

# THE RANDOM TUKEY DEPTH\*

J.A. Cuesta-Albertos and A. Nieto-Reyes  
Departamento de Matemáticas, Estadística y Computación,  
Universidad de Cantabria, Spain

February 8, 2022

## Abstract

The computation of the Tukey depth, also called halfspace depth, is very demanding, even in low dimensional spaces, because it requires the consideration of all possible one-dimensional projections. In this paper we propose a random depth which approximates the Tukey depth. It only takes into account a finite number of one-dimensional projections which are chosen at random. Thus, this random depth requires a very small computation time even in high dimensional spaces. Moreover, it is easily extended to cover the functional framework.

We present some simulations indicating how many projections should be considered depending on the sample size and on the dimension of the sample space. We also compare this depth with some others proposed in the literature. It is noteworthy that the random depth, based on a very low number of projections, obtains results very similar to those obtained with other depths.

*Key words and phrases:* Random Tukey depth, one-dimensional projections, multidimensional data, functional data, homogeneity test, supervised classification.

*A.M.S. 1980 subject classification:* Primary 62H05; Secondary: 62G07, 62G35.

## 1 Introduction

This paper is written in the same spirit as [9]. In the abstract of this paper, D.J. Hand states that “...*simple methods typically yield performance almost as good as more sophisticated methods to the extent that the difference in performance may be swamped by other sources of uncertainty...*”. Hand’s work is related to classification techniques. Here we analyze a conceptually simple and easy to compute multidimensional depth that can be applied to functional problems and that provides results comparable to those obtained with more involved depths.

---

\*Research partially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, grant MTM2005-08519-C02-02 and the Consejería de Educación y Cultura de la Junta de Castilla y León, grant PAPIJCL VA102/06.

Depths are intended to order a given set in the sense that if a datum is moved toward the center of the data cloud, then its depth increases and if the datum is moved toward the outside, then its depth decreases.

More generally, given a probability distribution  $P$  defined in a multidimensional (or even infinite-dimensional) space  $\mathcal{X}$ , a depth tries to order the points in  $\mathcal{X}$  from the “center (of  $P$ )” to the “outward (of  $P$ )”. Obviously, this problem includes data sets if we consider  $P$  as the empirical distribution associated to the data set at hand. Thus, in what follows, we will always refer to the depth associated to a probability distribution  $P$ .

In the one-dimensional case, it is reasonable to order the points using the order induced by the function

$$x \rightarrow D_1(x, P) := \min\{P(-\infty, x], P[x, \infty)\}. \quad (1)$$

Thus, the points are ordered following the decreasing order of the absolute values of the differences between their percentiles and 50, and the deepest points are the medians of  $P$ .

Several multidimensional depths have been proposed (see, for instance, the recent book [10]) but here we are mainly interested in the *Tukey (or halfspace) depth* (see [17]). If  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , then, the Tukey depth of  $x$  with respect to  $P$ ,  $D_T(x, P)$ , is the minimal probability which can be attained in the closed halfspaces containing  $x$ . According to [18], this depth behaves very well in comparison with various competitors.

An equivalent definition of  $D_T(x, P)$  is the following. Given  $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , let  $\Pi_v$  be the projection of  $\mathbb{R}^p$  on the one dimensional subspace generated by  $v$ . Thus,  $P \circ \Pi_v^{-1}$  is the marginal of  $P$  on this subspace, and it is obvious that

$$D_T(x, P) = \inf\{D_1(\Pi_v(x), P \circ \Pi_v^{-1}) : v \in \mathbb{R}^p\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (2)$$

I.e.,  $D_T(x, P)$  is the infimum of all possible one-dimensional depths of the one-dimensional projections of  $x$ , where those depths are computed with respect to the corresponding (one-dimensional) marginals of  $P$ . Some other depths based on the consideration of all possible one-dimensional projections, but replacing  $D_1(x, P)$  by some other function, have been proposed (see, for instance, [19]). We consider that what follows could be applied to all of them, but, we have chosen the Tukey depth to test it concretely.

Perhaps the most important drawback of the Tukey depth is the required computational time. This time is more or less reasonable if  $p = 2$ , but it becomes prohibitive even for  $p = 8$  [15, pag. 54]. To reduce the time, in [20] (page 2234) it is proposed to approximate their values using randomly selected projections.

On the other hand, in [6], a random depth is defined. In this paper, given a point  $x$ , the authors propose to choose at random a finite number of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_k$ , and then, take as depth of  $x$  the mean of the values  $D_1(\Pi_{v_i}(x), P \circ \Pi_{v_i}^{-1}), i = 1, \dots, k$ .

Our approach follows more closely the suggestion in [20]: We simply replace the infimum in (2) by a minimum over a finite number of randomly chosen projections.

**Definition 1.1** *Let  $P$  be a probability distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\nu$  be an absolutely continuous distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . The random Tukey depth of  $x$  with respect to  $P$  based on  $k$  random vectors chosen with  $\nu$  is*

$$D_{T,k,\nu}(x, P) = \min\{D_1(\Pi_{v_i}(x), P \circ \Pi_{v_i}^{-1}) : i = 1, \dots, k\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^p,$$

where  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  are independent and identically distributed random vectors with distribution  $\nu$ .

