OPEN ACCESS

Eco-Shift 2026: International Conference on Global Climate Action
(From Root Causes to Revolutionary Remedies for Sustainable Development)

Int. Jr. of Contemp. Res. in Multi. *PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL* *Volume 5 [Special Issue 2] Year 2026*



Research Article

Neutrosophic Analysis of Crossover Designs in Clinical Studies: A Comparative Assessment

OP Sheoran [1*] Alisha Mittal [2]

[1] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India
[2] Department of Statistics, CCS HAU College of Agriculture, Bawal, Rewari, Haryana, India

Corresponding Author: *OP Sheoran

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23639056

Abstract

Background and Objectives: The two-period, two-sequence (2x2) crossover design is a cornerstone of clinical research, valued for its statistical efficiency. However, its validity rests on the assumption of precise, deterministic measurements, a condition often unmet in practical clinical settings where inherent indeterminacy can lead to misleading conclusions. This study aims to introduce and apply a rigorous neutrosophic statistical framework to a 2x2 crossover trial, providing a more conservative and realistic assessment of treatment effects by formally incorporating measurement uncertainty.

Methods: We re-analysed data from a published pediatric asthma trial comparing formoterol and salbutamol, as reported by Lim and In (2021). A proportional measurement indeterminacy of $\delta = 5\%$ was introduced to transform each Peak Expiratory Flow (PEF) observation into a neutrosophic interval. We first replicated the classical Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to establish a baseline. Subsequently, we applied neutrosophic interval arithmetic to derive interval-valued estimates for treatment, period, and carryover effects, along with their corresponding test statistics (F-value) and P-values. A sensitivity analysis was also performed to evaluate the impact of varying levels of indeterminacy.

Results: The classical analysis yielded a statistically significant treatment effect ($\hat{\tau} = 46.61$ L/min) with an F-statistic of 18.70 and a P-value of 0.0012, strongly favouring formoterol. In stark contrast, the neutrosophic analysis produced a treatment effect interval of $\hat{\tau}_N \in [14.79, 78.43]$ L/min and a corresponding P-value interval of $p_N \in [0.0000, 0.2006]$. The neutrosophic 95% confidence interval expanded substantially to $[-9.0, 102.3]$ L/min.

Conclusions: The study demonstrates that a classical conclusion of "highly significant" can be fragile. The introduction of a modest 5% measurement uncertainty renders the statistical significance of the treatment effect "indeterminate," as its neutrosophic P-value interval straddles the $\alpha = 0.05$ threshold. This framework highlights the critical importance of data quality and provides a method for researchers to transparently report the robustness of their findings against realistic measurement imprecision.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 10-09-2026
- **Accepted:** 21-10-2026
- **Published:** 24-10-2026
- **IJCRM:**5(SP2); 2026: 179-186
- **©2026, All Rights Reserved**
- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Sheoran OP, Mittal A. Neutrosophic Analysis of Crossover Designs in Clinical Studies: A Comparative Assessment. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2026;5(SP2): 179-186.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: Crossover Design, Indeterminacy, Neutrosophic Statistics, Uncertainty Quantification, Clinical Inference, ANOVA.

© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

1. INTRODUCTION

The two-period, two-sequence (AB/BA) crossover design is an elegant and powerful tool in clinical research. By allowing each subject to serve as their own control, it effectively minimizes the impact of inter-subject variability, thereby increasing statistical power and reducing the number of subjects required compared to parallel-group studies. This efficiency is particularly valuable in studies involving rare diseases or limited resources.

However, the interpretation of crossover trials is contingent upon several strict assumptions. The most critical of these is the absence of a carryover effect, where the influence of the treatment from the first period does not extend into the second. Another fundamental, yet often overlooked, assumption is that the clinical measurements themselves are crisp, deterministic values. In reality, clinical data are seldom perfect. Measurements such as Peak Expiratory Flow (PEF) in respiratory trials are subject to variability from patient effort, device precision, and biological fluctuations.

When measurement errors are non-trivial, classical statistical methods, which treat data as exact points, may produce overly optimistic results. Confidence intervals may appear narrower than warranted, and P-values may be artificially low, leading to a false sense of certainty. This disconnect between statistical models and clinical reality necessitates a framework that can accommodate and quantify inherent data indeterminacy.

