

# Computing Moments with fromo

Steven E. Pav \*

January 12, 2019

## Abstract

The `fromo` package provides fast robust summation using the Welford-Terriberry method. The update formula used therein is described, as well as the output produced by various functions.

## 1 The update formula

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of indices over the data  $x_i$  and corresponding weights  $w_i > 0$ . The weights are *replication weights*, and are intended to simulate having observed multiple identical, though independent, values of  $x_i$ . In the standard setting the weights are identically 1.

Define the total elements, sum of weights, and (weighted) mean over  $\mathcal{A}$  via

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\mathcal{A}} &= |\mathcal{A}|, \\ W_{\mathcal{A}} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i, \\ \mu_{\mathcal{A}} &= \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i x_i}{W_{\mathcal{A}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then go on to define the  $k^{\text{th}}$  centered weighted sum via

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})^k.$$

Note that we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},0} = W_{\mathcal{A}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},1} = 0.$$

When  $\mathcal{A}$  consists of a single observation, that is when  $n_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$ , we have  $\mu_{\mathcal{A}} = x_a$  for the unique  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  be sets of indices with the restriction that  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , and define

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{C}.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathcal{A}$  ‘plus’  $\mathcal{B}$  ‘minus’  $\mathcal{C}$ . Consider how to compute  $W_{\mathcal{D}}$ ,  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k}$  from the sums of weights, weighted means, and centered sums over the sets  $\mathcal{A}$ ,

---

\*[shabbychef@gmail.com](mailto:shabbychef@gmail.com)

$\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ . [1, 2, 3] We have:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\mathcal{D}} &= n_{\mathcal{A}} + n_{\mathcal{B}} - n_{\mathcal{C}}, \\ W_{\mathcal{D}} &= W_{\mathcal{A}} + W_{\mathcal{B}} - W_{\mathcal{C}}, \\ \mu_{\mathcal{D}} &= \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}}\mu_{\mathcal{A}} + W_{\mathcal{B}}\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - W_{\mathcal{C}}\mu_{\mathcal{C}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}, \\ &= \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{W_{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) - W_{\mathcal{C}}(\mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k, \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k, \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + \mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}} + \mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{C}} + \mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k, \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})^j (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{B}})^j (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} w_i (x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{C}})^j (\mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j}, \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} - \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \right\}, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},k} - \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + W_{\mathcal{B}} (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k - W_{\mathcal{C}} (\mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} - \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if the centered sums are to be computed *in place*, that is, overwriting the vector of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j}$  with values of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},j}$ , then they should be computed in decreasing order, as updates to higher order sums require the old values of lower order sums.

It should also be noted that we did not use the restriction that  $w_i > 0$ . True, negative values of  $w_i$  can cause  $W_{\mathcal{D}}$  to be zero, and therefore  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$  is not defined, nor is  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k}$ . Negative weights also make no sense for most statistical uses. However, notice what happens when we substitute every  $w_c$  with  $-w_c$  for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . If we compute the total weight,  $W_{\mathcal{C}}$ , its sign has flipped, as has that of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},k}$ , but not of  $\mu_{\mathcal{C}}$ . In this case, using the negative weights we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},k} + \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{C},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + W_{\mathcal{B}} (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + \tilde{W}_{\mathcal{C}} (\tilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{B}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} + \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{C},j} (\tilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{C}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the  $\tilde{W}_{\mathcal{C}}$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{C}}$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{C},j}$  denote that they are computed with negative weights. Now the update formula for removing  $\mathcal{C}$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  looks just like that for adding  $\mathcal{B}$ , except negative weights are used.

