



TGP/10.3.2 Draft 1 ORIGINAL: English DATE: May 29, 2002

# INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS GENEVA

Associated Document <u>to the</u> <u>General Introduction to the Examination</u> <u>of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability and the</u> <u>Development of Harmonized Descriptions of New Varieties of Plants (document TG/1/3)</u>

# **DOCUMENT TGP/10**

### "EXAMINING UNIFORMITY"

Section TGP/10.3.2: Recommended Statistical Methods: Offtypes

Document prepared by experts from the United Kingdom

to be considered by the

Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC), at its twentieth session to be held in Texcoco, Mexico, from June 17 to 20, 2002

# SECTION 10.3.2 RECOMMENDED STATISTICAL METHODS: OFFTYPES

# **TESTING UNIFORMITY BY OFF-TYPES – FIXED POPULATION STANDARD**

# SUMMARY

1. This section describes the method of assessing uniformity by comparing the number of off-types observed to a fixed population standard. This is of particular use for self-pollinated and vegetatively propagated crops.

2. Uniformity of candidate varieties of self-pollinated and vegetatively propagated crops is normally assessed on the basis of the number of off-types recorded in tests. The maximum number of off-types that is acceptable should be chosen so that the probability of rejecting a candidate variety that should meet the crop standard is small. On the other hand the probability of accepting a candidate variety that has many more off-types than the standard of that crop should also be low.

3. The methods described here address the problem of choosing the maximum permitted number of off-types for different standards and sample sizes so that the probability of making errors is known and acceptable. The methods involve establishing a standard for the crop in question and then choosing the sample size and the number of off-types that best satisfy the risks that can be tolerated.

4. This document also outlines procedures for when more than a single test (more than one year for instance) is done and mentions the possibility of using sequential tests to minimize testing effort.

# INTRODUCTION

5. When testing for uniformity on the basis of a sample, there will always be some risk of making a wrong decision. The risks can be reduced by increasing the sample size but at a greater cost. The aim of the statistical procedure described here is to achieve an acceptable balance between risks.

6. The procedures described below require the user to define an acceptance standard (called the *population standard*) for the crop in question. The methods described then show how to determine the sample size and the maximum number of off-types allowed for various levels of risks.

7. The population standard is the maximum percentage of off-types that would be accepted if all individuals of the variety could be examined.

# UPOV RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FIXED POPULATION STANDARD METHOD OF ASSESSING UNIFORMITY BY NUMBER OF OFF-TYPES

8. This method is recommended for use in assessing the uniformity by number of off-types in self-pollinated and vegetatively propagated crops.

9. The sample size and acceptable number of off-types employed depend on the crop. Recommended sample sizes and acceptable numbers of off-types for different crops are given in the Annex to TGP/10.3.

# ERRORS IN TESTING FOR OFF-TYPES

10. As mentioned, there will be some risk of making wrong decisions. Two types of error exist:

(a) Declaring that the variety lacks uniformity when it in fact meets the standard for the crop. This is known as "type I error."

(b) Declaring that the variety is uniform when it in fact does not meet the standard for the crop. This is known as "type II error."

	Decision ma	de on variety
True state of the variety	Acceptance as uniform	Rejection as non-uniform
uniform	correctly accepted	type I error
heterogeneous	type II error	correctly rejected

11. The types of error can be summarized in the following table:

12. The probability of correctly accepting a uniform variety is called the acceptance probability and is linked to the probability of type I error by the relation:

"Acceptance probability" + "probability of type I error" = 100%

13. The probability of type II error depends on "how heterogeneous" the candidate variety is. If it is much more heterogeneous than the population standard then the probability of type II error will be small and we will have a small probability of accepting such a variety. If, on the other hand, the candidate variety is only slightly more heterogeneous than the standard, we will have a large probability of type II error. The probability of acceptance will approach the acceptance probability for a variety with a level of uniformity near to the population standard.

14. Because the probability of type II error is not fixed but depends on "how heterogeneous" the candidate variety is, this probability can be calculated for different degrees of heterogeneity. This document gives probabilities of type II error for three degrees of heterogeneity: 2, 5 and 10 times the population standard.

15. In general, the probability of making errors will be decreased by increasing the sample size and increased by decreasing the sample size.

16. For a given sample size, the balance between the probabilities of making type I and type II errors may be altered by changing the number of off-types allowed.

