# Technical University of Denmark

Written examination: June 25 2020

# Course name and number: Introduktion to Matematical Statistics (02403)

Duration: 4 hours

Aids and facilities allowed: All

The questions were answered by

(student number)

(signature)

(table number)

This exam consists of 30 questions of the "multiple choice" type, which are divided between 9 exercises. To answer the questions, you need to fill in the "multiple choice" form (6 separate pages) on CampusNet with the numbers of the answers that you believe to be correct.

5 points are given for a correct "multiple choice" answer, and -1 point is given for a wrong answer. ONLY the following 5 answer options are valid: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. If a question is left blank or an invalid answer is entered, 0 points are given for the question. Furthermore, if more than one answer option is selected for a single question, which is in fact technically possible in the online system, 0 points are given for the question. The number of points needed to obtain a specific mark or to pass the exam is ultimately determined during censoring.

The final answers should be given by filling in and submitting the form online via CampusNet. The table provided here is ONLY an emergency alternative. Remember to provide your student number if you do hand in on paper.

Exercise	I.1	I.2	I.3	II.1	II.2	II.3	II.4	II.5	III.1	III.2
Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Answer										

	V1.5
Question $(11)$ $(12)$ $(13)$ $(14)$ $(15)$ $(16)$ $(17)$ $(18)$ $(19)$	(20)
Answer	

Exercise	VI.4	VI.5	VII.1	VII.2	VIII.1	VIII.2	VIII.3	IX.1	IX.2	IX.3
Question	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)
Answer										

The exam paper contains 26 pages.

**Multiple choice questions:** Note that in each question, one and <u>only</u> one of the answer options is correct. Furthermore, not all the suggested answers are necessarily meaningful. Always remember to round your own result to the number of decimals given in the answer options before you choose your answer. Also remember that there may be slight discrepancies between the result of the book's formulas and corresponding built-in functions in R.

### Exercise I

Samples of DNA were obtained from 24 different types of tissue. The distribution of nucleotide bases was measured, and the ratio of guanine to cytosine was calculated for every sample. We will refer to this ratio as the GC ratio.

We will assume that the GC ratio follows a normal distribution, a histogram of the data is seen below:



#### Histogram of data

### Question I.1 (1)

Which of the following numbers might be the estimated mean  $\hat{\mu}$  for this data?

- $1 \square 0.031$
- $2\square 0.901$
- $3\square$  0.968
- $4 \square 1.027$
- 5 🗌 1.139

### Question I.2 (2)

Which of the following numbers might be the estimated standard deviation  $\hat{\sigma}$  for this data?

 $1 \square 0.042$ 

- $2\square$  0.180
- $3\square$  0.956
- $4 \square 1.017$
- 5 🗌 1.139

### Question I.3 (3)

We would like to study if the GC ratio differs significantly from 1 (the null-hypothesis).

The following formula was applied,

$$[\hat{\mu} - \hat{\sigma}/\sqrt{24} \cdot t_{0.975}, \hat{\mu} + \hat{\sigma}/\sqrt{24} \cdot t_{0.975}] = [1.0087, 1.0444]$$

where  $t_{0.975}$  is the 97.5% quantile in the *t*-distribution with 23 degrees of freedom.

Which of the following statements is correct:

- 1  $\Box$  We reject the null hypothesis on a 5% significance level, since 1 is outside the 95% confindence interval.
- 2  $\Box$  We reject the null hypothesis on a 2.5% significance level, since 1 is outside the 97.5% confindence interval.
- 3  $\Box$  We reject the null hypothesis on a 2.5% significance level, since 0 is outside the 97.5% confindence interval.
- 4  $\square$  We accept the null hypothesis, since  $|1 \hat{\mu}|$  is less than the standard deviation.
- $5 \square$  We do not have enough information to accept or reject the null hypothesis.

# Exercise II

In this exercise, a model for predicting the electricity price on the whole sale market for electricity, the so-called Day-ahead market, is studied. Explanatory variables used are forecasts of solar and wind power.

The data used consists of 28 day averages from February 2020 for the electricity market area "DK1", which mainly covers Jutland.

