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## SECTION A - STATISTICS FOR ECONOMICS

A1. Three administrative districts $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C in a large town consist of $N_{A}=5000, N_{B}=3000$ and $N_{C}=2000$ households respectively. A sociologist wishes to carry out a $10 \%$ sample survey of households to estimate the total number of resident children in these districts.
(i) A sample of 1000 households is taken (without replacement) from the total number of 10000 households, and the number of resident children $x_{i}$ is recorded in each sampled household. The sum of these observations is $\Sigma x_{i}=1429$ and the sum of their squares is $\Sigma x_{i}^{2}=4236$. Assuming that the data are a simple random sample from all 10000 households, obtain an approximate $95 \%$ confidence interval for the total number of children in districts A, B and C. State any assumptions needed for your analysis.
(ii) Suppose now that the sample is in fact a stratified random sample with districts as strata, allocated proportionally to the number of households in each district, and that the sum and sum of squares of the observations in each district are as shown in the following table.

| District | Number of <br> households sampled | $\sum x_{i}$ | $\sum x_{i}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $n_{A}=500$ | 556 | 1253 |
| B | $n_{B}=300$ | 426 | 1179 |
| C | $n_{C}=200$ | 447 | 1804 |

Obtain an approximate $95 \%$ confidence interval for the total number of children in districts A, B and C, based on the proportionally allocated stratified sample, making your reasoning clear.
(iii) Compare the results of your analyses in parts (i) and (ii). Why is stratified sampling usually expected to yield more precise results than a simple random sample of the same size? If your estimated within-stratum sample variances in part (ii) were in proportion to the true within-stratum variances (and unit costs of sampling were assumed to be equal in all strata), what would be the optimal allocation of sampling effort across the three districts? Comment on your results in the light of this allocation.

A2. (i) Briefly explain the purpose of standardisation in comparing mortality rates across (for example) diverse regions or occupational groups in a country.
(ii) Coal miners in a developing country are classified into three groups: high risk $(\mathrm{H})$, medium risk (M) and low risk (L). The table below shows numbers at risk and 10 -year numbers of deaths in each group, nationally and in two regions of the country, A and B .

|  |  | Risk group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | H | M | L |
| National | At risk | 10000 | 30000 | 60000 |
|  | Deaths | 1300 | 1500 | 1200 |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | At risk | 800 | 1200 | 3000 |
|  | Deaths | 96 | 60 | 54 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | At risk | 200 | 1000 | 2800 |
|  | Deaths | 28 | 60 | 56 |

(a) Calculate crude and standardised 10-year death rates for each of regions A and B using the direct method of standardisation, making your reasoning clear. Comment briefly on your results.
(b) Suppose now that at least some of the regional numbers of deaths within each group are considered to be too small to provide sufficiently reliable death rates. Explain what is meant by the index death rate for a region, and calculate this quantity for each region. For each region, compare the index death rate with the national rate and comment.
(c) Use the crude regional death rates in conjunction with the index death rates obtained in part (b) to obtain regional standardised mortality ratios, and comment briefly on your results.

A3. Investment trusts are companies whose sole activity is owning shares of other companies. The dividend paid by an investment trust is the total of the dividends which it receives from the companies whose shares it holds, less the costs of running the trust.

Random samples of 13 investment trusts and 20 other companies are taken and their dividend yields (\%), arranged in ascending order, are as follows.

| Investment | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | $\Sigma x=31.2$ | $x^{2}=142.56$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trusts | 1.9 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 7.9 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Other | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 6.4 | $\Sigma x=100.0$ | $\Sigma x^{2}=640.06$ |
| companies | 6.5 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 10.2 |  |  |  |

(i) (a) It is required to test the null hypothesis that the variances in the two populations are equal. Justify an economically appropriate alternative hypothesis, carry out the test, and comment on the result from an economist's standpoint.
(b) Assuming that the variances may be taken as equal, test the null hypothesis that the means in the two populations are equal against a twosided alternative. Suggest two possible economic reasons for the observed difference between the two population means.
(ii) Comment critically (but without further calculations) on the validity of the assumptions necessary for carrying out the test in part (i)(b). Briefly describe, but do not perform, a non-parametric test which could be applied to these data. State carefully the relevant null and alternative hypotheses for this test. Would you regard the non-parametric test applied to these data as having equal, more, or less validity compared with the test in part (i)(b)? Why?

A4. It is required to estimate an Engel expenditure curve relating household expenditure on recreation and culture, $y$, to total household expenditure, $x$. A commonly used model for fitting a sample of expenditures $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right), i=1,2, \ldots, n$, is

$$
y_{i}=\beta_{1}+\frac{\beta_{2}}{x_{i}}+e_{i} \quad\left(\beta_{1}>0, \beta_{2}<0\right),
$$

where the $e_{i}$ are assumed to be independent, identically Normally distributed error terms with mean zero.
(i) Briefly explain the reasoning behind this model, and its limitations. What is the economic significance of the quantities $\beta_{1}$ and $-\beta_{2} / \beta_{1}$ ?

