

Order of Addition in Mixture-Amount Experiments

Taha Hasan¹ and Touqeer Ahmed*²

¹*Department of Statistics, Islamabad Model College for Boys, F-10/4, Islamabad, Pakistan*

²*CREST, ENSAI, University of Rennes, France*

Abstract

In a mixture experiment, we study the behavior and properties of m mixture components, where the primary focus is on the proportions of the components that make up the mixture rather than the total amount. Mixture-amount experiments are specialized types of mixture experiments where both the proportions of the components in the mixture and the total amount of the mixture are of interest. Such experiments consider the total amount of the mixture as a variable. In this paper, we consider an Order-of-Addition (OofA) mixture-amount experiment in which the response depends on both the mixture amounts of components and their order of addition. Full Mixture OofA designs are constructed to maintain orthogonality between the mixture-amount model terms and the effects of the order of addition. These designs enable the estimation of mixture-component model parameters and the order-of-addition effects. The G-efficiency criterion assesses how well the design supports precise and unbiased estimation of the model parameters. The Fraction of Design Space (FDS) plot is used to provide a visual assessment of the prediction capabilities of a design across the entire design space.

Keywords: Mixture experiments; Order-of-addition; Mixture-Amount Experiment; G-efficiency; Simplex-Lattice and Simplex-Centroid designs.

1 Introduction

In product formulations, the combination of various ingredients is observed, which forms a mixture. For example, chocolate is made of many ingredients in different compositions, cement-producing companies use certain ingredients in different proportions for making cement, baking shops use different ingredients for baking a cake, etc. The main focus of a mixture experiment is to judge an optimal formulation of a mixture and to get an optimal response from a composition of certain ingredients. An experiment in which the response variable y depends on the proportion x_i of components constituting a mixture blend, which is called a mixture experiment with the constraints

$$0 \leq x_i \leq 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i; i = 1, \dots, m$$

The factor space of the mixture experiment in m components is a $(m-1)$ of dimensional simplex S^{m-1} . Factor spaces resulting from specified constraints on mixture components belong to the simplex S^{m-1} . The n points in the simplex S^{m-1} or its sub-region generate a mixture design with n runs. These n runs are used to fit the mixture model to the observed responses.

A mixture-amount experiment is generally performed at two or more levels of the total amount, say A . The response is assumed to depend on the individual proportions of components

*Corresponding author: touqeer.ahmed@ensai.fr

in the blend and the amount of blend. The effects of varying the mixture component proportions and the total amount of the mixture on the response are measured by fitting a mixture-amount model to the design.

This study focuses on the order in which the mixture proportions x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m or component amounts a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m are added in each blend. We assume that the blends add the m components individually. Consequently, there are $m!$ possible sequences of these proportions or amounts to investigate. This scenario is referred to as the order-of-addition (OofA) problem in a mixture-amount experiment. The response variable y depends on the order in which the component's proportions or amounts are added in a composition and the interaction effect between the order and component proportions or amounts. In general, there are many scientific applications where the order of addition of the component proportions or amounts in a mixture blend affects the response.

Many physical phenomena observed in science and engineering are influenced by the order in which m components or materials are added. Perhaps the first famous OofA experiment was performed by Fisher (1971) that of tasting tea by a lady who said that she could differentiate whether tea or milk was first added to her cup. The experiment consisted of four replications of each tea order \rightarrow milk and milk \rightarrow tea. The OofA experiments have found wide application also in bio-chemistry (Shinohara and Ogawa, 1998), nutritional science (Karim et al., 2000), bio-engineering (Chandrasekaran et al., 2006), chemical experiments (Jiang and Ng, 2014), combinatorial drug therapy (Ding et al., 2015), and many others.

Limited literature exists on Order-of-Addition (OofA) mixture experiments. Rios and Lin (2022) explored OofA mixture experiments and derived designs that account for interactions between the order of addition and mixture proportions. However, no prior research has addressed OofA mixture-amount experiments or their design construction. In our study, we develop designs that vary both the order of addition and the total mixture amount. These designs enable us to observe response changes for specific permutations of addition orders and total mixture amounts.

