## Lecture 5

## Single factor design and analysis

## Completely randomized design (CRD)

## Completely randomized design

- In the design of experiments, completely randomized designs are for studying the effects of one primary factor without the need to take other nuisance variables into account
- The experiment compares the values of a response variable based on the different levels of that primary factor. For completely randomized designs, the levels of the primary factor are randomly assigned to the experimental units.


## Completely randomized design

- A study design with only one independent factor (e.g. category) of treatment in which the factor is manipulated at multiple levels. Often used in experimental design to determine the effect of a certain treatment or intervention.
- May be contrasted with factorial design, which evaluates the effects of two or more factors simultaneously.


## Completely randomized design

- In the experiment, only one factor A , and a levels $A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots, A_{a}$. In each level $\mathrm{A}_{i}$, there are $r_{\mathrm{i}}$ replications, $i=1,2$, $3, \ldots, a$
- If $r_{1}=r_{2}=\ldots=r_{a}$, the design is balanced. Otherwise, it is an unbalanced design.
- $y_{i j}$ is the result of $i$ th level and $j$ th replication.


## Example

- For an unbalanced design, A1 has 7 samples, A2 has 5 samples, A3 has 6 samples, and A4 has 6 samples. In total, there are 24 samples.

| Levels of factor A | Number of experiment units |
| :--- | :--- |
| A1 | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7(7)$ |
| A2 | $8,9,10,11,12(5)$ |
| A3 | $13,14,15,16,17,18(6)$ |
| A4 | $19,20,21,22,23,24(6)$ |

## Example

- Can we arrange the 24 experiment units in the order of the four levels? No.
- The attention and skill proficiency of manipulators may change during the experiments. And the light intensity may also be different. The observations may not be independent!
- So we should use random design to solve this problem.

|  | Randomize RandNum |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Plot1 | A1 | 0.016941 |
| Plot2 | A3 | 0.040356 |
| Plot3 | A4 | 0.04234 |
| Plot4 | A3 | 0.063423 |
| Plot5 | A1 | 0.125257 |
| Plot6 | A3 | 0.126621 |
| Plot7 | A4 | 0.208301 |
| Plot8 | A4 | 0.221024 |
| Plot9 | A1 | 0.255363 |
| Plot10 | A2 | 0.334577 |
| Plot11 | A4 | 0.366835 |
| Plot12 | A2 | 0.418322 |
| Plot13 | A4 | 0.441407 |
| Plot14 | A2 | 0.635086 |
| Plot15 | A3 | 0.762573 |
| Plot16 | A2 | 0.799705 |
| Plot17 | A3 | 0.802349 |
| Plot18 | A1 | 0.829444 |
| Plot19 | A4 | 0.838652 |
| Plot20 | A3 | 0.848814 |
| Plot21 | A2 | 0.853357 |
| Plot22 | A1 | 0.860988 |
| Plot23 | A1 | 0.964504 |
| Plot24 | A1 | 0.9751 |

## Example

- 24 experiments for Folic acid content in green tea

| Levels of <br> factor A | Observed data (mg) | Sample <br> mean |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| A1 | $7.9,6.2,6.6,8.6,8.9,10.1,9.6$ | 8.27 |
| A2 | $5.7,7.5,9.8,6.1,8.4$ | 7.50 |
| A3 | $6.4,7.1,7.9,4.5,5.0,4.0$ | 5.82 |
| A4 | $6.8,7.5,5.0,5.3,6.1,7.4$ | 6.35 |

## Dot-plot



- Are the differences caused by chance or not? We use analysis of variance (ANOVA) for further analysis.


## General Data

## Levels of Data <br> Sum <br> Mean factor A <br> $$
\begin{array}{cccc} \hline \mathrm{A}_{1} & \mathrm{y}_{11} \mathrm{y}_{12} \cdots \mathrm{y}_{1 r_{1}} & T_{1}=y_{11}+y_{12}+\cdots+y_{11_{1}} & \bar{y}_{1}=T_{1} / r_{1} \\ \mathrm{~A}_{2} & \mathrm{y}_{21} \mathrm{y}_{22} \cdots \mathrm{y}_{2 r_{2}} T_{2}=y_{21}+y_{22}+\cdots+y_{2 r_{2}} & \bar{y}_{2}=T_{2} / r_{2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{a}} & \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{a} 1} \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{a} 2} \cdots \mathrm{y}_{a a_{a}}{ }_{a}=y_{a 1}+y_{a 2}+\cdots+y_{a_{2}} & \bar{y}_{a}=T_{a} / r_{a} \end{array}
$$ <br> <br> $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{a}}$

