## Statistics Qualifying Examination

Answer all questions and show all work.
This exam is closed-note/book. You need to use a calculator.

1. Let $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ have the joint probability density function (pdf)

$$
f_{X_{1}, X_{2}}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)= \begin{cases}15 x_{1}^{2} x_{2} & 0<x_{1}<x_{2}<1 \\ 0 & \text { elsewhere }\end{cases}
$$

(a) Calculate the probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(X_{1}+X_{2} \leq 1\right)$.
(b) Find the marginal pdf of $X_{2}, f_{X_{2}}\left(x_{2}\right)$.
(c) Show that $f_{X_{2}}\left(x_{2}\right)$ is a (legitimate) probability density function.
(d) Calculate $E\left(\frac{1}{X_{2}}\right)$.
2. Suppose that the random variable $X$ has a Poisson distribution such that

$$
50 \cdot \operatorname{Pr}(X=1)=\operatorname{Pr}(X=2)
$$

(a) Find the mean and the variance of $X$.
(b) Calculate the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(X \geq 1)$.
(c) Calculate the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(75<X<125)$ using the Chebyshev's inequality.

- Chebyshev's inequality: If $X$ has a finite variance $\sigma^{2}$ with mean $\mu, \operatorname{Pr}(|X-\mu| \geq$ $k \sigma) \leq 1 / k^{2}$ for every $k>0$.

3. Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ be a random sample from a Possion distribution with the probability mass function as $P(X=x)=\frac{e^{-\theta} \theta^{x}}{x!}, x=0,1,2, \ldots$, and $0<\theta<\infty$.
(a) Find the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) $\hat{\theta}$ of $\theta$.
(b) Is the MLE $\hat{\theta}$ an efficient estimator of $\theta$ ? Clearly justify your answer.
(c) Find the MLE $\hat{\tau}$ of $\tau=P(X \leq 1)$.
(d) Determine the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}-\tau)$.
4. Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ be a random sample from a $\operatorname{Gamma}(3, \theta)$ distribution, where $0<\theta<\infty$.
(a) Find the exact likelihood ratio test of size $\alpha$ for testing the hypotheses $H_{0}: \theta=\theta_{0}$ vs $H_{1}: \theta \neq \theta_{0}$. Clearly state the likelihood ratio, the rejection region, and the decision rule.
(b) For $\theta_{0}=3$ and $n=5$, specify the rejection region so that the test that rejects the null hypothesis has a significant level 0.05.
(c) Obtain the power function of the test in (a) with $\theta_{0}=3, n=5$, and $\alpha=0.05$.
5. Consider the normal error regression model as follows: $Y_{i}=\beta X_{i}+\epsilon_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$ where $X_{i}$ 's are known constants, $\epsilon_{i}$ 's are i.i.d. $N\left(0, \sigma^{2}\right)$, and $\beta$ and $\sigma^{2}$ are parameters to be estimated.
(a) Derive the maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) of $\beta$ and $\sigma^{2}$, say $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\sigma}^{2}$, respectively.
(b) Show that $\hat{\beta}$ is a linear combination of $Y_{i}$ 's, i.e, $\hat{\beta}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i} Y_{i}$ and that $\hat{\beta}$ is an unbiased estimator (UE) of $\beta$.
(c) Show that $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\beta})=\sigma^{2} / \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2}$.
(d) Let $e_{i}=Y_{i}-\hat{Y}_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$. Show that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i} e_{i}=0$.
6. The electric power consumed each month by a chemical plant is thought to be related to the average ambient temperature $X_{1}$, the number of days in the month $X_{2}$, the average product purity $X_{3}$, and the tons of product produced $X_{4}$. The past year's historical data are available. Consider all 4 variables as covariates in the multiple regression model with normal errors. Use the following information, with $n=12$.

Analysis of Variance

Source
Model
Error
Corrected Total

DF Squares Square F Value $\mathrm{Pr}>\mathrm{F}$
4957.24074
6656.25000

Parameter Estimates

|  | Parameter | Standard |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Variable | DF | Estimate | Error | t Value | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|t\|$ |
| Intercept | 1 | -102.71324 | 207.85885 | -0.49 | 0.6363 |
| x1 | 1 | 0.60537 | 0.36890 | 1.64 | 0.1448 |
| x2 | 1 | 8.92364 | 5.30052 | 1.68 | 0.1361 |
| x3 | 1 | 1.43746 | 2.39162 | 0.60 | 0.5668 |
| x4 | 1 | 0.01361 | 0.73382 | 0.02 | 0.9857 |