The following 3 variables are used in the model:

- Electricity price (EUR/MWh)
- Solar power forecast (MW)
- Wind power forecast (MW)

The data is read into 3 vectors: price, solar and wind, and the following code is run:

mean(price)
## [1] 17.4
mean(solar)
## [1] 30.4
mean(wind)
## [1] 2687
range(price)
## [1] -1.39 38.33
range(solar)
## [1] 6.08 64.00
range(wind)
## [1] 508 4135

Afterwards the coefficients in a linear regression model are estimated by:

```
fit <- lm(price ~ solar + wind)</pre>
 summary(fit)
##
## Residuals:
##
     Min
           1Q Median
                           ЗQ
                                 Max
## -8.730 -2.785 0.861 2.368 7.453
##
## Coefficients:
##
               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 38.566077
                          2.874305
                                    13.42 6.3e-13 ***
                          0.050260
                                      1.27
## solar
              0.063822
                                               А
                                                     В
## wind
              -0.008606
                          0.000722 -11.91
                                               С
                                                     D
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 4.01 on 25 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.867,Adjusted R-squared:
                                                  0.857
## F-statistic: 81.7 on 2 and 25 DF, p-value: 1.09e-11
```

Note that 4 fields have been replaced with letters.

# Question II.1 (4)

What will be the result of one step in the backward selection procedure with significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  based on this model?

- 1  $\Box$  The solar variable must be taken out of the model
- 2  $\Box$  The wind variable must be taken out of the model
- $3 \square$  None of the explanatory variables must be removed
- 4  $\Box$  Both the solar and wind variables must be taken out of the model
- $5 \square$  Not enough information has been provided to determine this

# Question II.2 (5)

With the estimated model, what is the prediction of the mean difference in electricity price between the day in the period with the lowest wind power and the day in the period with the highest wind power, if the solar power is assumed to be constant?

- 1 🗌 2.98 EUR/MWh
- $2\square$  11.8 EUR/MWh
- 3 🗌 31.2 EUR/MWh
- $4 \square 34.2 \text{ EUR/MWh}$
- 5 🗌 38.6 EUR/MWh

# Question II.3 (6)

Which of the following statements cannot be concluded for the estimated model?

- 1  $\Box$  The width of the prediction interval has its minimum at 30.4 MW solar power and 2687 MW wind power
- 2  $\Box$  The maximum value of the residuals is 7.453
- 3  $\Box$  The model can be applied to conclude if there are significant non-linear dependencies between the variables
- 4  $\square$  The estimate of the variance of the error  $\epsilon_i$  is  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = 16.1$
- 5  $\Box$  The model has explained 86.7% of the variance

# Question II.4 (7)

During the model validation it is examined if a new variable load, which indicates the daily electricity consumption for the 28 days in question, should be included in the model. Again, the significance level is set to  $\alpha = 5\%$  and a simple linear regression model is estimated with this new variable and the residuals from the previously estimated model:

```
summary(lm(fit$residuals ~ load))
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = fit$residuals ~ load)
##
## Residuals:
##
     Min
             10 Median
                            ЗQ
                                  Max
   -5.90 -1.35 -0.09
                          1.75
##
                                 6.07
##
## Coefficients:
                Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
## (Intercept) -38.57812
                            6.61879
                                      -5.83 3.8e-06 ***
## load
                 0.01465
                            0.00251
                                       5.84 3.7e-06 ***
## ---
                   0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Signif. codes:
##
## Residual standard error: 2.59 on 26 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.568, Adjusted R-squared: 0.551
## F-statistic: 34.2 on 1 and 26 DF, p-value: 3.68e-06
```

Which of the following conclusions should be drawn based on this result (both argument and conclusion must be correct)?

