=0.75, P=0.90, and n=2(1)21(5)41 were computed by five-point Lagrangian interpolation as described in section 3 above. These values were then compared with the exact 3-decimal values published by Owen [9], pp. 52 and 58. This permitted the comparison of 96 values of k. Of the 92 values corresponding to n>2, 88 were in full (3-decimal) agreement, and 4 differed by 0.001. For n=2, larger discrepancies were found. The values of k obtained here differed from Owen's exact values as indicated below:

n	Р	γ	Interpolation in Locks: (A)	Owen's Exact $k: (B)$	Difference: $(A)-(B)$
2	0. 90	0. 90	10. 264	10. 253	0. 011
2	. 90	. 75	3. 994	3. 992	. 002
2	. 75	. 90	5.859	5. 842	. 017
2	. 75	. 75	2. 227	2. 225	. 002

One may infer from these comparisons that the value of k for P=0.80, $\gamma=0.80$, n=2 given in table 1 is probably not in error by more than about 0.017 and is probably larger than the exact value. For n>2, any errors in the computed values of k are probably in the neighborhood of 0.001.

5. Comparison With an Approximation

The approximate values of k given here in table 1 are taken from table III of Owen [8]. This approximation was derived by Jennett and Welch [3] and was further discussed in chapter 1 of Eisenhart, Hastay and Wallis [1]. The formula for this approximation is

$$k \doteq \frac{K_p + \sqrt{K_p^2 - ab}}{a}$$

$$a=1-\frac{K_{\gamma}^{2}}{2(n-1)}, \ b=K_{p}^{2}-\frac{K_{\gamma}^{2}}{n}$$

and K_{γ} is defined in the same manner as was K_{γ} in eq (1).

The relative error in the approximate values of k shown in table 1 was computed from the formula

Rel. error=
$$\left|\frac{(\text{approx. }k)-k}{k}\right|$$
.

We note that in all cases covered by this table the approximations are smaller than the values of k computed by the method described in section 3. This is in agreement with Owen's statement [8] that the approximation will probably underestimate k for $\gamma \leq 0.95$.

6. References

- Eisenhart, Churchill, Hastay, Millard W., and Wallis, W. Allen, (eds.). Techniques of Statistical Analysis (McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1947).
- [2] Hogben, David, Peavy, Sally T., and Varner, Ruth N., OMNITAB II User's Reference Manual, Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.), Tech. Note 552, 264 pages (Oct. 1971).

where

- [3] Jennett, W. J., and Welch, B. L., The control of proportion defective as judged by a single quality characteristic varying on a continuous scale, Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 6, 80-88 (1939).
- [4] Johnson, Norman L., and Kotz, Samuel, Continuous Univariate Distributions—2 (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass., 1970).
- [5] Kelley, Truman Lee, The Kelley Statistical Tables (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1948).
- [6] Kunz, Kaiser S., Numerical Analysis (McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1957).
- [7] Locks, M. O., Alexander, M. J., and Byars, B. J., New Tables of the Noncentral t Distribution, Report ARL 63–19, Aeronautical Research Laboratories, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 1963.
- [8] Owen, Donald B., Tables of Factors for One-Sided Tolerance Limits for a Normal Distribution, Monograph No. SCR-13, Sandia Corporation, 1958.
- [9] Owen, D. B., Factors for One-Sided Tolerance Limits and for Variables Sampling Plans, Monograph No. SCR-607, Sandia Corporation, 1963.
- [10] Owen, D. B., A survey of properties and applications of the noncentral t-distribution, Technometrics 10, 445-478 (1968).

(Paper 80B3-449)