17. If the number of off-types allowed is increased, the probability of type I error is decreased but the probability of type II error is increased. On the other hand, if the number of off-types allowed is decreased, the probability of type I errors is increased while the probability of type II errors is decreased.

18. By allowing a very high number of off-types it will be possible to make the probability of type I errors very low (or almost zero). However, the probability of making type II errors will now become (unacceptably) high. If only a very low number of off-types are allowed, the result will be a small probability of type II errors and an (unacceptably) high probability of type I errors. This will be illustrated by examples.

# EXAMPLES

# Example 1

19. From experience, a reasonable standard for the crop in question is found to be 1%. So the population standard is 1%. Assume also that a single test with a maximum of 60 plants is done. From tables 4, 10 and 16 (chosen to give a range of target acceptance probabilities), the following schemes are found:

Scheme	Sample size	Target acceptance probability <sup>*</sup>	Maximum number of off-types
а	60	90%	2
b	53	90%	1
с	60	95%	2
d	60	99%	3

20. From the figures 4, 10 and 16, the following probabilities are obtained for the type I error and type II error for different percentages of off-types (denoted by  $P_2$ ,  $P_5$  and  $P_{10}$  for 2, 5 and 10 times the population standard).

See paragraph 54

Scheme	Sample size	Maximum number of off-types	Probabilities of error (%)			
			Type I		Type II	
				$P_2 = 2\%$	$P_{5} = 5\%$	$P_{10} = 10\%$
a	60	2	2	88	42	5
b	53	1	10	71	25	3
с	60	2	2	88	42	5
d	60	3	0.3	97	65	14

21. The table lists four different schemes and they should be examined to see if one of them is appropriate to use. (Schemes a and c are identical since there is no scheme for a sample size of 60 with a probability of type I error between 5 and 10%). If it is decided to ensure that the probability of a type I error should be very small (scheme d) then the probability of the type II error becomes very large (97, 65 and 14%) for a variety with 2, 5 and 10% of off-types, respectively. The best balance between the probabilities of making the two types of error seems to be obtained by allowing one off-type in a sample of 53 plants (scheme b).

# Example 2

22. In this example, a crop is considered where the population standard is set to 2% and the number of plants available for examination is only 6.

23. Using the tables and the figures 3, 9 and 15, the following schemes a-d are found:

Sche- me	Sample size	Acceptance probability	Maximum number of off-types	Probability of error (%)			
				Type I		Type II	
					$P_2 = 4\%$	$P_5 = 10\%$	$P_{10} = 20\%$
a	6	90	1	0.6	98	89	66
b	5	90	0	10	82	59	33
c	6	95	1	0.6	98	89	66
d	6	99	1	0.6	98	89	66
e	6		0	11	78	53	26

24. Scheme e of the table is found by applying the formulas (1) and (2) shown later in this document.

25. This example illustrates the difficulties encountered when the sample size is very low. The probability of erroneously accepting a heterogeneous variety (a type II error) is large for all the possible situations. Even when all five plants must be uniform for a variety to be accepted (scheme b), the probability of accepting a variety with 20% of off-types is still 33%.

26. It should be noted that a scheme where all six plants must be uniform (scheme e) gives slightly smaller probabilities of type II errors, but now the probability of the type I error has increased to 11%.

27. However, scheme e may be considered the best option when only six plants are available in a single test for a crop where the population standard has been set to 2%.

### Example 3

28. In this example we reconsider the situation in example 1 but assume that data are available for two years. So the population standard is 1% and the sample size is 120 plants (60 plants in each of two years).

29.	The	following	schemes	and	probabilities	are	obtained	from	the	tables	and	figures	4,	10
and	16:													

Sche- me	Sample size	Acceptance probability	Maximum number of off-types	Probability of error (%)			
				Type I		Type II	
					$P_2 = 2\%$	$P_5 = 5\%$	$P_{10} = 10\%$
a	120	90	3	3	78	15	< 0.1
b	110	90	2	10	62	8	< 0.1
c	120	95	3	3	78	15	< 0.1
d	120	99	4	0.7	91	28	1

30. Here the best balance between the probabilities of making the two types of error is obtained by scheme c, i.e. to accept after two years a total of three off-types among the 120 plants examined.

31. Alternatively a two-stage testing procedure may be set up. Such a procedure can be found for this case by using formulae (3) and (4) later in this document.

