| (a) A 90% (I. Is 
$$\mu t t_{1}^{\infty}$$
,  $C \sim N(0)$ )

= 2059 ± 1645  $\frac{C}{N_{1}}$ 

= [2008, 21.10]

(b) We want a 90% (I. I with width 0.1)

1 bes  $\frac{12}{3\pi} \le 0$  |

 $\sqrt{197}$ 
 $\sqrt{197}$ 

= 14839-12 409 ± 2 206  $\frac{9}{\sqrt{9}}$ 

= 1-3 94 8.81]

Since we are  $95\%$  confidence that the true value of the difference lies in this interval we conclude that the two diets do not have much difference

3. Ho: Marke the two diets do not have much difference

3. Ho:  $\mu_{1}$ 
 $\mu_{2}$ 
 $\mu_{3}$ 
 $\mu_{1}$ 
 $\mu_{2}$ 
 $\mu_{3}$ 
 $\mu_{3}$ 
 $\mu_{3}$ 
 $\mu_{4}$ 
 $\mu_{5}$ 
 $\mu_{5$ 

= 1- P(D< 1.413)

There is evidence reject Ho

4.(a) Let 
$$w = \sum_{i,j} V_{i,j}^2 + \lambda CT_i + T_2$$
)  
 $= \sum_{i,j} (y_{i,j} - \mu - T_i)^2 + \lambda (T_i + T_2)$   
 $= \sum_{i,j} (y_{i,j} - \mu - T_i)^2 + \sum_{i,j} (y_{i,j} - \mu - T_2)^2 + \lambda (T_i + T_2)$ 

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \mu} = 2\sum_{ij} (y_{ij} - \mu - \tau_i)$$

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \tau} = -2 \sum_{j} (y_{ij} - \mu - \tau_{ij}) + \lambda$$

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t_i} = -2 \sum_j (y_{2j} - \mu - \tau_i) + \lambda$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \lambda} = \mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2$$

(b) 
$$E(\widetilde{\tau}_{t}) = E(\overline{\gamma}_{t} - \overline{\gamma}_{t+})$$

$$= E(\sum_{j=1}^{5} \frac{Y_{ij}}{5} - \sum_{ij} \frac{Y_{ij}}{10})$$

$$=\frac{1}{5}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{5}\mathcal{U}^{+}T_{i}\right)-\frac{1}{5}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{5}\mathcal{U}^{+}T_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{5}\mathcal{U}^{+}T_{i}\right)$$
 Since  $E(\mathcal{L}_{i})=0$   $\forall$   $i,j$ 

= 
$$\frac{1}{5}(5\mu+5\tau_1)-\frac{1}{6}lo\mu$$
 Since  $\tau_1+\tau_2=0$ 

Since E(?,)=Ti, ?; is unbiased.

= 
$$Var(\overline{Y}_{1t}) + Var(\overline{Y}_{2t})$$
 Since independent

$$=\frac{1}{25} Var\left(\sum_{j=1}^{5} R_{(j)}\right) + \frac{1}{25} Var\left(\sum_{j=1}^{5} R_{2j}\right)$$