## 1.1 Adding a single observation

We now consider the special case where  $\mathcal{C}$  is empty, and  $\mathcal{B}$  consists of the single index  $b$ . We then have  $W_{\mathcal{D}} = W_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\mathcal{D}} &= \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}}\mu_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b x_b}{W_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b}, \\ &= \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b}, \\ &= \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}.\end{aligned}$$

So then

$$\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}} = -w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}.$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}} &= x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + \mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ &= x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}} - w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}, \\ &= W_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is a single index,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},k} = 0$  for  $k > 0$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} \left( -w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}} \right)^k + w_b \left( W_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}} \right)^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} \left( -w_b \frac{x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}} \right)^{k-j}, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{-w_b}{W_{\mathcal{A}}} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j}, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}}}{-w_b} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j}.\end{aligned}$$

For the  $k = 2$  case this further simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},2} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}} w_b}{W_{\mathcal{D}}} (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})^2, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + \frac{W_{\mathcal{D}} w_b}{W_{\mathcal{A}}} (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + W_{\mathcal{D}} (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}) (\mu_{\mathcal{D}} - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}).\end{aligned}$$

Note that the quantity  $W_{\mathcal{D}} (\mu_{\mathcal{D}} - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) = w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})$  is computed as an intermediary in updating the weighted mean, resulting in some computational savings.

### 1.1.1 Removing a single observation

As noted above, removing a single observation should look just like adding a single observation, except signs on the weights and weighted sums are flipped. Let  $c$  be the single index in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $c$ . We then have  $W_{\mathcal{D}} = W_{\mathcal{A}} - w_c$ , and

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}} = \mu_{\mathcal{A}} - w_c \frac{x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}.$$

The centered sum update formula is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} - w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{w_c}{W_{\mathcal{A}}} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j}, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}}}{w_c} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j}. \end{aligned}$$

For the  $k = 2$  case this further simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},2} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} - \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}} w_c}{W_{\mathcal{D}}} (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})^2, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} - \frac{W_{\mathcal{D}} w_c}{W_{\mathcal{A}}} (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + W_{\mathcal{D}} (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}) (\mu_{\mathcal{D}} - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}). \end{aligned}$$

## 1.2 Adding and removing a single observation

Consider the case of adding a single  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  and removing a single  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . The total number elements,  $n_{\mathcal{A}}$ , is unchanged, of course. We have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathcal{D}} &= W_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b - w_c, \\ \mu_{\mathcal{D}} &= \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) - w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The update formula for  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},k} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},k} - \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},k} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k + w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k - w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{2 \leq j < k} \binom{k}{j} \left\{ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},j} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},j} (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} - \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{C},j} (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^{k-j} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the  $k = 2$  case this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},2} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + W_{\mathcal{A}} (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2 + w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2 - w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2, \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + (\mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2 (W_{\mathcal{A}} - W_{\mathcal{D}}) + w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}) (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) - w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}) (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}), \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + \frac{W_{\mathcal{A}} w_b (x_b - \mu_{\mathcal{A}})^2 - W_{\mathcal{D}} w_c (x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{D}})^2}{W_{\mathcal{A}} + w_b}. \end{aligned}$$

Further simplifications are possible when  $w_b = w_c$  (as occurs in the vanilla case of equal weighted moments), and we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\mathcal{D}} &= \mu_{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{w_b (x_b - x_c)}{W_{\mathcal{D}}}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D},2} &= \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2} + w_b (x_b + x_c - \mu_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}) (x_b - x_c).\end{aligned}$$

## 2 The output

Several kinds of output are produced by the **fromo** package. We describe them in more detail here.

**mean** The (weighted) mean over the index set  $\mathcal{A}$  is simply  $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ .  
**standard deviation** The standard deviation over the index set  $\mathcal{A}$  is

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2}}{W_{\mathcal{A}} - \nu}},$$

where  $\nu$  are the ‘consumed degrees of freedom’, and is typically set to 1. When the normalization flag is set to true, however, it is intended that the weights be normalized to have mean value 1. In this case the standard deviation over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},2}}{W_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{n_{\mathcal{A}}}{n_{\mathcal{A}} - \nu}}.$$

When  $\nu = 0$ , these are identical.

**centered moment** The  $k^{\text{th}}$  centered moment is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A},k} = \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},k}}{W_{\mathcal{A}}}.$$

Note that for  $k > 2$  we do not support consumed degrees of freedom, and so normalization of weights has no effect.