Scheme	Sample size	Acceptance probability	Largest number for acceptance after year 1	Largest number before reject in year 1	Largest number to accept after 2 years
е	60	90	can never accept	2	3
f	60	95	can never accept	2	3
g	60	99	can never accept	3	4
h	58	90	1	2	2

# 32. The following schemes can be obtained:

### 33. Using the formulas (3), (4) and (5) the following probabilities of errors are obtained:

Scheme		Probability					
	Type I		Type II				
		$P_2 = 2\%$	$P_{5} = 5\%$	$P_{10} = 10\%$	year		
e	4	75	13	0.1	100		
f	4	75	13	0.1	100		
g	1	90	27	0.5	100		
h	10	62	9	0.3	36		

34. Schemes e and f (which are identical) result in a probability of 4% for rejecting a uniform variety (type I error) and a probability of 13% for accepting a variety with 5% off-types (type II error). The decision is:

- Never accept the variety after 1 year
- More than 2 off-types in year 1: reject the variety and stop testing
- Between and including 0 and 2 off types in year 1: do a second year test
- At most 3 off-types after 2 years: accept the variety
- More than 3 off-types after 2 years: reject the variety

35. Alternatively, scheme h may be chosen but scheme g seems to have a too large probability of type II errors compared with the probability of type I error.

36. Scheme h has the advantage of often allowing a final decision to be taken after the first test (year) but, as a consequence, there is a higher probability of a type I error.

# Example 4

37. In this example, we assume that the population standard is 3% and that we have 8 plants available in each of two years.

Sche-	Sample size	Acceptance	Maximum	Р	robability of	of error (%)	)
me		probability	number of off-types	Type I		Type II	
					$P_2 = 6\%$	$P_5 = 15\%$	$P_{10} = 30\%$
a	16	90	1	8	78	28	3
b	16	95	2	1	93	56	10
c	16	99	3	0.1	99	79	25

# 38. From the tables and figures 2, 8 and 14, we have:

39. Here the best balance between the probabilities of making the two types of error is obtained by scheme a.

# INTRODUCTION TO THE TABLES AND FIGURES

40. In the TABLES AND FIGURES section, there are 21 table and figure pairs corresponding to different combinations of population standard and acceptance probability. These are design to be applied to a single off-type test. An overview of the tables and the figures are given in table A.

41. Each table shows the maximum numbers of off-types (k) with the corresponding ranges in sample sizes (n) for the given population standard and acceptance probability. For example, in table 1 (population standard 5%, acceptance probability  $\ge$  90%), for a maximum set at 2 off-types, the corresponding sample size (n) is in the range from 11 to 22. Likewise, if the maximum number of off-types (k) is 10, the corresponding sample size (n) to be used should be in the range 126 to 141.

42. For small sample sizes, the same information is shown graphically in the corresponding figures (figures (1 to 21). These show the actual risk of rejecting a uniform variety and the probability of accepting a variety with a true proportion of off-types 2 times (2P), 5 times (5P) and 10 times (10P) greater than the population standard. (To ease the reading of the figure, lines connect the risks for the individual sample sizes, although the probability can only be calculated for each individual sample size).

Population standard %	Acceptance probability %	See table and figure no.
10	>90	19
10	>95	20
10	>99	21
5	>90	1
5	>95	7
5	>99	13
3	>90	2
3	>95	8
3	>99	14
2	>90	3
2	>95	9
2	>99	15
1	>90	4
1	>95	10
1	>99	16
0.5	>90	5
0.5	>95	11
0.5	>99	17
0.1	>90	6
0.1	>95	12
0.1	>99	18

Table A. Overview of table and figure 1 to 18.

43. When using the tables the following procedure is suggested:

(a) Choose the relevant population standard.

(b) Write down the different relevant decision schemes (combinations of sample size and maximum number of off-types), with the probabilities of type I and type II errors read from the figures.

(c) Choose the decision scheme with the best balance between the probabilities of errors.

44. The use of the tables and figures is illustrated in the example section.

#### DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE METHOD FOR ONE SINGLE TEST

45. The mathematical calculations are based on the binomial distribution and it is common to use the following terms:

(a) The percentage of off-types to be accepted in a particular case is called the "population standard" and symbolized by the letter P.

(b) The "acceptance probability" is the probability of accepting a variety with P% of off-types. However, because the number of off-types is discrete, the actual probability of accepting a uniform variety varies with sample size but will always be greater than or equal to the "acceptance probability." The acceptance probability is usually denoted by  $100 - \alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is the percent probability of rejecting a variety with P% of off-types (i.e. type I error probability). In practice, many varieties will have less than P% off-types and hence the type I error will in fact be less than  $\alpha$  for such varieties.

