

- **6.16 (pg 195)**

(a) We first calculate the estimated standard error, $s/\sqrt{n} = 12.4/\sqrt{10} = 3.92$.

We next find the 97.5 percentile of a t distribution with 9 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book: 2.262.

The 95% CI for the population mean is thus $13.0 \pm 2.262 \times 3.92 \approx 13.0 \pm 8.87 \approx (4.1, 21.9)$

(b) These are the plausible values for the effect of exercise on blood HBE levels; i.e., the plausible values for the average change in blood HBE level following such a physical fitness program. To be more precise, this interval is calculated by a procedure that, in advance of gathering the data, would have a 95% chance of capturing the true effect of exercise on blood HBE levels.

- **6.20 (pg 196)**

We first calculate the estimated standard error, $s/\sqrt{n} = 0.14/\sqrt{50} \approx 0.020$.

We next find the 95th percentile of a t distribution with 49 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book (looking at $df=50$): 1.676.

The 90% confidence interval for the population mean is thus $1.20 \pm 1.676 \times 0.020 \approx 1.20 \pm 0.033 \approx (1.17, 1.23)$.

- **7.10 (pg 231)**

We first calculate the estimated standard error, $\sqrt{(2.8)^2/489 + (2.9)^2/469} \approx 0.184$.

We next find the 97.5 percentile of a t distribution with 950 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book (looking at $df=1000$): 1.962.

The 95% confidence interval for the male-female difference in population averages is then $(45.8 - 40.6) \pm 1.962 \times 0.184 \approx 5.2 \pm 0.36 \approx (4.84, 5.56)$

- **7.14 (pg 232)**

(a) We first calculate the estimated standard error of the difference between the sample averages,

$$\sqrt{\frac{(10)^2}{10} + \frac{(8)^2}{10}} \approx 4.05$$

We next find the 95th percentile of a t distribution with 17.2 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book (looking at $df=17$): 1.740.

The 95% confidence interval for the male-female difference in population averages is then $(25 - 23) \pm 1.740 \times 4.05 \approx 2 \pm 7.0 \approx (-5.0, 9.0)$

- (b) These are the plausible values for the effect of the antibiotic on prothrombin times; i.e, plausible values for the difference between the average prothrombin times with and without the antibiotic treatment. To be more precise, this interval is calculated by a procedure that, in advance of gathering the data, would have a 95% chance of capturing the true effect of the antibiotic on prothrombin times.

• 7.30 (pg 245)

- (a) We first calculate the estimated standard error of the difference between the sample averages

$$\sqrt{\frac{(2.87)^2}{60} + \frac{(3.52)^2}{50}} \approx 0.621$$

The t-statistic is $(78.42 - 80.44)/0.621 = -2.02/0.621 \approx -3.26$.

We compare this to the 97.5 percentile of a t distribution with 94.3 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book (looking at $df=100$): 1.984.

Since $|-3.26| > 1.98$, we reject the null hypothesis.

The p-value is between 1% and 0.1%. (Using R, we find that is about 0.16%.)

- (b) We conclude that males and females have different average tibia lengths.
- (c) We males and females differ in their average tibia length, since the variability is large, we wouldn't be able to predict sex from tibia length very well.
- (d) If the sample sizes were 6 and 5, the estimated SE for the difference between the sample averages would increase by a factor of $\sqrt{10}$, and so would be $0.621 \times \sqrt{10} \approx 1.96$.
The t-statistic would thus decrease by a factor of $\sqrt{10}$, and so would be $-3.26/\sqrt{10} \approx -1.03$.

We compare this to the 97.5 percentile of a t distribution with 7.8 df. From the table at the back of the book (looking at $df=8$): 2.306.

Since $|-1.03| < 2.306$, we would now *fail to reject* the null hypothesis, and would conclude that we have insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the sexes differ in tibia length.

The p-value is between 20% and 40%.

• 9.39 (pg 385)

We first calculate the standard error of the sample average (of the differences): $1.20/\sqrt{15} = 0.310$.

The t-statistic is $-1/0.310 = -3.23$.

We compare this to the 97.5 percentile of a t distribution with 14 degrees of freedom. From the table at the back of the book: 2.145.

Since $|-3.23| > 2.145$, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that catnip does have an effect on cats' "negative interactions".

The p-value is between 1% and 0.1%

- **10.10 (pg 401)**

The observed and expected counts are as follows.

	Black	Brown	White	Total
Observed	40	59	42	141
Expected	35.25	70.50	35.25	141

The χ^2 statistic is

$$X^2 = \frac{(40 - 35.25)^2}{35.25} + \frac{(59 - 70.50)^2}{70.50} + \frac{(42 - 35.25)^2}{35.25} \approx 3.81$$

We compare this to the 95th percentile of a χ^2 distribution with 2 degrees of freedom. From Table 9: 5.99.

Since $3.81 < 5.99$, we *fail to reject* the null hypothesis and conclude that the data conform reasonably well to the 1:2:1 ratio.

The p-value is between 10% and 20%.

- **10.25 (pg 411)**

The observed counts are as follows.

No. relationships	Cold?		Total
	No	Yes	
≤ 5	66	57	123
≥ 6	101	52	153
Total	167	109	276

We get the expected count for the upper-left cell as $123 \times 167/276 \approx 74.4$. The others can be obtained by subtraction (e.g., $123 - 74.4 = 48.6$), and so we obtain:

No. relationships	Cold?		Total
	No	Yes	
≤ 5	74.4	48.6	123
≥ 6	92.6	60.4	153
Total	167	109	276

The χ^2 statistic is:

$$X^2 = \frac{(66 - 74.4)^2}{74.4} + \frac{(57 - 48.6)^2}{48.6} + \frac{(101 - 92.6)^2}{92.6} + \frac{(52 - 60.4)^2}{60.4} \approx 4.36$$

We compare this to the 95th percentile of a χ^2 distribution with 1 degree of freedom. From table 9: 3.84.

Since $4.36 > 3.84$, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is an association between the no. social relationships and the chance of getting a cold.

The p-value is between 2% and 5%.