The data below are compiled from published official statistics for the period 2001-2002.
Average Weekly Household Expenditure by Gross Income Decile Group, 2001-2002 (£)

|  | $y(\mathfrak{f})$ | $x(\mathfrak{£})$ | $1 / x$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1st decile (lowest 10\%) | 15.5 | 97.5 | 0.0102564 |
| 2nd decile | 21.8 | 99.9 | 0.0100100 |
| 3rd decile | 26.0 | 114.2 | 0.0087566 |
| 4th decile | 39.0 | 133.1 | 0.0075131 |
| 5th decile | 43.4 | 139.5 | 0.0071685 |
| 6th decile | 49.4 | 148.9 | 0.0067159 |
| 7th decile | 63.9 | 164.9 | 0.0060643 |
| 8th decile | 76.6 | 184.0 | 0.0054348 |
| 9th decile | 84.5 | 199.0 | 0.0050251 |
| 10th decile (highest 10\%) | 119.8 | 281.8 | 0.0035486 |

(ii) Plot a graph of the data with a view to assessing the suitability of an Engel model of the above form, and comment briefly.
(iii) Obtain ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates of the parameters $\beta_{1}$ and $\beta_{2}$ for the Engel model of the above form. For this purpose you are given that
$\Sigma y_{i}=539.9, \quad \Sigma\left(1 / x_{i}\right)=0.0704933, \quad \Sigma\left(1 / x_{i}^{2}\right)=0.000539166, \quad \Sigma\left(y_{i} / x_{i}\right)=3.19431$.
Provide a point estimate of the expected expenditure on recreation and culture given a total weekly expenditure of $£ 150$. Also give a point estimate of the threshold level of total expenditure below which nothing is spent on recreation and culture.

## Question A4 is continued on the next page

(iv) Summary information from OLS fitting of the extended Engel model

$$
y_{i}=\beta_{1}+\frac{\beta_{2}}{x_{i}}+\frac{\beta_{3}}{x_{i}^{2}}+e_{i}
$$

is as follows.

| Predictor | Coef | SE Coef | T | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | 243.181 | 7.060 | 34.45 | 0.000 |
| 1/x | -41092 | 2070 | -19.85 | 0.000 |
| 1/x_sq | 1863646 | 143441 | 12.99 | 0.000 |
| $S=1.95696$ | R-Sq | 99.7\% | R-Sq(adj) $=99.6 \%$ |  |
| Signs of sta | andardized | residual | - + | - - + + + |

Briefly explain with reasons whether or not you consider the extended model to be satisfactory as a summary of these data. Use the extended model to estimate the expected expenditure on recreation and culture given a total weekly expenditure of $£ 150$, and compare this answer with the corresponding result of part (iii).

Comment critically on the possibility of using the extended model outside the range of the available data.

## SECTION B - ECONOMETRICS

B1. The time series $\left\{y_{t}\right\}$ consists of the annual income in $£$ to the Receiver of Seamen's Sixpences for the years 1717-1828 inclusive. For $t=1,2, \ldots, 112$, the series $\left\{x_{t}\right\}$ is defined by $x_{t}=\log y_{t}$, and for $t=2,3, \ldots, 112$, the series $\left\{z_{t}\right\}$ is defined by $z_{t}=x_{t}-x_{t-1}$.

The edited computer output on the next page provides some summary analyses of the series $\left\{z_{t}\right\}$ and $\left\{x_{t}\right\}$.
(a) (i) Identify the model and write down its equation, for each of the statistical Models 1, 2 and 3 fitted to the series $\left\{z_{t}\right\}$.
(ii) Discuss with reasons which of the above fitted models for the series $\left\{z_{t}\right\}$ you would choose.
(iii) Briefly specify any further diagnostic checks you might wish to make on your chosen model.
(b) (i) Write down the equation for Model 1 in terms of the untransformed series $\left\{y_{t}\right\}$. Given that $\log$ (income) for 1828 is $x_{112}=9.92220$ and that the estimated residual for $1828(t=112)$ is $\hat{\varepsilon}_{112}=0.005306$, calculate point forecasts for the $y$ values in the years 1829 and 1830, based on this model.
(ii) Estimate the annual percentage increase in the $y$ values based on the fitted Model 1.

Autocorrelation Function of $\left\{z_{t}\right\}$

| Lag | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corr | -0.412 | -0.053 | 0.033 | 0.062 | -0.097 | 0.064 | -0.052 | -0.010 |

It may be assumed that no further correlations exceed 0.1 in absolute value.

Model 1 ARIMA $011{ }^{\prime} X^{\prime}$

| Type | Coef | SE Coef | T | P |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MA 1 | 0.5893 | 0.0774 | 7.62 | 0.000 |
| Constant | 0.010136 | 0.004323 | 2.34 | 0.021 |
| (Intercept) |  |  |  |  |

Differencing: 1 regular difference
Number of observations: Original series 112, after differencing 111
Residual Mean Square $=0.01219 \quad D F=109$

| Modified | Box-Pierce | (Ljung-Box) | Chi-Squ |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lag | 12 | 24 | 36 | 48 |
| Chi-Square | 6.5 | 12.5 | 18.5 | 28.9 |
| DF | 10 | 22 | 34 | 46 |
| P-Value | 0.770 | 0.947 | 0.986 | 0.977 |

Model 2 ARIMA $110{ }^{\prime} X^{\prime}$

| Type | Coef | SE Coef | T | P |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| AR 1 | -0.4126 | 0.0873 | -4.73 | 0.000 |
| Constant | 0.01387 | 0.01099 | 1.26 | 0.209 |
| (Intercept) |  |  |  |  |

Differencing: 1 regular difference
Number of observations: Original series 112, after differencing 111
Residual Mean Square $=0.01340 \quad D F=109$

| Modified | Box-Pierce | (Ljung-Box) | Chi-Squ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lag | 12 | 24 | 36 | 48 |
| Chi-Square | 13.5 | 21.6 | 28.3 | 43.2 |
| DF | 10 | 22 | 34 | 46 |
| P-Value | 0.198 | 0.485 | 0.742 | 0.591 |

