

2nd Homework

Due: May 21th 18:00

1. A process is in statistical control with $\bar{\bar{x}} = 199$ and $\bar{R} = 3.5$. The control chart uses a sample size of $n = 4$. Specifications are at 200 ± 8 . The quality characteristic is normally distributed.

a. Estimate the potential capability of the process.

$$\hat{\sigma} = \bar{R}/d_2 = 3.5/2.059 = 1.7$$

$$C_p = \frac{USL - LSL}{6\hat{\sigma}} = \frac{208 - 192}{6 \times 1.7} = 1.569$$

b. Estimate the actual process capability.

$$C_{pu} = \frac{208 - 199}{3 \times 1.7} = 1.765$$

$$C_{pl} = \frac{199 - 192}{3 \times 1.7} = 1.373$$

$$C_{pk} = \min(C_{pu}, C_{pl}) = 1.373$$

c. How much improvement could be made in process performance if the mean could be centered at the nominal value?

$$1.569 - 1.373 = 0.196$$

2. A normally distributed process has specifications of $LSL = 75$ and $USL = 85$ on the output. A random sample of 25 parts indicates that the process is centered at the middle of the specification band, and the standard deviation is $s = 1.5$. Calculate a point estimate of the process capability index of C_p .

$$C_p = \frac{85 - 75}{6 \times 1.5} = 1.11$$

3. The molecular weight of a particular polymer should fall between 2,100 and 2,350. Fifty samples of this material were analyzed with the results $\bar{x} = 2,275$ and $s = 60$. Assume that the molecular weight is normally distributed. Calculate a point estimate of C_{pk} .

$$C_{pu} = \frac{2350 - 2275}{3 \times 60} = 0.417$$

$$C_{pl} = \frac{2275 - 2100}{3 \times 60} = 0.972$$

$$C_{pk} = \min(C_{pu}, C_{pl}) = 0.417$$

4. A machine is used to fill cans with motor oil additive. A single sample can is selected every hour, and the weight of the can is obtained. Since the filling process is automated, it has very stable variability, and long experience indicates that $\sigma = 0.05$ oz.

The individual observations for 24 hours of operation are shown in the following Table.

| Sample Number | x | Sample Number | x |
|---------------|------|---------------|------|
| 1 | 8 | 13 | 8.05 |
| 2 | 8.01 | 14 | 8.04 |
| 3 | 8.02 | 15 | 8.03 |
| 4 | 8.01 | 16 | 8.05 |
| 5 | 8 | 17 | 8.06 |
| 6 | 8.01 | 18 | 8.04 |
| 7 | 8.06 | 19 | 8.05 |
| 8 | 8.07 | 20 | 8.06 |
| 9 | 8.01 | 21 | 8.04 |
| 10 | 8.04 | 22 | 8.02 |
| 11 | 8.02 | 23 | 8.03 |
| 12 | 8.01 | 24 | 8.05 |

a. Assuming that the process target is 8.02 oz, set up a tabular CUSUM for this process. Design the CUSUM using the standardized values $h = 4.77$ and $k = 0.5$.

$$H = 4.77 \times 0.05 = 0.2385$$

$$K = 0.5 \times 0.05 = 0.025$$

| #4 | H | 0.2385 | K | 0.025 | | | |
|----|------|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|----|----|
| | x | x - 8.045 | C+ | N+ | 7.995 - x | C- | N- |
| | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 1 | 8 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 | -0.005 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 8.01 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 8.02 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 8.01 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 8 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 | -0.005 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 8.01 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.06 | 0.015 | 0.015 | 1 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 8.07 | 0.025 | 0.04 | 2 | -0.075 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 8.01 | -0.035 | 0.005 | 3 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 8.04 | -0.005 | 0 | 0 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 8.02 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 8.01 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 8.05 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 1 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 8.04 | -0.005 | 0 | 0 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 8.03 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 8.05 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 1 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 8.06 | 0.015 | 0.02 | 2 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 8.04 | -0.005 | 0.015 | 3 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 8.05 | 0.005 | 0.02 | 4 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 8.06 | 0.015 | 0.035 | 5 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 8.04 | -0.005 | 0.03 | 6 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 8.02 | -0.025 | 0.005 | 7 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 8.03 | -0.015 | 0 | 0 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 8.05 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 1 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |

b. Does the value of $\sigma = 0.05$ seem reasonable for this process?

Yes.

filling process 가 stable variability와 long experience를 가지고 있기 때문.