A mixture-amount experiment examines how the response of a system is influenced by the individual proportions of components in a blend and the overall quantity of that blend, playing a crucial role in various fields such as pharmaceuticals, agriculture, nutrition, chemical engineering, and bioengineering. The primary objective is to determine the optimal proportions of ingredients to achieve the desired response, such as tablet weight and efficacy in the formulation of a pain relief tablet composed of active pharmaceutical ingredients, binders, and disintegrants. This involves designing experiments using factorial or mixture designs, identifying key variables like component proportions and total mixture amount, and measuring responses through statistical analysis to uncover significant effects on outcomes. The insights gained from these experiments can enhance product formulation and optimization, leading to improved performance and effectiveness across diverse applications, from developing optimal drug formulations to creating balanced nutrient profiles in fertilizers and food products.

1.1 Models for Mixture-Amount Experiments

The design for fitting the mixture-amount model is called the mixture-amount design, developed by Piepel and Cornell (1985). The linear and quadratic expected response mixture-amount models for m components is

$$E(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^0 x_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^1 x_i A \quad (1)$$

$$E(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^0 x_i + \sum_{i < j}^m \gamma_{ij}^0 x_i x_j + \sum_{l=1}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^l x_i + \sum_{i < j}^m \gamma_{ij}^l x_i x_j \right) A^l \quad (2)$$

This model consists of three second-order Scheffé polynomial forms in m components, each multiplied by the powers of the total amount A ($A^0 = 1, A$ and A^2). When $A = 0$, this model predict

a zero response. Piepel (1988) modified this model to accommodate zero-amount condition. The alternative model uses the actual amounts of the components denoted by a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m such that $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_m = A$. The proportions x_i are related to the amounts a_i through $x_i = a_i/A$ such that $a_i = x_i A$. This is called the component-amount model. The linear and quadratic expected response component-amount models are

$$E(y) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i a_i \quad (3)$$

$$E(y) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\alpha_{ii} a_i^2 + \sum_{i < j}^m \alpha_{ij} a_i a_j \right). \quad (4)$$

For further discussion on mixture-amount and component-amount models, see, for instance, Cornell (2002, pp. 403-418)

1.2 Designs for Mixture-Amount Experiments

This subsection discusses the designs used to fit mixture-amount models formulated by expressing the parameters of a Scheffé-type mixture model as functions of a total amount variable. The standard designs employed for fitting these models include the simplex-lattice designs; however, other mixture designs can also be utilized. For instance, a m -ingredient simplex-lattice design, denoted by the notation $\{m, w\}$, consists of all valid mixture combinations which can be made for m ingredients and with w degree of the lattice, making the levels $0, 1/w, 2/w, \dots, (w-1)/w$ and $w/w = 1$. In general, it has $\binom{m+w-1}{w}$ design points.

Another mixture design, as discussed in Cornell (2002), is the simplex-centroid design. For an m -ingredient mixture, the simplex-centroid design consists of all vertices of the $(m-1)$ -dimensional simplex, S^{m-1} , and centroids formed by taking these vertices in combinations, such as pairs. This design includes $2^m - 1$ design points, starting with m permutations of $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$, permutations of $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, 0)$, permutations of $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \dots, 0)$, continuing until the centroid $(\frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{1}{m})$ is reached. Prescott and Draper (2004, 2008) developed several component-amount designs by projecting standard symmetric mixture designs, achieved by removing one or more columns from the original design. Additionally, orthogonally blocked mixture designs based on Latin squares and F-squares blocking schemes were projected to create orthogonal blocked component-amount designs.

Any component-amount design with m components can be derived from a simplex-lattice, simplex-centroid, or other standard mixture designs with $m+r$ ingredients by removing r columns from the base design. For instance, in a $\{4, 3\}$ simplex-lattice design, deleting one column ($r = 1$) produces a component-amount design with three ingredients and four levels of total amount A ($0, 1/3, 2/3, 1$), denoted as $\{4, 3\}_1$. Similarly, removing one column from a 15-run, 4-ingredient simplex-centroid design results in a three-component, 15-run component-amount design with design points design includes the design points $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1), (1/2, 1/2, 0), (1/2, 0, 1/2), (0, 1/2, 1/2)$ and $(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ with $A = 1$; the three two ingredient centroids $(1/3, 1/3, 0), (1/3, 0, 1/3)$ and $(0, 1/3, 1/3)$ with $A = 2/3$; the centroid point $(1/4, 1/4, 1/4)$ with $A = 3/4$; the three vertices $(1/2, 0, 0), (0, 1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1/2)$ with $A = 1/2$, and the origin $(0, 0, 0)$ with $A = 0$. The design has five levels of total amount A , namely: $0, 1/2, 2/3, 3/4$, and 1 . Additionally, projecting a 5-ingredient simplex-centroid design into three dimensions yields a three-factor component-amount design with 31 design points at seven levels of A . For further details, see Prescott and Draper (2004).

