

---

Subject: Re: On errors calculated by curve-fitting routines  
Posted by [Anthony\[1\]](#) on Thu, 06 Mar 2008 08:51:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 6, 3:08 am, Gernot Hassenpflug <ger...@nict.go.jp> wrote:

> Hello all,  
>  
> I'm using IDL 6.1, as well as Maple 11, Mathematica 6.0, Matlab 7.5  
> and the statistical language R. My goal is to calculate the covariance  
> matrix of parameters of a second order polynomial curve fit. To  
> clarify: I refer to this as linear fitting, since the parameters are  
> linear; however, many books, papers and routines refer to this as  
> non-linear fitting.  
>  
> Matlab and Mathematica do not have built-in functions to do this  
> (Mathematica has an add-on module which my institute has not bought)  
> so I am comparing the parameter covariance matrix from IDL, Maple, R  
> and my own programmed output learned from section 15.4 of Numerical  
> Recipes, 2nd edition, and a paper by Keith Burrell in the American  
> Journal of Physics Vol. 58, No. 2, pp 160--164 (1990) titled "Error  
> analysis for parameters determined in nonlinear least-square fits",  
> both describing the same method which uses the variances of the  
> dependent data combined with the derivatives of the fitting function  
> wrt the fitted parameters; i.e., the dependent data values themselves  
> are not used, apparently.  
>  
> I find that in IDL the routines POLY\_FIT, LMFIT and CURVEFIT can all  
> calculate the parameter covariance matrix and it is documented that  
> LMFIT uses the method of Burrell and Numerical Recipes. I cannot tell  
> what method the other two routines use.  
>  
> Maple seems to use a different method apparently described on pp  
> 197--198 of David M. Himmelblau's 1970 book titled "Process Analysis  
> by Statistical Methods", which I have ordered used but not yet  
> received.  
>  
> I am hoping that contributors to this list could give their comments  
> and opinions on what method of parameter variance and covariance is  
> most sound, and which routines are therefore preferred for a  
> polynomial fitting case (possibly over-determined).  
>  
> Many thanks in advance,  
> Gernot Hassenpflug  
> --  
> BOFH excuse #72:  
>  
> Satan did it

Hi Gernot,

It's worth looking into MPFIT ("Robust non-linear least squares curve fitting"):

<http://cow.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/fitting.html>

Cheers,  
Anthony

---