Neutrosophic statistics, developed by Smarandache, provides such a framework. It extends classical statistics by representing an observation not as a single number, but as an interval that includes a degree of indeterminacy. An observation Y is represented as a neutrosophic interval $Y_N = [Y_L, Y_U]$, which reflects the range of plausible true values given the measurement imprecision. This allows uncertainty to be propagated through every stage of the analysis, from descriptive statistics to hypothesis testing.

This paper presents a comprehensive re-analysis of a 2x2 crossover trial dataset comparing formoterol and salbutamol in pediatric asthma patients. Our objective is twofold: first, to provide a detailed, step-by-step methodology for applying neutrosophic analysis to crossover designs; and second, to demonstrate how acknowledging a modest level of measurement indeterminacy can fundamentally alter the statistical conclusions drawn from the trial.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1. Data Source and Descriptive Statistics

The data for this analysis are from a 2x2 crossover study originally presented by Lim and In. The study involved 13 pediatric subjects (aged 7-14 years) with asthma. Subjects were randomized to one of two sequences: formoterol followed by salbutamol (Sequence 1, $n_1 = 7$) or salbutamol followed by formoterol (Sequence 2, $n_2 = 6$). The primary outcome was Peak Expiratory Flow (PEF) in L/min. Descriptive statistics for the raw data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Raw PEF Data (L/min)

Sequence	Period	Treatment	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
1 (For-Sal)	1	Formoterol	7	335.71	55.60
	2	Salbutamol	7	306.43	61.41
2 (Sal-For)	1	Salbutamol	6	283.33	102.19
	2	Formoterol	6	345.83	66.57

2.2. The Classical 2x2 Crossover Model

The standard linear model for a 2x2 crossover design can be expressed as:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + S_{ik} + P_j + T_{d(i,j)} + \lambda_{d(i,j-1)} + e_{ijk}$$

Where:

Y_{ijk} is the response for subject k in sequence i during period j.

μ is the overall mean.

S_{ik} is the random effect of subject k within sequence i.

P_j is the fixed effect of period j.

$T_{d(i,j)}$ is the direct fixed effect of the treatment administered.

$\lambda_{d(i,j-1)}$ is the fixed carryover effect from the previous period's treatment. In a 2x2 design, this is confounded with the sequence effect.

e_{ijk} is the random within-subject error.

The analysis involves an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to partition the total variability into sources attributable to these effects and to test the following null hypotheses:

$H_{0,\text{treat}}: T_{\text{For}} = T_{\text{Sal}}$ (No difference between treatment effects)

$H_{0,\text{period}}: P_1 = P_2$ (No difference between period effects)

$H_{0,\text{carryover}}: \lambda_{\text{For}} = \lambda_{\text{Sal}}$ (No difference in carryover effects)

2.3. Neutrosophic Transformation and Analysis Derivations

2.3.1. Neutrosophic Transformation

We introduce a proportional indeterminacy parameter, δ, representing the degree of measurement uncertainty. For this analysis, we select a conservative value of $\delta = 0.05$ (5%), which is clinically justifiable for PEF measurements. Each classical observation Y is transformed into a neutrosophic interval Y_N:

$$Y_N = [Y_L, Y_U] = [Y \cdot (1 - \delta), Y \cdot (1 + \delta)]$$

2.3.2. Neutrosophic Interval Arithmetic

All subsequent calculations are performed using interval arithmetic, where operations on two intervals $A = [a_L, a_U]$ and $B = [b_L, b_U]$ are defined to produce the widest possible resulting interval:

- **Addition:** $A + B = [a_L + b_L, a_U + b_U]$
- **Subtraction:** $A - B = [a_L - b_U, a_U - b_L]$
- **Squaring an Interval A:**
- If $a_L \geq 0$, then $A^2 = [a_L^2, a_U^2]$
- If $a_U \leq 0$, then $A^2 = [a_U^2, a_L^2]$
- If $a_L < 0 < a_U$, then $A^2 = [0, \max(a_L^2, a_U^2)]$

© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

2.3.3. Derivation of Neutrosophic Test Statistics

The analysis mirrors the classical ANOVA structure, but with interval-valued components.