Obviously,  $D_{T,k,\nu}(x, P)$  is a random variable. It may seem a bit strange to take a random quantity to measure the depth of a point, which is inherently not-random. We have two reasons to take this point of view.

Firstly, Theorem 4.1 in [4] shows that if  $P$  and  $Q$  are probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\nu$  is an absolutely continuous distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^p$  and

$$\nu\{v \in \mathbb{R}^p : P \circ \Pi_v^{-1} = Q \circ \Pi_v^{-1}\} > 0,$$

then  $P = Q$ . In other words, if we have two different distributions, and we randomly choose a marginal of them, those marginals are almost surely different. In fact, it is also required that at least one of the distributions is determined by their moments, but this is not too important for the time being. According to this result, one randomly chosen projection is enough to distinguish between two  $p$ -dimensional distributions. Since the depths determine one-dimensional distributions, a depth computed on just one random projection allows to distinguish between two distributions.

Secondly, if the support of  $\nu$  is  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , and, for every  $k$ ,  $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \subset \{v_1, \dots, v_{k+1}\}$ , then

$$D_{T,k,\nu}(x, P) \geq D_{T,k+1,\nu}(x, P) \rightarrow D_T(x, P), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3)$$

Therefore, if we choose a large enough  $k$ , the effect of the randomness in  $D_{T,k,\nu}$  will be negligible. Of course, the question of interest here is to learn how large  $k$  must be, because values of  $k$  that are too large would make this definition useless.

One way to select  $k$  is to compare  $D_T$  and  $D_{T,k,\nu}$ , but the long computation times required to obtain  $D_T$  make those comparisons unpractical. Instead of this, we have decided to choose a situation in which the deepness of the points are clearly defined and can easily be computed with a different depth.

If  $P$  is an elliptical distribution with centralization parameter  $\mu$  and dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ , then, it seems that every reasonable depth should consider  $\mu$  as the deepest point, that points at the same Mahalanobis distance of  $\mu$  should have the same depth, and that differences in depth should correspond with differences in Mahalanobis distance of  $\mu$ . Then, in this situation, every depth should be a monotone function of the Mahalanobis depth [13], where, given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , this depth is

$$D_M(x, P) := \frac{1}{1 + (x - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore, we can choose the right  $k$  in  $D_{T,k,\nu}$  as follows: If  $P$  is elliptical,  $D_T(\cdot, P)$ , is a monotone function of  $D_M(\cdot, P)$ . Thus, from (3), the larger the  $k$ , the larger the resemblance between  $D_{T,k,\nu}(\cdot, P)$  and a monotone function of  $D_M(\cdot, P)$ . However, there should exist a value  $k_0$  from which this resemblance starts to stabilize. This is the value for  $k$  we are looking for.

However, in practice, we do not know  $P$ , and we only have a random sample. It seems that the selection of  $k_0$  should take this fact into consideration. In Section 2 we present a procedure to do this.

The results of the comparison of  $D_M(\cdot, P)$  and  $D_{T,k,\nu}(\cdot, P)$  for several sample sizes, dimensions and elliptical distributions are shown in Table 2.1. According to this table  $k = 36$  is the maximum number of directions required if the sample size is below 1,000.

Once the right values of  $k$  have been fixed, we carry out, also in Section 2, a study to compare  $D_{T,k,\nu}$  with  $D_T$  from the applications point of view. The results are quite encouraging.

Section 2 ends with a comparison of the time required to compute  $D_{T,k,\nu}$  and the time to compute  $D_M$ . This comparison turns out to be favorable for  $D_{T,k,\nu}$ .

An important advantage of Definition 1.1 is that it can be applied in every space in which projections can be computed. Since this is an easy task in Hilbert spaces and Theorem 4.1 in [4] holds in separable Hilbert spaces, we propose to employ Definition 1.1 to compute depths of points in those spaces.

A difference with the  $p$ -dimensional case is that here we are not aware of any situation in which a gold standard to compare depths does exist. However, in [12], authors employ functional depths in a classification problem. In Section 3, we compare the results obtained with the random depth with those obtained in [12] in the same problem.

This study reinforces the feeling that the values obtained in Table 2.1 are accurate. Following this table, in Section 3, we have taken  $k = 10$  because the sample sizes are around 50. The results have been satisfactory even if there is no reason to assume any particular model on the distribution generating the samples.

Some other functional depths (not considered here) have been proposed in the literature. We are aware of the Fraiman-Muniz depth (introduced in [8]), the  $h$ -mode depth (proposed in [5]) and the above mentioned random depth and a double random depth (RPD) which appear in [6]. An interesting application of those depths to outlier detection is made in [7].

In [6], the authors apply the depths that they analyze to the same classification problem that we study here. The proportions of right classifications that they obtain with depths are similar to those reported here except for the RPD depth. This is a random depth which takes into account not only the curves but also their derivatives. Thus, it handles more information than we employ here, and the results are not comparable.