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 covers the OofA mixture experiment, the OofA mixture-amount experiment, and the related mixture amount and component-amount models. Section 3 contains the construction of designs for mixture-amount and component-amount experiments, section 4 uses two examples for the application of designs, and section 5 concludes the paper.

2 OofA Experiments

The current literature on OofA experiments focuses primarily on the Pair-Wise Ordering model, first introduced by (Van Nostrand, 1995). The Pair-Wise Ordering (PWO) model was formally named by Voelkel (2019). For a set of m components, their permutation is denoted by $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m)^T$. Let \mathcal{P} be the set of all pairs (j, k) where $1 \leq j < k \leq m$. The PWO factor $z_{jk}(\mathbf{c})$ is defined as

$$z_{jk}(\mathbf{c}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \text{ precedes } k \text{ in } c \\ -1 & \text{if } k \text{ precedes } j \text{ in } c \end{cases}$$

hence if $\mathbf{c} = (2, 1, 3)$ then $z_{12}(\mathbf{c}) = -1$, $z_{13}(\mathbf{c}) = 1$ and $z_{23}(\mathbf{c}) = 1$. The PWO model for the expected response $\eta(\mathbf{c})$ is given as

$$E(\mathbf{c}) = \beta_0 + \sum_{jk \in S} z_{jk}(\mathbf{c})\beta_{jk}.$$

The parameter β_{jk} shows how the pair-wise order of components j and k affect the response. For finding the optimal order Lin and Peng (2019) discussed the topological sorting methods for PWO model. There are several research papers on the Optimality of PWO experimental designs. See, for instance, Peng et al. (2019); Winker et al. (2020). Yuna Zhao and Liu (2021) and Chen et al. (2020).

2.1 The OofA mixture-amount experiments

An OofA mixture-amount experiment is a type of mixture experiment where we consider not only the effects of the component amounts on the response but also the effects of the order in which the components are added. So the response surface would be a function of components amounts a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m and the order of their addition in a mixture. We test the significant effect of the order of addition of components and the amounts of components on the response. Our concern in this study is how to incorporate OofA effects into the mixture-amount and component-amount models. Therefore, we construct the OofA mixture component-amount designs using mixture simplex designs. We use the modified PWO notations given by Rios and Lin (2022). Define $(m-1)$ dimensional simplex S and \mathcal{P} be the set of all pairs (j, k) where $1 \leq j < k \leq m$. To get the full design matrix for fitting the mixture-amount model, we define PWO factor $z_{jk}(x, \mathbf{c})$ as

$$z_{jk}(x, \mathbf{c}) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_j, x_i \neq 0 \text{ } j \text{ is before } k \text{ in } c \\ 0 & x_j = 0 \text{ or } x_i = 0 \\ -1 & x_j, x_i \neq 0 \text{ } k \text{ is before } j \text{ in } c \end{cases}$$

Now, to get a complete design matrix for fitting the component-amount model, the PWO factor $z_{jk}(a, \mathbf{c})$ for a permutation \mathbf{c} of $(1, 2, \dots, m)$ components amounts is defined as

$$z_{jk}(a, \mathbf{c}) = \begin{cases} 1 & a_j, a_i \neq 0 \text{ } j \text{ is before } k \text{ in } c \\ 0 & a_j = 0 \text{ or } a_k = 0 \\ -1 & a_j, a_i \neq 0 \text{ } k \text{ is before } j \text{ in } c \end{cases}$$

2.2 Models for OofA mixture-amount experiments

We further construct the model for the PWO and mixture component amounts. Without interaction between mixture-amount and PWO factor, the expected response additive model is developed as

$$E(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^0 x_i + \sum_{k < l} \delta_{kl}^0 Z_{kl} + \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^1 x_i A + \sum_{k < l} \delta_{kl}^1 Z_{kl} A. \quad (5)$$

