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#### Abstract

Being able to predict the strength characteristics of concrete can be of great advantage in the design and construction of structural members. This research work set out to develop a model for the compressive strength characteristics of concrete made with unwashed local grave based on Prof. Osadebe's optimization theory or second-degree polynomial. The unwashed aggregate was from Abagana and the river sand from Amansea, both in Anambra State. These aggregates were tested for their physical and mechanical properties based on BS 812: Part 2:1975 and BS 812: Part 3: 1975. Sixty concrete cubes of dimensions 150 mm $X 150 \mathrm{~mm} X 150 \mathrm{~mm}$-three cubes for each experimental point were made, cured and tested according to BS 1881:1983. The model equation developed was $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}=$ 2006.1Z1+ 1401.02Z2 -90.3Z3 -105.47Z4 +91.79Z1Z2 -9086Z1Z3 + 3268.26Z1Z4 + $7888.31 \mathrm{Z2Z3}$-1636.57Z2Z4 $+427.5 Z 3 Z 4$. The student's $t$-test and the Fisher's test were used to prove the adequacy of the model. The strengths predicted by the model were in complete agreement with the experimentally obtained values and the null hypothesis was satisfied.
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#### Abstract

I. INTRODUCTION > Osadebe's Concrete Optimisation Theory Concrete is a four-component material of mixing water, cement, fine and coarse aggregates. These ingredients are mixed in rational proportions to achieve desired strength of the hardened concrete [1]. Let us consider an arbitrary amount, S , of a given concrete mixture and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}}$, the portion of the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ component of the four constituent materials of the concrete where $\mathrm{i}=1,2,3,4$, then in keeping with the principle of absolute volume or mass [2]:


इSi = S--------------------------------------------------------1

Dividing through by S and substituting $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ for $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{S}$ gives:

Then, the compressive strength of concrete can be expressed as equation 3 :
Y = f (Zi) ----------------------------------------------------------3

Using Taylor's theorem and the assumption that Y is continuous, equation 3 becomes:
$f(Z)=f\left(Z^{(0)}\right)+\sum \partial f / \partial Z_{i}\left(Z^{0}\right)\left(Z_{i}-Z_{i}^{(0)}\right)+1 / 2!\sum \partial 2 f\left(Z^{(0)}\right) / \partial Z_{i} \partial Z_{j}\left(Z^{(0)}\right)\left(Z_{i}-Z_{i}^{(0)}\right)\left(Z_{j}-Z_{j}^{(0)}\right)+1 / 2!\sum \partial \partial^{2} f\left(Z^{(0)}\right) / \partial Z_{i}^{2} \partial Z_{j}\left(Z_{i}-Z_{i}^{(0)}\right)^{2}+$ $\qquad$
$(1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 4,1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 3,1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 4,1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 4)$ respectively and $\mathrm{Z}^{(0)}=0$.
If $\mathrm{b}_{0}=\mathrm{f}(0), \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}=\partial \mathrm{f}(0) / \partial \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\partial \mathrm{f}^{2}(0) / \partial \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}} \partial \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{j}}$ and $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{ii}}=\partial^{2} \mathrm{f}(0) / \partial \mathrm{Z}^{2}$, then eqn. 4 can be written as follows:

Multiplying eqn. 2 by $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ we have

Also, multiplying eqn. 2 by $Z_{1}, Z_{2}, Z_{3}$ and $Z_{4}$ in succession, making $Z_{1}{ }^{2}, Z_{2}{ }^{2}, Z_{3}{ }^{2}$ and $Z_{4}{ }^{2}$ the subject of the formula, substituting into eqn. 5 and factorizing gives:
$(1 \leq i \leq j \leq 4)$
Where $\beta i=b_{0}+b_{i}+b_{i i}$ and $\beta_{i j}=b_{i j}-b_{i i}-b_{i j}(i, j=1,2,3,4)$