5. Rework Problem 4 using the standardized CUSUM parameters of $h = 8.01$ and $k = 0.25$. Compare the results with those obtained previously in Exercise 4.a. What can you say about the performance of those two CUSUM schemes?

| #5 | H | 0.4005 | K | 0.0125 | | | |
|----|------|------------|--------|--------|------------|--------|----|
| | x | x - 8.0225 | C+ | N+ | 8.0175 - x | C- | N- |
| | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 1 | 8 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 | 0.0175 | 0.0175 | 1 |
| 2 | 8.01 | -0.0125 | 0 | 0 | 0.0075 | 0.025 | 2 |
| 3 | 8.02 | -0.0025 | 0 | 0 | -0.0025 | 0.0225 | 3 |
| 4 | 8.01 | -0.0125 | 0 | 0 | 0.0075 | 0.03 | 4 |
| 5 | 8 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 | 0.0175 | 0.0475 | 5 |
| 6 | 8.01 | -0.0125 | 0 | 0 | 0.0075 | 0.055 | 6 |
| 7 | 8.06 | 0.0375 | 0.0375 | 1 | -0.0425 | 0.0125 | 7 |
| 8 | 8.07 | 0.0475 | 0.085 | 2 | -0.0525 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 8.01 | -0.0125 | 0.0725 | 3 | 0.0075 | 0.0075 | 1 |
| 10 | 8.04 | 0.0175 | 0.09 | 4 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 8.02 | -0.0025 | 0.0875 | 5 | -0.0025 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 8.01 | -0.0125 | 0.075 | 6 | 0.0075 | 0.0075 | 1 |
| 13 | 8.05 | 0.0275 | 0.1025 | 7 | -0.0325 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 8.04 | 0.0175 | 0.12 | 8 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 8.03 | 0.0075 | 0.1275 | 9 | -0.0125 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 8.05 | 0.0275 | 0.155 | 10 | -0.0325 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 8.06 | 0.0375 | 0.1925 | 11 | -0.0425 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 8.04 | 0.0175 | 0.21 | 12 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 8.05 | 0.0275 | 0.2375 | 13 | -0.0325 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 8.06 | 0.0375 | 0.275 | 14 | -0.0425 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 8.04 | 0.0175 | 0.2925 | 15 | -0.0225 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 8.02 | -0.0025 | 0.29 | 16 | -0.0025 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 8.03 | 0.0075 | 0.2975 | 17 | -0.0125 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 8.05 | 0.0275 | 0.325 | 18 | -0.0325 | 0 | 0 |

둘 다 m -control을 나타내지만,

#5에서 k 가 감소해서 더 작은 upward shift를 빠르게 감지할 것이고,

k 가 큰 #9가 더 보수적인 감지를 할 것이다.

#5는 아직 out-of-control인 포인트가 발생하지 않았지만,

누적값이 계속 증가하고 있는 것을 확인할 수 있다.

6. Reconsider the data in Problem 4. Suppose the data there represent observations taken immediately after a process adjustment that was intended to reset the process to a target of $\mu_0 = 8.00$. Set up and apply an FIR CUSUM to monitor this process

| #6 | H | 0.2385 | K | 0.025 | | | |
|----|------|-----------|---------|-------|-----------|---------|----|
| | x | x - 8.025 | C+ | N+ | 7.975 - x | C- | N- |
| | | | 0.11925 | | | 0.11925 | |
| 1 | 8 | -0.025 | 0.09425 | 1 | -0.025 | 0.09425 | 1 |
| 2 | 8.01 | -0.015 | 0.07925 | 2 | -0.035 | 0.05925 | 2 |
| 3 | 8.02 | -0.005 | 0.07425 | 3 | -0.045 | 0.01425 | 3 |
| 4 | 8.01 | -0.015 | 0.05925 | 4 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 8 | -0.025 | 0.03425 | 5 | -0.025 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 8.01 | -0.015 | 0.01925 | 6 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.06 | 0.035 | 0.05425 | 7 | -0.085 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 8.07 | 0.045 | 0.09925 | 8 | -0.095 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 8.01 | -0.015 | 0.08425 | 9 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 8.04 | 0.015 | 0.09925 | 10 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 8.02 | -0.005 | 0.09425 | 11 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 8.01 | -0.015 | 0.07925 | 12 | -0.035 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 8.05 | 0.025 | 0.10425 | 13 | -0.075 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 8.04 | 0.015 | 0.11925 | 14 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 8.03 | 0.005 | 0.12425 | 15 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 8.05 | 0.025 | 0.14925 | 16 | -0.075 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 8.06 | 0.035 | 0.18425 | 17 | -0.085 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 8.04 | 0.015 | 0.19925 | 18 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 8.05 | 0.025 | 0.22425 | 19 | -0.075 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 8.06 | 0.035 | 0.25925 | 20 | -0.085 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 8.04 | 0.015 | 0.27425 | 21 | -0.065 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 8.02 | -0.005 | 0.26925 | 22 | -0.045 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 8.03 | 0.005 | 0.27425 | 23 | -0.055 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 8.05 | 0.025 | 0.29925 | 24 | -0.075 | 0 | 0 |

