

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
Mechanical Engineering

IE 446
Solutions to Problem Set #9

Michael J. Scott

Spring 2000

1. (Montgomery 6-44)
 - (a) An inspection unit is 4 transmissions; sample size n is 1 unit. The average number of nonconformities is $\bar{u} = 1.6875$, so the centerline is at 1.6875. The upper control limit is at $\bar{u} + 3\sqrt{\bar{u}} = 5.585$, the lower control limit is at 0.
 - (b) The process is in control.
 - (c) Now $n = 2$ inspection units. So the centerline is at $n\bar{u} = 3.375$. The upper control limit is at $n\bar{u} + 3\sqrt{n\bar{u}} = 8.886$. Lower control limit still 0.
2. (Montgomery 6-60) The c chart is for nonconformities per unit of 6 clocks, thus $\bar{c} = 6(0.75) = 4.5$. UCL is $\bar{c} + 3\sqrt{\bar{c}} = 10.86$, LCL is 0.
3. (Montgomery 7-4)
 - (a) $H = h\sigma = 0.2385$, and $K = k\sigma = 0.025$. The chart is developed as below:

i	x_i	$x_i - 8.045$	C_i^+	N^+	$7.995 - x_i$	C_i^-	N^-
1	8.00	-0.045	0	0	-0.005	0	0
2	8.01	-0.035	0	0	-0.015	0	0
3	8.02	-0.025	0	0	-0.025	0	0
4	8.01	-0.035	0	0	-0.015	0	0
5	8.00	-0.045	0	0	-0.005	0	0
6	8.01	-0.035	0	0	-0.015	0	0
7	8.06	0.025	0.025	1	-0.065	0	0
8	8.07	0.035	0.06	2	-0.075	0	0
9	8.01	-0.035	0.025	3	-0.015	0	0
10	8.04	0.005	0.03	4	-0.045	0	0
11	8.02	-0.025	0.005	5	-0.025	0	0
12	8.01	-0.035	0	0	-0.015	0	0
13	8.05	0.015	0.015	1	-0.055	0	0
14	8.04	0.005	0.02	2	-0.045	0	0
15	8.03	-0.045	0	0	-0.05	0	0
16	8.05	0.015	0.015	1	-0.055	0	0
17	8.06	0.025	0.04	2	-0.065	0	0
18	8.04	0.005	0.045	3	-0.045	0	0
19	8.05	0.015	0.06	4	-0.055	0	0
20	8.06	0.025	0.085	5	-0.065	0	0
21	8.04	0.005	0.09	6	-0.045	0	0
22	8.02	-0.025	0.065	7	-0.025	0	0
23	8.03	-0.045	0.02	8	-0.05	0	0
24	8.05	0.015	0.035	9	-0.055	0	0

which never signals out of control, even though the process is clearly biased above the nominal mean.

- (b) This is an individual measurements chart, so the best available estimate of σ is $\frac{MR}{d_2} = \frac{MR}{1.128}$. Since $MR = 0.187$, that estimate is $\hat{\sigma} = 0.0166$. So the assumption that $\sigma = 0.05$ is not a good assumption.

4. (Montgomery 7-5) For $k = 0.25$, $h = 8.01$, we have $K = 0.0125$, $H = 0.4005$, and the chart changes to:

i	x_i	$x_i - 8.0325$	C_i^+	N^+	$8.0075 - x_i$	C_i^-	N^-
1	8.00	-0.0325	0	0	0.0075	0.0075	1
2	8.01	-0.0225	0	0	-0.0025	0	0
3	8.02	-0.0125	0	0	-0.0125	0	0
4	8.01	-0.0225	0	0	-0.0025	0	0
5	8.00	-0.0325	0	0	0.0075	0.0075	1
6	8.01	-0.0225	0	0	-0.0025	0	0
7	8.06	0.0275	0.0275	1	-0.0525	0	0
8	8.07	0.0425	0.07	2	-0.0625	0	0
9	8.01	-0.0225	0.0475	3	-0.0025	0	0
10	8.04	0.0075	0.065	4	-0.0325	0	0
11	8.02	-0.0125	0.0525	5	-0.0125	0	0
12	8.01	-0.0225	0.03	6	-0.0025	0	0
13	8.05	0.0175	0.0475	7	-0.0425	0	0
14	8.04	0.0075	0.055	8	-0.0325	0	0
15	8.03	-0.0025	0.0525	9	-0.0225	0	0
16	8.05	0.0175	0.07	10	-0.0425	0	0
17	8.06	0.0275	0.0975	11	-0.0525	0	0
18	8.04	0.0075	0.105	12	-0.0325	0	0
19	8.05	0.0175	0.1225	13	-0.0425	0	0
20	8.06	0.0275	0.15	14	-0.0525	0	0
21	8.04	0.0075	0.1575	15	-0.0325	0	0
22	8.02	-0.0125	0.145	16	-0.0125	0	0
23	8.03	-0.0025	0.1425	17	-0.0225	0	0
24	8.05	0.0175	0.16	18	-0.0425	0	0

Once again the process seems clearly biased above the nominal mean, but the chart is in control.

As for theoretic performances of the two charts, the ARL_0 calculations based on Siegmund's approximation (p. 323) are identical.

5. (Montgomery 7-6) For the FIR chart, we use $H = 0.2385$, $K = 0.0125$, and $C_0^+ = C_0^- = H/2 = 0.119$. Note that the new target is $\mu = 8.00$. The chart develops:

i	x_i	$x_i - 8.0125$	C_i^+	N^+	$7.9875 - x_i$	C_i^-	N^-
1	8.00	-0.0125	0.1065	1	-0.0125	0.1065	1
2	8.01	-0.0025	0.104	2	-0.0225	0	0
3	8.02	0.0075	0.1115	3	-0.0325	0	0
4	8.01	-0.0025	0.1090	4	-0.0225	0	0
5	8.00	-0.0125	0.0965	5	-0.0125	0	0
6	8.01	-0.0025	0.0940	6	-0.0225	0	0
7	8.06	0.0475	0.1415	7	-0.0725	0	0
8	8.07	0.0575	0.1990	8	-0.0825	0	0
9	8.01	-0.0025	0.1965	9	-0.0225	0	0
10	8.04	0.0275	0.2240	10	-0.0525	0	0
11	8.02	0.0075	0.2315	11	-0.0325	0	0
12	8.01	-0.0025	0.2290	12	-0.0225	0	0
13	8.05	0.0375	0.2615	13	-0.0525	0	0

which is out of control at the thirteenth sample.