## > The Coefficients of the Regression Equation

If the $\mathrm{K}^{\text {th }}$ response (compressive strength for the serial number $k$ ) is $y^{(k)}$, substituting the vector of the corresponding set of variables, i.e., $\mathrm{Z}^{(\mathrm{K})}=\left[\mathrm{Z}_{1}{ }^{(\mathrm{K})}, \mathrm{Z}_{2}{ }^{(\mathrm{K})}, \mathrm{Z}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{K})}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{Z}_{4}{ }^{(\mathrm{K})}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$ (see table 1) into eqn. 7 generates the explicit matrix of equation 8 :

$$
\left[\mathrm{y}^{(\mathrm{k})}\right]=[\mathrm{B}][\mathrm{Z}]
$$

Re-arranging eqn. 8 yields:
$[\mathrm{Z}]^{\mathrm{T}}[\mathrm{B}]^{\mathrm{T}}=\left[\mathrm{y}^{(\mathrm{k})}\right]$ $\qquad$ $-9$

Solution of eqn. 9 gives the values of the unknown coefficients of the regression equation (eqn 7).

## > The Student's T-Test

The unbiased estimate of the unknown variance $S^{2}$ is given by [3],

$$
S_{r}^{2}=\frac{\sum\left(y_{i}-\breve{y}\right)^{2}}{n-1}
$$

If $a_{i}=z_{i}\left(2 z_{i}-1\right), a_{i j}=4 z_{i} z_{j}$; for $(1 \leq i \leq q)$ and $(1 \leq$ $\mathrm{i} \leq \mathrm{j} \leq \mathrm{q})$ respectively.

$$
\text { Then, } \varepsilon=\Sigma \mathrm{a}^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{i}}+\sum \mathrm{a}^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{ij}}{ }^{-}
$$

Where $\varepsilon$ is the error of the predicted values of the response.

The t -test statistic is given by [3]

Where $\Delta \mathrm{y}=\mathrm{y}_{0}-\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{y}_{0}=$ observed value, $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}=$ theoretical value; $n=$ number of replicate observations at every point; $\varepsilon=$ as defined in eqn.11.
> The Fisher's Test
The Fishers-test statistic is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}=\mathbf{S}_{1}{ }^{2} / \mathbf{S}_{2}{ }^{2}- \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The values of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}$ (lower value) and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ (upper value) are calculated from equation 10 .

## II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

## > Preparation, Curing and Testing of Cube Samples

The aggregates were sampled in accordance with the methods prescribed in BS 812: Part 1:1975 [4]. The test sieves were selected according to BS 410:1986 [5]. The water absorption, the apparent specific gravity and the bulk density of the coarse aggregates were determined following the procedures prescribed in BS 812: Part 2: 1975 [6]. The Los Angeles abrasion test was carried out in accordance with ASTM. Standard C131: 1976 [7]. The sieve analyses of the fine and coarse aggregate samples were done in accordance with BS 812: Part 1: 1975 [4] and satisfied BS 882:1992[8]. The sieving was performed by a sieve shaker. The water used in preparing the experimental samples satisfied the conditions prescribed in BS 3148:1980 [9]. The required concrete specimens were made in threes in accordance with the method specified in BS 1881: 108:1983 [10]. These specimens were cured for 28 days in accordance with BS 1881: Part 111: 1983 [11]. The testing was done in accordance with BS 1881: Part 116:1983 [12] using compressive testing machine.

Table 1 Selected Mix Ratios and Component's Fraction based on Osadebe's Second Degree Polynomial