We want to mention that Theorem 4.1 in [4] provides the theoretical background for the random depth proposed in [6] whose definition, in fact, only considers a vector. The only reason the authors give for handling  $k$  ( $> 1$ ) randomly chosen vectors is to provide more stability to the definition. Moreover, Theorem 4.1 in [4] has also been applied to construct goodness of fit test, for instance, in [1], [2] and [3]. In those papers, the authors also handle more than one projection. They take  $k$  ranging from 1 to 25 in [1], ranging from 2 to 40 in [2], and  $k = 100$  in [3] with the same objective as in [6] and also with no specific reason to make those selections.

We consider that the results provided in this paper could help to settle the way in

which the number of random projections should be chosen.

Computations have been carried out with MatLab. Computational codes are available from the authors upon request.

## 2 How many random projections? Testing homogeneity

In this section we analyze the  $p$ -dimensional case. Obviously, Theorem 4.1 in [4] also holds if we take  $\nu$  a probability distribution absolutely continuous with respect to the surface measure on the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . We are also interested in what (3) holds. Then, in this section, we fix  $\nu$  to be the uniform distribution on the unit sphere, and we will suppress the subindex  $\nu$  in the notation  $D_{T,k}$ .

As stated in the introduction, to decide how to choose  $k$ , we will analyze the case in which  $P$  is an elliptical distribution by comparing the functions  $D_M(\cdot, P)$  and  $D_{T,k}(\cdot, P)$  for several values of  $k$ .

Taking into account that depths only try to rank points according to their closeness to the center of  $P$ , it is reasonable to measure the resemblance between  $D_{T,k}(\cdot, P)$  and  $D_M(\cdot, P)$  looking only at the ranks of the points. This is equivalent to employing the Spearman correlation coefficient,  $\rho$ . Thus, the resemblance that we handle here is

$$r_{k,P} := \rho(D_{T,k}(X, P), D_M(X, P)), \quad (5)$$

where  $X$  is a random variable with distribution  $P$ .

If  $P$  is an elliptical distribution, then the function  $k \rightarrow r_{k,P}$  is strictly increasing. We try to identify  $k$  with the point  $k_0$  from which the increments become negligible.

Moreover, in practice, we will not have a distribution  $P$ , but a random sample  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  taken from  $P$ . This leads us to replace  $P$  in (5) by the empirical distribution  $P_n$  ( $P_n[A] = \#(A \cap \{x_1, \dots, x_n\})/n$ ) which does not follow exactly the model and, consequently, the function  $r_{k,P_n}$  is not necessarily increasing. We propose is to identify  $k_0$  with the point in which  $r_{k,P_n}$  starts to oscillate or, more precisely, estimate  $k_0$  by

$$\hat{k}_0 = \inf \{k \geq 1 : r_{k,P_n} > r_{k+1,P_n}\}.$$

To check the dependence between  $\hat{k}_0$  and the underlying distribution, we employ samples taken from multidimensional standard Gaussian distributions, from distributions with independent double exponential marginals and with independent Cauchy marginals. We are also interested in looking at the dependence between  $\hat{k}_0$  and the dimension of the space and the sample size. To do this, we have selected five dimensions ( $p = 2, 4, 8, 25, 50$ ), and six sample sizes ( $n = 25, 50, 100, 250, 500, 1,000$ ).

We need to compute the location center and the dispersion matrix of  $P_n$  to be employed in  $D_M$ . Those parameters should depend on the distribution which have generated the sample. We mean the following: the covariance matrix is an appropriate parameter in the Gaussian and exponential case. But it is not adequate for the Cauchy distribution, where, we have identified  $\Sigma$  with the robust covariance matrix proposed in [14], page 206.

On the other hand, we have replaced  $\mu$  by the sample mean in the Gaussian case and by the coordinate-wise median in the exponential and Cauchy settings.

We have done 10,000 simulations under each set of conditions. In Table 2.1 we show the mean and the 95% percentile of the values obtained for  $\hat{k}_0$ .

**Table 2.1** Mean and 95% percentile of the optimum values for the number of required random projections  $k$  for the sample sizes, dimensions and distributions shown.

Symbol \* means that Mahalanobis depth is not defined in those cases because the dispersion matrix is degenerated.