FIR을 적용하면 더욱 빠르게 out-of-control을 감지할 수 있다.

∴ process adjustment fail

7. Bath concentrations are measured hourly in a chemical process. Data (in ppm) for the last 32 hours are shown in Table (read down from left).

Table Bath Concentration

| | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 160 | 186 | 190 | 206 |
| 158 | 195 | 189 | 210 |
| 150 | 179 | 185 | 216 |
| 151 | 184 | 182 | 212 |
| 153 | 175 | 181 | 211 |
| 154 | 192 | 180 | 202 |
| 158 | 186 | 183 | 205 |
| 162 | 197 | 186 | 197 |

The process target is $\mu_0 = 175$ ppm.

a. Estimate the process standard deviation.

$$\text{process mean} = \sum x_i / n = 183.594$$

$$\text{process std} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}} = 19.434$$

- b. Construct a tabular CUSUM for this process using standardized values of $h = 5$ and $k = 1$

| #7 | target | 175 | std | 19.43 | H | 97.15 | K | 19.43 |
|----|--------|------------|---------------|-------|------------|-------|----|-------|
| | x | x - 194.43 | C+ | N+ | 155.57 - x | C- | N- | |
| | | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| 1 | 160 | -34.43 | 0 | 0 | -4.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | 158 | -36.43 | 0 | 0 | -2.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | 150 | -44.43 | 0 | 0 | 5.57 | 5.57 | 1 | |
| 4 | 151 | -43.43 | 0 | 0 | 4.57 | 10.14 | 2 | |
| 5 | 153 | -41.43 | 0 | 0 | 2.57 | 12.71 | 3 | |
| 6 | 154 | -40.43 | 0 | 0 | 1.57 | 14.28 | 4 | |
| 7 | 158 | -36.43 | 0 | 0 | -2.43 | 11.85 | 5 | |
| 8 | 162 | -32.43 | 0 | 0 | -6.43 | 5.42 | 6 | |
| 9 | 186 | -8.43 | 0 | 0 | -30.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | 195 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 1 | -39.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | 179 | -15.43 | 0 | 0 | -23.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | 184 | -10.43 | 0 | 0 | -28.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | 175 | -19.43 | 0 | 0 | -19.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | 192 | -2.43 | 0 | 0 | -36.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | 186 | -8.43 | 0 | 0 | -30.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | 197 | 2.57 | 2.57 | 1 | -41.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 17 | 190 | -4.43 | 0 | 0 | -34.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | 189 | -5.43 | 0 | 0 | -33.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 19 | 185 | -9.43 | 0 | 0 | -29.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 20 | 182 | -12.43 | 0 | 0 | -26.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | 181 | -13.43 | 0 | 0 | -25.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 22 | 180 | -14.43 | 0 | 0 | -24.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 23 | 183 | -11.43 | 0 | 0 | -27.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 24 | 186 | -8.43 | 0 | 0 | -30.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 25 | 206 | 11.57 | 11.57 | 1 | -50.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 26 | 210 | 15.57 | 27.14 | 2 | -54.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 27 | 216 | 21.57 | 48.71 | 3 | -60.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 28 | 212 | 17.57 | 66.28 | 4 | -56.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 29 | 211 | 16.57 | 82.85 | 5 | -55.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 30 | 202 | 7.57 | 90.42 | 6 | -46.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 31 | 205 | 10.57 | 100.99 | 7 | -49.43 | 0 | 0 | |
| 32 | 197 | 2.57 | 103.56 | 8 | -41.43 | 0 | 0 | |

8. Consider the “minute clinic” waiting time data in the following table

| Observation | Waiting Time | Observation | Waiting Time | Observation | Waiting Time |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2.49 | 11 | 1.34 | 21 | 1.14 |
| 2 | 3.39 | 12 | 0.5 | 22 | 2.66 |
| 3 | 7.41 | 13 | 4.35 | 23 | 4.67 |
| 4 | 2.88 | 14 | 1.67 | 24 | 1.54 |
| 5 | 0.76 | 15 | 1.63 | 25 | 5.06 |
| 6 | 1.32 | 16 | 4.88 | 26 | 3.4 |
| 7 | 7.05 | 17 | 15.19 | 27 | 1.39 |
| 8 | 1.37 | 18 | 0.67 | 28 | 1.11 |
| 9 | 6.17 | 19 | 4.14 | 29 | 6.92 |
| 10 | 5.12 | 20 | 2.16 | 30 | 36.99 |

a. These data may not be normally distributed. Set up a CUSUM chart for monitoring this process. Does the process seem to be in statistical control?

