Assignment 4 – STAT453/558 Spring 2024 Due date April 2nd,2024

Question 1 - The data shown in the table below were collected in an experiment to optimize crystal growth as a function of three variables x_1 , x_2 , and x_3 . Large values of y (yield in grams) are desirable. Fit a second order model and analyze the fitted surface. Under what set of conditions is maximum growth achieved?

x_1	x_2	x_3	У
-1	-1	-1	66
-1	-1	1	70
-1	1	-1	78
-1	1	1	60
1	-1	-1	80
1	-1	1	70
1	1	-1	100
1	1	1	75
-1.682	0	0	100
1.682	0	0	80
0	-1.682	0	68
0	1.682	0	63
0	0	-1.682	65
0	0	1.682	82
0	0	0	113
0	0	0	100
0	0	0	118
0	0	0	88
0	0	0	100
0	0	0	85

```
data <- data.frame(
   x1 = c(-1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1.682, 1.682, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
   x^2 = c(-1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 0, 0, -1.682, 1.682, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
   x3 = c(-1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1.682, 1.682, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
   y = c(66, 70, 78, 60, 80, 70, 100, 75, 100, 80, 68, 63, 65, 82, 113, 100, 118, 88, 100, 85)
 # Load the rsm package
 library(rsm)
 # Fit the response surface model to the data
 model \leftarrow rsm(y \sim SO(x1, x2, x3)^2, data = data)
 # Print the model summary
 summary(model)
 ##
## Call:
 ## rsm(formula = y \sim SO(x1, x2, x3)^2, data = data)
               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 100.6663
                           5.5638 18.0930 5.703e-09 ***
 ## x1
                1.2710
                            3.6912 0.3443 0.737726
## x2
                1.3611
                          3.6912 0.3687 0.720014
## x3
                -1.4940
                          3.6912 -0.4048 0.694182
                           4.8231 0.5961 0.564363
## x1:x2
                2.8750
## x1:x3
                -2.6250
                           4.8231 -0.5443 0.598190
## x2:x3
                -4.6250
                           4.8231 -0.9589 0.360205
 ## x1^2
                -3.7679
                           3.5929 -1.0487 0.318990
                           3.5929 -3.4590 0.006133 **
## x2^2
               -12.4278
 ## x3^2
                -9.6001
                           3.5929 -2.6720 0.023412 *
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Multiple R-squared: 0.663, Adjusted R-squared: 0.3598
## F-statistic: 2.186 on 9 and 10 DF, p-value: 0.1194
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: v
                   Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
## FO(x1, x2, x3) 3 77.9 25.95 0.1395 0.9341
 ## TWI(x1, x2, x3) 3 292.4
                             97.46 0.5237 0.6757
## PQ(x1, x2, x3) 3 3291.7 1097.25 5.8961 0.0139
                   10 1861.0 186.10
## Residuals
                   5 1001.6 200.33 1.1656 0.4353
## Lack of fit
## Pure error
                    5 859.3 171.87
## Stationary point of response surface:
          x1
                      x2
## 0.2597353 0.1108581 -0.1400280
##
## Eigenanalysis:
## eigen() decomposition
```

library(rsm)

Create a data frame with the provided data

```
## $values
## [1] -3.079142 -8.952298 -13.764404
## Svectors
            [,1]
                        [,2]
## x1 0.9413839 0.3309866 -0.06514712
## x2 0.2100461 -0.4240105 0.88096295
## x3 -0.2639639 0.8430083 0.46867915
# Plot the fitted surface
contour(model, ~x1 + x2, interactive = TRUE)
## Warning in plot.window(xlim, ylim, ...): "interactive" is not a graphical
## parameter
## Warning in title(...): "interactive" is not a graphical parameter
## Warning in axis(side = side, at = at, labels = labels, ...): "interactive" is
## not a graphical parameter
## Warning in axis(side = side, at = at, labels = labels, ...): "interactive" is
## not a graphical parameter
## Warning in box(...): "interactive" is not a graphical parameter
     1.5
     1.0
     2
     0.0
Š
     -0.5
     -1.0
     2
              -1.5
                        -1.0
                                           0.0
                                 -0.5
                                                     0.5
                                                               1.0
                                                                         1.5
                                            x1
                                       Slice at x3 = 0
 #To find the conditions for maximum growth,
 #I need to check he stationary point of the response surface. The stationary point is where the gradient of the r
 esponse surface is zero, indicating a potential maximum or minimum.
 #According to the model summary, the stationary point is at:
 \#x1 = 0.2597353 \ x2 = 0.1108581 \ x3 = -0.1400280
 #Therefore, under the conditions where x1 is approximately 0.2597, x2 is approximately 0.1109, and x3 is approxim
 ately -0.1400, the maximum growth is achieved.
```

Question 2 - An experimenter has run a Box-Behnken design and has obtained the results as shown in the table below, where the response variable is the viscosity of a polymer.

