## Problem 1 Exam 2015 Spring, Problem 2

Assume a linear regression model $\boldsymbol{Y}=X \boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, where $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is an $n$-dimensional random vector, $X$ an $n \times p$ design matrix, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ a $p$-dimensional parameter (coefficient) vector and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} n$-dimensional multinormal with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^{2} I$, where $I$ is an $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Assume further that the columns of $X$ are orthogonal.
a) Show that the least squares estimator of $\beta_{j}$, the $j$ th entry of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, depends only on the $j$ th column of $X$ (i.e., the $j$ th covariate vector) and $\boldsymbol{Y}$.

Consider a two-level $2^{2}$ factorial unreplicated experiment in which the levels are coded -1 and 1. The response vector is $\left(\begin{array}{llll}6 & 4 & 10 & 7\end{array}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$, corresponding to levels $\left(\begin{array}{llll}-1 & 1 & -1 & 1\end{array}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$ of the first factor and $\left(\begin{array}{llll}-1 & -1 & 1 & 1\end{array}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$ of the second.
b) Estimate the interaction effect (twice the coefficient) of the two factors.

## Problem 2 Factorial experiments

We want to examine if small changes on four critical dimensions in a carburettor will affect the horse powers produced with a standard engine with six cylinders. The data from a $2^{4}$ factorial experiment follow:

| Dimensions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $A$ | $B$ | $C$ | $D$ | Response, $y$ |
| - | - | - | - | 14.6 |
| + | - | - | - | 24.8 |
| - | + | - | - | 12.3 |
| + | + | - | - | 20.1 |
| - | - | + | - | 13.8 |
| + | - | + | - | 22.3 |
| - | + | + | - | 12.0 |
| + | + | + | - | 20.0 |
| - | - | - | + | 16.3 |
| + | - | - | + | 23.7 |
| - | + | - | + | 13.5 |
| + | + | - | - | 19.4 |
| - | - | + | + | 11.3 |
| + | - | + | + | 23.6 |
| - | + | + | + | 11.2 |
| + | + | + | + | 21.8 |

Use statistical software to solve this problem, see end of problem for hints for commands R.
$R$ hint: If you haven't done so, install the package FrF2, e.g. by writing install.packages("FrF2"). Load the package by writing library (FrF2).
a) Fit a full $2^{4}$ regression model with all interactions. Estimate the main effects and the interactions using statistical software. Construct a Daniel plot (normal plot) for the estimated effects, and main effects and (2-way) interaction plots.
$R$ hints:

```
plan <- FrF2(nruns=16, nfactors=4, randomize=FALSE)
y <- c(14.6,24.8,12.3,20.1,13.8,22.3,12.0,20.0,16.3,23.7,13.5,19.4,11.3, 23.6,11.2,
    21.8)
plan <- add.response(plan, y)
```

If we would perform real experiments we would randomize them, but to get a clearer overview (when adding the response) we skip it here. Now we have an ordinary data set up to be used with 1 m , which we know from the regression part of the course. The model formula notation to include up to 4th order terms is .^4. Remember that effects are twice coefficients in the regression.

```
lm4 <- lm(y~.^4, data=plan)
summary(lm4)
effects <- lm4$coeff*2
```

A normal plot showing the effects is constructed using DanielPlot. The effects that are significant (default level 0.05 ) by Lenth's method are labeled. Main effects and interaction plots are constructed using MEPlot and IAPlot.

DanielPlot(lm4)
MEPlot(lm4)
IAPlot(lm4)
b) Write down the regression model that corresponds to this analysis.
c) Why are there no standard deviation estimates in the software output? Assume that $\sigma^{2}=4$ is known from experience. Find $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the effects. Which effects are significantly different from 0 ?
d) If you assume that all three-way and four-way interactions are zero, how can you then estimate the variance $\sigma^{2}$ of the error and the variance of the effect estimators? How can you now find the significant effects?
$R$ hint: To include up to second order interactions terms, use . ${ }^{\wedge} 2$ in the model formula.
e) Assume now that the experiment is to be done in two blocks. Let the blocks be determined by the four-factor interaction $A B C D$. Which effects are now unconfounded with the block effect and can be estimated?
R hint: FrF2 can suggest a design:

```
design1 <- FrF2(16, 4, blocks=2, randomize=FALSE)
summary(design1)
```

f) How would you perform the experiment in four blocks?
$R$ hint: Again, FrF2 can suggest a design:
design2 <- FrF2(16, 4, blocks=4, alias.block.2fis=TRUE, randomize=FALSE)
summary (design2)
alias.block.2fis=TRUE is needed to allow aliasing between block factors and 2-factor interactions.

## Problem 3 Process development - from Exam TMA4255 2012 Summer

We will look at a designed experiment to develop an etching process. There are three design factors $(A, B$ and $C)$. The three design factors were run at two levels each.