(c) The number of plants examined in a random sample is called the sample size and denoted by n.

(d) The maximum number of off-types tolerated in a random sample of size n is denoted by k.

(e) The probability of accepting a variety with more than P% off-types, say  $P_q$ % of off-types, is denoted by the letter  $\beta$  or by  $\beta_q$ .

(f) The mathematical formulae for calculating the probabilities are:

$$\alpha = 100 - 100 \sum_{i=0}^{k} {\binom{n}{i}} P^{i} (1 - P)^{n - i}$$
(1)  
$$\beta_{q} = 100 \sum_{i=0}^{k} {\binom{n}{i}} P_{q}^{i} (1 - P_{q})^{n - i}$$
(2)

P and  $P_{q}$  are expressed here as proportions, i.e. percents divided by 100.

### MORE THAN ONE SINGLE TEST (YEAR)

46. Often a candidate variety is grown in two (or three years). The question then arises of how to combine the uniformity information from the individual years. Two methods will be described:

(a) Make the decision after two (or three) years based on the total number of plants examined and the total number of off-types recorded. (A combined test).

(b) Use the result of the first year to see if the data suggests a clear decision (reject or accept). If the decision is not clear then proceed with the second year and decide after the second year. (A two-stage test).

47. However, there are some alternatives (e.g. a decision may be made in each year and a final decision may be reached by rejecting the candidate variety if it shows too many off-types in both (or two out of three years)). Also there are complications when more than one single year test is done. It is therefore suggested that a statistician should be consulted when two (or more) year tests have to be used.

# DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS FOR MORE THAN ONE SINGLE TEST

#### Combined Test

48. The sample size in test i is  $n_i$ . So after the last test we have the total sample size  $n = \sum n_i$ . A decision scheme is set in exactly the same way as if this total sample size had been obtained in a single test. Thus, the total number of off-types recorded through the tests is compared with the maximum number of off-types allowed by the chosen decision scheme.

#### Two-stage Test

49. The method for a two-year test may be described as follows: In the first year take a sample of size n. Reject the candidate variety if more than  $r_1$  off-types are recorded and accept the candidate variety if less than  $a_1$  off-types are recorded. Otherwise, proceed to the second year and take a sample of size n (as in the first year) and reject the candidate variety if the total number of off-types recorded in the two years' test is greater than r. Otherwise, accept the candidate variety. The final risks and the expected sample size in such a procedure may be calculated as follows:

$$\alpha = P(K_1 > r_1) + P(K_1 + K_2 > r \mid K_1)$$
  
= P(K\_1 > r\_1) + P(K\_2 > r-K\_1 \mid K\_1)

$$=\sum_{i=r_{1}+1}^{n} {\binom{n}{i}} P^{i}(1-P)^{n-i} + \sum_{i=\alpha_{1}}^{r_{1}} {\binom{n}{i}} P^{i}(1-P)^{n-i} \sum_{j=r-i+1}^{n} {\binom{n}{i}} P^{j}(1-P)^{n-j}$$
(3)

$$\begin{split} \beta_{q} &= P(K_{1} < \alpha_{1}) + P(K_{1} + K_{2} \leq r \mid K_{1}) \\ &= P(K_{1} < \alpha_{1}) + P(K_{2} \leq r \text{-} K_{1} \mid K_{1}) \end{split}$$

$$=\sum_{i=0}^{\alpha_{1}-1} {n \choose i} P_{q}^{i} (1-P_{q})^{n-i} + \sum_{i=\alpha_{1}}^{r_{1}} {n \choose i} P_{q}^{i} (1-P_{q})^{n-i} \sum_{j=0}^{r-i} {n \choose i} P_{q}^{j} (1-P_{q})^{n-j}$$
(4)

$$n_{e} = n \left( 1 + \sum_{i=\alpha_{1}}^{r_{1}} {n \choose i} P^{i} (1 - P)^{n - i} \right)$$
(5)

where

 $n_e =$  expected sample size

 $r_1$ ,  $a_1$  and r are decision-parameters

 $P_q = q$  times population standard = q P

 $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are the numbers of off-types found in years 1 and 2 respectively.

