## $\underline{2}^{k}, \underline{2}^{k} r$ and $2^{k-p}$ Factorial Designs

## Types of Experimental Designs

Full Factorial Design:
> Uses all possible combinations of all levels of all factors.

|  | Factors |  |  | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CPU Clock Frequency (MHz) | Number of CPUs | Main Memory (MB) | Benchmark Execution Time (sec) |
| $$ | 550 | 1 | 128 | 25.0 |
|  | 750 | 1 | 128 | 32.0 |
|  | 1000 | 1 | 128 | 48.0 |
|  | 550 | 2 | 128 | 19.0 |
|  | 750 | 2 | 128 | 13.5 |
|  | 1000 | 2 | 128 | 10.0 |
|  | 550 | 1 | 256 | 23.0 |
|  | 750 | 1 | 256 | 29.0 |
|  | 1000 | 1 | 256 | 45.0 |
|  | 550 | 2 | 256 | 16.5 |
|  | 750 | 2 | 256 | 11.8 |
|  | 1000 | 2 | 256 | 8.8 |



$$
n=3 * 2 * 2=12
$$

Too costly!

## Types of Experimental Designs

## Reducing Cost of Full Factorial Design:

> Reduce the no. of levels of each factor. If all factors have 2 levels, we have a $2^{k}$ factorial design.
> Reduce the number of factors.
> Use fractional factorial designs.

## Types of Experimental Designs

## Fractional Factorial Design:

> Use a fraction of the full factorial design.

|  | Factors |  | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CPU Clock <br> Frequency <br> (MHz) | Number of CPUs | Benchmark Execution Time (sec) |
| $\stackrel{\frac{\infty}{0}}{\substack{0}}$ | 550 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 750 | 1 | 32.0 |
|  | 1000 | 1 | 48.0 |
|  | 550 | 2 | 19.0 |
|  | 750 | 2 | 13.5 |
|  | 1000 | 2 | 10.0 |

The factor memory size was eliminated.

$$
\begin{gathered}
n=\prod_{i=1}^{k-p} n_{i} \\
\mathrm{n}=3 * 2=6
\end{gathered}
$$

Some interactions among factors may be lost!

## $\underline{2}^{k}$ Factorial Designs

## $\underline{2}^{\mathrm{k}}$ Factorial Designs

$\square 2^{k}$ designs are used to determine the effects of $k$ factors, each of which have two alternatives or levels
> Easier to analyze than full factorial designs
> Help sort out factors in the order of their impact, especially when there are a large number of factors

## $\underline{2}^{2}$ Factorial Designs

$\square$ Special case of $2^{k}$ design with $k=2$

- Example: impact of cache size and memory size on the performance of a computer

| Cache <br> size (KB) | Memory <br> 4 MB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 MB |  |  |
| 1 | 15 | 45 |
| 2 | 25 | 75 |

Performance in MIPS

## Regression Model

Let $y$ denote the performance of the computer. We can model y using a non-linear regression model as follows:

$$
y=q_{0}+q_{a} x_{a}+q_{b} x_{b}+q_{a b} x_{a} x_{b}
$$

where $x_{a}$ and $x_{b}$ are variables that represent the factors memory size and cache size respectively, and the q's are called effects

## Regression Model (con'td)

Let $\quad x_{a}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}-1 & \text { if memory size }=4 \mathrm{MB} \\ 1 & \text { if memory size }=16 \mathrm{MB}\end{array}\right.$

$$
x_{b}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
-1 & \text { if cache size }=1 \mathrm{~KB} \\
1 & \text { if cache size }=2 \mathrm{~KB}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Substituting the four observations yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 15=q_{0}-q_{a}-q_{b}+q_{a b} \\
& 45=q_{0}+q_{a}-q_{b}-q_{a b} \\
& 25=q_{0}-q_{a}+q_{b}-q_{a b} \\
& 75=q_{0}+q_{a}+q_{b}+q_{a b}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Regression Model (cont'd)

There is a unique solution for the four effects: $q_{0}=40, q_{a}=20, q_{b}=10, q_{a b}=5$. So, we have:

$$
y=40+20 x_{a}+10 x_{b}+5 x_{a} x_{b}
$$

Thus the mean performance is 40 MIPS, the effect of memory size is 20 MIPS, the effect of cache size 10 MIPS, and the interaction between memory and cache size accounts for 5 MIPS

