Common Mistakes and How to Avoid Them

Raj Jain
Washington University in Saint Louis
Saint Louis, MO 63130
Jain@cse.wustl.edu

These slides are available on-line at:

http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/cse567-08/

Washington University in St. Louis

CSE567M



- □ Common Mistakes in Evaluation
- □ Checklist for Avoiding Common Mistakes
- □ A Systematic Approach to Performance Evaluation
- □ Case Study: Remote Pipes vs RPC

Common Mistakes in Evaluation

- 1. No Goals
 - No general purpose model
 - ➢ Goals ⇒ Techniques, Metrics, Workload
 - Not trivial
- 2. Biased Goals
 - "To show that OUR system is better than THEIRS"
 - Analysts = Jury
- 3. Unsystematic Approach
- 4. Analysis Without Understanding the Problem
- 5. Incorrect Performance Metrics
- 6. Unrepresentative Workload
- 7. Wrong Evaluation Technique

Washington University in St. Louis

CSE567M

Common Mistakes (Cont)

- 8. Overlook Important Parameters
- 9. Ignore Significant Factors
- 10. Inappropriate Experimental Design
- 11. Inappropriate Level of Detail
- 12. No Analysis
- 13. Erroneous Analysis
- 14. No Sensitivity Analysis
- 15. Ignoring Errors in Input
- 16. Improper Treatment of Outliers
- 17. Assuming No Change in the Future
- 18. Ignoring Variability
- 19. Too Complex Analysis

Washington University in St. Louis

CSE567M

Common Mistakes (Cont)

- 20. Improper Presentation of Results
- 21. Ignoring Social Aspects
- 22. Omitting Assumptions and Limitations

Checklist for Avoiding Common Mistakes

- 1. Is the system correctly defined and the goals clearly stated?
- 2. Are the goals stated in an unbiased manner?
- 3. Have all the steps of the analysis followed systematically?
- 4. Is the problem clearly understood before analyzing it?
- 5. Are the performance metrics relevant for this problem?
- 6. Is the workload correct for this problem?
- 7. Is the evaluation technique appropriate?
- 8. Is the list of parameters that affect performance complete?
- 9. Have all parameters that affect performance been chosen as factors to be varied?

Checklist (Cont)

- 10. Is the experimental design efficient in terms of time and results?
- 11. Is the level of detail proper?
- 12. Is the measured data presented with analysis and interpretation?
- 13. Is the analysis statistically correct?
- 14. Has the sensitivity analysis been done?
- 15. Would errors in the input cause an insignificant change in the results?
- 16. Have the outliers in the input or output been treated properly?
- 17. Have the future changes in the system and workload been modeled?
- 18. Has the variance of input been taken into account?

Washington University in St. Louis

CSE567M

Checklist (Cont)

- 19. Has the variance of the results been analyzed?
- 20. Is the analysis easy to explain?
- 21. Is the presentation style suitable for its audience?
- 22. Have the results been presented graphically as much as possible?
- 23. Are the assumptions and limitations of the analysis clearly documented?

A Systematic Approach to Performance Evaluation

- 1. State Goals and Define the System
- 2. List Services and Outcomes
- 3. Select Metrics
- 4. List Parameters
- 5. Select Factors to Study
- 6. Select Evaluation Technique
- 7. Select Workload
- 8. Design Experiments
- 9. Analyze and Interpret Data
- 10. Present Results

Repeat

Washington University in St. Louis

CSE567M