Model 3 ARIMA $111{ }^{\prime} X$ '

| Type | Coef | f SE Coef | P |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AR 1 | 0.0873 | 30.1586 | 0.55 | 0.583 |
| MA 1 | 0.6565 | 0.1201 | 5.47 | 0.000 |
| Constant | 0.009329 | 0.003630 | 2.57 | 0.012 |
| (Intercept) |  |  |  |  |
| Differencing: 1 regular difference |  |  |  |  |
| Number of observations: Original series 112, after differencing 111 |  |  |  |  |
| Residual Mean Square $=0.01228 \quad$ DF $=108$ |  |  |  |  |
| Modified Box-Pierce (Ljung-Box) Chi-Square statistic |  |  |  |  |
| Lag | 12 | 2436 | 48 |  |
| Chi-Square | 6.6 | $12.0 \quad 17.9$ | 28.7 |  |
| DF | 9 | $21 \quad 33$ | 45 |  |
| P-Value | 0.6830 | 0.9390 .985 | 0.972 |  |

B2. An OLS (ordinary least squares) regression model is sought for the sales of Quenchers Soft Drinks on the basis of quarterly observations over the 5-year period 2003-2007, using time $t$ and other predictor variables as explained below.

In the edited summary computer output tabulated below, $Y$ denotes $\log _{10}($ sales $)$, where sales are in units of $£ 10000$; data are quarterly from Winter (January February March), Spring (April May June), Summer (July August September), Autumn (October November December); and time $t$ runs from Winter $2003=1$ to Autumn $2007=20$. For $i=1,2,3,4$, four quarterly dummy variables $Q_{i}$ are defined to equal 1 in the $i$ th quarter and zero otherwise. The explanatory variable seasl is defined as $-Q_{1}+Q_{2}+Q_{3}-Q_{4}$, and the explanatory variable seas2 is defined as $Q_{3}-Q_{4}$. Estimated standard errors of the regression coefficients are given in parentheses below the coefficients to which they refer. Four fitted models, (1), (2), (3), (4), are shown in the table.

(i) Test each of $Q_{2}, Q_{3}$ and $Q_{4}$ in Model 2 for partial significance and explain why only three of the four dummy variables are used in this model. What would you expect to find if $Q_{1}$ were also included in the regression?
(ii) Explain how you might use the above results to test for the seasonality of sales, and carry out this test.
(iii) Suggest reasons why models (3) and (4) were fitted.
(iv) Comment on the DW (Durbin-Watson) statistics for each of these regressions. Making any further tests you consider necessary, discuss which of the four models best represents the data.
(v) Using your chosen model of part (iv), give point forecasts of actual sales for each quarter of 2008.

B3. The level of beer consumption in year $t\left(y_{t}\right.$, in millions of bulk barrels) is modelled as a function of its relative price $\left(x_{1 t}\right)$ and the level of personal disposable income ( $x_{2 t}$, measured in $£ 000$ at 1988 prices). The model used is

$$
y_{t}=\alpha+\beta_{1} x_{1 t}+\beta_{2} x_{2 t}+\varepsilon_{t},
$$

where the $\left\{\varepsilon_{t}\right\}$ are taken to be independent Normally distributed random variables with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^{2}$.

Data are available for the 17 years from 1988 to 2004 inclusive and give the following summary quantities.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^{17} y_{t}=612 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(y_{t}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=415 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17} x_{1 t}=1411 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(x_{1 t}-\bar{x}_{1}\right)^{2}=2100 \\
& \sum_{t=1}^{17} x_{2 t}=1139 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(x_{2 t}-\bar{x}_{2}\right)^{2}=1272 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(x_{1 t}-\bar{x}_{1}\right)\left(y_{t}-\bar{y}\right)=-859 \\
& \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(x_{2 t}-\bar{x}_{2}\right)\left(y_{t}-\bar{y}\right)=682 \quad \sum_{t=1}^{17}\left(x_{1 t}-\bar{x}_{1}\right)\left(x_{2 t}-\bar{x}_{2}\right)=-1521
\end{aligned}
$$

(i) Find the least squares estimates of $\beta_{1}$ and $\beta_{2}$ and their estimated standard errors.
(ii) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: \beta_{1}=0$ against an economically plausible alternative.
(iii) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: \beta_{2}=0$ against an economically plausible alternative.
(iv) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: \beta_{1}=\beta_{2}=0$ against the alternative hypothesis that at least one of $\beta_{1}$ and $\beta_{2}$ is non-zero.
(v) Test the hypothesis $H_{0}: 2 \beta_{1}+\beta_{2}=0$ against $H_{1}: 2 \beta_{1}+\beta_{2} \neq 0$.
(vi) Comment briefly on the results of your tests.

B4. (a) (i) What is meant by heteroscedasticity in an econometric regression model?
(ii) What are the consequences for OLS (ordinary least squares) estimators in a regression model if heteroscedasticity is present?
(iii) Outline two approaches for dealing with heteroscedasticity in a regression model.
(b) Summary results from OLS regression analysis of the relationship between consumption expenditure $(y)$ and net income $(x)$, both in $\$$ per day, are tabulated below.

| Regression | Model | $R^{2}$ | Resid SS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $y=a+b x+$ error <br> (full regression, $n=30)$ | 0.947 | 2361.0 |
| 2 | $y=a+b x+$ error <br> $(n=10$, lowest 10 incomes $)$ | 0.785 | 292.9 |
| 3 | $y=a+b x+$ error <br> $(n=10$, highest 10 incomes $)$ | 0.708 | 1204.0 |
| 4 | $\hat{e}^{2}=a+b x+$ error $\quad(n=30)$ <br> $(\hat{e}=$ estimated error from regression 1$)$ | 0.176 | 302972.0 |

Each of the tests Goldfeld-Quandt (GQ) and Breusch-Pagan (BP) may be used to test the null hypothesis of homoscedasticity against the contrary alternative hypothesis. GQ uses the usual $F$ test for equality of variances, applied to the residual variances from fitting the same regression to two separate subsets of the data, with a significant result indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. BP regresses the squares of the residuals from the fitted model on the regressor variables (see regression 4 above), and takes as test statistic the regression sum of squares divided by twice the (ML-estimated) residual mean square from the original regression. Under the null hypothesis, this statistic has an approximate $\chi^{2}$ distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of explanatory variables used.