- $1 \square$  A model for predicting the electricity price should be made with load as the only explanatory variable
- 2 Since correlation between load and residuals is significantly different from zero, then load should be included in the model selection
- 3 Since the coefficient for load is positive, then load should <u>not</u> be included in the model selection
- 4 Since the coefficient for load is positive, then load should be included in the model selection
- $5 \square$  Based on the given information none of the above conclusions can be drawn

Regardless of the outcome above, a model including load is now estimated. I.e. using the model

$$\operatorname{price}_{i} = \beta_{0} + \operatorname{load}_{i}\beta_{1} + \operatorname{solar}\beta_{2} + \operatorname{wind}_{i}\beta_{3} + \epsilon_{i}; \quad \epsilon_{i} \sim N(0, \sigma^{2})$$
(1)

or written in matrix notation

price = 
$$\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}; \quad \epsilon_i \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I})$$
 (2)

As an aid for the further calculations, the following R code is given (which can be copied into R), where XX is the matrix  $X^T X$ 

```
XX <- c(28, 73743, 851, 75239, 73743, 195282372, 2267307, 197399368, 851,
        2267307, 32733, 2159250 , 75239, 197399368, 2159250, 235403829)
XX <- matrix(XX, ncol=4)
ΧХ
##
         [,1]
                    [,2]
                            [,3]
                                      [,4]
## [1,]
           28
                  73743
                            851
                                     75239
## [2,] 73743 195282372 2267307 197399368
## [3,]
                2267307
          851
                           32733
                                   2159250
## [4,] 75239 197399368 2159250 235403829
```

#### Question II.5 (8)

The variance estimate is calculated as  $\hat{\sigma}^2$ , what is the standard error for the parameter  $\beta_0$ ?



#### Exercise III

In developing a new drug, a number of candidate substances were tested in a laboratory experiment. The experiment was designed so that a higher value of the score y indicates that the substance works better. The experiment was performed on 7 different drugs (A to G, in R given in the factor **drug**) and with 5 repetitions. The following values of the score were observed:

А	В	С	D	Ε	F	G
9.0	9.5	9.7	11.3	12.0	13.4	9.5
11.3	11.8	10.4	11.3	13.2	12.4	11.5
10.1	10.1	10.8	11.3	11.9	11.1	9.2
9.9	8.6	8.8	9.5	11.8	11.2	10.3
8.9	8.8	10.2	11.3	12.1	13.0	9.6

An ANOVA analysis was done by the drug developers and it can be assumed that the necessary assumptions for this test are met. The result of the analysis is:

```
anova(lm(y ~ drug))
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: y
##
             Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value
                                           Pr(>F)
## drug
              6 36.107
                        6.0179
                               6.9115 0.0001397 ***
## Residuals 28 24.380
                        0.8707
## ---
## Signif. codes:
                   0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

#### Question III.1 (9)

What will be the conclusion at significance level  $\alpha = 5\%$  based on the analysis result (both argument and conclusion must be correct)?

- $1 \square$  None of the conclusions below are correct
- 2  $\Box$  A significant difference in the effect is found, since the *p*-value is <u>above</u> the significance level
- 3  $\Box$  A significant difference in the effect is not found, since the *p*-value is <u>below</u> the significance level
- 4  $\Box$  A significant difference in the effect is found, since the *p*-value is below the significance level
- 5  $\Box$  A significant difference in the effect <u>is not</u> found, since the *p*-value is <u>above</u> the significance level

# Question III.2 (10)

What is the critical value, at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ , for the test carried out in the ANOVA analysis?

- $\begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & \square & 2.445 \\ 2 & \square & 0.262 \end{array}$
- 3 🗌 0.913
- 4 🗌 1.691
- 5 🗌 1.701

### Exercise IV

In the board game Risk, players attack each other by moving armies (consisting of divisions) across borders on a map, after which a battle is fought between the two armies. The rules are such that the attacking party rolls with 3 dice and the defending party rolls 2 dice. The attacker uses only the two dice with the highest numbers. Usual 6-sided dice are used.

# Question IV.1 (11)

A player is about to attack and wants to calculate the probability of getting at least 5 with at least 2 of 3 dice, which of the following R commands calculates this probability?