After including mixture-order interaction, the expected response model becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
E(y) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^0 x_i + \sum_{i<j} \gamma_{ij}^0 x_i x_j + \sum_{k<l} \delta_{kl}^0 Z_{kl} + \sum_i \sum_{k<l \text{ or } k>l, i=k} \lambda_{i(kl)}^t x_i Z_{kl} \\
&+ \sum_{t=1}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^t x_i + \sum_{i<j} \gamma_{ij}^t x_i x_j + \sum_{k<l} \delta_{kl}^t Z_{kl} + \sum_i \sum_{k<l \text{ or } k>l, i=k} \lambda_{i(kl)}^t x_i Z_{kl} \right) A^t. \quad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the expected response additive model for the component amount and PWO factor without interaction is

$$E(y) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i a_i + \sum_{k<l} \delta_{kl} Z_{kl}. \quad (7)$$

After including component-amount and order interaction, the model has the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
E(y) &= \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i a_i + \sum_{k<l} \beta_{kl} Z_{kl} + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{ii} a_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} \gamma_{ij} a_i a_j \\
&+ \sum_i \sum_{k<l \text{ or } k>l, k \neq l} \delta_{i(kl)} a_i Z_{kl}. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

3 Formulation of new designs

In this section, we first construct the OofA component-amount experiment. Then, we construct the designs that are suitable for fitting mixture-amount and component-amount models with PWO variables.

3.1 Construction of OofA mixture-amount design

We construct OofA mixture component-amount designs using mixture simplex designs. The modified PWO notations are used as given in section 2.1. The 3,3 simplex-lattice design is used as the base design. We further defined three PWO variables z_{12} , z_{13} , and z_{23} , and as a result, the design matrix has 21 design points. It can be used for fitting the models given in (5) and (6). The constructed design matrix is given in Table 1.

3.2 Construction of OofA component-amount design

A three ingredients component-amount design with five levels of the total amount ($A = 0, 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 1$) is developed by projecting a four-component simplex centroid design. This is done by following the footsteps of [Prescott and Draper \(2004\)](#). Using this as the base design, we derived a three-components OofA component-amount design with 31 design points and included three PWO variables z_{12} , z_{13} , and z_{23} . By way forward, we can fit the models (7) and (8), and can analyze the design. The constructed design is given in Table 2.

4 Application of OofA mixture-amount designs

The OofA mixture-amount designs developed in Section 3 have been implemented in practical, real-world scenarios. These designs have been applied to real-life examples to demonstrate their effectiveness in capturing both the influence of component amounts and the sequence in which the components are added to the final response. Two real-life examples are considered in the following sections.

Table 1: The OofA simplex-lattice design with $m = 3$ and $l = 3$.

Run	Proportions			Interaction Terms		
	x_1	x_2	x_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}
1	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	0.33	0.67	0	1	0	0
5	0.33	0.67	0	-1	0	0
6	0.33	0	0.67	0	1	0
7	0.33	0	0.67	0	-1	0
8	0.67	0.33	0	-1	0	0
9	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	0
10	0.67	0	0.33	0	-1	0
11	0.67	0	0.33	0	1	0
12	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	1
13	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	-1
14	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	-1
15	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	1
16	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	1
17	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	-1
18	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	-1	-1
19	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	1	1
20	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	1
21	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	-1

Table 2: The OofA mixture component-amount design for three ingredients and five levels of total amount A .

Runs	a_1	a_2	a_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}	A
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
4	1/2	1/2	0	1	0	0	1
5	1/2	1/2	0	-1	0	0	1
6	1/2	0	1/2	0	1	0	1
7	1/2	0	1/2	0	-1	0	1
8	0	1/2	1/2	0	0	1	1
9	0	1/2	1/2	0	0	-1	1
10	1/3	1/3	1/3	1	1	1	1
11	1/3	1/3	1/3	1	1	-1	1
12	1/3	1/3	1/3	1	-1	-1	1
13	1/3	1/3	1/3	-1	1	1	1
14	1/3	1/3	1/3	-1	-1	1	1
15	1/3	1/3	1/3	-1	-1	-1	1
16	1/4	1/4	1/4	1	1	1	3/4
17	1/4	1/4	1/4	1	1	-1	3/4
18	1/4	1/4	1/4	1	-1	-1	3/4
19	1/4	1/4	1/4	-1	1	1	3/4
20	1/4	1/4	1/4	-1	-1	1	3/4
21	1/4	1/4	1/4	-1	-1	-1	3/4
22	1/3	1/3	0	1	0	0	2/3
23	1/3	1/3	0	-1	0	0	2/3
24	1/3	0	1/3	0	1	0	2/3
25	1/3	0	1/3	0	-1	0	2/3
26	0	1/3	1/3	0	0	1	2/3
27	0	1/3	1/3	0	0	-1	2/3
28	1/2	0	0	0	0	0	1/2
29	0	1/2	0	0	0	0	1/2
30	0	0	1/2	0	0	0	1/2
31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