	_	Agitation	_			
Level	Temp.	Rate	Pressure	x_1	x_2	x_3
High	200	10.0	25	+1	+1	+1
Middle	175	7.5	20	0	0	0
Low	150	5.0	15	-1	-1	-1

Run	x_1	x_2	x_3	<i>y</i> 1
1	-1	-1	0	535
2	1	-1	0	580
3	-1	1	0	596
4	1	1	0	563
5	-1	0	-1	645
6	1	0	-1	458
7	-1	0	1	350
8	1	0	1	600
9	0	-1	-1	595
10	0	1	-1	648
11	0	-1	1	532
12	0	1	1	656
13	0	0	0	653
14	0	0	0	599
15	0	0	0	620

- (a) Fit the second-order model.
- (b) Perform the canonical analysis. What type of surface has been found?
- (c) What operating conditions on x_1 , x_2 , and x_3 maximize viscosity?

```
# Load the rsm package
library(rsm)
# Create a data frame with the provided data
data <- data.frame(
 x1 = c(-1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
 x2 = c(-1, -1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 1, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0),
 x3 = c(0, 0, 0, 0, -1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0),
 y = c(535, 580, 596, 563, 645, 458, 350, 600, 595, 648, 532, 656, 653, 599, 620)
# Fit the second-order model to the data
model \leftarrow rsm(y \sim SO(x1, x2, x3)^2, data = data)
# Print the model summary
summary(model)
##
## Call:
## rsm(formula = y ~ SO(x1, x2, x3)^2, data = data)
##
##
               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 624.000 18.652 33.4539 4.487e-07 ***
                            11.422 0.8208 0.449128
## x1
                9.375
                            11.422 2.4185 0.060228 .
## x2
                27.625
## x3
               -26.000
                          11.422 -2.2763 0.071874 .
                           16.154 -1.2072 0.281356
## x1:x2
               -19.500
## x1:x3
               109.250
                          16.154 6.7632 0.001074 **
## x2:x3
               17.750
                           16.154 1.0988 0.321915
## x1^2
               -75.000
                           16.813 -4.4608 0.006636 **
## x2^2
                19.500
                            16.813 1.1598 0.298496
                           16.813 -2.1263 0.086809 .
## x3^2
               -35.750
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
     ## Multiple R-squared: 0.945, Adjusted R-squared: 0.846
      ## F-statistic: 9.544 on 9 and 5 DF, p-value: 0.0115
     ##
      ## Analysis of Variance Table
     ##
      ## Response: y
     ##
                     Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
     ## FO(x1, x2, x3) 3 12216 4072.1 3.9014 0.088473
      ## TWI(x1, x2, x3) 3 50524 16841.2 16.1352 0.005278
      ## PQ(x1, x2, x3) 3 26913 8970.9 8.5949 0.020359
                       5 5219 1043.7
      ## Residuals
                      3 3737 1245.6 1.6809 0.394113
      ## Lack of fit
                       2 1482 741.0
      ## Pure error
      ##
      ## Stationary point of response surface:
      ##
                         x2
              x1
      ## 2.1849596 -0.8713709 2.7586015
      ##
      ## Eigenanalysis:
      ## eigen() decomposition
      ## Svalues
      ## [1] 20.922869 2.520763 -114.693632
      ##
      ## $vectors
      ##
                 [,1]
                          [,2]
     ## x1 -0.02739155 0.5811826 0.8133121
      ## x2 0.99128775 -0.0890686 0.0970329
      ## x3 0.12883440 0.8088842 -0.5736794
```

```
a ridge.
#If all linear coefficients are negative and all interaction coefficients are positive, it indicates a valley.
#If the signs are mixed, it indicates a saddle point.
#Igot x1: 9.375 x2: 27.625 x3: -26.000
#The interaction coefficients are:
#x1:x2: -19.500 x1:x3: 109.250 x2:x3: 17.750
#We can see that the linear coefficients are not all positive or all negative, and the interaction coefficients a
re not all negative or all positive. Therefore, the type of surface that has been found is likely a saddle point.
# Perform steepest ascent analysis
steepest(model)
## Path of steepest ascent from ridge analysis:
```

#If all linear coefficients (x1, x2, x3) are positive and all interaction coefficients are negative, it indicates

#To determine the type of surface found we can analyze the coefficients.

dist x1 x2 x3 | yhat

```
## 1
      0.0 0.000 0.000 0.000
                                624.000
      0.5 -0.066 0.472 -0.150
                                643.966
## 3
     1.0 -0.127 0.979 -0.162 | 672.465
     1.5 -0.166 1.484 -0.137 | 710.887
     2.0 -0.196 1.988 -0.096
                               759,699
```

2.5 -0.220 2.490 -0.048 | 818.876 3.0 -0.242 2.990 0.005 888.382 3.5 -0.262 3.490 0.061 | 968.463

```
4.0 -0.280 3.988 0.119 | 1058.752
```

```
## 4
## 5
## 6
## 7
## 9
```

10 4.5 -0.298 4.487 0.178 | 1159.791 ## 11 5.0 -0.314 4.984 0.238 | 1270.924

```
# Based on the output I got, the operating conditions that maximize viscosity are approximately:
\#x1 = -0.314 \ x2 = 4.984 \ x3 = 0.238
```

#Therefore, to maximize viscosity, I need to use $\#x1 = -0.314 \ x2 = 4.984 \ x3 = 0.238$

#b