Dimension	Distribution		Sample sizes					
			25	50	100	250	500	1,000
$p = 2$	Gaussian	mean	3.61	3.90	4.17	4.19	4.23	4.20
		95% percentile	6	7	8	8	8	8
	D. Expone.	mean	3.43	3.77	3.97	4.18	4.33	4.44
		95% percentile	6	7	7	8	9	9
	Cauchy	mean	3.25	3.56	3.81	4.06	4.36	4.82
		95% percentile	6	6	7	8	9	11
$p = 4$	Gaussian	mean	4.06	5.53	7.19	9.12	9.99	10.61
		95% percentile	7	10	12	16	18	20
	D. Expone.	mean	3.95	5.25	6.69	8.49	9.30	9.93
		95% percentile	7	9	12	15	17	19
	Cauchy	mean	3.55	4.44	5.48	6.66	7.43	8.00
		95% percentile	6	8	10	12	14	16
$p = 8$	Gaussian	mean	3.45	4.80	6.91	11.56	15.80	20.18
		95% percentile	6	9	13	20	27	35
	D. Expone.	mean	3.76	5.11	7.53	11.98	15.80	19.41
		95% percentile	7	9	13	20	27	34
	Cauchy	mean	3.58	4.64	6.23	8.53	10.06	11.43
		95% percentile	6	9	11	16	19	23
$p = 25$	Gaussian	mean	*	3.05	4.25	6.53	10.07	16.04
		95% percentile	*	6	9	14	20	29
	D. Expone.	mean	*	3.84	5.27	8.93	14.08	21.64
		95% percentile	*	7	10	17	25	36
	Cauchy	mean	*	4.74	6.67	10.22	13.54	16.50
		95% percentile	*	9	12	18	24	30
$p = 50$	Gaussian	mean	*	*	3.16	4.71	6.55	9.96
		95% percentile	*	*	7	10	14	20
	D. Expone.	mean	*	*	4.17	6.48	9.88	15.64
		95% percentile	*	*	8	13	19	28
	Cauchy	mean	*	*	6.75	10.94	15.16	19.61
		95% percentile	*	*	12	19	26	34

Since, in each simulation, the obtained value of  $\hat{k}_0$  is bounded from below by 1 and it can take arbitrary large values, the distribution of  $\hat{k}_0$  is right skew. Thus, the mean produces larger values than the median giving some guaranty against the possibility to selecting values that are too low. Moreover, even if the mean could be a reasonable selection, we chose the 95% percentile for additional safety.

It is apparent from Table 2.1 that, in every dimension, the optimum value for  $k$  increases with the sample size. This increment is due to the fact that when  $n$  increases, the function  $r_{k,P_n}$  approaches  $r_{k,P}$ , which is strictly increasing. In other words, when we take a random sample, the randomness introduces some noise in the model which makes taking high values of  $k$  useless. However, when  $n$  increases, this randomness is lower, and, then, it is worth it to increase  $k$ .

The variation of the optimum  $k$  with the dimension is more striking. If we fix a sample size, in the Gaussian and exponential case, it happens that the optimum value, first increases with  $p$  but, after a change point, it decreases. However, the change point increases with the sample size.

It seems obvious that the number of projections required to accurately represent a cloud of points should increase with  $p$ . But, why does this number decrease after the change point? The answer lies in the noise introduced by the randomness in taking the sample. The problem is that we are comparing the random Tukey depth with the Mahalanobis one. But, in order to compute  $D_M$  we need to estimate the dispersion matrix and, if we keep the sample size fixed, this estimation worsens when the dimension increases. The noise introduced by this fact makes considering high values for  $k$  useless. We will briefly analyze this point.

Let us consider the Gaussian case. In order to figure out how good the estimator sample covariance is depending on the sample size and the dimension of the space, we show in Table 2.2 the mean of the determinants of the sample covariance matrices for the same sample sizes and dimensions as in Table 2.1 obtained along 1,000 simulations taken from a standard Gaussian distribution.

**Table 2.2** *Mean of the determinants of the sample covariance matrices computed in 1,000 random samples taken from a standard Gaussian distribution.*

Dimension	Sample sizes					
	25	50	100	250	500	1,000
$p = 2$	.953	.982	.990	.998	.998	.999
$p = 4$	.771	.884	.944	.973	.988	.994
$p = 8$	.273	.546	.749	.891	.946	.973
$p = 25$	*	.001	.037	.288	.546	.736
$p = 50$	*	*	.000	.005	.079	.289

The comparison of Tables 2.1 and 2.2 shows that the 95% percentiles shown in Table 2.1 for the standard Gaussian distribution increase while the mean of the determinant of the covariance matrix in Table 2.2 is above (roughly speaking) .750 and starts to decrease

when the determinant is below this quantity. The same behavior can be observed in the Double Exponential case.

With respect to the Cauchy case, the mean of the determinant of the employed estimate of the dispersion matrix never falls below this threshold, for the considered sample sizes and dimensions.

Precisely, this difference in the behavior between the Cauchy and the other distributions makes some differences appear if we compare the results between distributions with the same sample size and dimension, but, in most cases, those differences are not significantly large. Except when dimension is  $p = 50$ , the rate between the largest and the lower 95% percentiles lies between 1 and 1.5. However, it is noticeable that, if for each sample size and distribution, we take the largest 95% percentile along dimensions, we obtain that the differences between the largest and the lower values are just 1 except for sample size  $n = 1,000$  in which this difference is 2.

Thus, we propose to choose  $k$ , for a fixed dimension, as the maximum of the 95% percentiles along distributions and sample sizes. However, if we prefer to fix the sample size, then we propose to take the maximum on dimensions and distributions. Either way, to have a full guarantee it is only required to take the maximum in the table which gives the (surprisingly low) value  $k = 36$ .