## Computing effects

In general, the model for a $2^{2}$ design can be solved to obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q_{0}=\frac{1}{4}\left(y_{1}+y_{2}+y_{3}+y_{4}\right) \\
& q_{A}=\frac{1}{4}\left(-y_{1}+y_{2}-y_{3}+y_{4}\right) \\
& q_{B}=\frac{1}{4}\left(-y_{1}-y_{2}+y_{3}+y_{4}\right) \\
& q_{A B}=\frac{1}{4}\left(y_{1}-y_{2}-y_{3}+y_{4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Sign table method for calculating effects

| I | A | B | AB | Y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 15 |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 45 |
| 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 25 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 75 |
| 160 | 80 | 40 | 20 | Total |
| 40 | 20 | 10 | 5 | Total/4 |

## Allocation of variation

The importance of a factor is explained by the proportion of the total variation in the response that is explained by the factor
> If one factor contributes $90 \%$ of the variation whereas another factor contributes only $5 \%$, then the second factor may be considered relatively unimportant

- The total variation of $y$ or Sum of Squares Total (SST) is given by:

$$
S S T=\sum_{i=1}^{2^{2}}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}
$$

## Allocation of variation (cont'd)

For a $2^{2}$ design, the variation can be divided into three parts:

$$
S S T=2^{2} q_{A}^{2}+2^{2} q_{B}^{2}+2^{2} q_{A B}^{2}
$$

where the three terms on the RHS represent the portion of the variation that is explained by the effects of $A, B$, and the interaction $A B$ respectively (see derivation in textbook). Thus

$$
S S T=S S A+S S B+S S A B
$$

## Example

For the memory-cache example,

$$
\bar{y}=\frac{1}{4}(15+55+25+75)=40
$$

Total variation $=\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}=\left(25^{2}+15^{2}+15^{2}+35^{2}\right)$

$$
=2100=4 \times 20^{2}+4 \times 10^{2}+4 \times 5^{2}
$$

Thus, $76 \%$ (1600) of the total variation can be attributed to memory size, $19 \%$ (400) can be attributed to cache, and only $5 \%$ (100) can be attributed to the interaction between memory and cache.

## General 2k Factorial Designs

The analysis techniques described so far for $2^{2}$ designs can be extended to that for a $2^{k}$ design
$>$ Given $k$ factors with two levels each, $2^{k}$ experiments are required and there are $2^{k}$ effects

- k main effects, $\binom{k}{2}$ two-factor interactions, $\binom{k}{3}$ three-factor interactions, and so on
- The sign table technique for calculating effects and allocating the variation is applicable


# $\underline{2}^{k} \underline{r}$ Factorial Designs with Replications 

## $\underline{2}^{k} \underline{r}$ Factorial Designs

$\square$ Shortcoming of $2^{k}$ design: cannot estimate experimental error because no experiment is repeated
$\square$ Solution: Replication
> Repeat each experiment in a $2^{k}$ design $r$ times yielding $2^{k} r$ observations (called a $2^{k} r$ design)
> We will discuss $k=2$

- Can be generalized as in $2^{k}$ design (see section 18.9 of Jain)


## $\underline{2}^{2} r$ Factorial Design

- Model for $2^{2}$ design is extended to add an error term

$$
y=q_{0}+q_{A} x_{A}+q_{B} x_{B}+q_{A B} x_{A} x_{B}+e
$$ where the $q$ 's are effects as before and $e$ is the experimental error

- Holding the factor level constant and repeating the experiment yields samples of the response $y_{i}$
- Statistical analysis of the $y_{i}$ 's yields the fraction of variation due to experimental error, and confidence intervals for $y$


## Computation of Effects

The effects can be calculated using a sign table as before except that in the $y$ column we put the sample mean of $r$ measurements at the given factor level

| I | A | B | AB | Y | Mean $\bar{y}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | $(15,18,12)$ | 15 |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | $(45,48,51)$ | 48 |
| 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | $(25,28,19)$ | 24 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $(75,75,81)$ | 77 |
| 164 | 86 | 38 | 20 |  | Total |
| 41 | 21.5 | 9.5 | 5 |  | Total/4 |