```
1 □ dbinom(2, size = 2, prob = 1/3)
2 □ 1 - pbinom(1, size = 3, prob = 1/3)
3 □ 1 - dbinom(2, size = 3, prob = 1/6)
4 □ pbinom(2, size = 2, prob = 1/3)
5 □ 1 - dbinom(1, size = 2, prob = 1/6)
```

### Question IV.2 (12)

A player is about to attack and wants to calculate the probability of getting at least 4 with at least 2 of 3 dice, while the defender gets a maximum of 3 with each of his 2 dice, what is the desired probability?

- $1 \square 0.25$
- $2 \square 0.125$
- $3\square 0.5$
- $4 \square 0.0625$
- $5 \square 0.75$

# Exercise V

The table below shows the number of girls and boys born in Denmark in year 2016 by women age 20, 25, 30 and 35 years, respectively:

	20	25	30	35	Total
Girls	281	1490	2333	1430	5534
Boys	282	1539	2536	1518	5875
Total	563	3029	4869	2948	11409

I.e. 281 girls were born by 20-year-old mothers in 2016.

### Question V.1 (13)

What is the 95% confidence interval for the probability that a pregnant woman aged 30 years will give birth to a girl?

- $1 \square [0.48, 0.52]$
- $2 \square [0.47, 0.49]$
- $3 \square [0.49, 0.51]$
- $4 \square [0.46, 0.50]$
- $5 \square [0.44, 0.48]$

# Question V.2 (14)

We will now consider all of our data, and we want to investigate if a significant difference between the probability of getting a girl and the probability of getting a boy can be detected. What is the *p*-value and the conclusion from the corresponding test, when we use a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ ?

- $1 \square$  *p*-value = 0.49, and the relevant null hypothesis can be rejected.
- $2 \square$  *p*-value = 0.94, and the relevant null hypothesis cannot be rejected.
- $3 \square$  *p*-value = 0.0014, and the relevant null hypothesis can be rejected.
- $4 \square$  p-value = 0.06, and the relevant null hypothesis can be rejected.
- $5 \square$  p-value = 0.51, and the relevant null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

### Question V.3 (15)

We would like to investigate, if the probability of giving birth to a girl can be assumed equal for women in the 4 investigated age groups. Under the corresponding null hypothesis, what is the expected number of girls born by women age 25?

- 1 🗌 1514
- $2 \square 1469$
- $3\square$  1490
- $4 \square 1383$
- 5 🗌 1560

# Question V.4 (16)

We would still like to investigate, if the probability of giving birth to a girl can be assumed equal for women in the 4 investigated age groups. What is the number of degrees of freedom in the relevant  $\chi^2$ -test?

# Question V.5 (17)

The test statistic, when we are investigating, if the probability of giving birth to a girl can be assumed equal for women in the 4 investigated age groups, is estimated to be 1.6943. Which command in R will provide the corresponding *p*-value? Assume that the correct number of degrees of freedom is stored in the variable  $\mathbf{x}$ .

1 □ 1-pchisq(1.6943, df=x, lower.tail = FALSE)
2 □ 1-pchisq(sqrt(1.6943), df=x, lower.tail = FALSE)
3 □ pchisq(1.6943^2, df=x, lower.tail = FALSE)
4 □ pchisq(1.6943^2, df=x)
5 □ 1-pchisq(1.6943, df=x)

#### Exercise VI

The figure below shows the annual number of so-called "Major earthquakes" globally during the period 1900-2016.



There are a total of 117 observations (1900-2016), the average number being 19.2/year, with the standard deviation 6.97.

#### Question VI.1 (18)

Assuming that the number of major earthquakes per year is Poisson distributed with mean 19.2, which of the following statements is then true?

- 1 The time between major earthquakes follows an exponential distribution with mean value 19.2
- 2  $\Box$  The time between major earthquakes follows a Binomial distribution with mean value 19.2
- 3  $\Box$  The time between major earthquakes follows an exponential distribution with mean value 1/19.2
- 4 The time between major earthquakes follows a Poisson distribution with mean value 19.2
- 5 The time between major earthquakes follows a Poisson distribution with mean value 1/19.2

#### Question VI.2 (19)

With the same assumption as in the previous question, what is the probability of observing more than 40 major earthquakes over a two-year period?

1 0.581

- $2 \square 0.358$
- $3 \square 0.419$
- $4 \square 0.5$
- $5 \square 0.642$

#### Question VI.3 (20)

We now want a 95 % confidence interval for the parameter  $\lambda$  (the mean value) based on parametric bootstrap. In order to answer the question the R code below has been executed, where earthquakes is a vector with the annual number of earthquakes