In this point the initial Hand's phrase is in force. There is no doubt that, theoretically, the accuracy of the depth improves if  $k$  increases. However, for a *fixed sample size*, the noise coming from the sampling process makes large values for  $k$  useless. This point is reinforced in the following subsection where we compute  $D_T$ , with  $p = 2$ , using 1,000 vectors with no practical gain.

## 2.1 Testing homogeneity

Our goal in this subsection is to show that the values obtained for  $k$  in Table 2.1 give depths which provide results similar to those obtained in practice with the Tukey depth. To this end, we are going to reproduce the simulation study carried out in [11], where the authors apply depth measures to test differences in homogeneity between two distributions. Let us begin by giving a brief description of the problem and the procedure. Additional details can be found in [11].

Assume that we have two random samples  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{n_1}\}$  and  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$  taken from the centered distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  respectively. Let us assume that those distributions coincide except for a scale factor, i.e., we are assuming that there exists  $r > 0$  such that the r.v.'s  $\{rX_1, \dots, rX_{n_1}\}$  and  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$  are identically distributed. The problem consists in testing the hypotheses:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : & \quad r = 1 \text{ (both scales are the same)} \\ H_a : & \quad r > 1 \text{ (} Q \text{ has a larger scale).} \end{aligned}$$

The idea is that, under the alternative, the observations in the second sample should appear in the outside part of the joint sample  $\{X_1, \dots, X_{n_1}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$ , and, consequently,



should have lower depths than the points in the first sample. Thus, it is possible to test  $H_0$  against  $H_a$  by computing the depths of the points  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$  in the joint sample, replacing them by their ranks and rejecting  $H_0$  if those ranks are small.

The Wilcoxon rank-sum test can be used to test when the ranks of the points  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$  are small. In [11] several possibilities to break the ties are proposed. We have tried all of them, with no important differences. Thus, we have selected to break the ties at random as the only method to be shown here.

In Table 2.3 we show the rate of rejections under the exposed conditions when we carry out the test at the significance level  $\alpha = .05$ . The table also includes, between parenthesis, the rejection rates when the random depth is replaced by the Tukey depth using 1,000 directions uniformly scattered on the upper halfspace.

The distributions used in the simulations are the 2-dimensional standard Gaussian, and the double exponential and Cauchy with independent marginals. We have centered the samples from the Gaussian distribution in mean and the samples from the double exponential and the Cauchy distributions in component-wise median. We have considered the values  $r = 1, 1.2, 2$ , and  $n_1 = n_2 = n$  with  $n \in \{20, 30, 100\}$ . We have done 10,000 simulations for each combination of distribution, sample size and  $r$ .

Concerning the value of  $k$  for the random depth, since we have to compute random depths in samples with sizes  $2n \in \{40, 60, 200\}$  we have chosen  $k = 6, 7$  and 8 respectively. Those values are close to the suggestions in Table 2.1 for  $p = 2$  and the corresponding sample sizes. We have not followed the hints at the end of the previous section because we are interested in seeing the behavior of the procedure with  $k$  as low as possible.

**Table 2.3** *Rate of rejections in 10,000 simulations using  $D_{T,k}$  with  $k$  as shown (between parenthesis, the rate with  $D_T$ ) for the considered distributions, sample sizes and values of  $r$ . Dimension is  $p = 2$ . The significance level is .05.*

Sample size	Scale factor	Distribution					
		Cauchy		Gaussian		D. exponential	
$n = 20$ $k = 6$	$r = 1$	.054	(.057)	.059	(.061)	.053	(.056)
	$r = 1.2$	.125	(.125)	.249	(.259)	.174	(.177)
	$r = 2$	.556	(.552)	.963	(.963)	.833	(.824)
$n = 30$ $k = 7$	$r = 1$	.051	(.048)	.051	(.052)	.052	(.053)
	$r = 1.2$	.140	(.148)	.316	(.325)	.219	(.214)
	$r = 2$	.691	(.699)	.995	(.996)	.940	(.941)
$n = 100$ $k = 8$	$r = 1$	.086	(.055)	.055	(.057)	.050	(.051)
	$r = 1.2$	.297	(.300)	.719	(.720)	.507	(.514)
	$r = 2$	.991	(.994)	1	(1)	1	(1)

In [11] previous ideas are also applied to check the homogeneity between  $K$  samples,  $K > 2$ . The problem is the following. Let  $\{X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,n_1}\}, \dots, \{X_{K,1}, \dots, X_{K,n_K}\}$  be random samples obtained, respectively, from the distributions  $P_1, \dots, P_K$  and let us assume that there exist  $r_1, \dots, r_{K-1} > 0$  such that the random vectors  $r_1 X_{1,1}, \dots, r_1 X_{1,n_1}, \dots,$

$r_{K-1}X_{K-1,1}, \dots, r_{K-1}X_{K-1,n_{K-1}}, X_{K,1}, \dots, X_{K,n_K}$  are identically distributed.

We are interested in testing the following hypotheses:

$$H_0 : r_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, K - 1 \text{ (all scales are the same)}$$

$$H_a : \text{there exists } r_i \neq 1 \text{ (scales are different).}$$

If we center separately each sample, join all the observations in a unique sample, compute the depths of all the points and transform those depths in ranks, then, we can apply the Kruskal-Wallis test to check if there are lacks of homogeneity between the ranks in each sub-sample.

