

---

Subject: Re: "Correct" Data Philosophy  
Posted by [rogass](#) on Thu, 17 Dec 2009 21:41:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 17 Dez., 21:33, Laura <haixia...@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Dec 17, 11:43 am, David Fanning <n...@dfanning.com> wrote:

>

>

>

>> Folks,

>

>> Every couple of weeks I get an e-mail from someone whose  
>> data is "missing" and they want to replace it with the  
>> "correct" value. These e-mails bug me because if the  
>> data is "missing" how the hell would I know what the  
>> "correct" value is suppose to be?

>

>> But, generally speaking, they want some method to  
>> guess at the "correct" values by looking around the  
>> neighborhood, shuffling their feet, etc. I guess we  
>> have all been tempted to fudge data, if only for  
>> aesthetic reasons, so maybe it is a legitimate request.

>

>> What would you tell them to do?

>

> Is it similar to "interpolation" or "approximation" or "estimation"?

>

> How about linear/bilinear/trilinear interpolation? Or minimum  
> curvature surface or thin-plate-spline? It also depends on how many  
> values are available and/or missing. There are other fitting/  
> interpolation functions too.

As Laura said you can't give general recommendations - it always depends on that special case. Maybe you can suggest to leave some data out and to test then the goodness of fit due to the missing but existent data.

Just my 2 cents

CR

---