 <br> <br> $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{a}}$}
## Basic assumptions

- 1. Normality: samples $y_{i 1}, y_{i 2}, \ldots, y_{i r_{i}}$ under level $A_{i}$ have the Normal distribution

$$
\mathrm{N}\left(\mu_{i}, \sigma_{i}^{2}\right), i=1,2, \cdots, a
$$

- 2. Homogeneity of Variance: the variances of the a Normal distributions are the same, i.e.

$$
\sigma_{1}^{2}=\sigma_{2}^{2}=\cdots=\sigma_{a}^{2}=\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}
$$

- 3. Randomness. All data $y_{i j}$ are independent.


## Targets

- 1. Are the means of the a levels $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \cdots, \mu_{a}$ the same? (using One-way ANOVA)
- If the means are not the same, which difference between means is significant? (using multiple comparison)


## The linear model

- The model is

$$
y_{i j}=\mu_{i}+\varepsilon_{i j}, i=1,2, \cdots, a ; j=1,2, \cdots, r_{i}
$$

- $\varepsilon_{i j}$ is the experimental error of the $\boldsymbol{t}$ level and jth experiment. $\varepsilon_{i j} \sim N\left(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$, i.i.d
- Theory 1: $y_{i j}$ are sum of a constant $\mu_{i}$ and random error $\varepsilon_{i j}$
- Theory 2: $E\left(\varepsilon_{i j}\right)=0, \operatorname{Var}\left(\varepsilon_{i j}\right)=\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}$, so

$$
E\left(y_{i j}\right)=\mu_{i}, \operatorname{Var}\left(y_{i j}\right)=\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}
$$

## The linear model

- Theory 3: $\varepsilon_{i j} \sim N\left(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$, so $y_{i j} \sim N\left(\mu_{\mathrm{i}}, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$
- Theory 4: The random errors are independent, so all $y_{i j}$ are also independent.


## Least square estimation

- Minimize

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S_{\varepsilon}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\mu_{i}\right)^{2} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{r_{1}}\left(y_{1 j}-\mu_{1}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{r_{2}}\left(y_{2 j}-\mu_{2}\right)^{2}+\cdots+\sum_{j=1}^{r_{a}}\left(y_{a j}-\mu_{a}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

- The least square estimator of $\mu_{i}$ is

$$
\hat{\mu}_{i}=\bar{y}_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, a
$$

- In previous example,

$$
\hat{\mu}_{1}=8.27, \hat{\mu}_{2}=7.50, \hat{\mu}_{3}=5.82, \hat{\mu}_{4}=6.35
$$

## One-way ANOVA

## Hypothesis in one-way ANOVA

- The one-way analysis of variance is used to test the claim that more than 2 population means are equal
- This is an extension of the two independent samples $t$-test
- $H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2}=\cdots=\mu_{a}$
- $H_{\mathrm{A}}: \mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \cdots, \mu_{a}$ are not equal.
- If we reject $H_{0}$ under the significance level $\alpha$, then factor $A$ is significant under the level $\alpha$. Otherwise, factor A is not significant.


## Sum of squares

- Definition

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad \bar{y}=\left(y_{1}+y_{2}+\cdots+y_{a}\right) / a \\
& Q=\left(y_{1}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{2}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}+\cdots+\left(y_{a}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{a}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Because $\sum_{i=1}^{a}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)=0$
- There are only a-1 independent deviations in $Q$, we call the number of independent deviations in sum of squares as degree of freedom for sum of squares which is often denoted as $f$.