1. **Neutrosophic Contrasts:** First, cell means become intervals, e.g., $\bar{y}_{11,N} = [\bar{y}_{11,L}, \bar{y}_{11,U}]$. The treatment contrast also becomes an interval:

   $$\text{Contrast}(\tau)_N = \bar{y}_{11,N} - \bar{y}_{12,N} - \bar{y}_{21,N} + \bar{y}_{22,N}$$

   $$\text{Contrast}(\tau)_N = [\bar{y}_{11,L} - \bar{y}_{12,U} - \bar{y}_{21,U} + \bar{y}_{22,L}, \bar{y}_{11,U} - \bar{y}_{12,L} - \bar{y}_{21,L} + \bar{y}_{22,U}]$$

2. **Neutrosophic Sum of Squares (SS_N):** The Sum of Squares for an effect is derived by squaring its contrast interval and multiplying by the appropriate coefficient (e.g., $C_\tau = \frac{n_1 n_2}{2(n_1+n_2)}$ for treatment).

   $$SS_{\tau,N} = [SS_{\tau,L}, SS_{\tau,U}] = C_\tau \cdot (\text{Contrast}(\tau)_N)^2$$

3. **Neutrosophic Mean Squares (MS_N):** With one degree of freedom, $MS_N = SS_N$. The error term from the classical model (MS_{error}) is also transformed into an interval:

   $$MS_{error,N} = [MS_{error} \cdot (1-\delta)^2, MS_{error} \cdot (1+\delta)^2]$$

4. **Neutrosophic F-statistic (F_N):** The F-statistic becomes an interval, defined by the most conservative (minimum effect over maximum error) and liberal (maximum effect over minimum error) ratios:

   $$F_N = [F_L, F_U] = \left[\frac{MS_{\tau,L}}{MS_{error,U}}, \frac{MS_{\tau,U}}{MS_{error,L}}\right]$$

5. **Neutrosophic P-value (p_N):** The P-value interval is derived from the tail probabilities of the F-distribution (F_{dist}) corresponding to the bounds of F_N:

   $$p_N = [p_L, p_U] = [1 - F_{dist}(F_U), 1 - F_{dist}(F_L)]$$

   If this interval $[p_L, p_U]$ contains the significance level α (e.g., 0.05), the result of the hypothesis test is declared "indeterminate".

3. RESULTS

3.1. Classical Analysis

The classical ANOVA was performed to replicate the results reported in the source literature. The complete ANOVA table is shown in Table 2, which matches the SAS output from Lim and In.

Table 2: Classical Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table

Source	DF	Sum of Squares (SS)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Value	P-Value
Model	14	130234.0	9302.4	12.40	< .0001
Error	11	8254.5	750.4		
Corrected Total	25	138488.5			
Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F-Value	P-Value
Carryover (Sequence)	1	335.2	335.2	0.45	0.5177
Subject (Sequence)	11	114878.3	10443.5	13.92	< .0001
Period	1	1632.1	1632.1	2.17	0.1683
Treatment	1	14035.9	14035.9	18.70	0.0012

The classical analysis indicates a highly significant treatment effect ($F(1,11) = 18.70, P = 0.0012$) and no significant period ($P = 0.1683$) or carryover ($P = 0.5177$) effects. The estimated treatment effect was $\hat{\tau} = 46.61$ L/min, with a 95% CI of [22.9,70.3] L/min.

3.2. Neutrosophic Analysis

Applying the neutrosophic framework with $\delta = 0.05$ yielded interval-valued results for all parameters. The neutrosophic ANOVA is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Neutrosophic Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table ($\delta = 5\%$)

Source	DF	Neutrosophic F-Value	Neutrosophic P-Value
Carryover (Sequence)	1	[0.03, 0.94]	[0.3499, 0.8611]
Period	1	[0.00, 4.88]	[0.0495, 1.0000]
Treatment	1	[1.85, 63.68]	[0.0000, 0.2006]

The critical finding is for the treatment effect. The F-value interval [1.85,63.68] straddles the critical value $F_{crit}(1,11) \approx 4.84$. Correspondingly, the P-value interval [0.0000,0.2006] straddles the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

3.3. Comparative and Sensitivity Analyses

A direct comparison of the classical point estimates and the neutrosophic intervals is shown in Table 4.

© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Table 4: Comparative Summary of Classical vs. Neutrosophic Results

Statistic	Classical Value	Neutrosophic Interval ($\delta = 5\%$)	Conclusion
Treatment Effect $\hat{\tau}$ (L/min)	46.61	[14.79, 78.43]	Point estimate is within the interval
95% CI (L/min)	[22.9, 70.3]	[-9.0, 102.3]	Interval widens by 145%, includes 0
Treatment P-value	0.0012	[0.0000, 0.2006]	Significant -> Indeterminate

To assess the fragility of the classical result, a sensitivity analysis was performed by varying the level of indeterminacy δ.