Assess whether heteroscedasticity is present in the data as modelled by Regression 1 by applying each of
(i) the Goldfeld-Quandt test,
(ii) the Breusch-Pagan test.

Comment briefly on your findings, including reliance on any assumptions unsupported by the summary results above.

## SECTION C - OPERATIONAL RESEARCH

C1. (a) Consider a machine that is to operate continuously for the foreseeable future. Its maintenance cost is at per unit time, where $t$ is its age. At regular intervals of length $T$ the machine is replaced with a new machine of the same type.

Suppose that the cost of replacing the machine is $K$. This includes any costs due to downtime. Derive the average cost per unit time for operating the machine and thus show that the optimal value of $T$ is $\sqrt{2 K / a}$.
(b) The lifespan of a certain machine has probability density function

$$
f(t)=t^{-2}, \quad t>1
$$

The machine can be replaced before it breaks down at a cost of $£ 10000$, or after breakdown at a cost of $£ 15000$.

Suppose that we replace the machine at age $T$ if it has not yet broken down. Calculate the expected cost per lifecycle and expected length of lifecycle for the machine. (Note that we are considering only replacement costs, not maintenance costs.)

At what age should the machine be replaced?

C2. (a) Consider a Markovian queue with a buffer of size 3 (that is, the maximum number waiting to begin service is 3 ) and two servers, A and B. Customers arrive at rate $\lambda$, server A serves at rate $\alpha$ and server B at rate $\beta$. If only one customer is present then server A is used (a customer switching immediately from server B if necessary); if more customers are present then both servers are used.
(i) Draw a transition diagram for this system, clearly indicating the transition rates. Use the numbers of people in the system as the states.
(ii) Let $\pi(i)$ be the limiting probability of being in state $i$. Write down and solve the detailed balance equations for the $\pi(i)$.
(b) A dock company owns one berth with a crane, and further space for up to two ships to wait for unloading. Ships arrive at a rate of four per week, and any ships that arrive while all three spaces are full are lost to rival docks. It takes on average two days to unload a ship with the crane, and the dock company earns $£ 10000$ per day for its use. The dock works 52 weeks each year.
(i) The company is considering converting one of the two spare berths into an unloading bay, by installing a second similar crane at a cost of $£ 5000000$. Using Markovian queuing models, in which the states are the numbers of ships in the dock, draw transition diagrams for both the existing and proposed models. By solving these systems, estimate how many years it would take to pay off this expense from the additional profit.
(ii) Which of the assumptions implicit in your model do you consider the least appropriate, and why?

C3. (i) Formulate the following goal programming problem as a Lexicographic/Preemptive linear programming problem.

| Goal 1 | $x_{1}+x_{2}$ | $\geq$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Goal 2 | $x_{1}+2 x_{2}$ | $\geq$ |
| Subject to | $x_{1}-x_{2}$ | $\leq$ |
|  | $x_{1}, x_{2}$ | $\geq$ |
|  |  |  |

(ii) Solve the problem, assuming Goal 1 is the more important.

C4. For both parts of this question, assume that an ample supply of independent $\mathrm{U}(0,1)$ random variables $U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}, \ldots$ is available.
(a) Suppose that $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ are independent random variables, all having the logistic density function

$$
f(x)=\frac{\exp \left(-\frac{x-\alpha}{\beta}\right)}{\beta\left(1+\exp \left(-\frac{x-\alpha}{\beta}\right)\right)^{2}} \quad \text { for } x \in(-\infty, \infty) \text {, }
$$

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are known parameters. Also suppose that $N$ is independent of the $X_{i}$ and has a Poisson distribution with mass function

$$
p(x)=\frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x}}{x!} \quad \text { for } x=0,1, \ldots
$$

Let $Y=\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_{i}$. Explain how you would use $U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}, \ldots$ to simulate from the distribution of $Y$. Give pseudo-code describing your algorithm.
(b) Suppose that you have a closed form expression for the density function $g(x)$ of $X$ that satisfies

$$
g(x) \begin{cases}\leq \alpha \lambda e^{-\lambda x} & \text { for } x \geq 0 \\ =0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $\alpha$ and $\lambda$ are known positive constants, but no closed form expression for either the cumulative distribution function $G$ or its inverse $G^{-1}$.

Explain how you would use $U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}, \ldots$ to simulate from the distribution of $X$. Give pseudo-code describing your algorithm.

## SECTION D - MEDICAL STATISTICS

D1. Researchers wished to compare two different methods, SBB and Control, of delivering analgesia during shoulder surgery. They were interested in whether post-operative pain experience was better with the new therapy (SBB) compared with the old therapy (Control), so they treated 19 randomly chosen patients with SBB and another 15 patients with Control.
(i) (a) What is meant by a two-sided hypothesis? Write down suitable null and alternative hypotheses for this study.
(b) Two-sided alternative hypotheses are often used except when the study is a non-inferiority study or an equivalence study.

What is meant by non-inferiority and by equivalence?
How are the sample size calculations for standard comparative trials affected when these two types of study are carried out?