4.1 Study of the joint action of three related hormones in groups of mice

This example is taken from [Cornell \(2002\)](#). The presented results of an experiment involved administering 10 different blends or combinations of three distinct hormones to 10 groups of 12 mice each. The detail can be found in [Claringbold \(1955\)](#). The hormone blends were also prepared in three amounts: $0.75 \times 10^{-4} \mu g$, $1.50 \times 10^{-4} \mu g$, and $3.00 \times 10^{-4} \mu g$, resulting in a total of 30 groups. The primary focus is on determining how different mixtures of hormones influenced the cornification response of the vaginal epithelium in ovariectomized mice. As we consider the order of addition in this experiment, therefore using $\{3, 3\}$ simplex-lattice design, we get 63 blends in the hormone proportions x_1, x_2, x_3 with PWO variables z_{12}, z_{13}, z_{23} , and with the total amounts $A = 0.75, 1.50, 3.00$. The design matrix, using model (6), is given in Table 3. The objective of the analysis includes how the order of addition and proportions impacted the response while fitting the mixture-amount model (6) in the design matrix given in Table 3. For model identifiability, we omit the mixture-order interactions $x_1 z_{13}, x_2 z_{12}, x_3 z_{23}$ and only use $x_1 z_{12}, x_2 z_{23}, x_3 z_{31}$. The design analysis reveals that the maximum prediction variance

Table 3: The OofA simplex-lattice design with $m = 3$ and $l = 3$ with three levels of total amount A

Runs	a_1	a_2	a_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}	A	Runs	a_1	a_2	a_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}	A
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	33	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	1	1.50
2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.75	34	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	-1	1.50
3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.75	35	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	-1	1.50
4	0.33	0.67	0	1	0	0	0.75	36	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	1	1.50
5	0.33	0.67	0	-1	0	0	0.75	37	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	1	1.50
6	0.67	0.33	0	-1	0	0	0.75	38	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	-1	1.50
7	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	0	0.75	39	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	-1	-1	1.50
8	0.33	0	0.67	0	1	0	0.75	40	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	1	1	1.50
9	0.33	0	0.67	0	-1	0	0.75	41	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	1	1.50
10	0.67	0	0.33	0	-1	0	0.75	42	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	-1	1.50
11	0.67	0	0.33	0	1	0	0.75	43	1	0	0	0	0	0	3.00
12	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	1	0.75	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	3.00
13	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	-1	0.75	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	3.00
14	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	-1	0.75	46	0.33	0.67	0	1	0	0	3.00
15	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	1	0.75	47	0.33	0.67	0	-1	0	0	3.00
16	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	1	0.75	48	0.67	0.33	0	-1	0	0	3.00
17	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	-1	0.75	49	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	0	3.00
18	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	-1	-1	0.75	50	0.33	0	0.67	0	1	0	3.00
19	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	1	1	0.75	51	0.33	0	0.67	0	-1	0	3.00
20	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	1	0.75	52	0.67	0	0.33	0	-1	0	3.00
21	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	-1	0.75	53	0.67	0	0.33	0	1	0	3.00
22	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.50	54	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	1	3.00
23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.50	55	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	-1	3.00
24	0	0	1	0	0	0	1.50	56	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	-1	3.00
25	0.33	0.67	0	1	0	0	1.50	57	0	0.67	0.33	0	0	1	3.00
26	0.33	0.67	0	-1	0	0	1.50	58	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	1	3.00
27	0.67	0.33	0	-1	0	0	1.50	59	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	1	-1	3.00
28	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	0	1.50	60	0.33	0.33	0.33	1	-1	-1	3.00
29	0.33	0	0.67	0	1	0	1.50	61	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	1	1	3.00
30	0.33	0	0.67	0	-1	0	1.50	62	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	1	3.00
31	0.67	0	0.33	0	-1	0	1.50	63	0.33	0.33	0.33	-1	-1	-1	3.00
32	0.67	0	0.33	0	1	0	1.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