## Distribution of sum of square ( $Q$ )

- Theorem: assume $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{a}$ is a sample from a normal distribution $N\left(\mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$. Then
- 1. Sample mean

$$
\bar{y} \sim N\left(\mu, \sigma^{2} / a\right)
$$

- 2. Ratio of sum of squares to $\sigma^{2}$ is

$$
Q / \sigma^{2} \sim \chi^{2}(a-1)
$$

- 3. $\bar{y}$ and $Q$ are independent


## Decomposing the sum of squares

- Mean of all data $y_{i j}$ is

$$
\bar{y}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}} y_{i j}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i} \bar{y}_{i}
$$

- Define $S S_{\mathrm{T}}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}$, degree of freedom $f_{T}=n-1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S_{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{i}+\bar{y}_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{i}\right)^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i}\left(\bar{y}_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Define

$$
\stackrel{S S_{\varepsilon}}{ }+S S_{A}
$$

## Sum of Squares

- $\mathrm{SS}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is the sum between groups, with degree of freedom $a-1 ; \mathrm{SS}_{\varepsilon}$ is the sum within groups (i.e. sum squares of errors), with degree of freedom $n-a$


## Sum of Squares

- Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S_{\mathrm{T}}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i}} y_{i j}^{2}-n \bar{y}^{2}, f_{T}=n-1 \\
& S S_{\mathrm{A}}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i}\left(\bar{y}_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i} \bar{y}_{i}^{2}-n \bar{y}^{2}, f_{A}=a-1 \\
& S S_{\varepsilon}=S S_{T}-S S_{A}, f_{\varepsilon}=n-a
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example

- The data and sum of squares

| Level | Data | Rep | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ | $7.9,6.2,6.6,8.6,8.9$, <br> $10.1,9.6$ | $r_{1}=7$ | 8.27 |
| $\mathrm{~A}_{2}$ | $5.7,7.5,9.8,6.1,8.4$ | $r_{2}=5$ | 7.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}_{3}$ | $6.4,7.1,7.9,4.5,5.0, r_{3}=6$ <br> 4.0 | 5.82 |  |
| $\mathrm{~A}_{4}$ | $6.8,7.5,5.0,5.3,6.1, r_{4}=6$ <br> 7.4 | 6.35 |  |
|  |  | $n=24$ | 7.02 |

## Example

- So

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S_{\mathrm{A}}=7 \times 8.27^{2}+5 \times 7.5^{2}+6 \times 5.82^{2}+ \\
& 6 \times 6.35^{2}-24 \times 7.02^{2}=23.50 \\
& S S_{\mathrm{T}}=\left(7.9^{2}+6.2^{2}+\cdots+6.1^{2}+7.4^{2}\right)-24 \times 7.02^{2}=65.27
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
S S_{\varepsilon}=65.27-23.50=41.77
$$

## Mean square

- Mean square is sum of squares divided by its degree of freedom

$$
M S_{\varepsilon}=\frac{S S_{\varepsilon}}{n-a} \quad M S_{A}=\frac{S S_{A}}{a-1}
$$

- Theory: Under the basic assumption of single factor design, we have:
$E\left(S S_{\varepsilon}\right)=(n-a) \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \quad E\left(S S_{A}\right)=(a-1) \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i}\left(\mu_{i}-\mu\right)^{2}$
- Where $\mu=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i} \mu_{i}=E(\overline{\mathrm{y}})$


## Distributions under $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{0}}$

- It is proved, under $\mathrm{H}_{0}$,
$S S_{\mathrm{A}} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \sim \chi^{2}(a-1)$
$S S_{\varepsilon} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \sim \chi^{2}(n-a)$
$\mathrm{SS}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\mathrm{SS}_{\varepsilon}$ are independent.
- Then $\frac{S S_{A} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} /(a-1)}{S S_{\varepsilon} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} /(n-a)}=\frac{M S_{A}}{M S_{\varepsilon}} \sim F(a-1, n-a)$
i.e. $F=\frac{M S_{A}}{M S_{\varepsilon}} \sim F(a-1, n-a)$


## The analysis of variance table for the single factor

| Source | Degrees of <br> freedom | Sum of <br> squares | Mean <br> square | F ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Factor A | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{a}-1$ | $S S_{A}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_{i}\left(\overline{y_{i}}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}$ | $\mathrm{M} S_{\mathrm{A}}=\frac{S S_{A}}{a-1}$ | $F=\frac{M S_{A}}{M S_{\varepsilon}}$ |
| Error | $\mathrm{f}_{\varepsilon}=n-\mathrm{a}$ | $S S_{\varepsilon}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{i}\right)^{2}$ | $\mathrm{MS} S_{\varepsilon}=\frac{S S_{\varepsilon}}{n-a}$ |  |
| Total T | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{T}}=n-1$ | $S S_{\mathrm{T}}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}$ |  |  |