```
k <- 1000
n <- length(earthquakes)</pre>
sim <- replicate(k, rpois(n, lambda = mean(earthquakes)))</pre>
my.means <- apply(sim, 2, mean)</pre>
quantile(my.means, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
##
       2.5%
                97.5%
## 18.40171 19.94038
mean(my.means) + sd(my.means) * c(-1, 1) * 1.96 / sqrt(n)
## [1] 19.11887 19.26401
mean(earthquakes) + sd(earthquakes) * c(-1, 1) * 1.96 / sqrt(n)
## [1] 17.91720 20.44178
sim2 <- replicate(k,sample(earthquakes, replace=TRUE))</pre>
my.means2 <- apply(sim2, 2, mean)</pre>
quantile(my.means2, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
##
       2.5%
                97.5%
## 17.94850 20.45363
mean(my.means2) + sd(my.means2) * c(-1, 1) * 1.96
## [1] 17.88962 20.45184
```

Which of the following is a 95% confidence interval for the mean based on parametric bootstrap?

- $1 \square [17.95, 20.45]$
- $2 \square [19.12, 19.26]$
- $3 \square [17.89, 20.45]$
- $4 \square [17.92, 20.44]$
- $5 \square [18.40, 19.94]$

#### Question VI.4 (21)

Regardless of the answer to the previous question, the distribution assumption is considered questionable and therefore it is decided to base the further analysis on non-parametric bootstrap. An estimate (including 95% confidence interval) for the 75% quantile of annual major earthquakes is desired. For this purpose, the following R-code has been executed

```
k <- 1000
sim1 <- replicate(k, sample(earthquakes, replace = TRUE))</pre>
Q1 <- function(x) { quantile(x, 0.25) }
samp1 <- apply(sim1, 2, Q1)</pre>
quantile(samp1, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
    2.5% 97.5%
##
##
      13
         16
sim2 <- replicate(k, sample(earthquakes, replace = TRUE))</pre>
samp2 <- apply(sim2, 2, quantile, prob = 0.75)</pre>
quantile(samp2, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
##
    2.5% 97.5%
      21
             25
##
sim3 <- replicate(k, rpois(length(earthquakes), lambda = mean(earthquakes)))</pre>
Q3 <- function(x) { quantile(x, 0.75) }
samp3 <- apply(sim3, 2, Q3)</pre>
quantile(samp3, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
    2.5% 97.5%
##
      21
             23
##
sim4 <- replicate(k, rpois(length(earthquakes), lambda = mean(earthquakes)))</pre>
Q1 <- function(x) { quantile(x, 0.25) }
samp4 <- apply(sim4, 2, Q1)</pre>
quantile(samp4, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
```

```
## 2.5% 97.5%
## 15 17
sim5 <- replicate(k, sample(earthquakes))
quantile(sim5, prob = c(0.025, 0.975))
## 2.5% 97.5%
## 8 36</pre>
```

What is the 95% confidence interval for the 75% quantile?

### Question VI.5 (22)

We now want to investigate whether there has been a development in the number of earthquakes during the period. As a first investigation a 95 % non-parametric bootstrap confidence interval for the difference in mean value over two periods (called earthquakes1 and earthquakes2) should be calculated. The R code below has been executed in order to investigate the question.

Which of the following intervals is a non-parametric bootstrap 95% confidence interval for the difference in mean?

- 1
   [4.38, 6.90] 

   2
   [3.22, 8.16] 

   3
   [2.09, 9.19] 

   4
   [3.20, 7.92]
- $5 \square [5.00, 6.30]$

# Exercise VII

A plant cooperative has designed a germination system for households, and it has been placed at many of their members. They are now in search of the right soil mix, and therefore they have run an experiment in which several of their members were testing five different soil mixtures. Each participant made five germinations simultaneously - one with each of the five soil mix.

The germination time in hours were recorded for all germinations using a simple camera system and the following observations have been collected:

	Mix 1	Mix 2	Mix 3	Mix 4	Mix 5
Participant 1	9.9	8.7	6.8	10.0	10.0
Participant 2	5.2	3.1	8.8	10.0	5.0
Participant 3	10.9	8.1	10.3	10.1	9.9
Participant 4	6.1	10.6	7.6	7.1	9.8
Participant 5	8.9	8.9	3.8	8.0	8.8
Participant 6	5.9	6.4	5.9	6.0	7.7
Participant 7	8.9	8.9	8.3	10.2	7.5
Participant 8	10.3	13.4	9.3	9.6	9.7

An analysis was carried out (note that some of the values have been replaced by letters and potential stars have been removed):