We have carried out a simulation study applying previous procedure to the Tukey depth and to the random Tukey depth in the 2-dimensional case with Gaussian distributions,  $K = 3$  and sample sizes  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n$ , where  $n \in \{20, 30\}$ . We have carried out 10,000 replications in each case at the significance level  $\alpha = .05$ .

Concerning the selection of  $k$ , we have to compute the depths of points in samples with sizes  $3n = 60, 90$ . Thus, according to Table 2.1, we have taken  $k = 7$  and 8 random directions to project.

Results are shown in Table 2.4, where we also include between parenthesis the results applying the same procedure with the Tukey depth.

**Table 2.4** *Rate of rejections in 10,000 simulations using  $D_{T,k}$  with  $k$  as shown (between parenthesis the rate with  $D_T$ ) to test the homogeneity in three samples of Gaussian distributions with independent, identically distributed marginals and the exposed values of  $r$ . Dimension is  $p = 2$ . The significance level is .05.*

Covariance matrices	Sample sizes and random directions			
	$n = 20$ and $k = 7$		$n = 30$ and $k = 8$	
$r_1 = r_2 = 1$	.05	(.05)	.05	(.06)
$r_1 = r_2 = 1.2$	.16	(.15)	.21	(.21)
$r_1 = 2, r_2 = 1.2$	.89	(.89)	.98	(.98)
$r_1 = r_2 = 2$	.96	(.97)	1	(1)

The results of both studies in this subsection are quite encouraging, because there are no important differences among the rejection rates with both depths in spite of the big differences on the employed number of directions.

## 2.2 Computational time

We end this section paying some attention to the required computational time to compute the random Tukey depth. As a comparison we have selected the time to compute the Mahalanobis depth which is one of the quickest depths according to Table 1 in [15].

In Table 2.5 we present the mean time, along 200 simulations, employed to compute the random Tukey and Mahalanobis depths for all points in a sample with the shown

sizes and dimensions. The number of employed random directions correspond with those obtained in Table 2.1.

Since the random Tukey and Mahalanobis depths are computed on the same samples, the first depth to be computed may have an advantage in that the RAM memory may be cleaner than when the second one is computed. In order to avoid this, we have computed the random Tukey depth first 100 times and the Mahalanobis depth first 100 times.

The computations have been carried out on a computer Xserve G5, PowerPC G5 Dual 2.3 GHz and 2Gb of RAM memory.

**Table 2.5** *Time, in seconds, to compute the random Tukey and the Mahalanobis depths (between parenthesis) of all points in a sample with size  $n$  taken from a standard Gaussian distribution.*

Dimension	Random vectors	Sample size			
		$n = 100$	$n = 500$	$n = 1,000$	
$p = 2$	$k = 8, 9, 11$	$5.9344 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (.0027)	.0025 (.0091)	.0060 (.0176)	
$p = 4$	$k = 12, 18, 20$	$8.0011 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (.0026)	.0064 (.0094)	.0144 (.0178)	
$p = 8$	$k = 13, 27, 35$	$8.5459 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (.0027)	.0119 (.0098)	.0334 (.0185)	
$p = 25$	$k = 12, 25, 36$	$8.3209 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (.0031)	.0104 (.0111)	.0356 (.0220)	
$p = 50$	$k = 12, 26, 34$	$8.9296 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (.0048)	.0116 (.0161)	.0325 (.0296)	

The main computational effort to compute the Mahalanobis depth is devoted to obtain the inverse of the covariance matrix. In consequence, the computational time for this depth converges to infinity with the dimension.


On the other hand, the main difficulty in computing the random Tukey depth is obtaining the projections of the involved points. Thus, the main increment in required time for the random Tukey depth comes from the increment in  $k$ . Taking into account that, according to Table 2.1,  $k$ , as a function of  $p$ , is bounded, the required time to compute random depths of a sample should not increase as quickly. This is made apparent in Table 2.5 where, except for  $n = 100$ , the maximum computation time is not attained in the highest dimension.

### 3 Functional random Tukey depth. Functional classification

An interesting possibility of the random Tukey depth is that it can be straightforward extended to functional spaces. The only requirement of the main results in [4] is that the sample space has to be a separable Hilbert space. Thus, in this section we will assume that we are considering a distribution  $P$  defined on this kind of space.

Concerning the number of random directions to take, it is possible to consider the infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces as the limit of finite dimensional euclidean spaces, and, then, given a sample size  $n$ , it is enough to take  $k$  as the maximum of the values provided in Table 2.1 for this sample size.

For the reasons given in the introduction, we will directly check how this depth works in practice. To this end, we have repeated the classification problem carried out in [12], where the authors handle a data set consisting of the growth curves of a sample of 39 boys and 54 girls, with the goal to classify them, by sex, using just this information. Heights were measured at 31 times in the period from one to eighteen years. The data were taken from the file growth.zip, downloaded from <ftp://ego.psych.mcgill.ca/pub/ramsay/FDAfuns/Matlab>. The data are drawn in Figure 3.1.