- Given significance level $\alpha$, find the $F_{1-\alpha}(a-1, n-a)$, then
- If $F>F_{1-\alpha}(a-1, n-a)$, reject $H_{0}$
- If $F \leq F_{1-\alpha}(a-1, n-a)$, accept $H_{0}$


## Example (continued)

- We have calculated the sum of squares. The table of ANOVA is

| Source | Degres of <br> freedom (DF) | Sum of <br> squares (SS) | Mean <br> square (MS) | (Malue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Factor A | 3 | 23.50 | 7.83 | $3.75^{*}$ |
| Error | 20 | 41.77 | 2.09 |  |
| Total T | 23 | 65.27 |  |  |

- $\alpha=0.05, F_{0.95}(3,20)=3.10, F>3.10$, reject $H_{0}$, i.e. the four classes have significant difference.


## Example (continued)

- Meanwhile, we can get the unbiased estimation of $\sigma^{2}: \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}^{2}=2.09$
- Estimation of means are

$$
\hat{\mu}_{1}=8.27, \hat{\mu}_{2}=7.50, \hat{\mu}_{3}=5.82, \hat{\mu}_{4}=3.5
$$

- The mean under $A_{1}$ is the largest. $\alpha=0.05, t_{1-\alpha / 2}(n-a)=t_{0.975}(20)=2.0860, r_{1}=7, \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}=1.45$
So $\bar{y}_{1} \pm t_{1-\alpha / 2}(n-a) \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon} / \sqrt{r_{1}}=8.27 \pm 2.0860 \times 1.45 / \sqrt{7}=8.27 \pm 1.14$
- The interval estimation of $\mu_{1}$ is [7.13, 9.41]


## Balanced experiment

- If the experiment has the same number of replications in every level, the design is a balanced experiment.
- Advantages:
-Exclude the impact of different replications
- The equations for calculation are simpler.


## ANOVA of balanced experiment

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{1} & =r_{2}=\cdots=r_{a}=r \\
S S_{\mathrm{T}} & =\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{i j}^{2}-a r \bar{y}^{2}, f_{T}=a r-1 \\
S S_{A} & =r \sum_{i=1}^{a}\left(\overline{\mathrm{y}}_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=r \sum_{i=1}^{a} \bar{y}_{i}^{2}-a r \bar{y}^{2}, f_{A}=a-1 \\
S S_{\varepsilon} & =S S_{T}-S S_{A}, f_{\varepsilon}=(r-1) a
\end{aligned}
$$

- Under $H_{0}, \quad S S_{\mathrm{A}} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \sim \chi^{2}(a-1)$

$$
S S_{\varepsilon} / \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \sim \chi^{2}((r-1) a)
$$

## ANOVA table

| Source | Degrees of freedom | Sum of squares | Mean square | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Expected } \\ & \text { MS } \end{aligned}$ | F ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factor A | $f_{A}=a-1$ | $S S_{\Lambda}=\sum_{i=1}^{s} r_{\text {che }}$ | $\mathrm{MS}_{A}=\frac{S S_{A}}{a-1}$ | $\sigma_{s}^{2}+r \sigma_{A}^{2}$ | $F=\frac{M S_{A}}{M S_{e}}$ |
| Error | $f_{\varepsilon}=(r-1) a$ | $s s_{c}=\sum_{i=1}^{i} \sum_{i=1}^{n}(0$ | $S_{c}=\frac{s s_{s}}{(r-1) a}$ | $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}$ |  |
| Total T | $t_{T}=r a-1$ | $s S_{T}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_{i}\right.$ |  |  |  |

## Let's work on the previous example together on our computers

Levels of factor A

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
A_{1} & 7.9,6.2,6.6,8.6,8.9,10.1,9.6 \\
A_{2} & 5.7,7.5,9.8,6.1,8.4 \\
A_{3} & 6.4,7.1,7.9,4.5,5.0,4.0 \\
A_{4} & 6.8,7.5,5.0,5.3,6.1,7.4
\end{array}
$$

- Do the randomization of the 24 plots
- Build the ANOVA table for the observed data


## Randomly complete block design (RCBD)

Blocking to increase precision by grouping the experimental units into homogeneous blocks to compare treatments within a more uniform environment

## Complete block design (CBD)

- If every treatment is used and replicated the same number of times in every block, the design is a complete block design (CBD).
- If each treatment is used once in every block, it is a randomly complete block design (RCBD).
- Here we consider a experiment with a treatments and $\boldsymbol{b}$ blocks (replications).