of the design is 0.761, which is recommended for moderate prediction accuracy. The average prediction variance of the design is 0.571, which suggests a reasonably good overall predictive performance that balances accuracy and robustness. A G-efficiency of 75.1% is pretty good, indicating that the design is quite efficient. This means the design is well-constructed, balancing the number of runs and the precision of parameter estimates. We use the fraction of design space plot (FDS) to assess design prediction capability visually: see Figure 1. The FDS plot indicates that the design is robust, with a large portion of design space having low prediction variance. This suggests reliable and consistent predictions for most factor combinations. We performed a power analysis in Table 4 to determine the likelihood of detecting significant effects in the experiment. The standard errors for the main effects and the 1/2 standard deviation values




Figure 1: Fraction of Design Space plot for OofA mixture-amount model.

Table 4: Power analysis at 5% alpha level for effects

Terms	Std. Error	$\frac{1}{2}$ Std. Dev	Terms	Std. Error	$\frac{1}{2}$ Std. Dev
x_1	0.36	10.2%	x_1x_2	0.57	7.1%
x_2	0.36	10.2%	x_1x_3	0.57	7.1%
x_3	0.36	10.2%	x_2x_3	0.57	7.1%
z_{12}	0.28	13.5%	x_1z_{12}	0.84	6.0%
z_{13}	0.27	14.2%	x_2z_{23}	0.73	6.3%
z_{23}	0.27	14.2%	x_3z_{13}	0.73	6.3%

indicate moderate precision in estimating these effects. All three hormones and their order of addition in the mixture significantly affect the cornification response. The interaction effects between each pair of the three hormones are significant, as are the interaction effects between the hormones and the PWO variables. However, the precision of these estimates is lower than that of the main effects.

4.2 A Placebo tablet formulation with three components

It might be easier to explain dosage units like tablets or gelatin capsules by the amount of each component rather than their proportions when the total mass varies. However, using proportions and the variable total amount in the model is usually more convenient. This example is taken from Lewis et al. (1991). Huisman et al. (1984) have discussed using a mixture of experimental designs to prepare placebo tablets. Their formulation included up to three diluents: α -lactose monohydrate, potato starch, and anhydrous α -lactose. The tablets also had magnesium stearate as a lubricant, but since this was kept at a constant low level, the rest of the formulation, made up entirely of diluents, was considered to be 100%. The measured response was the crushing strength of the tablets. In practice, the total weight of the three components (diluents) in a placebo tablet formulation is typically up to 500mg i.e. $A_{max} = 500mg$. We assume that several dosage strengths are to be formulated. A component-amount model (8), with interaction effect and including PWO variable, is used. With the total maximum, the design given in Table 2 is transformed this amount and the resulting design is given in Table 5. The design has five levels of the total amount, i.e., 0, 250, 333.3, 375, and 500. The zero-amount situation is used for control test and discussed by Piepel (1988). Once we analyse the design, we notice that the maximum prediction variance is 0.96, which ensures that most predictions remain reasonably reliable. A value of 0.516 for average prediction variance suggests that, on average, model predictions are reasonably precise. A G-efficiency of 53.8% is above the commonly accepted threshold of 50%, indicating that the design is relatively efficient. The Scaled D-optimality of 12.29 indicates

Table 5: The OofA mixture component-amount design for three ingredients and five levels of total amount A .

Runs	a_1	a_2	a_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}	A	Runs	a_1	a_2	a_3	z_{12}	z_{13}	z_{23}	A
1	500	0	0	0	0	0	500	17	125	125	125	1	1	-1	375
2	0	500	0	0	0	0	500	18	125	125	125	1	-1	-1	375
3	0	0	500	0	0	0	500	19	125	125	125	-1	1	1	375
4	250	250	0	1	0	0	500	20	125	125	125	-1	-1	1	375
5	250	250	0	-1	0	0	500	21	125	125	125	-1	-1	-1	375
6	250	0	250	0	1	0	500	22	166.7	166.7	0	1	0	0	333.3
7	250	0	250	0	-1	0	500	23	166.7	166.7	0	-1	0	0	333.3
8	0	250	250	0	0	1	500	24	166.7	0	166.7	0	1	0	333.3
9	0	250	250	0	0	-1	500	25	166.7	0	166.7	0	-1	0	333.3
10	166.7	166.7	166.7	1	1	1	500	26	0	166.7	166.7	0	0	1	333.3
11	166.7	166.7	166.7	1	1	-1	500	27	0	166.7	166.7	0	0	-1	333.3
12	166.7	166.7	166.7	1	-1	-1	500	28	250	0	0	0	0	0	250
13	166.7	166.7	166.7	-1	1	1	500	29	0	250	0	0	0	0	250
14	166.7	166.7	166.7	-1	-1	1	500	30	0	0	250	0	0	0	250
15	166.7	166.7	166.7	-1	-1	-1	500	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	250
16	125	125	125	1	1	1	375	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

