

Assessment of Permanent Marker Removal Methods



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Professor Ramya Thinniyam
Statistics Department
April 4, 2019

GROUP 4

SEAN BERRY 1000014245
CHEN YAN MICHAEL CHOU 1003212926
ADITYA DHANKAR 999857436
PAVENDEEP KAINTH 1003447969
VLAD SHUVALOV 1000853150
TANYA WOLOSHANSKY 994564011

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Names and Descriptions of Investigational Products	1
2	Study Objective and Hypothesis	1
2.1	Objectives	1
2.2	Hypothesis	1
3	Study Design and Rationale	1
3.1	Description of Study Design	1
3.2	Methodology	2
4	Results	2
5	Limitations	3
6	Conclusions	3
7	References	3
8	Appendix	4

1 Introduction

Permanent markers are markers that are used to create permanent markings on objects. One of the hallmark characteristics of a permanent marker is its stubbornness to being erased which makes it impervious to a multitude of removal methods. This could potentially cause unwanted defects and imprints all over undesirable locations. To combat this issue, we have decided to test multiple products that have been rumored to have some effects on removing permanent markings. In order to test the effectiveness of each product, an experiment was conducted. In this report, we thoroughly discuss the effectiveness of the different removal products using statistical analysis and make conclusions based off of those results.

1.1 Names and Descriptions of Investigational Products

In this experiment, we test the removal methods against a streak made by a black Sharpie marker. The streak will be made on 2 (two) different surface materials; white tiling and a whiteboard. We will be testing 4 (four) different removal methods. The four removal methods are:

- Dollar Store brand acetone based nail polish remover.
- Room temperature, undistilled Nestle natural spring water.
- Clorox bleach cleaner - spray variant.
- Greenworks natural all-purpose cleaner - spray variant.

In addition to the main removal products, we also used the following products to aid us in the investigation. These products were kept constant throughout the experiment. The additional products are:

- Generic brand, brown paper napkins.
- Dollar store brand, 500 mL spray bottles.

2 Study Objective and Hypothesis

2.1 Objectives

To evaluate the effectiveness of the 4 (four) different removal methods and to determine whether the surface on which the markings are made has an effect on the removal difficulty (interaction effect).

2.2 Hypothesis

Due to the chemical composition of permanent markers, they can be vulnerable to a variety of organic compounds. We believe that removal methods that contain higher concentrations of chemical will be more effective than those with lower concentrations, regardless of whether the surface is tile or the whiteboard. This leads us to hypothesize that the Nail Polish remover (99% acetone) will be more effective than Clorox bleach cleaner (1-5% bleach), Clorox Greenworks (unknown composition) and the control group water respectively.

3 Study Design and Rationale

3.1 Description of Study Design

We will begin by making identical 8cm lines on both a white board and on our tile squares. The marker line is then photographed and allowed to dry for a period of one minute. At this point, our wiper (Paven) will receive a clean paper towel that has one spritz of a cleaner (sprayed by the same person throughout the experiment) that is unknown to him. The wiper will then wipe the marker line exactly twice, starting from the bottom. We then repeat the process three times for each cleaner on each surface type. Using

the two-way ANOVA sample size adjustment in figure 4 (appendix), we wish to achieve a power of 0.8 at the 0.05 significance level, so we need 48 samples. However, due to time and monetary constraints, we decided to cut the sample size in half for a total of 24 observations. Finally, we will use an image processing system to quantify the differences in marker intensity, our response variable (the higher the value the better).

This is a blinded, randomized, fully crossed and balanced two factor between-subjects design. Both the sprayer and the wiper do not know the chemical they are dealing with (blinding). Each 8 cm marker line was numbered from 1-24, and randomly assigned through a random number generator to a treatment (randomization). All treatment combinations were available in this experiment (fully-crossed) and every treatment had the same number of units (balanced), but not all sample units were able to receive all the treatments (between-subjects).

3.2 Methodology

Target Population	Permanent Marker Brands
Experimental Unit	One 8 cm ink line drawn by a permanent marker
Factor A	Removal Method: Nail Polish Remover (NP), Clorox Cleaner (CC), Water (W), Green Cleaner (GC)
Factor B	Surface Material: Tile, Whiteboard
Treatment	(NP, Tile), (NP, Whiteboard), (CC, Tile), (CC, Whiteboard), (W, Tile), (W, Whiteboard), (GC, Tile), (GC, Whiteboard)
Response	Difference in raw score based off of the app “ImageJ” (measures how much ink was wiped off)

4 Results

Before we actually looked at our models, we first applied Cook’s distance to make sure we didn’t have any outliers affecting our response variable in figure 6 (appendix). Because there are no values greater than 1, we know there are no outliers and we can proceed to analyze our models. Since we have a two factor design, we checked for interaction effects. We examined the interaction plot and analyzed the R output of the interaction model. The results are illustrated in figures 1 and 2(appendix).