|  | $\mathbf{M I X ~ R A T I O S}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | COMPONENT'S FRACTION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{n y y y y y y y y y y}$ | $\mathbf{S / N O}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.88 | 1 | 2.5 | 4 | 0.105 | 0.119 | 0.298 | 0.477 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.86 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0.109 | 0.127 | 0.254 | 0.509 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0.855 | 1 | 2 | 3.5 | 0.116 | 0.136 | 0.272 | 0.476 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.86 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.125 | 0.146 | 0.292 | 0.437 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0.855 | 1 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.109 | 0.127 | 0.318 | 0.446 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.865 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0.098 | 0.113 | 0.338 | 0.451 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.87 | 1 | 3 | 4.5 | 0.093 | 0.107 | 0.320 | 0.480 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.86 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 0.135 | 0.157 | 0.236 | 0.472 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.86 | 1 | 2.75 | 3.4 | 0.107 | 0.125 | 0.343 | 0.424 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.865 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 0.107 | 0.123 | 0.246 | 0.524 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | CONTROL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.858 | 1 | 2.43 | 4 | 0.104 | 0.121 | 0.293 | 0.483 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 0.86 | 1 | 1.75 | 3 | 0.130 | 0.151 | 0.265 | 0.454 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 0.855 | 1 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 0.110 | 0.129 | 0.309 | 0.451 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 0.86 | 1 | 2 | 4.33 | 0.105 | 0.122 | 0.244 | 0.529 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 0.862 | 1 | 2.25 | 3.13 | 0.119 | 0.138 | 0.311 | 0.432 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 0.858 | 1 | 2 | 2.83 | 0.128 | 0.150 | 0.299 | 0.423 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | 0.858 | 1 | 2.67 | 3.29 | 0.110 | 0.128 | 0.342 | 0.421 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 0.86 | 1 | 3 | 4.13 | 0.096 | 0.111 | 0.334 | 0.459 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 19 | 0.855 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.125 | 0.146 | 0.292 | 0.438 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 0.8595 | 1 | 2.75 | 4 | 0.100 | 0.116 | 0.319 | 0.465 |

LEGEND: $S_{1}=$ water/cement ratio; $S_{2}=$ Cement; $S_{3}=$ Fine aggregate; $S_{4}=$ Coarse aggregate, $Z_{i}=S_{i} / S$
Table $2 Z^{\mathrm{T}}$ Matrix

| $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.105 | 0.119 | 0.298 | 0.477 | 0.013 | 0.031 | 0.050 | 0.036 | 0.057 | 0.142 |
| 0.109 | 0.127 | 0.254 | 0.509 | 0.014 | 0.028 | 0.056 | 0.032 | 0.065 | 0.129 |
| 0.116 | 0.136 | 0.272 | 0.476 | 0.016 | 0.032 | 0.055 | 0.037 | 0.065 | 0.129 |
| 0.125 | 0.146 | 0.292 | 0.437 | 0.018 | 0.037 | 0.055 | 0.042 | 0.064 | 0.127 |
| 0.109 | 0.127 | 0.318 | 0.446 | 0.014 | 0.035 | 0.049 | 0.041 | 0.057 | 0.142 |
| 0.098 | 0.113 | 0.338 | 0.451 | 0.011 | 0.033 | 0.044 | 0.038 | 0.051 | 0.153 |
| 0.093 | 0.107 | 0.320 | 0.480 | 0.010 | 0.030 | 0.045 | 0.034 | 0.051 | 0.154 |
| 0.135 | 0.157 | 0.236 | 0.472 | 0.021 | 0.032 | 0.064 | 0.037 | 0.074 | 0.111 |
| 0.107 | 0.125 | 0.343 | 0.424 | 0.013 | 0.037 | 0.046 | 0.043 | 0.053 | 0.146 |
| 0.107 | 0.123 | 0.246 | 0.524 | 0.013 | 0.026 | 0.056 | 0.030 | 0.065 | 0.129 |

Table 3 Responses of the Mix Ratios

| $\mathbf{S / N O}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | AVERAGE COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH[N/mm2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.88 | 1 | 2.5 | 4 | 13.2 |
| 2 | 0.86 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13.8 |
| 3 | 0.855 | 1 | 2 | 3.5 | 14.6 |
| 4 | 0.86 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15.3 |
| 5 | 0.855 | 1 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 14.5 |
| 6 | 0.865 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10.3 |
| 7 | 0.87 | 1 | 3 | 4.5 | 9.8 |
| 8 | 0.86 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 16.6 |
| 9 | 0.86 | 1 | 2.75 | 3.4 | 14.9 |
| 10 | 0.865 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 13.5 |

LEGEND: $S_{1}=$ water/cement ratio; $S_{2}=$ Cement; $S_{3}=$ Fine aggregate; $S_{4}=$ Coarse aggregate

## > Testing the Fit of the Quadratic Polynomials

The polynomial regression equation developed was tested to see if the model agreed with the actual experimental results. The null hypothesis was denoted by $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ and the alternative by $\mathrm{H}_{1}$.