Post-operative pain was measured using visual analogue scores recorded at $1,2,4,8,12$ and 24 hours post-operative. These measurements were combined by calculating the area under the curve (AUC) and this was used as a suitable summary measure of the average effect for post-operative pain. The table shows the mean and standard deviation of AUC for each group, and also the median and sample size.

|  |  | AUC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | Mean | Median | St Dev |
| Group | SBB | 19 | 39.7 | 36.5 | 23.9 |
|  | Control | 15 | 67.0 | 67.5 | 20.2 |

(ii) Stating any assumptions that you make, perform an appropriate hypothesis test to compare the mean AUC between the SBB and Control therapy groups. Calculate a $95 \%$ confidence interval for the difference in the mean AUC between the two therapies. Comment on the inferences that can be deduced from this hypothesis test and confidence interval.
(iii) The researchers were concerned that age and sex might be important factors in determining post-operative pain. The output on the next page is from a multiple regression analysis of these data including group, age and sex in the model. Examining the output from this model, would you conclude that either age or sex were significant risk factors? Comment on your conclusions.

## Results of regression analysis for question D1 part (iii)

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = | 34 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | F ( 3, 30) | 5.55 |
| Model | 7946.85 | 3 | 2648.95 | Prob > F = | 0.0038 |
| Residual | 14323.76 | 30 | 477.46 | R -squared | 0.3568 |
|  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared = | 0.2925 |
| Total | 22270.62 | 33 | 674.87 | Root MSE = | 21.851 |


| auc | Coef | Std Err | t | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | 95\% Conf Interval |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| group | 26.95 | 7.56 | 3.57 | 0.001 | 11.52 | 42.38 |
| age | 0.54 | 0.30 | 1.82 | 0.079 | -0.07 | 1.14 |
| sex | 1.53 | 7.68 | 0.20 | 0.844 | -14.16 | 17.22 |
| intercept | -44.18 | 24.44 | -1.81 | 0.081 | -94.09 | 5.72 |

D2. (i) Define the following terms in respect of an event occurring.
(a) Absolute risk
(b) Relative risk
(c) Odds
(d) Odds ratio.
(ii) In what circumstances can an odds ratio be used to approximate to a relative risk? Explain why this is the case.

In a recent study conducted to examine why some cases of paediatric meningococcal disease were fatal whilst others were not, the researchers found that there was an absence of paediatric care in 33 of the 133 fatal cases, whilst there was an absence of paediatric care in 32 of the 355 non-fatal cases.
(iii) What type of study is this?
(iv) Construct an appropriate $2 \times 2$ contingency table showing the results given above. Calculate both a point estimate and a $95 \%$ confidence interval for the odds ratio of absence of care for fatal cases compared with non-fatal cases. Comment on the results.
(v) The researchers were also interested in whether other factors might be important in distinguishing between fatal and non-fatal cases. Some possible factors were severity of illness, sex and failure of management. How might one model the influence of these different variables?

D3. The table shows the time to revision surgery (survival time in years) for 17 patients who had had a previous hip replacement. The study investigators were interested in whether there was a difference in survival times for patients whose reason for revision surgery was aseptic loosening of the hip compared with other reasons.

| Survival time for aseptic loosening group | Survival time for others |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10.16 | 11.21 |
| 10.56 | 6.85 |
| 12.81 | 11.08 |
| 10.47 | $9.56 *$ |
| $17.35 *$ | 1.21 |
| 4.03 | 5.11 |
| 15.00 | $15.02 *$ |
| 13.67 | 1.00 |
| 12.27 |  |

* indicates right-censored observations

Explain what is meant by a right-censored observation.

Compute Kaplan-Meier survival curves for the two treatment groups and show both curves on one graph. Estimate the median time to revision for each group from this graph.

The log rank statistic for these data was 0.62 on $1 \mathrm{df}, p=0.43$. Comment on this result. Explain whether you would expect the confidence interval for the difference in survival times to include or exclude 0 .

Previous studies have suggested that in addition to aseptic loosening, age and sex could be important factors in determining the time to revision surgery. What method could you use to investigate whether these factors were indeed important? What is the key assumption for this method and how can it be tested?

On the next page is shown some abbreviated computer output from fitting two models to the data above, one using only aseptic loosening as a predictor, and one including age and sex in addition. Sex was coded as "male" $=1$, "female" $=2$. Aseptic loosening was coded as "no" $=0$, "yes" $=1$. Comment on the regression coefficients from this model.

## Computer output for question D3

aseptic


D4. Describe the difference between the direct and indirect methods of standardisation of mortality rates. Comment on when each might be used.

The number of babies born varies across populations depending upon such factors as the size and age structure of the population. In order to make comparisons across populations it is necessary to standardise for any difference in the age distributions that might occur between populations. The table shows the number of women between the ages of 15 and 49 for the English cities Birmingham and Sheffield, together with the agespecific birth rates for England and Wales for 2005. In 2005 the actual number of live births was 15893 for Birmingham and 6101 for Sheffield. Assuming that all the births occurred to women between the ages of 15 and 49 , what was the crude birth rate for women in this age range, in Birmingham in 2005? What was the rate in Sheffield? Compare your results for the two cities.

| Age | Age-specific <br> fertility rates, <br> England and <br> Wales <br> per 1 000 women, <br> 2005 | Birmingham <br> population | Sheffield <br> population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 26.3 | 35789 | 16491 |
| $20-24$ | 71.2 | 38530 | 20351 |
| $25-29$ | 98.8 | 35264 | 17143 |
| $30-34$ | 100.9 | 38316 | 19538 |
| $35-39$ | 50.3 | 36815 | 19205 |
| $40-44$ | 10.3 | 31452 | 17145 |
| $45-49$ | 0.6 | 27892 | 14911 |
| Total <br>  <br>  <br> Total live births |  |  |  |
| 244058 | 124784 |  |  |
|  | 15893 | 6101 |  |

Using the birth rate for England and Wales as a standard, calculate for each city (Birmingham and Sheffield) the expected number of births in 2005. Calculate also, for each city, the standardised birth ratio and a $95 \%$ confidence interval for this ratio.