that the design is relatively efficient in estimating model parameters. The standard errors for

Table 6: Power at 5% alpha level for effects

Terms	Std. Error	2 Std. Dev	R_i^2	Terms	Std. Error	2 Std. Dev	R_i^2
a_1	2.17	7.2%	0.9645	a_{33}	0.96	49.8%	0.7966
a_2	2.17	7.2%	0.9645	a_1a_2	1.48	9.7%	0.9127
a_3	2.17	7.2%	0.9645	a_1a_3	1.48	9.7%	0.9127
z_{12}	0.63	32.0%	0.8416	a_2a_3	1.48	9.7%	0.9127
z_{13}	0.63	32.0%	0.8416	a_1z_{12}	1.69	8.6%	0.8527
z_{23}	0.63	32.0%	0.8416	a_2z_{23}	1.69	8.6%	0.8527
a_{11}	0.96	49.8%	0.7966	a_3z_{13}	1.69	8.6%	0.8527
a_{22}	0.96	49.8%	0.7966	—	—	—	—

linear effects a_1, a_2 and a_3 are relatively high, suggesting that all three diluent effects are less significant. High R^2 -value (0.9645) suggests that these effects explain a significant portion of the variability in the response. The quadratic effects (a_{11}, a_{22}, a_{33}) and certain interactions (a_1a_2, a_1a_3 and a_2a_3) show possible significance. The orders of addition effects (z_{12}, z_{13} and z_{23}) are likely to be significant, especially at larger standard deviations. The interaction effects between diluents and their order of addition (a_1z_{12}, a_3z_{13} , and a_2z_{23}) may be less significant but still warrant consideration.

The FDS plot in Figure 2 shows that the majority of the design space has a prediction variance below 0.96. The higher prediction variances are limited to a smaller portion of the design space. So FDS plot for this design likely indicates strong prediction capabilities across most of the design space.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we developed OofA mixture-amount experiments where the component amounts and the order of their addition to the mixture affect the overall response. We modified mixture-amount and component-amount models by incorporating the order-of-addition effect. To fit these models, we constructed designs for the OofA mixture-amount experiment. The designs constructed in this paper can be used to determine whether the order and the mixture amounts have a significant effect on the response. These full mixture-amount OofA designs confirmed orthogonality between mixture-amount model terms and OofA effects. This allows precise estimation of both mixture-component parameters and order-of-addition effects.




Figure 2: Fraction of Design Space Plot for OofA component-amount model.

In the first example, we constructed a three-ingredient OofA mixture-amount design using three levels of mixture total A. We fitted the model (6) and analyzed that the model has 35 and residuals have 27 degrees of freedom, which allows for estimating main effects, interactions, and higher-order interactions and a reasonable basis for error estimation. The G-efficiency value 75.1% indicates that the design is quite efficient. Further, it was noted that proportions and order-of-addition effects are significant. The interactions of mixture components and order-of-addition effects exhibit higher variability and potentially lower significance.

In the second example, we generated a three-components OofA component-amount design in 31 runs with five levels of total amount. We fitted the OofA component-amount model given in (8) to the design derived. The analysis described that, on average, the model predictions are reasonably precise, fairly robust in parameter estimation, and rational level of variability in parameter estimates. A G-efficiency of 53.8% indicates that the design is relatively efficient. The component amounts, order of addition, and their interaction effects are significant.

The developed OofA designs provide a systematic approach to including order-of-addition effects in mixture-amount experiments, enabling a more comprehensive design space exploration and better optimization of the response variable. It is the initial step for designing OofA mixture-amount experiments. For future work, it would be best to use a fraction of such designs to control the cost of the experiment. This work can be extended to the orthogonally blocked mixture experiments.