Fig 1 Grading Curve for the Fine Aggregate


Fig 2 Grading Curve for the Local Gravel

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## > Physical and Mechanical Properties of Aggregates

Sieve analyses of both the fine and coarse aggregates were performed and the grading curves shown in figures 1 and 2. These grading curves showed the particle size distribution of the aggregates. The maximum aggregate size for the unwashed gravel was 53 mm and 2 mm for the fine sand. The local gravel had water absorption of $4.55 \%$, moisture content of $53.25 \%$, apparent specific gravity of 1.88, Los Angeles abrasion value of $60 \%$ and bulk density of $1302.7 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$.

## > The Regression Equation for the Compressive Strength Tests Results

Solution of eqn.9, given $Z^{T}$ values of table 2 and the responses (average compressive strengths) in table 3 gave the values of the unknown coefficients of the regression equation (eqn.7) as follows:
$\beta_{1}=-2006.1, \beta_{2}=1401.02, \beta_{3}=-90.3, \beta_{4}=-105.47$, $\beta_{12}=91.79, \beta_{13}=-9086, \beta_{14}=3268.26, \beta_{23}=7888.31, \beta_{24}=-$ 1636.57, $\beta_{34}=427.5$. Thus, from eqn.7, the model equation based on Osadebe's second-degree polynomial was given by:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\hat{Y}=-2006.1 Z_{1}+1401.02 Z_{2}-90.3 Z_{3}-105.47 Z_{4}+91.79 Z_{1} Z_{2}-- \\
9086 Z_{1} Z_{3}+3268.26 Z_{1} Z_{4}+7888.31 Z_{2} Z_{3}-1636.57 Z_{2} Z_{4}+ \\
427.5 Z_{3} Z_{4} .
\end{gathered}
$$

## $>$ Fit of the Polynomial

Selected mix ratios and component's fraction based on Osadebe's second degree polynomial was shown in table 1. The polynomial regression equation developed i.e., $\hat{Y}=$ $2006.1 \mathrm{Z}_{1}+1401.02 \mathrm{Z}_{2}-90.3 \mathrm{Z}_{3}-105.47 \mathrm{Z}_{4}+91.79 \mathrm{Z}_{1} \mathrm{Z}_{2}--$ $9086 Z_{1} Z_{3}+3268.26 Z_{1} Z_{4}+7888.31 Z_{2} Z_{3}-1636.57 Z_{2} Z_{4}$ $+427.5 Z_{3} Z_{4}$, was tested to see if the model agreed with the actual experimental results. There was no significant difference between the experimental and the theoretically expected results. The null hypothesis, $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was satisfied.

Table 4 T-Statistic for the Controlled Points, Unwashed-Gravel Concrete Compressive Test, based on Osadebe's

| RESPONSE | i | j | $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{a}_{\text {ij }}$ | $\mathbf{a i d}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{aij}{ }^{2}$ | $\varepsilon$ | $\check{y}$ | $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ | t |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1 | 2 | -0.082 | 0.050 | 0.007 | 0.003 | 0.4835 | 16.0 | 16.9 | -1.58008 |
|  | 1 | 3 | -0.082 | 0.121 | 0.007 | 0.015 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 4 | -0.082 | 0.120 | 0.007 | 0.0399 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 3 | -0.092 | 0.142 | 0.01 | 0.020 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 4 | -0.092 | 0.233 | 0.013 | 0.0543 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 4 | -0.121 | 0.566 | 0.016 | 0.3202 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | - | -0.017 | - | 0.001 | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\Sigma$ | 0.052 | 0.4316 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Simila |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4809 | 16.3 | 15.9 | 0.617625 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.9234 | 16.1 | 17.1 | -1.9825 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4642 | 16.2 | 17.0 | -1.26789 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.5053 | 13.5 | 12.8 | 1.086064 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4966 | 15.7 | 14.4 | 2.377246 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{7}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.5707 | 14.6 | 13.4 | 2.026749 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{8}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.5624 | 13.1 | 14.6 | -2.72798 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{9}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4949 | 15.7 | 16.9 | -2.20202 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.5236 | 14.8 | 15.3 | -0.91441 |