## Statistical model of RCBD

$i=1,2, \ldots$, a for the $a$ treatments; $j=1,2, \ldots, b$ for the $b$ replications

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{i j} & =\bar{y}_{. .}+\left(\bar{y}_{i} .-\bar{y}_{. .}\right)+\left(\bar{y}_{. j}-\bar{y}_{. .}\right) \\
& +\left[y_{i j}-\left(\bar{y}_{i} .-\bar{y}_{. .}\right)-\left(\bar{y}_{. j}-\bar{y}_{. .}\right)-\bar{y}_{. .}\right] \\
& =\mu+\alpha_{i}+\beta_{j}+\varepsilon_{i j}
\end{aligned}
$$

- $\mu$ : the general mean
- $\alpha_{i}$ : the treatment effect
- $\beta_{j}$ : the block effect
- $\varepsilon_{i j}$ : the experimental error


## Field layout of 8 mutants and 3 blocks (i.e. 3 replications)



## Example: Observations of 8 mutants and 3 blocks (i.e. 3 replications)

| Mutants | Observations |  |  | Mean across replications $\bar{y}$ | Mutant effects $\alpha_{i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rep I | Rep II | Rep III |  |  |
| A | 10.9 | 9.1 | 12.2 | 10.7 | -0.9 |
| B | 10.8 | 12.3 | 14.0 | 12.4 | 0.8 |
| C | 11.1 | 12.5 | 10.5 | 11.4 | -0.2 |
| D | 9.1 | 10.7 | 10.1 | 10.0 | -1.6 |
| E | 11.8 | 13.9 | 16.8 | 14.2 | 2.6 |
| F | 10.1 | 10.6 | 11.8 | 10.8 | -0.8 |
| G | 10.0 | 11.5 | 14.1 | 11.9 | 0.3 |
| H | 9.3 | 10.4 | 14.4 | 11.4 | -0.2 |
| Mean across mutants $\bar{y}_{j}$ | 10.4 | 11.4 | 13.0 | 11.6 ( $\bar{y}$ ) |  |
| Block effects $\beta_{j}$ | -1.2 | -0.2 | 1.4 |  |  |

## ANOVA of RCBD

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S_{T}=\sum_{i=1, \ldots, ;, j=1, \ldots, 3}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1, \ldots,, ; ; j=1, \cdots, 3} y_{i j}{ }^{2}-24 \bar{y}^{2}=84.61 \\
& S S_{A}=3 \sum_{i=1}^{8} \bar{y}_{i .}^{2}-24 \bar{y}^{2}=3 \sum_{i=1, \cdots, 8} \alpha_{i}^{2}=34.08 \\
& S S_{B}=8 \sum_{j=1}^{3} \bar{y}_{. j}^{2}-24 \bar{y}^{2}=8 \sum_{j=1}^{3} \beta_{j}^{2}=27.56
\end{aligned}
$$

## ANOVA of RCBD

$$
\begin{aligned}
S S_{T} & =\sum_{i, j}\left(y_{i j}-\mu\right)^{2} \\
& =\sum_{i, j}\left[\left(\bar{y}_{i} \cdot-\mu\right)+\left(\bar{y}_{\cdot j}-\mu\right)+\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{i} \cdot-\bar{y}_{\cdot j}+\mu\right)\right]^{2} \\
& =r \sum_{i}\left(\bar{y}_{i} \cdot-\mu\right)^{2}+n \sum_{j}\left(\bar{y}_{\cdot j}-\mu\right)^{2}+\sum_{i, j}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{i} \cdot-\bar{y}_{\cdot j}+\mu\right)^{2} \\
& =S S_{A}+S S_{B}+S S_{\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
S S_{\varepsilon}=S S_{T}-S S_{A}-S S_{B}=22.97
$$