```
anova(lm(Time ~ Mix + Participant))
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: Time
##
               Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
                4
                     7.3
                             1.82
                                     А
                                            В
## Mix
## Participant
               7
                    77.5
                            11.07
                                     С
                                           D
## Residuals
               28
                    89.1
                             3.18
## ---
                   0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Signif. codes:
```

# Question VII.1 (23)

Which conclusion can be drawn at significance level  $\alpha = 5\%$  from this analysis (both conclusion and argument must be correct)?

- 1  $\Box$  There is no significant effect of mix, however there is a significant effect of participant, since the relevant *p*-values are 0.68 and 0.0083, respectively
- 2  $\Box$  There is neither a significant effect of mix nor participant, since the relevant *p*-values are 0.093 and 0.17, respectively
- 3  $\Box$  There is both a significant effect of mix and participant as the relevant *p*-values are 0.0034 and 0.014, respectively
- 4  $\Box$  There is both a significant effect of mix and participant as the relevant *p*-values are 0.023 and 0.57, respectively
- 5  $\Box$  There is a significant effect of mix, however, there is no significant effect of participant, since the relevant *p*-values are 0.0045 and 0.85, respectively

# Question VII.2 (24)

How much of the total variation is explained by the model used?

- $1 \square \frac{4+7}{28} = 0.393$
- $2 \square \frac{7.3 1.82 + 77.5 11.07}{89.1 3.18} = 0.837$
- $3 \square \frac{7.3+77.5}{89.1} = 0.952$
- $4 \square \frac{7.3 + 77.5}{7.3 + 77.5 + 89.1} = 0.488$
- $5 \square \frac{1.82 + 11.07 + 3.18}{7.3 + 77.5 + 89.1} = 0.0924$

# Exercise VIII

As part of an UX design study, users were randomly presented for one of two webpage layouts (A and B). The users had to perform a specific action; the time spent (in seconds) was measured.

The following code reads the data into R, A is the users who were presented for layout A, whereas B is the other users who were presented for layout B.

```
A <- c(8.360, 6.377, 7.385, 6.245, 8.766, 6.848, 6.074, 6.310, 5.946, 8.270)
B <- c(8.806, 6.513, 10.209, 5.495, 6.513, 8.529, 8.354, 5.681, 7.553, 6.834)
```

### Question VIII.1 (25)

What is the 99% confidence interval for the difference in means between the two groups A and B?

- $1 \square [6.674, 7.783]$
- $2 \square [-2.093, 1.312]$
- $3 \square [-1.409, 0.628]$
- $4 \square [-1.627, 0.846]$
- $5 \square [-2.116, 1.335]$

#### Question VIII.2 (26)

The usual t-test gave a *p*-value of 0.513. Find the right conclusion on significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  (both conclusion and argument must be correct):

- 1  $\Box$  The two variances are significantly different as the *p*-value is large.
- $2 \square$  The two means are significantly different as the *p*-value is large.
- $3 \square$  The two means can reasonably be assumed to be equal as the *p*-value is large.
- $4 \square$  The two means can reasonably be assumed to be equal as the *p*-value is small.
- 5  $\Box$  The two means are significantly different as the *p*-value is small.

# Question VIII.3 (27)

The webpage designers would like to repeat the study with more people. It is assumed that the standard deviation within each group is 1.2, and that a *t*-test on level  $\alpha = 0.05$  should be carried out.

The following code was run in R:

