1. Consider the following BIBD for 3 treatments (indicated in the following table) with blocks of size 2:

Block						
1	2	3	4	5	6	
1 3	2 3	12	13	2 3	12	

5 (a) What are the values of r and λ for this design?

5 (b) Under the assumptions that $(\tau_1 = \tau_2 + 1 = \tau_3 + 2)$ and $(\sigma = 2)$ completely characterize the distribution of the F statistic used to test for equality of the three treatments.

blocks
$$\leq \sum (x-\bar{x})^2 = 2$$
, times $= 8$, times $\frac{1}{4(4-1)} = 6$

result Θ
 $E'(2,4,1\frac{1}{2})$
 $E'(2,4,1\frac{1}{2})$

 \leq (c) Suppose the sum-of-squares for "blocks ignoring treatments" and "treatments after correction for blocks" are each equal to 00 and the corrected total sum-of-squares is 240 Compute the F-statistic that would be used to test $Hyp_0: \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3$.

(d) Suppose we had fitted the model "backward", finding sums-of-squares for "treatments ignoring blocks" and "blocks after correction for treatments" (e.g. acting as if the τ 's were nuisance parameters and the β 's were the parameters of interest to the experimenter). Given the information in the previous problem part, what can you say about the values of these two sums-of-squares?

- (e) Suppose now that an inter-block analysis had been performed for this experiment.
 - i. What is the fundamental assumption that is necessary for this analysis, that is not required for the intra-block analysis?

ii. How many degrees of freedom would be used for a t-quantile needed for a confidence interval for $\tau_1 - \tau_2$ based only on the inter-block analysis?

(f) Suppose that only blocks 1, 3, 4, and 6 were actually executed (or that the data from blocks 2 and 5 were lost). What treatment contrasts (i.e. contrasts of τ_1 , τ_2 and τ_3) are estimable in an inter-block analysis? Write the *full* model matrix that would be used for this analysis and defend your answer using this.

- 2. Recall that in Homework 6, we discussed a split-plot experiment involving steel bars. The final part of that problem involved expanding the experiment to include three different levels or strata of experimental units. Here is a short description of that setting, with some of the details changed:
 - Experimental factors of interest are the type of steel used in the bar (4 levels), the temperature at which the steel is treated in the furnace (3 levels), and the type of coating applied to each bar (2 levels).
 - For each type of steel, two batches of uncoated bars are received. (For clarity, each "batch" contains
 - 12 bars.) 48 betches 48 groups of bars (2 bars each). A group of bars is processed one run of the furnace, which has been randomly set to one of the 3 temperatures, under the constraint that each temperature is used for 2 of the 6 groups of bars in a batch.
 - For the pair of bars from the same batch and treated with the same run of the furnace, a coin-flip is used to determine which is coated with coating 1 and which with coating 2.
 - Hint: Note that coating is applied to an individual bar, temperature is applied to a batch of bars, and that steel type is a property of a batch of bars. Steel type wasn't really "applied to" the batch as required in a true experiment, but answer the questions here as if this were the case.
- (a) Construct the "source" and "degrees of freedom" columns for the appropriate split-split-plot ANOVA table. Indicate which residual mean square would be used in the denominator for testing wach of the 7 treatment main effects and interactions in the $4 \times 3 \times 2$ factorial treatment structure.

Stertum	Source	$\overline{g_{\mathcal{L}}}$	
1	steel (S)	3	
	resid	H	
	Ct. (betch)	7	
2	Lemp (T)	z l	(5)
	SXT'	6	
	resid	32	
	Et (group)	47]	
3	Cost (0)	i	
	546	3 (59)
	コメア	2 \	
	SXTXC	6_	
	resid	36	
	(fr (pr-)	95	

(b) Suppose it were determined that batch of bars could not be regarded as random, but could still be assumed not to interact with treatments. What factorial effects (e.g. groups of main effects and interactions) could still be tested?

(c) Suppose it were determined that neither batch of bars nor furnace run could be regarded as random, but could still be assumed not to interact with treatments. What factorial effects (e.g., groups of main effects and interactions) could still be tested?

3. Consider a 2⁵ factorial experiment in which each treatment is applied to r = 2 experimental units. The investigators select a reduced model for their analysis; the estimates of the factorial effects they will include in their model are:

$$\widehat{\alpha}=2 \quad \ \widehat{\beta}=2 \quad \ \widehat{(\alpha\beta)}=1 \quad \ \widehat{(\alpha\gamma)}=1 \quad \ \widehat{(\alpha\delta)}=1 \quad \ \widehat{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}=-1$$

and the corrected total sum-of-squares from their analysis is 968.

10 (a) Complete the following partial ANOVA decomposition as indicated:

Source	degrees of freedom	sum of squares	_
Treatments	6	768	4
Residual		200	
Corrected Total	63	968	_ /
	64.422	5 + 1 + 1 +	12 + 6-15]

With Using the proposed model, what is the variance of the least-squares estimate of $\mu_{22222} - \mu_{11122}$? (Write this as a number times σ^2 .)

- 10 (c) What effects would have to be added to the proposed model in order to satisfy:
 - i. the hierarchy principle?

ii. the heredity principle?

nme