

18 July 2001

(Terminology as in the paper.)

$$\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}_m + \tilde{Y} g^T$$

$\uparrow$  calibration spectra       $\nwarrow$  unknown

$$(I) \quad \tilde{Y}_R^T \tilde{X} (\tilde{X}^T \tilde{X})^{-PLS} \tilde{X}^T \tilde{Y}_R = (\tilde{Y}_R^T \tilde{Y}_R) \cdot \frac{SNR_x^2}{1 + SNR_x^2} \cdot \frac{SNR_y^2}{1 + SNR_y^2}$$

$\uparrow$  calibration lab references

$$= (\tilde{Y}_R^T \tilde{Y}_R) \cdot \frac{SNR_x^2}{1 + SNR_x^2}$$

$$(II) \quad \tilde{Y}_R^T \tilde{X} (\tilde{X}_m^T \tilde{X}_m)^{-PLS} \tilde{X}^T \tilde{Y}_R = (\tilde{Y}_R^T \tilde{Y}_R) \cdot SNR_x^2 \cdot \frac{SNR_y^2}{1 + SNR_y^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{ratio } \frac{(II)}{(I)} = 1 + SNR_x^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \underline{SNR_x = \sqrt{\frac{(II)}{(I)} - 1}}$$

Problem:  $\tilde{X}_m^T \tilde{X}_m$  unknown so you can not compute (II)

Solution: Find spectra (other than the calibration spectra) for which:

(a)  $\tilde{X}^T \tilde{X} \approx \tilde{X}_m^T \tilde{X}_m$  because their RMS glucose signal  $\approx 0$ ; and

(b) their  $\tilde{X}_m^T \tilde{X}_m$  is similar to what was in the calibration spectra.

— Confidential & Proprietary to NAE MARBACH —

18 July 2001

- E.g., take 1000 prediction spectra and according to their 1000 predictions divide them into three ranges: low, med, and hi glucose (with, say, 200, 500 and 300 spectra). Say the std is  $25 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{dl}}$  rms in each range. That means that

$$\left( \tilde{X}_m^T \tilde{X}_m \right)_{\text{estimate}} = \frac{\frac{\tilde{X}_l^T \tilde{X}_l}{200} + \frac{\tilde{X}_{med}^T \tilde{X}_{med}}{500} + \frac{\tilde{X}_{hi}^T \tilde{X}_{hi}}{300}}{3}$$

has about 3x less glucose signal than the original ( $\sim 75 \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{dl}}$ ).

- The more ranges, the cleaner the noise estimate.
- The cleaner the noise estimate (the less glucose signal in the spectral covariance matrix) the higher the  $\text{SNR}_x$ -result. In other words, in practice, you end up with a statement like "my  $\text{SNR}_x$  is at least 0.000".
- Once you know  $\text{SNR}_x$  you also know  $\text{SNR}_y$  from the total-SNR (see paper).

— Confidential & Proprietary to Ray MANBACH —

18 July 2001

# Technicality:

Because the number of spectra in the calibration data set  $\tilde{X}$ ,  $\tilde{y}_R$  and the data set for the estimation of  $\tilde{X}^T \tilde{X}$  may be different, all variances must be scaled. E.g.:

$$\frac{\tilde{y}_R^T \tilde{X}}{250} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\tilde{X}_0^T \tilde{X}_0}{200} + \frac{\tilde{X}_{med}^T \tilde{X}_{med}}{500} + \frac{\tilde{X}_{hi}^T \tilde{X}_{hi}}{300} \right\}^{-PLS} \cdot \frac{\tilde{X}^T \tilde{y}_R}{250}$$


---


$$\frac{\tilde{y}_R^T \tilde{X}}{250} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\tilde{X}^T \tilde{X}}{250} \right\}^{-PLS} \cdot \frac{\tilde{X}^T \tilde{y}_R}{250} \cong 1 + SNR_x^2$$

assuming: 250 calibration spectra

|     |                                |
|-----|--------------------------------|
| 200 | spectra in the low-focus range |
| 500 | " " " medium " "               |
| 300 | " " " high " "                 |

— Confidential & Proprietary to NIST —