**Figure 3.1** *Growth curves of 54 girls (left hand side) and 39 boys (right hand side) measured 31 times each between 1 and 18 years.*

It is well known that when handling this kind of data, it is useful to consider not only the growth curve but also accelerations of height (see, for instance, [16]). However, since we are mainly interested in comparing our results with those ones obtained in [12], where only growth curves were considered, here we will do the same. Indeed, we will repeat the study [12] with three differences:

1. Most importantly, we will replace the functional depths handled there by the random Tukey depth.
2. In [12] the authors consider the curves as elements in  $L^1[0, 1]$ , which is not possible here, because we need a separable Hilbert space.

We will assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is the space of square-integrable functions in a given interval which, after re-scaling, we can assume to be  $[0, 1]$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H} = L^2[0, 1]$  and given  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$  we have that  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(t)g(t)dt$ .

3. In [12], the authors smoothed the original data using a spline basis. We have skipped this step because it did not seem necessary to us.

The classification procedure can be extended to an arbitrary number of groups, but, just to keep the notation as simple as possible, we will assume that we have just two groups. Thus, let us assume that we have two samples  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  in  $\mathcal{H}$

selected from two populations and that we are interested in classifying another curve  $Z \in \mathcal{H}$  in one of those groups using a depth  $D$  to be chosen later. Three classification methods are proposed in [12]:

### 1.- Distance to the trimmed mean (M)

Compute the depths of the points in the sample  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Choose  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . The  $\alpha$ -trimmed mean of this sample,  $\mu_\alpha(X)$ , is the mean of the  $n \times (1 - \alpha)$  deepest points.

Given  $\beta \in [0, 1)$ , compute similarly  $\mu_\beta(Y)$  the  $\beta$ -trimmed mean of the sample  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ .

Now, we classify  $Z$  in the first group if

$$\|Z - \mu_\alpha(X)\| < \|Z - \mu_\beta(Y)\|.$$

Otherwise we classify  $Z$  in the second group.

When applying this method,  $\alpha = \beta = .2$ .

### 2.- Weighted average distance (AM)

In some sense, in method M, each group is represented by its trimmed mean. Here, we compute the distance between  $Z$  and the group as a weighted mean of the distances between  $Z$  and the members of the group where the weights are the depths of the points.

Thus, we would classify the function  $Z$  in the first group only if

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \|Z - X_i\| D_X(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n D_X(X_i)} < \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \|Z - Y_j\| D_Y(Y_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^m D_Y(Y_j)}, \quad (6)$$

where the subscripts in  $D_X$  and  $D_Y$  mean that the depths are computed with respect to the empirical distribution associated to the corresponding sample.

### 3.- Trimmed weighted average distance (TAM)

In the AM method, the result of the classification could be affected by the number of elements in each sample if  $n \neq m$ . The solution for this consists of taking a third value  $l \leq \min(n, m)$  and replacing (6) by

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^l \|Z - X_{(i)}\| D_X(X_{(i)})}{\sum_{i=1}^l D_X(X_{(i)})} < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l \|Z - Y_{(i)}\| D_Y(Y_{(i)})}{\sum_{i=1}^l D_Y(Y_{(i)})},$$

where  $X_{(1)}$  is the deepest point in the  $X$ -sample,  $X_{(2)}$  is the second deepest point in the  $X$ -sample, ... and similarly for the  $Y$ -sample.

In [12] the authors consider three possibilities to split the sample in training and validation sets. We have analyzed all three possibilities, but in order to shorten the exposition we will only present the results corresponding to the cross-validation setting. However, we want to remark that, when using the random Tukey depth, the differences between the error rates obtained with those possibilities are less important than those reported in [12].

Regarding the selection of  $k$ , since the bigger sample size is around 50, following the suggestion at the beginning of this section, we have taken  $k = 10$ .

In Table 3.2 we show the obtained failure rates using the described methods, the random Tukey depth and the depths proposed in [12]. The last three columns contain the error rates obtained with the depths handled in [12]. They are the band depth determined by three different curves (DS3), by four different curves (DS4) and the generalized band depth (DGS). Their values have been taken from Tables 1-3 in [12].

On the other hand, taking into account the random nature of the proposed depth, we have tried 10,000 times each classification method with the random Tukey depth. The second column in Table 3.2 contains the rate of errors we have obtained.

To facilitate comparisons, we present in bold the lowest failure rate for each method.

Once again, in spite of the low number of random projections, the results are similar to those in [12], the random Tukey depth with the AM method being the global winner.

**Table 3.2** *Rate of mistakes when classifying the growth curves by sex using cross validation for the shown methods and depths.*

Classification method	Random Tukey $k = 10$	Depths proposed in [12]		
		DS3	DS4	DGS
M	.2033	.1828	.1828	<b>.1613</b>
AM	<b>.1485</b>	.2473	.2473	.1935
TAM	<b>.1651</b>	.2436	.2436	.1690

## 4 Discussion

In this paper we introduce a random depth which can be considered as a random approximation to the Tukey depth. The new depth is interesting because of the little effort required into its computation and because it can be extended to cover Hilbert valued data.