Yes. C+, C-가 H보다 작다

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|-------|----|
| #8 | | | | | | | |
| | h | 5 | k | 0.5 | | | |
| | x | x - 8.049 | C+ | N+ | 1.242 - x | C- | N- |
| | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 1 | 2.49 | -5.559 | 0 | 0 | -1.248 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 3.39 | -4.659 | 0 | 0 | -2.148 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 7.41 | -0.639 | 0 | 0 | -6.168 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 2.88 | -5.169 | 0 | 0 | -1.638 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0.76 | -7.289 | 0 | 0 | 0.482 | 0.482 | 1 |
| 6 | 1.32 | -6.729 | 0 | 0 | -0.078 | 0.404 | 1 |
| 7 | 7.05 | -0.999 | 0 | 0 | -5.808 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 1.37 | -6.679 | 0 | 0 | -0.128 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 6.17 | -1.879 | 0 | 0 | -4.928 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 5.12 | -2.929 | 0 | 0 | -3.878 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 1.34 | -6.709 | 0 | 0 | -0.098 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0.5 | -7.549 | 0 | 0 | 0.742 | 0.742 | 1 |
| 13 | 4.35 | -3.699 | 0 | 0 | -3.108 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 1.67 | -6.379 | 0 | 0 | -0.428 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 1.63 | -6.419 | 0 | 0 | -0.388 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 4.88 | -3.169 | 0 | 0 | -3.638 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 15.19 | 7.141 | 7.141 | 1 | -13.948 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0.67 | -7.379 | 0 | 0 | 0.572 | 0.572 | 1 |
| 19 | 4.14 | -3.909 | 0 | 0 | -2.898 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 2.16 | -5.889 | 0 | 0 | -0.918 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 1.14 | -6.909 | 0 | 0 | 0.102 | 0.102 | 1 |
| 22 | 2.66 | -5.389 | 0 | 0 | -1.418 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 4.67 | -3.379 | 0 | 0 | -3.428 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 1.54 | -6.509 | 0 | 0 | -0.298 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 5.06 | -2.989 | 0 | 0 | -3.818 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 3.4 | -4.649 | 0 | 0 | -2.158 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 | 1.39 | -6.659 | 0 | 0 | -0.148 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 | 1.11 | -6.939 | 0 | 0 | 0.132 | 0.132 | 1 |
| 29 | 6.92 | -1.129 | 0 | 0 | -5.678 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 36.99 | 28.941 | 28.941 | 1 | -35.748 | 0 | 0 |
| x_bar | 4.6456667 | | | | | | |
| sigma | 6.8073 | | | | | | |
| H | 34.0365 | | | | | | |

b. These data may not be normally distributed. Set up an EWMA control chart using $\lambda = 0.1$ for monitoring this process. Does the process seem to be in statistical control?