| Number in Model | R-Square | C(p) | AIC | MSE | SSE | Variables in Model |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.6446 | 1.7471 | 67.4074 | 236.57679 | 2365.76786 | x 2 |
| 1 | 0.5647 | 3.9371 | 69.8397 | 289.73308 | 2897.33079 | x 1 |
| 1 | 0.0024 | 19.3586 | 79.7922 | 664.03676 | 6640.36765 | x3 |
| 1 | 0.0001 | 19.4218 | 79.8198 | 665.56870 | 6655.68695 | x4 |
| 2 | 0.7314 | 1.3665 | 66.0471 | 198.66239 | 1787.96148 | $\mathrm{x} 1 \times 2$ |
| 2 | 0.6463 | 3.6989 | 69.3479 | 261.56262 | 2354.06360 | $\mathrm{x} 2 \times 3$ |
| 2 | 0.6447 | 3.7437 | 69.4032 | 262.77130 | 2364.94169 | $\mathrm{x} 2 \times 4$ |
| 2 | 0.6412 | 3.8385 | 69.5194 | 265.32872 | 2387.95845 | $\mathrm{x} 1 \times 3$ |
| 3 | 0.7447 | 3.0003 | 67.4353 | 212.38659 | 1699.09274 | $\mathrm{x} 1 \times 2 \times 3$ |
| 3 | 0.7316 | 3.3612 | 68.0386 | 223.33621 | 1786.68970 | $\mathrm{x} 1 \times 2 \times 4$ |
| 3 | 0.6466 | 5.6930 | 71.3406 | 294.07956 | 2352.63647 | $\mathrm{x} 2 \times 3 \times 4$ |
| 3 | 0.6414 | 5.8343 | 71.5143 | 298.36753 | 2386.94025 | $\mathrm{x} 1 \times 3 \times 4$ |
| 4 | 0.7447 | 5.0000 | 69.4347 | 242.71561 | 1699.00926 | x 1 x 2 x 3 x 4 |

(a) Predict power consumption for a month and compute a $95 \%$ confidence interval for the predicted power consumption when $X_{1}=75, X_{2}=24, X_{3}=90$, and $X_{4}=98$.
(b) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: \beta_{1}=\beta_{3}=0$ v.s. $H_{1}: \operatorname{not} H_{0}$.
(c) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: \beta_{1}=\beta_{3}=0$ v.s. $H_{1}: \beta_{1}=0$.
(d) Perform a stepwise regression using a $\alpha=.05$ level of significance.
7. Disk drive substrates may affect the amplitude of the signal obtained during readback. A manufacturer compares four substrates: aluminum(A), nickel-plated aluminum (B), and two types of glass ( C and D ). Sixteen disk drives will be made, four using each of the substrates. The design responses (in microvolts) are given in the following table (data from Nelson 1993; Greek letters indicate day)

|  | Operator |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 1 | $A \alpha=8$ | $C \gamma=11$ | $D \delta=2$ | $B \beta=8$ |  |
| 2 | $C \delta=7$ | $A \beta=5$ | $B \alpha=2$ | $D \gamma=4$ |  |
| 3 | $D \beta=3$ | $B \delta=9$ | $A \gamma=7$ | $C \alpha=9$ |  |
| 4 | $B \gamma=4$ | $D \alpha=5$ | $C \beta=9$ | $A \delta=3$ |  |

The grand mean is $\bar{Y}_{. . .}=6$, and the level means for the four substrates are:

$$
A: 5.75 \quad B: 5.50 \quad C: 9.00 \quad D: 3.75
$$

(a) What kind of design is used for the experiment? Give a model and state the assumptions.
(b) Calculate the estimates of the treatment (i.e. the substrates) effects.
(c) Part of the ANOVA table from SAS is given below. Test if the substrates are different from each other in terms of their effects on the response. To get full credits, state the hypotheses, obtain the test statistic, and draw your conclusion ( $\alpha=0.05$ ).

| Source | DF | Squares | Mean Square | F | Value | $\mathrm{Pr}>\mathrm{F}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | 12 | 100.5000000 | 8.3750000 |  | 1.17 | 0.5098 |
| Error | 3 | 21.5000000 | 7.1666667 |  |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 15 | 122.0000000 |  |  |  |  |
| Source | DF | Type I SS | Mean Square | F | Value | $\mathrm{Pr}>\mathrm{F}$ |
| row | ?? | 21.50000000 | 7.16666667 |  | 1.00 | 0.5000 |
| col | ?? | 14.00000000 | 4.66666667 |  | 0.65 | 0.6335 |
| substrate | ?? | ?? | ?? |  | ?? | ?? |
| greek | ?? | 3.50000000 | 1.16666667 |  | 0.16 | 0.9149 |


| $\left(d f_{1}, d f_{2}\right)$ | $(3,3)$ | $(3,12)$ | $(3,15)$ | $(4,3)$ | $(4,12)$ | $(4,15)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $F_{0.025 ; d f_{1}, d f_{2}}$ | 15.4392 | 4.4742 | 4.1528 | 15.1010 | 4.1212 | 3.8043 |
| $F_{0.05 ; d f_{1}, d f_{2}}$ | 9.2766 | 3.4903 | 3.2874 | 9.1172 | 3.2592 | 3.0556 |