Acknowledgment

Touqeer Ahmad acknowledges support from the R egion Bretagne through project SAD-2021-MaEVa.

References

- Chandrasekaran, S. M., Bhartiya, S., and Wangikar, P. P. (2006), “Substrate specificity of lipases in alkoxyacylation reaction: QSAR model development and experimental validation,” *Biotechnology and bioengineering*, 94(3), 554–564.
- Chen, J., Mukerjee, R., and Lin, D. K. (2020), “Construction of optimal fractional order-of-addition designs via block designs,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 161, 108728.
- Claringbold, P. (1955), “Use of the simplex design in the study of joint action of related hormones,” *Biometrics*, 11(2), 174–185.

- Cornell, J. A. (2002), *Experiments with Mixtures: Designs, Models, and the Analysis of Mixture Data*, 3rd edn, New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ding, X., Matsuo, K., Xu, L., Yang, J., and Zheng, L. (2015), “Optimized combinations of bortezomib, camptothecin, and doxorubicin show increased efficacy and reduced toxicity in treating oral cancer,” *Anti-cancer drugs*, 26(5), 547–554.
- Fisher, R. A. (1971), *The Design of Experiments*, 9th edn, London, UK: Macmillan.
- Huisman, R., Van Kamp, H., Weyland, J., Doornbos, D., Bolhuis, G., and Lerk, C. (1984), “Development and optimization of pharmaceutical formulations using a simplex lattice design,” *Pharmaceutisch Weekblad*, 6, 185–194.
- Jiang, X.-J., and Ng, D. K. (2014), “Sequential logic operations with a molecular keypad lock with four inputs and dual fluorescence outputs,” *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 53(39), 10481–10484.
- Karim, M., McCormick, K., and Kappagoda, C. T. (2000), “Effects of cocoa extracts on endothelium-dependent relaxation,” *The Journal of nutrition*, 130(8), 2105S–2108S.
- Lewis, G. A., Mathieu, D., and Phan-Tan-Luu, R. (1991), *Pharmaceutical Experimental Design*, 1st edn, Boca Raton, Florida, USA: CRC Press.
- Lin, D. K., and Peng, J. (2019), “Order-of-addition experiments: A review and some new thoughts,” *Quality Engineering*, 31(1), 49–59.
- Peng, J., Mukerjee, R., and Lin, D. K. (2019), “Design of order-of-addition experiments,” *Biometrika*, 106(3), 683–694.
- Piepel, G. F. (1988), “A note on models for mixture-amount experiments when the total amount takes a zero value,” *Technometrics*, 30(4), 449–450.
- Piepel, G. F., and Cornell, J. A. (1985), “Models for mixture experiments when the response depends on the total amount,” *Technometrics*, 27(3), 219–227.
- Prescott, P., and Draper, N. R. (2004), “Mixture component-amount designs via projections, including orthogonally blocked designs,” *Journal of Quality Technology*, 36(4), 413–431.
- Prescott, P., and Draper, N. R. (2008), “D-optimal mixture component-amount designs for quadratic and cubic models,” *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 35(7), 739–749.
- Rios, N., and Lin, D. K. (2022), “Order-of-addition mixture experiments,” *Journal of Quality Technology*, 54(5), 517–526.
- Shinohara, A., and Ogawa, T. (1998), “Stimulation by Rad52 of yeast Rad51-mediated recombination,” *Nature*, 391(6665), 404–407.
- Van Nostrand, R. (1995), Design of experiments where the order of addition is important,, in *ASA proceedings of the Section on Physical and Engineering Sciences*, Vol. 155, American Statistical Association Alexandria, VA, USA, p. 160.
- Voelkel, J. G. (2019), “The design of order-of-addition experiments,” *Journal of Quality Technology*, 51(3), 230–241.
- Winker, P., Chen, J., and Lin, D. K. (2020), “The construction of optimal design for order-of-addition experiment via threshold accepting,” in *Contemporary Experimental Design, Multivariate Analysis and Data Mining: Festschrift in Honour of Professor Kai-Tai Fang*, Cham: Springer, pp. 93–109.

Yuna Zhao, D. K. J. L., and Liu, M.-Q. (2021), “Designs for order-of-addition experiments,”
Journal of Applied Statistics, 48(8), 1475–1495.