| | Lambda | 0.1 | L | 3 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | x | z | UCL | LCL |
| | | 4.646 | | |
| 1 | 2.49 | 4.4304 | 6.6878567 | 2.6034767 |
| 2 | 3.39 | 4.32636 | 7.3931523 | 1.898181 |
| 3 | 7.41 | 4.634724 | 7.8526853 | 1.438648 |
| 4 | 2.88 | 4.4592516 | 8.1813936 | 1.1099398 |
| 5 | 0.76 | 4.0893264 | 8.4267572 | 0.8645762 |
| 6 | 1.32 | 3.8123938 | 8.6143973 | 0.676936 |
| 7 | 7.05 | 4.1361544 | 8.7601176 | 0.5312157 |
| 8 | 1.37 | 3.859539 | 8.8744717 | 0.4168616 |
| 9 | 6.17 | 4.0905851 | 8.9648798 | 0.3264536 |
| 10 | 5.12 | 4.1935266 | 9.036746 | 0.2545874 |
| 11 | 1.34 | 3.9081739 | 9.0941066 | 0.1972268 |
| 12 | 0.5 | 3.5673565 | 9.1400321 | 0.1513013 |
| 13 | 4.35 | 3.6456209 | 9.1768905 | 0.1144428 |
| 14 | 1.67 | 3.4480588 | 9.2065275 | 0.0848058 |
| 15 | 1.63 | 3.2662529 | 9.230393 | 0.0609403 |
| 16 | 4.88 | 3.4276276 | 9.2496334 | 0.0416999 |
| 17 | 15.19 | 4.6038649 | 9.2651594 | 0.026174 |
| 18 | 0.67 | 4.2104784 | 9.2776973 | 0.0136361 |
| 19 | 4.14 | 4.2034305 | 9.2878281 | 0.0035052 |
| 20 | 2.16 | 3.9990875 | 9.2960179 | -0.004685 |
| 21 | 1.14 | 3.7131787 | 9.3026411 | -0.011308 |
| 22 | 2.66 | 3.6078609 | 9.307999 | -0.016666 |
| 23 | 4.67 | 3.7140748 | 9.3123344 | -0.021001 |
| 24 | 1.54 | 3.4966673 | 9.3158431 | -0.02451 |
| 25 | 5.06 | 3.6530006 | 9.3186833 | -0.02735 |
| 26 | 3.4 | 3.6277005 | 9.3209825 | -0.029649 |
| 27 | 1.39 | 3.4039305 | 9.322844 | -0.031511 |
| 28 | 1.11 | 3.1745374 | 9.3243514 | -0.033018 |
| 29 | 6.92 | 3.5490837 | 9.3255719 | -0.034239 |
| 30 | 36.99 | 6.8931753 | 9.3265604 | -0.035227 |
| | | | | |
| x_bar | 4.6456667 | | | |
| sigma | 6.8073 | | | |

Yes.

모든 점이 UCL과 LCL 안에 있다.

c. Set up an EWMA control chart using $\lambda = 0.4$ for monitoring this process. Compare this EWMA chart to the one from Problem 8.b

| | Lambda | 0.4 | L | 3 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | x | z | UCL | LCL |
| | | 4.646 | | |
| 1 | 2.49 | 3.7836 | 12.814427 | -3.523093 |
| 2 | 3.39 | 3.62616 | 14.171996 | -4.880663 |
| 3 | 7.41 | 5.139696 | 14.61557 | -5.324237 |
| 4 | 2.88 | 4.2358176 | 14.770501 | -5.479168 |
| 5 | 0.76 | 2.8454906 | 14.825699 | -5.534366 |
| 6 | 1.32 | 2.2352943 | 14.845497 | -5.554164 |
| 7 | 7.05 | 4.1611766 | 14.852615 | -5.561282 |
| 8 | 1.37 | 3.044706 | 14.855176 | -5.563843 |
| 9 | 6.17 | 4.2948236 | 14.856098 | -5.564765 |
| 10 | 5.12 | 4.6248941 | 14.85643 | -5.565097 |
| 11 | 1.34 | 3.3109365 | 14.856549 | -5.565216 |
| 12 | 0.5 | 2.1865619 | 14.856592 | -5.565259 |
| 13 | 4.35 | 3.0519371 | 14.856608 | -5.565275 |
| 14 | 1.67 | 2.4991623 | 14.856614 | -5.56528 |
| 15 | 1.63 | 2.1514974 | 14.856616 | -5.565282 |
| 16 | 4.88 | 3.2428984 | 14.856616 | -5.565283 |
| 17 | 15.19 | 8.0217391 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 18 | 0.67 | 5.0810434 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 19 | 4.14 | 4.7046261 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 20 | 2.16 | 3.6867756 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 21 | 1.14 | 2.6680654 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 22 | 2.66 | 2.6648392 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 23 | 4.67 | 3.4669035 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 24 | 1.54 | 2.6961421 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 25 | 5.06 | 3.6416853 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 26 | 3.4 | 3.5450112 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 27 | 1.39 | 2.6830067 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 28 | 1.11 | 2.053804 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 29 | 6.92 | 4.0002824 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| 30 | 36.99 | 17.196169 | 14.856617 | -5.565283 |
| | | | | |
| x_bar | 4.6456667 | | | |
| sigma | 6.8073 | | | |

statistically out of control.

시가 큰 C가 b보다 훨씬 변화에 민감하다.

그래서 b에서는 in control이라고 모니터링하지만,

C에서는 즉각적으로 변화를 감지해서 out of control을 모니터링할 수 있다.