## Table of ANOVA

| Source of <br> variation | Degree of <br> freedom (df) | Sum of <br> squares <br> SS) | Mean <br> squares <br> $(M S)$ | F-test | Pr > F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | $a \times b-1=23$ | 84.61 |  |  |  |
| Mutants | $a-1=7$ | 34.08 | 4.87 | $2.97^{*}$ | 0.0395 |
| Blocks | $b-1=2$ | 27.56 | 13.78 | $8.40^{* *}$ | 0.004 |
| Error | $(a-1) \times(b-1)$ <br> $=14$ | 22.97 | 1.64 |  |  |

A sum of squares for blocks is partitioned out of the sum of squares of experimental error. The blocked design will markedly improve the precision on the estimates of treatment means if the reduction in $S S_{\varepsilon}$ with blocking is substantial.

## Confidence interval of treatment mean

- Standard error of treatment mean

$$
s_{\bar{y}_{i} .}=\sqrt{\frac{M S_{\varepsilon}}{b}}=\sqrt{\frac{1.64}{3}}=0.74
$$

- The $95 \%$ confidence interval (CI)

$$
C C_{\bar{y}_{i} \cdot}=\bar{y}_{i} \cdot \pm t_{0.975}(14) \times s_{\bar{y}_{i}}=\bar{y}_{i} . \pm 2.14 \times s_{\bar{y}_{i_{i}}}=\bar{y}_{i} \cdot \pm 1.58
$$

- Mutant A: $(9.15,12.31)$; B: (10.79, 13.95); C: (9.79, 12.95); D: (8.39, 11.55); E: (12.59, 15.75); F: (9.25, 12.41); G: (9.79, 12.95)


## Test of hypothesis of treatment mean

- F statistic to test the null hypothesis of no yield difference among the eight mutants

$$
F=\frac{M S_{A}}{M S_{\varepsilon}}=\frac{4.87}{1.64}=2.97
$$

- Critical value

$$
F_{0.05}(7,14)=2.76
$$

- Observed significance level

$$
P>F=F(2.76,7,14)=0.0395
$$

## Estimation of variance component

| Source | DF | MS | Expected MS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | $a \times b-1=23$ |  |  |
| Mutants | $a-1=7$ | 4.87 | $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b \sigma_{G}^{2}$ |
| Blocks | $b-1=2$ | 13.78 |  |
| Error | $(a-1) \times(b-1)=14$ | 1.64 | $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}$ |

- Error variance $\quad \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}=1.64$
- Genotypic variance $\sigma_{G}^{2}=\left(M S_{\mathrm{A}}-M S_{\varepsilon}\right) / b=1.08$
- Repeatability (H) $\quad H=\sigma_{G}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{G}^{2}+\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)=39.71 \%$


## Reporting the experiment

- Analysis of yield data indicates significant differences in yield among the eight wheat mutants
- Mutant E produces the highest yield
- Mutant D is clearly inferior to the others



## Compared to One-way ANOVA

| Source | Degrees of <br> freedom | Sum of <br> squares | Mean <br> square | F ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mutants | 7 | 34.08 | 4.87 | 1.54 |
| Error | 16 | 50.53 | 3.16 |  |
| Total T | 23 | 84.61 |  |  |

- $\alpha=0.05, F_{0.95}(7,16)=2.66, F<2.66$, we can't reject $H_{0}$, i.e. the eight mutants doesn't have significant difference.
- Here error variance=3.16>1.64 (error using the last analysis method)


## Let's work on the previous example together on our computers

| Mutants | Rep I | Rep II | Rep III |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 10.9 | 9.1 | 12.2 |
| B | 10.8 | 12.3 | 14.0 |
| C | 11.1 | 12.5 | 10.5 |
| D | 9.1 | 10.7 | 10.1 |
| E | 11.8 | 13.9 | 16.8 |
| F | 10.1 | 10.6 | 11.8 |
| G | 10.0 | 11.5 | 14.1 |
| H | 9.3 | 10.4 | 14.4 |

- Do the randomization of the three blocks
- Build the ANOVA table for the observed data