Figure 1: Interaction Plot

Notice that in the our interaction plot we observe intersecting lines. However, after analyzing the interactive model summary we see the difference in means of whiteboard material is not statistically significant. Hence, we make the assumption that there is no interaction.

We next fit an additive model to see the main effects of our factors in figure 3 (appendix).

After analyzing the additive model summary, we notice only the nail polish remover is statistically significant at the 5% level. Of all the products, we have evidence to suggest that on average, the nail polish remover performs the best when used to clean permanent markings made by permanent markers. In general, if we look at the ANOVA summaries of both the interaction and general additive model in figures 7 and 8 (appendix), we can see that the type of chemical (removal method) used is the only statistically significant factor compared to the material and the interaction between material and chemical. Through the box plot in figure 5 (appendix), we can also clearly see that the nail polish remover, on average, has the highest difference in raw removal score of the ink which confirms our hypothesis.

5 Limitations

- Chemical reaction rate: It's possible if given more time to interact with the marker, certain cleaners would be more effective.
- Spray bottle variation: Although all bottles were set to the same spray rate, variations in the amount of chemical sprayed may have affected our results. One possible fix could be using an eyedropper instead which has a set volume of liquid coming out.
- Pressure variations in wiping: Although we kept the wiper and number of wipes constant, it is possible there were variations in pressure of wipes affecting our results.
- Marker ink level: We used a single marker to make every single line that we experimented on. Markers are known to be less effective the more they're used. This could mean that the lines created earlier in the experiment might have been stronger and ultimately harder to remove.
- Sample size: As we mentioned earlier, the optimal sample size to retrieve a power of 0.8 in the experiment is 48, but because of the price of tiles and all the cleaning products, we opted to use 24 samples instead. This means the power of our experiment is below 0.8 which increases the chance of us failing to reject the null when the null is true; a type 2 error.

6 Conclusions

In conclusion, our research clearly showed that out of all the permanent marker removal methods tested, the nail polish remover is the most effective. This substantiates our hypothesis that removal methods that contain higher concentrations of chemicals will be more effective than those with lower concentrations, regardless of whether the surface is tile or the whiteboard. If we were to re-conduct this entire research to make it better, we would definitely need to control for more nuisance variables such as chemical reaction rate and spray bottle variation. The effectiveness of a removal method can have a profound effect on the daily lives of people whether its cleaning the bathroom, removing a stain off a shirt, or simply trying to get rid of a permanent marker ink. Through the results of this experiment, companies can consider making more effective removal methods; maybe a more potent form of the chemical compounds found in nail polish removers which could help make cleaning effortless.

7 References

<https://www.rdocumentation.org/>

8 Appendix

```
Call:
lm(formula = Difference ~ Chemical * Material)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-40.237 -12.774   2.071  17.865  46.673

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)      24.222    15.003   1.615   0.1260
ChemicalClorox Cleaner      26.005    21.217   1.226   0.2381
ChemicalGcleaner      28.223    21.217   1.330   0.2021
ChemicalNailpolish     115.387    21.217   5.438 5.47e-05 ***
MaterialWhite Board       3.601    21.217   0.170   0.8674
ChemicalClorox Cleaner:MaterialWhite Board -23.871    30.005  -0.796   0.4379
ChemicalGcleaner:MaterialWhite Board   -9.708    30.005  -0.324   0.7505
ChemicalNailpolish:MaterialWhite Board -53.085    30.005  -1.769   0.0959 .
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 25.99 on 16 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.7492,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.6394
F-statistic: 6.827 on 7 and 16 DF,  p-value: 0.000742
```

