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7.2.5. Alternative performance evaluation approaches

Some PT schemes use a simple difference between assigned value and participant result, often denoted $D_i$ as an indication of performance. This can also be expressed as a percentage of the assigned value, $D_i\%$.

$$D_i = x_i - x_{pt} \quad D_i\% = \frac{x_i - x_{pt}}{x_{pt}}\times 100$$

The difference $D_i$ or $D_i\%$ is usually compared with a criterion based on fitness for purpose or expected performance. These have the advantage of simplicity for an analyst familiar with the field, but do not have a consistent interpretation for different characteristics.
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