Compare your results for the two cities.

## SECTION E - BIOMETRY

E1. A research worker has carried out an experiment on a crop which is planted in rows in the field. The experimental units were plots of a fixed size, and four treatments A, B, C and D were compared. Two pieces of land, in adjacent fields, had to be used because each was only large enough to take a $4 \times 4$ Latin square layout. The experimenter has analysed the data on crop yield from each field separately, and is surprised that the results seem slightly different. He wants to write a report covering the whole experiment, and calls in the statistician to explain how to include a possible difference between fields (squares) in the full analysis.

The data, coded into convenient units, and useful sums of squares from his analysis, follow.

| Field 1 |  |  |  |  |  | Field 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
|  | A: 14 | D: 7 | B: 13 | C: 18 | 52 |  | D: 15 | A: 17 | C: 20 | B: 20 | 72 |
|  | D: 8 | A: 12 | C: 17 | B: 15 | 52 |  | A: 20 | C: 19 | B: 21 | D: 19 | 79 |
|  | B: 14 | C: 17 | D: 9 | A: 10 | 50 |  | B: 18 | D: 13 | A: 15 | C: 18 | 64 |
|  | C: 16 | B: 12 | A: 8 | D: 10 | 46 |  | C: 23 | B: 17 | D: 12 | A: 13 | 65 |
| Total | 52 | 48 | 47 | 53 | 200 | Total | 76 | 66 | 68 | 70 | 280 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Totals } & \text { A: } 44 & \mathrm{~B}: 54 & \mathrm{C}: 68 & \mathrm{D}: 34\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Totals } & \text { A: } 65 & \mathrm{~B}: 76 & \mathrm{C}: 80 & \mathrm{D}: 59\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sums of squares:$\begin{aligned} & 14^{2}+7^{2}+13^{2}+\ldots \ldots+10^{2}=2690 \\ & 52^{2}+52^{2}+50^{2}+46^{2}=10024 \\ & 52^{2}+48^{2}+47^{2}+53^{2}=10026 \\ & 44^{2}+54^{2}+68^{2}+34^{2}=10632 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Sums of squares:$\begin{aligned} & 15^{2}+17^{2}+20^{2}+\ldots . .+13^{2}=5050 \\ & 72^{2}+79^{2}+64^{2}+65^{2}=19746 \\ & 76^{2}+66^{2}+68^{2}+70^{2}=19656 \\ & 65^{2}+76^{2}+80^{2}+59^{2}=19882 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(i) Construct the analysis of variance for each field (square) separately.
(ii) Construct also a single analysis of variance for the whole experiment which includes a term for the difference between fields, deals in a suitable way with the terms for rows and columns within squares, and allows the treatments to be compared on the basis of their means over the whole experiment.

Comment on the results, and on the statistical assumptions made during the analysis.

E2. A field experiment using plots (units) each planted with 40 strawberry plants was laid out in 4 randomised blocks. There were 8 treatments $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{H}$ which are described in part (ii). The layout was as shown below, with North at the top of the diagram.

|  | A1 | F1 | D2 | E2 | G3 | D3 | G4 | A4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | G1 | D1 | B2 | F2 | B3 | A3 | D4 | C4 |
|  | H1 | E1 | H2 | A2 | C3 | H3 | B4 | F4 |
|  | B1 | C1 | C2 | G2 | E3 | F3 | E4 | H4 |
| Block | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  |

Some plants failed to grow after planting, and the number of failures $w$ on each plot was recorded. It was also noticed during the growing season that there were several poor plants on the North side of the plantation, but the actual number was not recorded.
(i) The total crop for the season on each plot, $y$, was recorded and the analysis of these data was to be made incorporating corrections for $w$ and for the poor growth on the North side. Explain how a suitable indicator variable $x$ could be constructed to correct for the poor growth, and state what values it would take on which plots.

Write down the linear model that would be the basis for the analysis.
(ii) Before planting, the plots either had cover crops growing on them to keep down weeds and improve soil quality (treatments A-G) or were ploughed and had no cover crop (treatment H). The cover crops were two different grasses A and B, two different fescues C and D, two different clovers E and F, and G was Lucerne Grass.

Suggest seven orthogonal contrasts among these treatments which could be tested in the analysis and which would give useful information to include in a report. State the coefficients required in each one.

Comment on whether all the useful contrasts that could be made would in fact be orthogonal.
(iii) Suppose that plot H 4 was damaged by machinery during the season. How might this be allowed for in the analysis?

E3. The Agricultural Service in a large country is planning to carry out a survey of the production of a major ground crop. This has not been done for a few years but there are maps of all the main areas where the crop is grown and there is a budget for one aerial survey to be carried out early in the growing season. Some parts of the country are reasonably flat, while others are hilly; the crop can be grown in both conditions. The survey (or surveys) carried out on the ground should cover both conditions. Information is required on the area planted with this crop and on the yield of the crop when harvested.

Draw up a detailed proposal for this survey. Your proposal should include advice on the following topics, and on any others which you consider important.