**standardized moment** The  $k^{\text{th}}$  standardized (and centered) moment is defined as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{A},k} = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A},k}}{\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^k}.$$

Normalization and consumed degrees of freedom affect the computation of  $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^k$ , and so affect the standardized moments.

**centered value** For a given index  $i$  and some fixed set  $\mathcal{A}$ , the centered version of  $x_i$  is merely  $x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**standardized value** For a given index  $i$  and some fixed set  $\mathcal{A}$ , the standardized version of  $x_i$  is merely  $x_i / \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ . It is affected by normalization and consumed degrees of freedom.

**z-scored value** For a given index  $i$  and some fixed set  $\mathcal{A}$ , the z-scored version of  $x_i$  is  $(x_i - \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) / \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ . It is affected by normalization and consumed degrees of freedom.

Cumulants Sometimes called “centered cumulants” in the package, though this is redundant and not common usage. Cumulants are defined from the centered moments by the recursive formula: [4]

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{A},r} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A},r} - \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} \binom{r-1}{j} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A},j} \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{A},r-j}. \quad (1)$$

Standardized Cumulants These are the regular cumulants normalized by the computed standard deviation:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},r} = \frac{\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{A},r}}{\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^r}. \quad (2)$$

### 3 Running Moments

The `fromo` package can also perform running<sup>1</sup> computations of moments, centered moments, centered values, standardized values, z-scored values and so on. Given an integral window,  $W$ , and data and weights vectors  $x_i$ ,  $w_i$ , we compute output  $y_i$  as follows: let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of  $j$  with  $i - W < j \leq i$ . Then compute the desired moment over  $\mathcal{D}$ , and return it as  $y_i$ . The ‘comparison’ operations (computed centered, standardized, or z-scored versions of a variable) admit a *lookahead* parameter,  $l$ . In this case, we let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of  $j$  with  $i - W + l < j \leq i + l$ , then compute the moments over  $\mathcal{D}$  and normalize  $x_i$  with respect to those moments. When  $l > 0$ , we are using future information to compute  $y_i$ . That is,  $y_i$  will depend on  $x_j$  with  $j > i$ . This is not the case for the typical moments computations or for the case where the lookahead is non-positive.

We also support a time (or other counter) based running computation. Here the input are the data, and weights vectors,  $x_i$ ,  $w_i$ , but also a vector of time indices, say  $t_i$  which are non-decreasing:  $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots$ . It is assumed that  $t_0$  is essentially  $-\infty$ . The window,  $W$  is now a time-based window. The output  $y_i$  is defined in terms of the moments computations over the set  $\mathcal{D}$  which are all  $j$  such that  $t_i - W < t_j \leq t_i$ . For comparison functions, we again admit a lookahead so that  $\mathcal{D}$  are all  $j$  such that  $t_i - W + l < t_j \leq t_i + l$ . Obviously if we let  $t_i = i$ , we recover the ‘vanilla’ running moments computations. We also support supplying the  $t_i$  implicitly as the sum of positive deltas: let vector  $d_i$  of strictly positive elements be given. Then we assume

$$t_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i} d_j,$$

and then perform the time-based running computation. We also support the case where the  $d_i$  are actually just the  $w_i$ .

### References

- [1] J. Bennett, R. Grout, P. Pebay, D. Roe, and D. Thompson. Numerically stable, single-pass, parallel statistics algorithms. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing and Workshops*, pages 1–8, Aug 2009. doi: 10.1109/CLUSTER.2009.5289161.

<sup>1</sup>Variously known also as *rolling*, *boxcar*, or *finite impulse response* computations.

- [2] John D. Cook. Accurately computing running variance. URL [http://www.johndcook.com/standard\\_deviation.html](http://www.johndcook.com/standard_deviation.html).
- [3] Timothy B. Terriberry. Computing higher-order moments online, 2008. URL <http://people.xiph.org/~tterribe/notes/homs.html>.
- [4] R. Willink. Relationships between central moments and cumulants, with formulæ for the central moments of Gamma distributions. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 32(4):701–704, 2003. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1081/STA-120018823>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1081/STA-120018823>.