A: The gap between the electrodes. Low: 0.80 cm . High: 1.20 cm .
B: The flow of gas. Low: 125. High: 200.
$C$ : The power applied to the cathode. Low: 275 W. High: 325 W.

The response variable is the etch rate for the process $(\AA / \mathrm{m})$. A high value for the etch rate is desired. A $2^{3}$ factorial design was run, and the results were as follow:

| Run | $A$ | $B$ | $C$ | Response |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 550 |
| 2 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 669 |
| 3 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 633 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 642 |
| 5 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1037 |
| 6 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 749 |
| 7 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1075 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 729 |

From these results we have the following design of experiment (DOE) effect estimates.

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
A & B & C & A B & A C & B C & A B C \\
\hline-126.5 & * & 274.0 & -42.0 & -190.5 & -9.5 & 13.0
\end{array}
$$

a) Fill in the missing effect estimate for factor $B$. Construct a main effects plot for factor $B$, and explain with words how the estimated main effect of factor $B$ is interpreted.

In addition to this first replicate of the experiment a second replicate was made, such that each factor combination was run twice, that is $n=16$. The result from fitting a multiple linear regression model to these data, with intercept, $A, B, C, A B, A C, B C$ and $A B C$ as covariates, is given in the printout below. We call this the full regression model. Note that the estimates ("Estimate") are the estimated regression coefficients and not the effect estimates.

|  | Estimate | Std. Error | $t$ value | $p$-value |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 776.062 | 11.865 | 65.406 | $3.32 \mathrm{e}-12$ |
| $A$ | -50.812 | 11.865 | -4.282 | 0.002679 |
| $B$ | 3.688 | 11.865 | $*$ | 0.763911 |
| $C$ | 153.062 | 11.865 | 12.900 | $1.23 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| $A B$ | -12.437 | 11.865 | -1.048 | 0.325168 |
| $A C$ | -76.812 | 11.865 | -6.474 | 0.000193 |
| $B C$ | -1.062 | 11.865 | -0.090 | 0.930849 |
| $A B C$ | 2.813 | 11.865 | 0.237 | 0.818586 |

Residual standard error: 47.46 on 8 degrees of freedom
b) What does the "Std. Error" column give, and why is the "Std. Error" the same for all covariates?
Now turn to factor $B$, in the second row of the printout table. What is the relationship between an estimated coefficient for $B$ and the estimated effect for $B$ ? Calculate the missing number for the $t$-statistic. What are the hypotheses underlying the $p$-value and what is the conclusion of that test?
What are the significant covariates in the model?
We now assume that we use a regression model with intercept and covariates $A, C$ and $A C$, and get the following printout for this new regression model. Let us call this the reduced regression model.

|  | Estimate | Std. Error | $t$ value | $p$-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 776.06 | 10.42 | 74.458 | $<2 \mathrm{e}-16$ |
| $A$ | -50.81 | 10.42 | -4.875 | 0.000382 |
| $C$ | 153.06 | 10.42 | 14.685 | $4.95 \mathrm{e}-09$ |
| $A C$ | -76.81 | 10.42 | -7.370 | $8.62 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| Residual standard error: | 41.69 on 12 degrees of freedom |  |  |  |

c) Why are the estimated coefficients for $A, C$ and $A C$ in the reduced model the same as in the full model? Why have the estimated standard deviations changed from the full to the reduced model?
What would you suggest are the optimal choices of level (low or high) for each of these two factors when the aim is to use the fitted regression model to arrive at the combination with the highest estimated etch rate?
Calculate a $95 \%$ prediction interval for the etch rate based on your chosen levels for $A$ and $C$.

We now assume that in a pilot study with three factors only runs $1,4,6$ and 7 of the original plan (see table at the top of the Problem) were performed.
d) What type of experiment is this?

What is the generator and the defining relation for the experiment?
Write down the alias structure of the experiment.
What is the resolution of the experiment?

## Problem 4 Blocking

This should be solved by hand (no software).
A $2^{5}$ experiment must be divided into 8 blocks with four observations in each block. We assume that factor $A$ has the greatest impact on the response and we therefore want to construct a design where no main effect and none of the two-factor interactions involving factor $A(A B$, $A C, A D$ and $A E)$ are confounded with the block effects. Find out how you can block the experiment.

## Problem 5 Fractional factorial design

This should be solved by hand (no software).
Suppose you want to run a $2^{4-1}$ fractional factorial experiment and have chosen $D=A B C$ as the generator for the design.
a) What is the resolution of the design?

In a $2^{8-4}$ experiment the generators are $E=A B C, F=A B D, G=A C D$ and $H=B C D$.
b) What is the resolution of this design?

Suppose you run the $2^{8-4}$ experiment in two blocks using $A B$ as blocking factor.
c) How will this affect the estimation of the effects?

