## STAT 403/603 Midterm, Spring 2020

Full Name:

## Student ID:

1. (10 marks) The following are data collected from a randomized paired comparison design that aims at finding out if treatment B produces high response than treatment A.

A	В	A	B	A	B	Ho:	Α	ጷ	B	same;	
13	16	A 12	11	8	10	Ha:	В	is	6.	etter than A	•

(a) (5 marks) Find the p-value from the paired randomization test.

(b) (5 marks) If this were actually a completely randomized design, obtain the *p*-value from an appropriate randomization test.

Solution: For randomization tests, the testing statistic is defined to be the difference of two treatment means, i.e.  $D = \overline{Y}B - \overline{Y}A$ , where  $\overline{Y}B$  is the average of obs. from treatment B, and  $\overline{Y}A$  is the average of obs. from treatment A. Dobs =  $\frac{1}{3}(16+11+10) - \frac{1}{3}(13+12+8) = \frac{1}{3}$ .

- (a). In a paired design, randomization is done by switching treatment labels "A" and "B" in each block. In our case, there are  $2^3 = 8$  possible treatment assignments. If Ho is true, then one of them yields a D value larger than Dobs: [ABBA] and one of them yields a D value equal to Dobs: [ABBA] (same as given). Thus, p-value =  $p(D>Dobs) + \frac{1}{2}p(D=Dobs) = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{16} \approx 0.187$ .
- (b). If the design is not paired, then the randomization is done by randomly picking 3 to assign "A" and the rest to assign "B". Among the  $\binom{b}{3} = 20$  treatment assignments, 5 of them give D values larger than Dobs: ABBAAB, BBAAAB, AABBAB, BBABAA, BBBAAA; two of them give D values identical to Dobs: BBAABA, ABABAB. Therefore, the p-value =  $P(D>D_{obs}) + \frac{1}{2}P(D=D_{obs}) = \frac{5}{20} + \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{2}{20} = 0.3$ .

2. (10 marks) Data were collected to compare two treatments A and B with the following summary results:

$$A m = 5 \bar{Y}_A = 8 S_1^2 = 1.5$$
  
 $B n = 3 \bar{Y}_B = 6 S_2^2 = 1.0$ 

- (a) (5 marks) At level  $\alpha = 0.01$ , conduct an appropriate test to compare the two treatments.
- (b) (5 marks) Suppose there is another observation Y = 7 from treatment B. Re-do part(a) using all available data.

## Solution:

Dearte the 5 observations from treatment A by  $Y_A^{(1)}$ ,...,  $Y_A^{(m)}$   $\stackrel{iid}{\sim}$   $N(\mu_A, \sigma^2)$ , m=5; and the 3 observations from treatment B by  $Y_B^{(1)}$ ,...,  $Y_B^{(m)}$   $\stackrel{iid}{\sim}$   $N(\mu_A, \sigma^2)$ , m>5. We wish to test the:  $\mu_A=\mu_B$  v.s. Ha:  $\mu_A$ 

(b). If there is an adolitional observation 
$$Y=7$$
 from treatment B.

Then 
$$Y_{8} = \frac{1}{n+1} [nY_{8} + Y] = \frac{1}{4} [3 \times 6 + 7] = 6.25$$
;

$$(S_{2}^{2})' = \frac{1}{n+1-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{B}^{i} - \overline{Y}_{B}^{i})^{2} + (Y - \overline{Y}_{B}^{i})^{2} \right] = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{B}^{i} + Y^{2} - (n+1)(\overline{Y}_{B}^{i})^{2} \right]$$
 (\*)

Note that

$$S_{2}^{2} = \frac{1}{n-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{8}^{(i)} - \bar{Y}_{8})^{2} \right] = \frac{1}{n-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{8}^{(i)} - n \bar{Y}_{8}^{2} \right]$$

=> 
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} {r_{i}^{(i)^{2}}} = (n-1) S_{2}^{2} + n \overline{r_{k}^{2}} = 2 \times 1 + 3 \times 6^{2} = 110$$
.

$$T'_{\text{obs}} = \frac{6.25 - 8}{\sqrt{(\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{6}) \times (4 \times 1.5 + 3 \times 0.9167)/7}} = -2.33,$$

hence |T'obs | < to.ors, 7 = 3.50. => We still cannot reject to at 1% level.

(ii). If we choose F-test, note that 
$$\overline{Y}' = \frac{5}{7} \times 8 + \frac{4}{9} \times 6.55 = 7.22$$

$$\overline{F}'_{obs} = \frac{\left[5 \times (8 - 7.22)^2 + 4 \times (6.55 - 7.22)^2\right]/i}{\left[4 \times 1.5 + 3 \times 0.9167\right]/7} = \frac{6.81}{1.25} = 5.448$$

which is less than Fo. 01, 1, 7 = 12.25.