Figure 2: Interactive Model Summary

```
Call:
lm(formula = Difference ~ Chemical + Material)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-41.436 -19.034  -1.868  12.338  45.571

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)      35.05     12.04   2.913  0.00893 **
ChemicalClorox Cleaner      14.07     15.22   0.924  0.36697
ChemicalGcleaner      23.37     15.22   1.535  0.14126
ChemicalNailpolish      88.84     15.22   5.836 1.27e-05 ***
MaterialWhite Board     -18.07     10.76  -1.678  0.10968
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 26.37 on 19 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.6933,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.6287
F-statistic: 10.74 on 4 and 19 DF,  p-value: 0.0001009
```

Figure 3: Additive Model Summary

```
Balanced two-way analysis of variance sample size adjustment

a = 4
b = 2
sig.level = 0.05
power = 0.8
n = 6

NOTE: n is number in each group, total sample = 48
```

Figure 4: Sample Size Prediction for Experiment




Figure 5: Chemical Type vs. Score Difference Boxplot

```

15      18      4      16      14      23      19      9      22
4.385205e-05 1.278052e-03 1.779771e-03 2.420083e-03 5.683368e-03 6.249322e-03 7.340161e-03 8.975640e-03 1.235165e-02
11      7      5      17      3      2      21      20      1
1.349988e-02 1.423242e-02 4.343031e-02 4.702129e-02 5.545492e-02 5.960694e-02 6.618871e-02 7.816990e-02 9.189341e-02
6      24      12      8      13      10
9.351741e-02 1.080984e-01 1.127128e-01 1.428195e-01 2.247856e-01 3.024466e-01

```

Figure 6: Cook's Distance for Interaction Model

```

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: Difference
              Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
Chemical      3  27903.3   9301.1  13.7746 0.0001066 ***
Material      1   1958.1   1958.1    2.8999 0.1079276
Chemical:Material 3   2406.6    802.2    1.1881 0.3456851
Residuals    16  10803.7    675.2
---
signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

```

Figure 7: Figure 7: ANOVA for Interaction Model

```

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: Difference
              Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
Chemical      3  27903.3   9301.1  13.3774 6.296e-05 ***
Material      1   1958.1   1958.1    2.8163  0.1097
Residuals    19  13210.4    695.3
---
signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

```

Figure 8: Figure 8: ANOVA for General Additive Model

```

1 setwd("D:\\School Work\\STA305\\Data Analysis") #Set my directory
2
3 install.packages("pwr2")
4 library(pwr2)
5
6 chem <- read.csv("Chemical Data.csv") #read the data
7 chemicaldata <- chem[0:24,0:3] #Clean the dataset
8 chemicaldata <- droplevels(chemicaldata)
9
10 attach(chemicaldata)
11
12 #Changing Reference Group
13 chemicaldata = relevel(chemicaldata, ref="water")
14
15 #Interaction Model
16 model <- lm(Difference ~ Chemical*Material) |
17 summary(model)
18 anova(model)
19
20 #Residual graph for IM
21 plot(model, main= "Chemical/Material Interaction vs. Difference of Removal", which = 2)
22 hist(model$residuals, main= "Chemical/Material Interaction vs. Difference of Removal", xlab = "Interaction Model Residuals")
23
24 #Calculating cook's distance and influential points
25 inf = sort(cooks.distance(model))
26 inf
27
28 #General Additive Model
29 model2 <- lm(Difference ~ Chemical + Material)
30 summary(model2)
31 anova(model2)
32
33 #Residual graph for GAM
34 plot(model2, main= "Chemical and Material vs. Difference of Removal", which = 2)
35 hist(model2$residuals, main= "Chemical and Material vs. Difference of Removal", xlab = "General Additive Model Residual")
36
37 #Calculating cook's distance and influential points
38 inf = sort(cooks.distance(model2))
39 inf
40
41 #Boxplots
42 boxplot(Difference~Chemical, xlab="Chemical Type", ylab="Difference of Removal", ylim=c(0, 200), main="Chemical vs. Difference of Removal")
43 boxplot(Difference~Material, xlab="Material", ylab="Difference of Removal", ylim=c(0, 200), main="Material vs. Difference of Removal")
44
45 #Two Sample t-test + Barplot for Material
46 means = c(mean(Difference[Material == "white Board"]), mean(Difference[Material == "tile"]))
47 Differences.Material = data.frame(means, c("white Board", "tile"))
48 t.test(Difference[Material == "white Board"], Difference[Material == "tile"], var.equal = FALSE)
49
50 #Sample Size Prediction
51 ss.2way(a=4, b=2, alpha=0.05, beta=0.2, f.A=0.5, f.B=0.5, B=100)

```

Figure 9: R Code