- The use which should be made of an aerial survey, and how it may be combined with information obtained from surveys of the crop on the ground during the growing season
- The method of sampling, especially whether stratification and/or cluster sampling might be used
- Whether ratio or regression methods can be used to improve the estimates obtained from sampling the crop on the ground
- What supplementary data, for example use of fertiliser and method of cultivation (hand, mechanical, etc), it would be useful to collect
- How data should be collected so that transfer for analysis by computer may be made accurately

E4. Logistic functions are used in two major ways in biometry:
(a) in modelling the growth of plants or organisms over time;
(b) in the analysis of binary response data in assays.

For (a), explain the three phases of growth as size $y$ moves from an initial small value towards a final approach to a limiting size as time $x$ increases. Discuss how the logistic model arises, sketch the growth curve and describe how the parameters in the model may be estimated. Comment also on the problems that may arise in designing experiments to study growth, and how to choose times $\left\{x_{i}\right\}$ at which to measure size $\left\{y_{i}\right\}$.

For (b), explain the application of a (linear) logistic model in studying how proportions $p_{i}$ depend on the values $x_{i}$ of a single explanatory variable $x$. Discuss how the results of such a study should be presented and used in biological assay.

## SECTION F - STATISTICS FOR INDUSTRY AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

F1. A company manufactures springs for fuel injectors. The customer's specification for length of each spring is that it should be between 49 mm and 51 mm . Assume that lengths of springs are independent and have a Normal distribution with mean 50 mm and standard deviation 0.30 mm .
(i) Calculate the process capability index. Use the Statistical tables for use in examinations to calculate a least upper bound for the parts per million outside the specification.
(ii) Random samples of 5 springs are taken every shift, and the mean and range of the lengths of the sampled springs are calculated. The results from the first four shifts are as follows.

| Shift | Sample size | Mean (mm) | Range (mm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 50.2 | 0.80 |
| 2 | 5 | 49.9 | 0.26 |
| 3 | 5 | 50.1 | 1.07 |
| 4 | 5 | 49.5 | 0.85 |

(a) Construct Shewhart mean and range charts. The mean chart should include both action and both warning lines. Report your conclusions. (6)
[You are given that the multiplying factors for the process standard deviation that give lower and upper $0.1 \%$ points for the range of a random sample of 5 from a Normal distribution are 0.37 and 5.48 respectively.]
(b) Draw a cumulative sum (cusum) chart for the means.
(c) Use the following algorithm to decide whether action should be taken on the basis of your cusum chart. Let the target value be $\tau$, the standard deviation of the variable that is being plotted be $\theta$, and $K$ be $0.5 \theta$. Set $S H(0)=0$ and $S L(0)=0$. Calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S H(t)=\max \left[0,\left(x_{t}-\tau\right)-K+S H(t-1)\right] \\
& S L(t)=\max \left[0,-\left(x_{t}-\tau\right)-K+S L(t-1)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

for $t=1,2,3,4$. Action is indicated if any of the $\operatorname{SH}(t)$ or $\operatorname{SL}(t)$ values exceeds $5 \theta$. Comment on your calculations.
(iii) Suppose the process mean shifts to 49.70 mm , with the standard deviation unchanged.
(a) Calculate the new process performance index.
(b) What is the probability the next sample mean will be below the lower action line? What is the expected run length before action is indicated?

F2. A company manufactures aluminium aircraft engine blocks using a casting process, and an engineer is asked to conduct an experiment that investigates the porosity of the blocks with the objective of determining conditions that minimize porosity. The engineer considers the 6 control factors described in the following table, each at two levels, in a single performance of a one-quarter fraction of the full factorial design. The response is porosity measured on a scale from 0 to 1000 .

| Factor | Description | Coding for regression |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Mould lining compound | Type I $(-1)$ Type II $(+1)$ |
| B | Time in mould | Low ( -1 High $(+1)$ |
| C | Time of pour | Low $(-1)$ High $(+1)$ |
| D | Melt temperature | Low $(-1)$ High $(+1)$ |
| E | Quench temperature | Low ( -1$)$ High $(+1)$ |
| F | Pressure applied to mould | Low $(-1)$ High $(+1)$ |

(i) The design generators are $\mathrm{ABC}=\mathrm{E}$ and $\mathrm{BCD}=\mathrm{F}$. Write down the aliases of A , of $A B$ and of $A E$.
(ii) The results of fitting a model that includes the main effects only, and a plot of the residuals against fitted values, follow.

Coefficients:

|  | Estimate | Std Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathrm{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Intercept) | 27.4375 | 2.5414 | 10.796 | $1.88 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| A | 7.1875 | 2.5414 | 2.828 | 0.0198 |
| B | 18.1875 | 2.5414 | 7.156 | $5.33 \mathrm{e}-05$ |
| C | -0.4375 | 2.5414 | -0.172 | 0.8671 |
| D | 0.1875 | 2.5414 | 0.074 | 0.9428 |
| E | 0.5625 | 2.5414 | 0.221 | 0.8298 |
| F | 0.0625 | 2.5414 | 0.025 | 0.9809 |

Estimated standard deviation of errors: 10.17

(a) How many degrees of freedom are available for the residual standard deviation?
(b) Refer to the above plot and explain why you might have reservations about the adequacy of this model.
(iii) The results of fitting a model that includes the main effects and the maximum number of 2 -factor interactions are shown below.