(d) If the machine were not considered as blocks and not included in ANOVA model, will the test results in part (c) change? Justify your answer.
8. An engineer suspects that the surface finish of a metal part is influenced by the feed rate and the depth of cut. He selects three feed rates and four depths of cut. He then conducts a factorial experiment and obtains the following data.

|  | Depth of |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feed rate (in/min) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | $74,64,60$ | $79,68,73$ | $82,88,92$ | $99,104,96$ |
| 2 | $92,86,88$ | $98,104,88$ | $99,108,95$ | $104,110,99$ |
| 3 | $99,98,102$ | $104,99,95$ | $108,110,99$ | $114,111,107$ |

Some summary statistics are give below.

| feed | mean | 1 | depth | mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 81.583 | 1 | 1 | 84.778 |
| 2 | 97.583 | 1 | 2 | 89.778 |
| 3 | 103.833 | 1 | 3 | 97.889 |
|  |  | 1 | 4 | 104.889 |
| feed | depth | mean |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 66.000 |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 73.333 |  |  |
| 1 | 3 | 87.333 |  |  |
| 1 | 4 | 99.667 |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | 88.667 |  |  |
| 2 | 2 | 96.667 |  |  |
| 2 | 3 | 100.667 |  |  |
| 2 | 4 | 104.333 |  |  |
| 3 | 1 | 99.667 |  |  |
| 3 | 2 | 99.333 |  |  |
| 3 | 3 | 105.667 |  |  |
| 3 | 4 | 110.667 |  |  |

Suppose the following statistical model is used to fit the data.

$$
Y_{i j k}=\mu+\tau_{i}+\beta_{j}+(\tau \beta)_{i j}+\epsilon_{i j k} ; k=1,2,3
$$

where $\tau_{i}(i=1,2,3)$ and $\beta_{j}(j=1,2,3,4)$ are the effects of feed rate and cut depth, and $(\tau \beta)_{i j}$ are their interactions. For parameter estimation, we impose the following constraints as in the lecture notes: $\sum_{i} \tau_{i}=\sum_{j} \beta_{j}=\sum_{i}(\tau \beta)_{i j}=\sum_{j}(\tau \beta)_{i j}=0$.
The ANOVA of the data was done in SAS and the output is shown.
(a) What are the estimates of $\tau_{1}$ and $(\tau \beta)_{22}$ ?
(b) Test if the interaction between feed rate and cut depth is significant. To get full credits, give a test statistic, the corresponding $p$-value, and your conclusion.

| Dependent Variable: finish |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sum of |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | DF | Squares | Mean Square | F Value | Pr $>\mathrm{F}$ |
| Model | 11 | 5842.667 | 531.151515 | 18.49 | <. 0001 |
| Error | 24 | 689.333 | 28.722222 |  |  |
| Co Total | 35 | 6532.000 |  |  |  |
| ource | DF | Type I SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| feed | 2 | 3160.500 | 1580.250 | 55.02 | <. 0001 |
| depth | 3 | 2125.111 | 708.370 | 24.66 | <.0001 |
| feed*depth | 6 | 557.056 | 92.843 | 3.23 | 0.0180 |

(c) If we plan to perform pairwise comparison for all treatment combinations, which procedure should we use? What is the corresponding critical difference (using $\alpha=5 \%$ )? Note: No table of critical values from distributions is given for this part, and thus you don't need to calculate the final numerical answer. Instead, please give the formula of the critical difference and specify the components in the formula, including but not limited to the degrees of freedom, significance level, and the distribution.
(d) Use the Bonferroni method to compare the following treatments (i.e. these four specific level combinations of speed and depth): $(2,3),(2,4),(3,3)$ and $(3,4)$, pairwisely (Use $\alpha=6 \%)$. Calculate the critical difference and report your results of comparison. You can report the result as we have seen in SAS output by labeling significantly different combinations with different Latin letters.

| $d f$ | 2 | 3 | 6 | 24 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t_{0.005 ; d f}$ | 9.9248 | 5.8409 | 3.7074 | 2.7969 |
| $t_{0.01 ; d d}$ | 6.9646 | 4.5407 | 3.1427 | 2.4922 |
| $t_{0.015 ; d f}$ | 5.6428 | 3.8960 | 2.8289 | 2.3069 |
| $t_{0.03 ; d f}$ | 3.8964 | 2.9505 | 2.3133 | 1.9740 |