## Estimation of experimental errors

Once the effects have been computed, the model can be used to estimate the response for any given factor values as:

$$
\hat{y}_{i}=q_{0}+q_{A} x_{A i}+q_{B} x_{B i}+q_{A B} x_{A i} x_{B i}
$$

The difference between the estimate and the measured value $y_{i j}$ in the jth replication of the ith experiment represents the experimental error

$$
e_{i j}=y_{i j}-\hat{y}_{i}=y_{i j}-q_{0}+q_{A} x_{A i}+q_{B} x_{B i}+q_{A B} x_{A i} x_{B i}
$$

## Sign table augmented with errors

| I | A | B | AB | $\left(y_{i 1}, y_{i 2}, y_{i 3}\right)$ | $\hat{y}_{i}$ | $e_{i 1}$ | $e_{i 2}$ | $e_{i 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | $(15,18,12)$ | 15 | 0 | 3 | -3 |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | $(45,48,51)$ | 48 | -3 | 0 | 3 |
| 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | $(25,28,19)$ | 24 | 1 | 4 | -5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $(75,75,81)$ | 77 | -2 | -2 | 4 |
| 41 | 21.5 | 9.5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
S S E=\sum_{i=1}^{2^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{r} e_{i j}^{2}=102
$$

## Allocation of variation

Let $\bar{y}$. represent the mean of responses from all replications of all experiments. Then

$$
\begin{gathered}
S S T=\sum_{i, j}\left(y_{i j}-\bar{y}_{. .}\right)=2^{2} r q_{A}^{2}+2^{2} r q_{B}^{2}+2^{2} r q_{A B}^{2}+\sum_{i, j} e_{i j}^{2} \\
S S T=S S A+S S B+S S A B+S S E
\end{gathered}
$$

We can also show that SST = SSY - SSO, giving us an easier way to compute SSE:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S S E=S S Y-(S S 0+S S A+S S B+S S A B) \\
& \text { where } S S Y=\sum_{i, j} y_{i j}^{2} \text { and } S S 0=2^{2} r q_{0}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example

For our memory-cache example
SSY $=15^{2}+18^{2}+12^{2}+45^{2}+\ldots+75^{2}+75^{2}+81^{2}=27,204$
SSO $=12 \times 41^{2}=20,172$
$S S A=5547, S S B=1083, S S A B=300$
SSE $=27,204-2^{2} \times 3\left(41^{2}+21.5^{2}+9.5^{2}+5^{2}\right)=102$
SST = SSY - SSO = 27,204-20,172 = 7032
Thus, factor $A$ explains $5547 / 7032$ or $78.88 \%$ of the variation, factor $B$ explains $15.4 \%$, interaction $A B$ explains $4.27 \%$ of the variation.
The remaining $1.45 \%$ is attributed to experimental errors

## Confidence intervals for effects

The effects computed from a sample are random variables
$\square$ We can calculate the confidence intervals for the effects if we assume that

- Errors are normally distributed with zero mean
> Errors for different experiments are independent
> Errors have a constant standard deviation
- Under these assumptions, we can use the tdistribution to compute confidence intervals as discussed previously (Chapter 13, Jain)


## Confidence intervals for effects

- The sample variance of errors can be estimated from the SSE as follows:

$$
\begin{gathered}
s_{e}^{2}=\frac{S S E}{2^{2}(r-1)} \\
s_{q_{0}}^{2}=s_{q_{A}}^{2}=s_{q_{B}}^{2}=s_{q_{A B}}^{2}=s_{e}^{2} /\left(2^{2} r\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

- The confidence intervals for effects can then be computed as $q_{i} \pm t_{\left[1-\alpha / 2 ; 2^{2}(r-1)\right]} s_{q_{i}}$


## Example

$\square$ For the memory-cache example,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s_{e}=\sqrt{\frac{S S E}{2^{2}(r-1)}}=\sqrt{\frac{102}{8}}=\sqrt{12.75}=3.57 \\
& s_{q_{i}}=s_{e} / \sqrt{\left(2^{2} r\right)}=3.57 / \sqrt{12}=1.03
\end{aligned}
$$

$\square$ The $t$-value for 8 degrees of freedom and $90 \%$ confidence is 1.86 . Thus, the confidence intervals for the effects are $q_{i} \pm(1.86)(1.03)=q_{i} \pm 1.92$ that is $(39.08,42.91),(19.58,23.41),(7.58,11.41)$, $(3.08,6.91)$ for $q_{0}, q_{A}, q_{B}$ and $q_{A B}$ respectively