```
power.t.test(n=40, delta=0.5, sd=1.2, sig.level=0.05)
##
##
        Two-sample t test power calculation
##
##
                 n = 40
##
             delta = 0.5
                sd = 1.2
##
         sig.level = 0.05
##
##
             power = 0.4524276
##
       alternative = two.sided
##
## NOTE: n is number in *each* group
power.t.test(power=0.80, delta=0.4, sd=1.2, sig.level=0.05)
##
##
        Two-sample t test power calculation
##
##
                 n = 142.2466
##
             delta = 0.4
##
                sd = 1.2
##
         sig.level = 0.05
##
             power = 0.8
##
       alternative = two.sided
##
## NOTE: n is number in *each* group
```

Which of the following statements is true?

- $\Box$  The chance that a study with n = 40 in each group finds a significant difference between the means, if the real difference is 0.5, is around 45%.
- $\Box$  The chance that a study with n = 142 in each group finds a significant difference between the means, if the real difference is 0.5, is around 80%.
- $\square$  The risk that a study with n = 40 in each group does not find a significant difference between the means, if the real difference is 0.5, is around 45%.
- $\Box$  The risk that a study with n = 142 in each group does not find a significant difference between the means, if the real difference is 0.5, is around 80%.
- $\square$  The probability that  $\mu_A \neq \mu_B$  is around 45% when n = 40, and increases to 80% when n = 142.

#### Exercise IX

Let  $X_i \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $Y_i \sim N(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)$  be independent random variables, further assume that samples of the size  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  respectively are taken from each of the two populations. Let  $S_p^2$ denote the usual pooled variance estimator.

#### Question IX.1 (28)

What is  $V(S_p^2)$ ?  $\Box$   $\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)$  $\Box$   $2\frac{(n_1-1)\sigma_1^4 + (n_2-1)\sigma_2^4}{(n_1+n_2-2)^2}$  $\Box$   $\frac{\sigma_1^4}{(n_1-1)^2} + \frac{\sigma_2^4}{(n_2-1)^2}$  $\Box$   $2\frac{(n_1-1)\sigma_1^2 + (n_2-1)\sigma_2^2}{n_1+n_2-2}$  $\Box$   $(\sigma_1^4 + \sigma_2^4)$ 

Now define

$$Q = \frac{n_1(\bar{X} - \mu_1)^2 + n_2(\bar{Y} - \mu_2)^2}{S_p^2} = \frac{D_1 + D_2}{S_p^2}$$
(3)

#### Question IX.2 (29)

Considering Q as a function of  $D_1$ ,  $D_2$  and  $S_p^2$ . What is the error propagation law expression for the variance of Q, expressed by  $\sigma_1^2$ ,  $\sigma_2^2$ ,  $\mu_s = E[S_p^2]$ , and  $\sigma_s^2 = V[S_p^2]$ . It is further given that  $E[D_1] = \sigma_1^2$ ,  $E[D_2] = \sigma_2^2$ ,  $V[D_1] = 2\sigma_1^4$ , and  $V[D_2] = 2\sigma_2^4$ ?

 $1 \Box \frac{1}{\mu_s^2} \left( 2\sigma_1^2 + 2\sigma_2^2 + \frac{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^2}{\mu_s} \sigma_s^2 \right)$   $2 \Box \frac{1}{\mu_s^2} \left( 2\sigma_1^2 + 2\sigma_2^2 + \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}{\mu_s^4} \sigma_s \right)$   $3 \Box \frac{1}{\mu_s} \left( 2\sigma_1^2 + 2\sigma_2^2 + \frac{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)}{\mu_s} \sigma_s^2 \right)$   $4 \Box \frac{1}{\mu_s^2} \left( 2\sigma_1^4 + 2\sigma_2^4 + \frac{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^2}{\mu_s^2} \sigma_s^2 \right)$   $5 \Box \frac{1}{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^2} \left( 2\sigma_1^4 + 2\sigma_2^4 + \frac{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^2}{\mu_s} \sigma_s^2 \right)$ 

# Question IX.3 (30)

Now suppose that  $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \sigma^2$ , what is the exact expression for E(Q)?

 $1 \square 2\frac{n_1+n_2-2}{n_1+n_2-4}$   $2 \square 4\frac{n_1+n_2}{n_1+n_2-2}\sigma^2$   $3 \square 4\frac{n_1+n_2}{n_1+n_2-2}$   $4 \square \frac{n_1+n_2-2}{n_1+n_2-4}\sigma^2$   $5 \square 2\frac{n_1+n_2}{n_1+n_2-2}\sigma^2$ 

The exam is finished. Have a great summer!