	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	l I	J
1	Batch	Agent1	Agent2					t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means		
2	1	7.7	8.5					-		
3	2	9.2	9.6						Agent1	Agent2
4	3	6.8	6.4					Mean	8.25	8.683333333
5	4	9.5	9.8					Variance	1.059091	1.077878788
6	5	8.7	9.3					Observations	12	12
7	6	6.9	7.6					Pearson Correlation	0.901056	
8	7	7.5	8.2					Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
9	8	7.1	7.7					df	11	
10	9	8.7	9.4					t Stat	-3.26394	
11	10	9.4	8.9					P(T<=t) one-tail	0.003773	
12	11	9.4	9.7					t Critical one-tail	1.795885	
13	12	8.1	9.1					P(T<=t) two-tail	0.007546	
14								t Critical two-tail	2.200985	
15										
16								Difference in means	-0.43333	
17										
18						Exercise	7.1 One tailed test:	To determine whether Filter Agent 1 is significant		
19								Agent 2, based on data from 12 matched batches. A	_	aired-sample t-
20								test was conducted to test this h		
21								H0:μd =0(No difference in mean effectiveness)		
22								$H1:\mu d>0$ (Filter Agent 1 is more effective than Agent 2)		: 2)
23								where d =Agent 1 – Agen		
24								For a one-tailed test at the 5% significance lev	el α =0.05 α an	d df = 11 t
25								critical=+1.796		
26								The observed value $t=-3.27$ lies fa	r below zero.	
27								Corresponding p-value ≈ 0.901 , meaning there is		bability that
28								Agent 1 exceeds Agent		
29								Since t <tcritical and="" p="">0.05</tcritical>		
30 31								Fail to reject H0		
32								_		
33								There is no statistical evidence to support that Fil-		
34								than Filter Agent 2.In fact, the negative mean differ		indicates that
35								Agent 2 performed slightly better	on average.	
36								-		
37								At the 5% level of significance:		
38								-		
39								The observed results suggest that Filter Agent 2 c		
40								affectiveness readings than Agent 1 Hence conduct	ing a one-taile	nd tast for Agant
41										
42										
43										
44						Exercise	7.3 Two tailed test:	H0:μd=0(No mean difference betwee	en imnurities	1
45							3 - 11 3 - 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$H1:\mu d \neq 0$ (Mean impurity differs between the agents)		·
46								where d=Agent 1-Agen	_	-7
47								- mere w rigener rigen	- -	
48								For a two-tailed test a	+	
49								α =0.05 tcritical=±2.20		
50								Computed $ t =3.27>2.201$ so we reject $H0$		
51								p-value ≈ 0.0075 (two-tailed).		
52								At the 5% significance le		
53								At the 370 significance le	v C1.	
54								The mean impurity level for Filter Agent 1 (mean	- 9 25) difford	e cignificantly
55								from that of Filter Agent 2 (mean		significality
- 55								irom mai of Fliter Agent 2 Imea	ш = δ.bö l.	

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	J				
56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65								The negative mean difference (-0.433) indicates that Agent 1 yields slightly					
57								lower impurity levels on average than Agent 2.					
58													
59								Thus, there is strong evidence that the population mean impurity differs between the two agents, with Agent 1 performing marginally better (i.e., producing purer					
60													
61								output).					
62													
63													
64													
65													