```
(WE(T-Ti)=E(Ti)-E(Ti)=Ti-Ti (unbiased)
  Var (7-72) = Var ( 9+ - 9+ - 72+ + 9+1)
                  = Var ( \ \ 74 - \ \ 5+)
                  = Var ( \(\frac{\gamma_{14}}{\gamma_{1}}\) + Var (\(\frac{\gamma_{24}}{\gamma_{2}}\)
                   = 602+602
  Ho: \tau_1 - \tau_2 = 0 H_{\alpha}: \tau_1 - \tau_2 \neq 0
d = \frac{c_1 - c_2 - 0}{c_1 - c_2} = \frac{3c_2 - \frac{3c_2}{2}}{1.049J_{\frac{5}{2}}} = -1.206 \quad D \sim t_{10-5-2-1+2} = t_4
  p-value=PLD>fd[)=2(1-P(DCd))=0.294
  We have no evidence reject Ho. Hence there is no difference between the effects of treatments.
 (b) Q = \# of blocks - 1 = 4
      b=#9 trts-1=1
      C=N-9+C=10-5-2-112=4
      d=a+6+C=4+1+4=9
      e= SSTOT - SSLLK - SSLVE=76-70-1.6=4.4
      f = SSblk = 70 = 17.5
     y = \frac{MSire}{MSires} = \frac{1.6}{1.1} = 1.4545
      h= P(F>15.9091)=1-P(F=15.9091)=0.01008
  (C) Since the p-value of Ti-Tz=0 is large, we have no evidence against Ho which is there is no
  difference botneen the effects of the treatment Hence
 (d) H_0: T_1 = T_2 = T_3 = \beta_1 = \dots = \beta_k = 0 Hai are least f = \frac{(SUL+5Sert)}{7} = \frac{80.4 + 11.6}{21.2} = 6.819, F \sim F_{7.11}
                                             Hai at least one of them are not 0.
  p-Value = P(F>f) = 1-P(F<f) = 0.0027} from r 1-pt(6.89,711)
 There is tons of evidence reject Ho. Not all averages across the rows and colours are the same.
```