Therefore, we still count reject to at 1% level.

3. (10 marks) The following data were collected from an interlaboratory calibration check. Each of the laboratories (A, B and C) was sent a sample of some standard wire. The results obtained from their horizontal tension testing machines were as follows:

A	48	50		
В	51	52	50	
C	50	50	48	52

- (a) (5 marks) At 5% level, compare the three laboratories.
- (b) (5 marks) Another objective of the study is to compare laboratory A with the average of laboratories B and C. Answer this question using a suitable contrast. You may use  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

(a). Label the three laboratories 
$$A, B, C$$
 by  $1, 2, 3$ , respectively. Denote the j-th observation in the i-th laboratory by  $Y_{ij}$ . Suppose  $Y_{ij} \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2)$ . To assess Ho:  $\mu_i = \mu_2 = \mu_3$  v.s. Ha:  $\mu_i$  not the same. We else  $F$ -test. 
$$F = \frac{SStr4}{SSerr} / \text{olfers}$$
, where 
$$\begin{cases} SStr4 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_i \left( \overline{Y}_{i}, -\overline{Y}_{i}. \right)^2 \\ \text{olfers} = 1 \\ \text{olfers} = 1 \\ \text{olfers} = N-t \end{cases}$$

$$\bar{f}_{obs} = \frac{\left[2x(\psi_1^0 - 50.11)^2 + 3x(51 - 50.11)^2 + 4x(50 - 50.11)^2\right]/(3-1)}{\left[(\psi_8 - 50.11)^2 + (50 - 50.11)^2 + ... + (52 - 50.11)^2\right]/(q-3)} = 1.22 < \bar{f}_{0.05,2,6} = 5.14$$

Therefore, we cannot say the three laboratories are different at 1% level.

(b). The objective of the study is equivalent to assess whether  $\theta = \mu_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 - \mu_1)$  equals to 0. Then  $\theta$  can be estimated by  $\hat{\theta} = \tilde{Y}_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{Y}_2 + \tilde{Y}_1) = -1.5$ (See Tutorial Notes) with variance  $Var(\hat{\theta}) = \left[\frac{1}{2} + (-\frac{1}{2})\frac{1}{3} + (-\frac{1}{2})\frac{1}{4}\right] \sigma^2 = \frac{3}{2} \sigma^2$ , where  $\sigma^2$  can be estimated by  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{2} \sigma^2$ , and stand error  $se(\hat{\theta}) = \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{$ 

Here Tobs = -1.52 => |Tobs = +1.32 < to.o.s, 6 = 2.45, do not reject to at 5% level.

- 4. (10 marks) A randomized block design was used to compare several treatments. Suppose that the treatment averages are 43, 45, 49, 47, and 51.
- (a) (5 marks) Complete the following ANOVA table. Show your work.

source	SS	df
treatment	240	4
block	928	5
error	160	20
total	1250	29

Solution: 
$$\overline{7}_{..} = \frac{1}{5} (43+45+49+47+51)=47$$
, number of blocks  $b=5+1=6$ 

SStrt =  $b[(43-47)^2+(45-47)^2+...+(51-47)^2]=240$ ; SSblk=SStotal-SStrt-SSerr=850.

Offire =  $t-1=5-1=4$  (  $t=$  number of treatments)

Offirer = olftreatment × olfblock = 20.

Olftotal = olftreatment + olfblock = 20.

(b) At 5% level, is there any difference in the treatments? How would your analysis have been different if the experiment had not been blocked?

Solution. (i) 
$$F = \frac{8 \text{ Streatment}}{8 \text{ Streatment}} / \text{ Of treatment}} \sim F$$
 deferences, deferror  $F_{\text{obs}} = \frac{24 \text{ o}/4}{16 \text{ o}/20} = 7.5 > F_{\text{o.os.}}, 4.20 = 2.87$ . Thus at 5% level, there are some differences in the treatments.

(ii) If the experiment had not been blocked, 
$$SSerror = SSblock + SSerror = 850 + 160 = 1010;$$
 
$$olferror = olfblock + olferror = 5 + 20 = 25.$$
 Thus, 
$$\overline{F}_{obs} = \frac{240/4}{1010/25} = 1.49 < \overline{F}_{0.05,4,25} = 2.76.$$

Therefore, at 5% level we cannot say there are differences in treatments.