LEGEND: $c_{i}=$ response; $a_{i}=z_{i}\left(2 z_{i}-1\right) ; a_{i j}=4 z_{i} z_{j} ; \varepsilon=\Sigma a^{2}+\sum a^{2}{ }_{i j} ; ~ y ~=~ e x p e r i m e n t a l l y-o b s e r v e d ~ v a l u e ; ~ \hat{Y}=$ theoretical value; $\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{t}$-test statistic.

## > T-Value from Table

The t -student's test had a significance level, $\alpha=0.05$ and $\mathrm{t}_{\alpha /(\mathrm{ve})}=\mathrm{t}_{0.005(9)}=3.69$. This was greater than any of the t values calculated in table 4. Therefore, the regression equation for the unwashed gravel concrete was adequate.

## > F-Statistic Analysis

The sample variances $\boldsymbol{S}_{1}{ }^{2}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{2}{ }^{2}$ for the two sets of data were not significantly different (table 5). It implied that the error(s) from experimental procedure were similar and that the sample variances being tested are estimates of the same population variance. Based on eqn.10, we had that $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{K}}{ }^{2}=12.319 / 9=1.369, \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{E}}{ }^{2}=22.486 / 9=2.498 \& \mathbf{F}=1.369 / 2.498=0.548$. From Fisher's table, $\mathrm{F}_{0.95(9,9)}=3.3$, hence the regression equation for the compressive strength of the unwashed gravel concrete was adequate.

Table 5 F -Statistic for the Controlled Points, Granite Concrete Compressive Strength, based on Osadebe's
Second-Degree Polynomial

| Response Symbol | $\mathbf{Y}_{K}$ | $\mathbf{Y}_{\text {E }}$ | $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{K}} \breve{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{K}}$ | $\mathbf{Y E E}_{\mathrm{E}} \breve{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{E}}$ | $\left(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{K}}-\check{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{K}}\right)^{2}$ | $\left(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}-\check{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathrm{E}}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 16.0 | 16.9 | 0.778 | 1.450 | 0.606 | 2.102 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 16.3 | 15.9 | 1.116 | 0.505 | 1.245 | 0.255 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3}$ | 16.1 | 17.1 | 0.909 | 1.674 | 0.827 | 2.803 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4}$ | 16.2 | 17.0 | 1.047 | 1.541 | 1.096 | 2.374 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5}$ | 13.5 | 12.8 | -1.740 | -2.618 | 3.026 | 6.855 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6}$ | 15.7 | 14.4 | 0.545 | -1.085 | 0.297 | 1.178 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{7}$ | 14.6 | 13.4 | -0.604 | -2.003 | 0.365 | 4.011 |
| C8 | 13.1 | 14.6 | -2.118 | -0.818 | 4.486 | 0.669 |
| C9 | 15.7 | 16.9 | 0.462 | 1.491 | 0.213 | 2.223 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10}$ | 14.8 | 15.3 | -0.398 | -0.122 | 0.158 | 0.015 |
| $\sum$ | 152 | 154.3 |  |  | 12.319 | 22.486 |

Legend: $\ddot{y}=\Sigma y / n$ where $y$ is the response and $n$, the number of observed data (responses) $y_{k}$ is the experimental value (response) $y_{E}$ is the expected or theoretically calculated value (response)

## IV. CONCLUSION

The strengths (responses) of concrete were a function of the proportions of its ingredients: water, cement, fine aggregate and coarse aggregates. Since the predicted strengths by the model were in total agreement with the corresponding experimentally -observed values, the null hypothesis was satisfied. This meant that the model equation was valid.
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