## Additional Reading (Jain)

$\square$ Confidence intervals for predicted responses: Section 18.6
$\square$ Visual tests for verifying the model: Section 18.7
$\square$ Multiplicative models: Section 18.8
$\square$ General $2^{k} r$ factorial design: Section 18.9

## $\underline{2}^{k-p}$ Fractional Factorial Designs

## Fractional Factorial Designs

$\square$ If we have 7 factors, a $2^{7}$ factorial design will require 128 experiments

- How much information can we obtain from fewer experiments, e.g. $2^{7-4}=8$ experiments?
$\square$ A $2^{k-p}$ design allows the analysis of $k$ twolevel factors with fewer experiments


## A $2^{7-4}$ Experimental Design

Consider the $2^{3}$ design below:

| Experiment \# | I | A | B | C | AB | AC | BC | ABC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| 5 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 |
| 7 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

If the factors, $A B, A C, B C, A B C$ are replaced by $D, E, F$, and $G$ we get a $2^{7-4}$ design

## A $2^{7-4}$ design

If the interactions $A B, A C, A D, \ldots, A B C D$ are negligible we can use the table below

| Experiment \# | I | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 20 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 35 |
| 3 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 7 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 42 |
| 5 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 36 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 50 |
| 7 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 45 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 82 |
| Total | 317 | 101 | 35 | 109 | 43 | 1 | 47 | 3 |  |
| Total/8 | 39.62 | 12.62 | 4.37 | 13.62 | 5.37 | 0.12 | 5.9 | 0.37 |  |
| Percent <br> variation |  | 37.26 | 4.74 | 43.4 | 6.75 | 0 | 8.1 | 0.03 |  |

## Preparing the sign table for a $2^{k-p}$ design

1. Choose $k-p$ factors and prepare a complete sign table for a full factorial design with k-p factors.

There are $2^{k-p}$ rows and columns in the table.
The first column is marked I and consists of all 1's.
The next $k$-p columns correspond to the $k$-p selected factors. The remaining columns correspond to the products of these factors.
2. Of the $2^{k-p}-k+p-1$ remaining columns, select $p$ columns corresponding to the $p$ factors that were not chosen in step 1.
Note: there are several possibilities; the columns corresponding to negligible interactions should be chosen.

## A $2^{4-1}$ design

| Experiment \# | I | A | B | C | AB | AC | BC | ABC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| 5 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -1 |
| 7 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -1 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

If the $A B C$ interaction is negligible, we should replace $A B C$ with $D$. If $A B$ is negligible, we can replace $A B$ with $D$.

## Confounding

- The drawback of $2^{k-p}$ designs is that the experiments only yield the combined effects of two or more factors. This is called confounding
> On the previous slide, the effects of $A B C$ and $D$ are confounded (denoted as $A B C=D$ )
$\square$ In a $2^{k-1}$ design, every column represents a sum of two effects.
> For our example,
- $A=B C D, B=A C D, C=A B D, A B=C D, A C=B D$, $B C=A D, A B C=D, I=A B C D$
- This means that columns for $A, B, C, D$ actually correspond to $A+B C D, B+A C D, C+A B D, D+A B C$, etc.
> If we replace $A B$ with $D$,
- $I=A B D, A=B D, B=A D, C=A B C D, D=A B, A C=B C D$, $B C=A C D, A B C=C D$
$\square$ In a $2^{k-p}$ design, $2^{p}$ effects are confounded


## Algebra of Confounding

Consider the first design in which $A B C$ is replaced with D
> Here, $I=A B C D$
> All the confoundings can be generated using the following rules

1. I is treated as unity.e.g. I multiplied by A is A
2. Any term with a power of 2 is erased, e.g. $A B^{2} C$ is the same as AC.
The polynomial $I=A B C D$ is used to generate all the confoundings for this design, and is called the generator polynomial
The second design in which $A B$ was replaced by $D$ in the sign table has generator polynomial I = ABD

## Design Resolution

$\square$ The resolution of a design is measured by the order of effects that are confounded
> The effect $A B C D$ is of order 4 , while $I$ is of order 0
> If an i-th order effect is confounded with a $j$-th order term, the confounding is of order $i+j$
> The minimum of orders of all confoundings of a design is called its resolution

- We can easily determine the resolution of a design by looking at the generator polynomial, e.g. if $I=A B C D$, then the design has resolution 4 , if $I=A B D$, the design has resolution 3

In general, higher resolution designs are considered better under the assumption that higher order interactions are smaller than lower-order effects