From a theoretical point of view, this random depth enjoys no new properties. Its interest lies in the fact that taking very few one-dimensional projections, it is possible to obtain similar results to those obtained with more involved depths. The number of required projections is surprisingly low, indeed. In fact, for samples sizes smaller or equal to 1,000, it seems that 36 projections suffice for every dimension.

If the dimension of the space is fixed, the number of required projections increases with the sample size. This dependence is related to the fact that when the sample size is small, the randomness included in the sample makes the gain achieved by considering a high number of projections useless.

On the other hand, if we fix the sample size, the number of required projections increases with the dimension until the point in which the dimension is too large to allow a reasonable estimation of the underlying distribution. From this point on, the number

decreases. The initial increment is related to the course of the dimensionality. The later decrement is due to the uncertainty on the parent distribution which makes a large number of projections useless.

We consider remarkable the fact that a not too high number of projections provides very good results even in the infinite dimensional setting. This is shown in the comparisons with some other depths that we have carried out. Those studies, do not show really important differences between the considered depths and the random Tukey one. Thus, we conclude that, at least under considered conditions, the random Tukey depth is an alternative which is worth considering because of the small computational time required.

## References

- [1] Cuesta-Albertos, J., Cuevas, A. and Fraiman, R., 2007. A test for directional uniformity with applications to high-dimensional sphericity. Preprint.
- [2] Cuesta-Albertos, J., del Barrio, T., Fraiman, R. and Matrán, C., 2007. The random projection method in goodness of fit for functional data. *Computat. Statist. Data Anal.*, 51 4814-4831.
- [3] Cuesta-Albertos, J., Fraiman, R. and Ransford, T., 2006. Random projections and goodness-of-fit tests in infinite-dimensional spaces. *Bull. Brazilian Math. Soc.*, 37(4) 1-25.
- [4] Cuesta-Albertos, J., Fraiman, R. and Ransford, T., 2007. A sharp form of the Cramér-Wold theorem. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 20 201-209.
- [5] Cuevas, A., Febrero, M. and Fraiman, R., 2006. On the use of the bootstrap for estimating functions with functional data. *Computation. Statist. Data Anal.*, 51 1063–1074.
- [6] Cuevas, A., Febrero, M. and Fraiman, R., 2007. Robust estimation and classification for functional data via projection-based depth notions. To appear in *Computation. Statist.*
- [7] Febrero, M., Galeano, P. and González-Manteiga, W., 2007. Outlier detection in functional data by depth measures with application to identify abnormal NOx levels. To appear in *Environmetrics*.
- [8] Fraiman, R. and Muniz, G., 2001. Trimmed means for functional data. *Test*, 10 419-440.
- [9] Hand, D.J., 2006. Classifier technology and the illusion of progress. *Statist. Sci.*, 21(1) 1-14.
- [10] Liu, R., Serfling, R. and Souvaine, D.L., editors, 2006. *Data Depth: Robust Multivariate Analysis, Computational Geometry and Applications*. American Mathematical Society, DIMACS Series, Vol. 72.

- [11] Liu, R.Y. and Singh, K., 2006. Rank tests for nonparametric description of dispersion. In: R. Liu, R. Serfling and D.L. Souvaine (Ed.), Data Depth: Robust Multivariate Analysis, Computational Geometry and Applications, American Mathematical Society, DIMACS Series, Vol. 72, 17-35.
- [12] López-Pintado, S. and Romo, J., 2006. Depth-based classification for functional data. In: R. Liu, R. Serfling and D.L. Souvaine (Ed.), Data Depth: Robust Multivariate Analysis, Computational Geometry and Applications, American Mathematical Society, DIMACS Series, Vol. 72, 17-35.
- [13] Mahalanobis, P. C., 1936. On the Generalized Distance in Statistics. Proceed. Nat. Academy of India, 12 49-55.
- [14] Maronna, R.A., Martin, R. D. and Yohai, V.J., 2006. Robust Statistics. Theory and Methods. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- [15] Mosler, K. and Hoberg, R., 2006. Data analysis and classification with the zonoid depth. In: R. Liu, R. Serfling and D.L. Souvaine (Ed.), Data Depth: Robust Multivariate Analysis, Computational Geometry and Applications, American Mathematical Society, DIMACS Series, Vol. 72, 17-35.
- [16] Ramsay, J.O. and Silverman, B.W., 1997. Functional Data Analysis. Springer Verlag, New York.
- [17] Tukey, J.W., 1975. Mathematics and picturing of data. Proceedings of ICM, Vancouver, 2 523-531.
- [18] Zuo, Y. and Serfling, R., 2000. General notions of statistical depth function. Ann. Statist., 28(2) 461-482.
- [19] Zuo, Y., 2003. Projection-based depth functions and associated medians. Ann. Statist., 31(5) 1460-1490.
- [20] Zuo, Y., 2006. Multidimensional trimming based on projection depth. Ann. Statist., 34(5) 2211-2251.