Coefficients:

|  | Estimate | Std Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathrm{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Intercept) | 27.4375 | 1.9009 | 14.434 | 0.00477 |
| A | 7.1875 | 1.9009 | 3.781 | 0.06337 |
| B | 18.1875 | 1.9009 | 9.568 | 0.01075 |
| C | -0.4375 | 1.9009 | -0.230 | 0.83937 |
| D | 0.1875 | 1.9009 | 0.099 | 0.93042 |
| E | 0.5625 | 1.9009 | 0.296 | 0.79519 |
| F | 0.0625 | 1.9009 | 0.033 | 0.97676 |
| A:B | 6.1875 | 1.9009 | 3.255 | 0.08282 |
| A:C | -0.9375 | 1.9009 | -0.493 | 0.67071 |
| A:D | -3.3125 | 1.9009 | -1.743 | 0.22352 |
| A:E | -0.6875 | 1.9009 | -0.362 | 0.75223 |
| A:F | 0.0625 | 1.9009 | 0.033 | 0.97676 |
| B:D | -0.3125 | 1.9009 | -0.164 | 0.88453 |
| B:F | -0.4375 | 1.9009 | -0.230 | 0.83937 |

Estimated standard deviation of errors: 7.603
(a) Use the fitted model to recommend values for the control factors that are significant at the $20 \%$ level, and explain why you have made these recommendations.
(b) What reservations do you have about this model?
(iv) Consider the following model and plots of residuals.

Coefficients:

|  | Estimate | Std Error | t value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|\mathrm{t}\|)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Intercept) | 27.4375 | 1.5750 | 17.421 | $1.20 \mathrm{e}-07$ |
| A | 7.1875 | 1.5750 | 4.564 | 0.00184 |
| B | 18.1875 | 1.5750 | 11.548 | $2.87 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| C | -0.4375 | 1.5750 | -0.278 | 0.78822 |
| D | 0.1875 | 1.5750 | 0.119 | 0.90817 |
| E | 0.5625 | 1.5750 | 0.357 | 0.73021 |
| F | 0.0625 | 1.5750 | 0.040 | 0.96932 |
| A:B | 6.1875 | 1.5750 | 3.929 | 0.00436 |

Estimated standard deviation of errors: 6.3

(a) Use the fitted model to recommend values for the control factors, and explain why you have made these recommendations.
(b) The specification for porosity is that it must be less than 20. Make a rough estimate of the process capability using your recommended values from (a), and provide some justification for your estimate.

F3. The lifetime $T$ of a machine component has cumulative distribution function (cdf) $F(t)$. A random sample of $n$ such components has been drawn.
(i) Prove that the random variable $F(T)$ has a uniform distribution.
(ii) Let $T_{i: n}$ be the $i$ th order statistic of the sample. Show that $E\left[F\left(T_{i: n}\right)\right]=\frac{i}{n+1}$.
[You are given that if $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}$ is a random sample of size $n$ from a probability distribution with cdf $F$ and probability density function (pdf) $f$, then the pdf of the $i$ th order statistic is

$$
\left.f_{X_{i n}}(x)=\frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} f(x)\{F(x)\}^{i-1}\{1-F(x)\}^{n-i} .\right]
$$

(iii) A random sample of 50 pieces of mylar-polyurethane laminated DC HV insulating structure was selected. Each was tested at a voltage stress of 219 $\mathrm{kV} / \mathrm{mm}$ for 10 hours. Thirty-eight failed and the mean survival time of these 38 pieces was 195.1 minutes. Twelve pieces survived the 600 minute test period. Suppose lifetimes have an exponential distribution with pdf $f(t)=\lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ for $t>0$, where $\lambda>0$ is a parameter. The following is a plot of the $i$ th smallest lifetime, $t_{i: n}$, against $-\log \left(1-\frac{i}{n+1}\right)$ for $i$ from 1 to 38. [Note. "log", meaning logarithm to base $e$, is referred to as " $\ln$ " as the horizontal axis title on the plot.]


Given that the gradient of the fitted line is 397.2 , estimate the rate parameter $\lambda$ of the exponential distribution. Hence estimate the lifetime lower and upper first percentiles.
(iv) Derive a formula for the maximum likelihood estimator of $\lambda$, use your formula to estimate $\lambda$, and hence estimate the lifetime lower and upper first percentiles.
(v) What are the relative advantages of the two estimation methods?

F4. (i) A machine has a lifetime that is exponentially distributed with a mean $1 / \lambda$. The repair time has a distribution which is equivalent to the sum of two independent exponential distributions each with mean $1 /(2 \theta)$. The lifetimes and repair times are independent.
(a) What are the mean and variance of the repair time distribution? What is the general name of such a distribution?
(b) Set up a Markov chain model for the state of the machine.
(c) For what proportion of a long period of time is the machine operating?
(d) Comment briefly on the difference between this model and a model with an exponential distribution of repair time which has a mean of $1 / \theta$.
(ii) A factory has two production lines, line 1 and line 2, for manufacturing car seats.

The preferred arrangement is to run both lines at standard speed. When running at standard speed the lifetime of line 1 has an exponential distribution with a mean of 30 days and the lifetime of line 2 has an exponential distribution with a mean of 15 days.

There is one repair crew and repair times are exponentially distributed with mean 2 days.

If one line fails the other can meet the production target if it is run at double speed. However, the means of the lifetime distributions are then reduced to 10 days and 5 days for lines 1 and 2 respectively.

If both lines fail the repair crew will repair line 1 , because it is the more reliable, even if this means abandoning repair of line 2 .

The lifetimes and repair times are independent.
(a) According to this protocol, if the repair crew is repairing line 2 and line 1 fails, the crew immediately moves to line 1 , abandoning the repair on line 2 until later. Explain why it is unnecessary to allow for the time spent repairing line 2 in a model.
(b) Set up a Markov chain model for the state of the factory.
(c) Calculate the proportion of a long period of time that the factory is able to meet production.