50. The decision parameters,  $a_1$ ,  $r_1$  and r, may be chosen according to the following criteria:

- (a)  $\alpha$  must be less than  $\alpha_0$ , where  $\alpha_0$  is the maximum type I error, i.e.  $\alpha_0$  is 100 minus the required acceptance probability
- (b)  $\beta_q$  (for q=5) should be as small as possible but not smaller than  $\alpha_0$
- (c) if  $\beta_q$  (for q=5) <  $\alpha_0 n_e$  should be as small as possible.

51. However, other strategies are available. No tables/figures are produced here as there may be several different decision schemes that satisfy a certain set of risks. It is suggested that a statistician should be consulted if a 2-stage test (or any other sequential tests) is required.

# SEQUENTIAL TESTS

52. The two-stage test mentioned above is a type of sequential test where the result of the first stage determines whether the test needs to be continued for a second stage. Other types of sequential tests may also be applicable. It may be relevant to consider such tests when the practical work allows analyses of off-types to be carried out at certain stages of the examination. The decision schemes for such methods can be set up in many different ways and it is suggested that a statistician should be consulted when sequential methods are to be used.

# NOTE ON TYPE I AND TYPE II ERRORS

53. Because the number of off-types is discrete, we cannot in general obtain type I-errors that are nice pre-selected figures. The scheme a of example 2 with 6 plants above showed that we could not obtain an  $\alpha$  of 10% - our actual  $\alpha$  became 0.6%. Increasing the sample size will result in varying  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values. Figure 3 - as an example - shows that  $\alpha$  gets closer to its nominal values at certain sample sizes and that this is also the sample size where  $\beta$  is relatively small. It is also seen that increasing the sample size of five gives  $\alpha = 10\%$  and  $\beta_2 = 82\%$  whereas a sample size of six gives  $\alpha = 0.6\%$  and  $\beta_2 = 98\%$ . It appears that the sample sizes, which give  $\alpha$ -values in close agreement with the acceptance probability are the largest in the range of sample sizes with a specified maximum number of off-types. Thus, the smallest sample sizes in the range of sample sizes with a given maximum number of off-types should be avoided.

# DEFINITION OF STATISTICAL TERMS AND SYMBOLS

54. The statistical terms and symbols used have the following definitions:

*Population standard.* The percentage of off-types to be accepted if all the individuals of a variety could be examined. The population standard is fixed for the crop in question and is based on experience.

Acceptance probability. The probability of accepting a uniform variety with P% of off-types. Here P is population standard. However, note that the actual probability of accepting a uniform variety will always be greater than or equal to the acceptance probability in the heading of the table and figures. The probability of accepting a uniform variety and the probability of a type I error sum to 100%. For example, if the type I error probability is 4%, then the probability of accepting a uniform variety is 100 - 4 = 96%, see e.g. figure 1 for n=50). The type I error is indicated on the graph in the figures by the sawtooth peaks between 0 and the upper limit of type I error (for instance 10 on figure 1). The decision schemes are defined so that the actual probability of accepting a uniform variety is always greater than or equal to the acceptance probability in the heading of the table.

*Type I error:* The error of rejecting a uniform variety.

*Type II error*: The error of accepting a variety that is too heterogeneous.

#### P Population standard

 $P_q$  The assumed true percentage of off-types in a heterogeneous variety.  $P_q = q P$ .

In the present document q is equal to 2, 5 or 10. These are only 3 examples to help the visualization of type II errors. The actual percentage of off-types in a variety may take any value. For instance we may examine different varieties which in fact may have respectively 1.6%, 3.8%, 0.2%, ... of off-types.

- n Sample size
- k Maximum number of off-types allowed
- $\alpha$  Probability of type I error
- $\beta$  Probability of type II error

#### **TABLES AND FIGURES**



Table and figure 2:

Population Standard = 3% Acceptance Probability ≥90% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 3:

Population Standard = 2% Acceptance Probability ≥90% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 4:

Population Standard = 1% Acceptance Probability ≥90% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 5:

**Population Standard** = .5% Acceptance Probability ≥90% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types

n		k
1	01	0
1-	21	0
22-	106	1
107-	220	2
221-	349	3
350-	487	4
488-	631	5
632-	780	6
781-	932	7
933-	1087	8
1088-	1245	9
1246-	1405	10
1406-	1567	11
1568-	1730	12
1731-	1895	13
1896-	2061	14
2062-	2228	15
2229-	2397	16
2398-	2566	17
2567-	2736	18
2737-	2907	19
2908-	3000	20



