

Problem 1

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{bmatrix} = A \underline{v}$$

$$E \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Cov} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}$ is a linear transformation of \underline{v} which is

trivariate normal distributed $\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}$ is bivariate normal distributed i.e. $\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} \sim N_2 \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow E \begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Cov} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & a \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 2a-b \\ 2a-b & 2a^2 - 2ab + b^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence the correlation between u and w is zero when

$b = 2a$. Since $\begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix}$ is bivariate normal distributed

they are also independent when $b = 2a$.

Problem 2

a)

A two-way analysis of variance has been performed

α_i , $i=1,2,3$ is the main effect of the i -th level of sand

β_j , $j=1,2,3$ is the main effect of the j -th level of carbon

$(\alpha\beta)_{ij}$ is the interaction effect between the i -th level of sand and j -th level of carbon, $i=1,2,3$, $j=1,2,3$.

$H_0^1: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$, $H_1^1: \text{at least one } \alpha_i \neq 0, i=1,2,3$

$H_0^2: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$, $H_1^2: \text{at least one } \beta_j \neq 0, j=1,2,3$

$H_0^3: (\alpha\beta)_{11} = (\alpha\beta)_{12} = \dots = (\alpha\beta)_{33} = 0$, $H_1^3: \text{at least one } (\alpha\beta)_{ij} \neq 0, i=1,2,3, j=1,2,3$

b)

$$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_{ijk} - \bar{Y}_{ij.})^2$$

$$SS_S = 6 \sum_{i=1}^3 (\bar{Y}_{i..} - \bar{Y}_{...})^2$$

$$SS_C = 6 \sum_{j=1}^3 (\bar{Y}_{.j.} - \bar{Y}_{...})^2$$

$$SS_{SC} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 (\bar{Y}_{ij.} - \bar{Y}_{i..} - \bar{Y}_{.j.} + \bar{Y}_{...})^2$$

Then the respective test statistics are

$$1: F_1 = \frac{SS_S/2}{SSE/9}, \quad 2: F_2 = \frac{SS_C/2}{SSE/9}, \quad 3: F_3 = \frac{SS_{SC}/4}{SSE/9}$$

$$P(F_1 \geq F_{1,obs} = 6.54) = 0.018$$

$$P(F_2 \geq F_{2,obs} = 5.33) = 0.03$$

$$P(F_3 \geq F_{3,obs} = 0.27) = 0.89$$

In this case only the main effects are significant on a 5% level.

Hypothesis 3 should always be performed before the two others.

c)

$$\hat{\alpha}_1 = \bar{Y}_{1..} - \bar{Y}_{...} = 66.333 - 69.611 = \underline{3.28}$$

$$\hat{\beta}_2 = \bar{Y}_{.2.} - \bar{Y}_{...} = 71.17 - 69.61 = \underline{1.56}$$

$$(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})_{33} = \bar{Y}_{33.} - \bar{Y}_{3..} - \bar{Y}_{.3.} + \bar{Y}_{...} = 74 - 72.17 - 71.17 + 69.61 = \underline{0.27}$$

let $\mu_{33} = E[\bar{Y}_{33.}]$ and $\mu_{11} = E[\bar{Y}_{21.}]$

then $\bar{Y}_{33.} \sim N(\mu_{33}, \frac{\sigma^2}{2})$ and $\bar{Y}_{21.} \sim N(\mu_{11}, \frac{\sigma^2}{2})$

and $\bar{Y}_{33.} - \bar{Y}_{21.} \sim N(\mu_{33} - \mu_{11}, \sigma^2)$

$H_0: \mu_{33} = \mu_{11}$ $H_1: \mu_{33} > \mu_{11}$

Test statistics $T = \frac{\bar{Y}_{33.} - \bar{Y}_{21.}}{S} \sim t$ -distributed with 9 degrees of freedom

Reject if $P(T_9 \geq \frac{12}{\sqrt{18.16}}) \leq 0.05$

$P(T_9 \geq 4.2) < 0.005 \Rightarrow$ reject. i.e. The hardness

on the level combination (53, C3) is harder

d)

The coefficient in front of X_2^2 in model 2 is not significant on a 5% level. However if we compare the R^2 , R_{adj}^2 and p-values for significant regression we get.

Model	R^2	R_{adj}^2	p-value
Model 1	0.61	0.55	0.00093
Model 2	0.68	0.62	0.00083

Hence in this case it is natural to prefer model 2.

The column for X_{22} is (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)

which is orthogonal to both X_1 and X_2 . Hence the estimation of the coefficients in front of X_1 and X_2 are not affected by adding the term X_{22} to the model.

Problem 3

a) $\hat{\underline{u}} = \underline{X} \hat{\underline{\beta}}$

$$E[\hat{\underline{u}}] = E[\underline{X} \hat{\underline{\beta}}] = \underline{X} E[\hat{\underline{\beta}}] = \underline{X} \underline{\beta}$$
$$\text{Cov}[\hat{\underline{u}}] = \underline{X} \text{Cov}(\hat{\underline{\beta}}) \underline{X}' = \sigma^2 \underline{X} (\underline{X}' \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}' = \sigma^2 \underline{H}$$

b) \underline{H} is idempotent and symmetric $\Rightarrow \text{rank}(\underline{H}) = \text{trace}(\underline{H})$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}(\hat{u}_i) = \sigma^2 \text{trace}(\underline{H}) = \sigma^2 \text{rank}(\underline{H}) = \sigma^2 (p+1)$$

c) $\underline{e} = (\underline{I} - \underline{H})(\beta_0 \underline{1} + \beta_1 \underline{x}_1 + \beta_2 \underline{x}_2 + \underline{\varepsilon})$

$$= \beta_0 (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{1} + \beta_1 (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{x}_1 + \beta_2 (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{x}_2 + (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{\varepsilon}$$

$\underline{H} \underline{1} = \underline{1}$, $\underline{H} \underline{x}_1 = \underline{x}_1 \Rightarrow \underline{e} = \beta_2 (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{x}_2 + (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{\varepsilon}$

$$\underline{e} = (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{y} \quad E[\underline{e}' \underline{e}] = E[\underline{y}' (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{y}] \text{ which is a quadratic form}$$

$$\text{Cov}(\underline{y}) = \sigma^2 \underline{I} \quad \text{Hence } E[\underline{e}' \underline{e}] = \text{tr}((\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \sigma^2 \underline{I}) + \underline{\mu}' (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{\mu}$$

$$\text{tr}(\underline{I} - \underline{H}) = m - 2$$

$$(\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{\mu} = \beta_2 (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{x}_2$$

$$\text{Hence } E[\underline{e}' \underline{e}] = \sigma^2 (m - 2) + \beta_2^2 \underline{x}_2' (\underline{I} - \underline{H}) \underline{x}_2$$