#### Table and figure 6:

**Population Standard** = .1% Acceptance Probability ≥90% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types

n	к	
1- 105 106- 532 533-1102 1103-1745 1746-2433 2434-3000	0 1 2 3 4 5	actual type I error 
		0 900

Sample wire

#### Table and figure 7:

Population Standard = 5% Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 8:

Population Standard = 3% Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 8 continued:

1423- 1451	54
1452- 1481	55
1482- 1511	56
1512- 1541	57
1542- 1570	58
1571- 1600	59
1601- 1630	60
1631- 1660	61
1661- 1690	62
1691- 1720	63
1721- 1750	64
1751- 1780	65
1781- 1810	66
1811- 1840	67
1841- 1870	68
1871- 1900	69
1901- 1930	70
1931- 1960	71
1961- 1990	72
1991-2000	73

#### **Table and figure 9:**

**Population Standard** = 2%Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



Sample size

#### Table and figure 10:

#### Population Standard = 1% Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 11:

Population Standard = .5% Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 12:

 $\begin{array}{c}
 0 \\
 1 \\
 2 \\
 3 \\
 4 \\
 5 \\
 6
\end{array}$ 

Population Standard = .1% Acceptance Probability ≥95% n=sample size, k=maximum number off-types

1-	51
52-	355
356-	818
819-1	367
1368-1	971
1972-2	614
2615-3	000



#### Table and figure 13:

Population Standard = 5% Acceptance Probability ≥99% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 13 continued:

793-	809	55
810-	826	56
827-	843	57
844-	860	58
861-	877	59
878-	894	60
895-	911	61
012	028	62
912-	920	62
929-	943	05
940-	962	04
963-	979	65
980-	997	66
998-	1014	67
1015-	1031	68
1032-	1048	69
1049-	1066	70
1067-	1083	71
1084-	1100	72
1101-	1118	73
1119-	1135	74
1136-	1153	75
1154-	1170	76
1171-	1187	77
1188-	1205	78
1206-	1203	70
1200-	1240	80
1223-	1240	00 01
1241-	1237	01
1258-	12/5	82
12/6-	1292	83
1293-	1310	84
1311-	1327	85
1328-	1345	86
1346-	1362	87
1363-	1380	88
1381-	1398	89
1399-	1415	90
1416-	1433	91
1434-	1451	92
1452-	1468	93
1469-	1486	94
1487-	1504	95
1505-	1521	96
1522-	1539	97
1540-	1557	98
1558-	1574	99
1575-	1592	100
1593-	1610	101
1611-	1628	102
1629-	1645	103
1646-	1663	104
1664	1691	104
1692	1600	105
1082-	1099	100
1710	1/1/	107
1/18-	1/34	108
1735-	1752	109
1753-	1770	110
1771-	1788	111
1789-	1806	112

#### Table and figure 14:

Population Standard = 3% Acceptance Probability ≥99% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 15:

Population Standard = 2% Acceptance Probability ≥99% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types





#### Table and figure 17:

Population Standard = .5% Acceptance Probability ≥99% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types



#### Table and figure 18:

Population Standard = .1% Acceptance Probability ≥99% n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types

				•					
			1.	_		1	0		
	1	1	1	-	1	4	8		
	14	4	9.	-	4	З	6		
	4	31	7.	-	8	2	4		
	82	2!	5.	-1	2	8	0		
1	21	B:	1.	-1	7	8	6		
1	78	87	7-	- 2	3	3	2		
2	33	33	3.	- 2	9	0	8		
2	9(	39	9-	- 3	0	0	¢		





ŝamo e site

#### Table and figure 20: **Population Standard** = 10% Acceptance Probability $\geq 95\%$ n=sample size, k=maximum number of off-types k л 1-3 1 4-8 2 14 3 9-15-20 4 150 18 FC ST az¦az) (γρ€ 5 21-27 52 ╋ nype li error ° C 7 **x x x** : <sub>YCE</sub> enter for 58 i 28-34 6 • lype erior lor 162 35-41 $\overline{7}$ 91 8 42-48 9 49-56 57-63 10 80 64-7111 72-79 12 70 13 80-86 87 94 ۱4 95-10215 50 Freeshijily of error 103-011 16 119 17 111-:20-127 1853 19 128-135 20 336 143 144-152 21 $U_{\rm f}$ ì 160 22 153-23 168161j5 169-177 24 :78-185 25 26186-194 20 195-200 27 10 ġ, ī 100 2) 120 140 660 180 tů, 50 80 100 9

Somple size



Somple size

[End of document]