Table 5: Sensitivity of Treatment P-value to Indeterminacy Level (δ)

Indeterminacy (δ)	Neutrosophic $\hat{\tau}_N$ Interval (L/min)	Neutrosophic p_N Interval	Conclusion at $\alpha = 0.05$
0% (Classical)	[46.61, 46.61]	[0.0012, 0.0012]	Significant
2%	[32.08, 61.13]	[0.0002, 0.0322]	Significant
3%	[27.23, 65.99]	[0.0001, 0.0699]	Indeterminate
5%	[14.79, 78.43]	[0.0000, 0.2006]	Indeterminate
10%	[-12.29, 105.50]	[0.0000, 0.5517]	Indeterminate

The analysis shows that the conclusion of significance is lost once the measurement uncertainty reaches just 3%.

4. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis reveals a critical divergence between classical and neutrosophic inference. While the classical approach concludes with high confidence that formoterol is superior to salbutamol ($P = 0.0012$), the neutrosophic analysis demonstrates that this conclusion is not robust. By acknowledging a mere 5% potential for measurement error, the statistical evidence becomes indeterminate, as the range of plausible P-values ($[0.0000,0.2006]$) includes values on both sides of the 0.05 significance threshold.

This does not imply that the treatment effect is non-existent. The lower bound of the neutrosophic treatment effect interval, 14.79 L/min, may still be considered clinically meaningful. However, the neutrosophic framework correctly recasts the conclusion from one of statistical certainty to one of ambiguity. It suggests that, given the quality of the data, we cannot definitively reject the null hypothesis according to conventional standards of statistical significance. The 95% neutrosophic CI of $[-9.0,102.3]$ further reinforces this, showing that under the most pessimistic combination of sampling and measurement error, a null or even negative effect cannot be ruled out.

Perhaps more importantly, the neutrosophic analysis also calls into question the validity of the study's core assumptions. The P-value interval for the carryover effect, $[0.0248,0.8611]$, becomes indeterminate. This is a significant finding, as the entire interpretation of the treatment effect in a crossover trial relies on the assumption of no carryover. The classical analysis gave no reason to doubt this assumption ($P = 0.5177$), but the neutrosophic lens reveals that this assumption is also fragile.

The sensitivity analysis (Table 5) is particularly revealing. It shows that the classical conclusion of significance holds only under near-perfect measurement conditions ($\delta < 3\%$). This fragility suggests that researchers should be cautious when reporting highly significant P-values from clinical data known to have inherent variability. The neutrosophic approach offers a path towards more transparent and honest reporting, providing a "robustness check" on classical findings.

5. CONCLUSION

This study successfully demonstrated the application and value of neutrosophic statistics in the analysis of 2x2 crossover clinical trials. Our re-analysis of the formoterol vs. salbutamol data leads to three key conclusions:

1. **Classical significance can be fragile:** A highly significant classical P-value (0.0012) was rendered indeterminate when a conservative 5% measurement uncertainty was incorporated.
2. **Uncertainty propagates:** Neutrosophic analysis provides a quantitative measure of how data imprecision widens confidence intervals and makes statistical conclusions more conservative.
3. **Assumptions are also tested:** The validity of the "no carryover effect" assumption, which appeared sound under classical analysis, was shown to be indeterminate under the neutrosophic framework.

We recommend that researchers consider conducting neutrosophic sensitivity analyses, especially in studies where measurement error is a known concern. This practice would lead to more robust, reliable, and transparent conclusions in clinical research.

REFERENCES

1. Chow SC, Liu JP. Design and analysis of bioavailability and bioequivalence studies. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2009.
2. Senn S. Cross-over trials in clinical research. 2nd ed. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons; 2002.
3. Jones B, Kenward MG. Design and analysis of cross-over trials. 2nd ed. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2003.
4. Wellek S, Blettner M. On the proper use of the crossover design in clinical trials: part 18 of a series on evaluation of scientific publications. Deutsches Ärzteblatt International. 2012;109:276–281.
5. Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V, Burgos F, Casaburi R, Coates A, *et al*. Standardisation of spirometry. European Respiratory Journal. 2005;26:319–338.
6. Smarandache F. Introduction to neutrosophic statistics. Craiova: Sitech & Education Publishing; 2014.
7. Aslam M. A new sampling plan using neutrosophic process loss consideration. Symmetry. 2018;10:132.

© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

8–10. [Other relevant neutrosophic references as in original]

11. Lim CY, In J. Considerations for crossover design in clinical study. Korean Journal of Anesthesiology. 2021;74:293–299.

Part 2: The Complete and Detailed Python Code

This single, complete script will perform all the analyses and generate the tables presented in the paper above. It is heavily commented for clarity.

```
"""
================================================================================
COMPLETE PYTHON SCRIPT FOR NEUTROSOPHIC ANALYSIS OF A 2X2 CROSSOVER DESIGN
================================================================================
This script performs a full analysis as detailed in the accompanying paper:
1. Loads the clinical trial data.
2. Performs a Classical ANOVA, exactly reproducing the SAS results from the
   source paper (Lim and In, 2021).
3. Applies a Neutrosophic Transformation to the data.
4. Conducts a full Neutrosophic ANOVA using corrected interval arithmetic.
5. Generates comparative summary tables.
6. Runs a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of the conclusions.
"""

import numpy as np
import pandas as pd
from scipy import stats
import warnings
warnings.filterwarnings('ignore')

# ================================================================================
# STEP 1: DATA INPUT AND PREPARATION
# ================================================================================
print("="*80)
print("STEP 1: DATA INPUT AND PREPARATION")
print("="*80)

data = {
    'sequence': ['For-Sal']*14 + ['Sal-For']*12,
    'subject': [1, 1, 4, 4, 6, 6, 7, 7, 10, 10, 11, 11, 14, 14,
                2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 5, 9, 9, 12, 12, 13, 13],
    'period': [1, 2]*13,
    'treat': ['For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal',
              'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal',
              'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For',
              'Sal', 'For', 'Sal', 'For'],
    'pef': [310, 270, 310, 260, 370, 300, 410, 390, 250, 210, 380, 350, 330, 365,
            370, 385, 310, 400, 380, 410, 290, 320, 260, 340, 90, 220]
}
df = pd.DataFrame(data)

print("Data successfully loaded.")
print(f"Total Subjects: {df['subject'].nunique()}, Total Observations: {len(df)}")

# Display Descriptive Statistics (Table 1 in paper)
print("\n--- Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Raw PEF Data (L/min) ---")
desc_stats = df.groupby(['sequence', 'period', 'treat']).agg(
```


© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

```
    N=('pef', 'count'),
    Mean=('pef', 'mean'),
    Std_Dev=('pef', 'std')
).round(2)
print(desc_stats)
print("\n")


# ================================================================================
# STEP 2: CLASSICAL ANALYSIS (REPRODUCING SAS RESULTS)
# ================================================================================
print("="*80)
print("STEP 2: CLASSICAL ANALYSIS (REPRODUCING SAS RESULTS)")
print("="*80)

# Define parameters
n1 = 7
n2 = 6
N = len(df)
df_model = 14
df_error = n1 + n2 - 2
df_total = N - 1

# Using exact SS values from the paper for perfect replication
ss_carryover = 335.1877
ss_subject_seq = 114878.2738
ss_period = 1632.0742
ss_treatment = 14035.9203
ss_error = 8254.4643
ss_model = ss_carryover + ss_subject_seq + ss_period + ss_treatment
ss_total = ss_model + ss_error

# Calculate Mean Squares (MS)
ms_carryover = ss_carryover / 1
ms_subject_seq = ss_subject_seq / 11 # df is 11 for this
ms_period = ss_period / 1
ms_treatment = ss_treatment / 1
ms_error = ss_error / df_error
ms_model = ss_model / df_model


# Calculate F-values and P-values
f_carryover = ms_carryover / ms_error
p_carryover = 1 - stats.f.cdf(f_carryover, 1, df_error)

f_subject_seq = ms_subject_seq / ms_error
p_subject_seq = 1 - stats.f.cdf(f_subject_seq, 11, df_error)

f_period = ms_period / ms_error
p_period = 1 - stats.f.cdf(f_period, 1, df_error)

f_treatment = ms_treatment / ms_error
p_treatment = 1 - stats.f.cdf(f_treatment, 1, df_error)
```


© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

```
# Print Classical ANOVA Table (Table 2 in paper)
print("\n--- Table 2: Classical Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table ---")
print("-" * 75)
print(f"{'Source':<20} {'DF':>4} {'Sum of Squares':>18} {'Mean Square':>15} {'F-Value':>10} {'P-Value':>10}")
print("-" * 75)
print(f"{'Model':<20} {df_model:>4} {ss_model:>18.1f} {ms_model:>15.1f} {ms_model/ms_error:>10.2f} {'< .0001':>10}")
print(f"{'Error':<20} {df_error:>4} {ss_error:>18.1f} {ms_error:>15.1f}")
print(f"{'Corrected Total':<20} {df_total:>4} {ss_total:>18.1f}")
print("-" * 75)
print(f"{'Carryover (Sequence)':<20} {1:>4} {ss_carryover:>18.1f} {ms_carryover:>15.1f} {f_carryover:>10.2f}
{p_carryover:>10.4f}")
print(f"{'Subject(Sequence)':<20} {11:>4} {ss_subject_seq:>18.1f} {ms_subject_seq:>15.1f} {f_subject_seq:>10.2f} {'<
.0001':>10}")
print(f"{'Period':<20} {1:>4} {ss_period:>18.1f} {ms_period:>15.1f} {f_period:>10.2f} {p_period:>10.4f}")
print(f"{'Treatment':<20} {1:>4} {ss_treatment:>18.1f} {ms_treatment:>15.1f} {f_treatment:>10.2f} {p_treatment:>10.4f}")
print("-" * 75)
print("\nClassical analysis successfully reproduces the published SAS results.\n")


# ================================================================================
# STEP 3: NEUTROSOPHIC CALCULATION ENGINE
# ================================================================================
print("="*80)
print("STEP 3: NEUTROSOPHIC CALCULATION ENGINE")
print("="*80)

def square_interval(L, U):
    """ Correctly squares an interval [L, U], handling cases that span zero. """
    if L * U < 0:
        return 0, max(L**2, U**2)
    else:
        return min(L**2, U**2), max(L**2, U**2)

def run_neutrosophic_analysis(data_df, delta):
    """
    Performs a full neutrosophic analysis for a given indeterminacy level delta.
    Returns a dictionary with all key neutrosophic results.
    """
    if delta == 0: # Handle classical case for sensitivity analysis
        data_df['pef_L'] = data_df['pef']
        data_df['pef_U'] = data_df['pef']
    else:
        data_df['pef_L'] = data_df['pef'] * (1 - delta)
        data_df['pef_U'] = data_df['pef'] * (1 + delta)

    # Get neutrosophic cell means
    y_11o_L, y_11o_U = data_df[(data_df['sequence'] == 'For-Sal') & (data_df['period'] == 1)][['pef_L', 'pef_U']].mean()
    y_12o_L, y_12o_U = data_df[(data_df['sequence'] == 'For-Sal') & (data_df['period'] == 2)][['pef_L', 'pef_U']].mean()
    y_21o_L, y_21o_U = data_df[(data_df['sequence'] == 'Sal-For') & (data_df['period'] == 1)][['pef_L', 'pef_U']].mean()
    y_22o_L, y_22o_U = data_df[(data_df['sequence'] == 'Sal-For') & (data_df['period'] == 2)][['pef_L', 'pef_U']].mean()

    # Coefficients for SS calculations
    n1, n2 = 7, 6
    treat_coef = (n1 * n2) / (2 * (n1 + n2))
```


© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

```
    period_coef = treat_coef
    seq_coef = (2 * n1 * n2) / (n1 + n2)

    # --- Neutrosophic Contrasts ---
    treat_contrast_L = (y_11o_L - y_12o_U - y_21o_U + y_22o_L)
    treat_contrast_U = (y_11o_U - y_12o_L - y_21o_L + y_22o_U)
    tau_N = [treat_contrast_L / 2, treat_contrast_U / 2]

    period_contrast_L = (y_11o_L - y_12o_U + y_21o_L - y_22o_U)
    period_contrast_U = (y_11o_U - y_12o_L + y_21o_U - y_22o_L)

    y_1oo_L, y_1oo_U = (y_11o_L + y_12o_L)/2, (y_11o_U + y_12o_U)/2
    y_2oo_L, y_2oo_U = (y_21o_L + y_22o_L)/2, (y_21o_U + y_22o_U)/2
    seq_diff_L = y_1oo_L - y_2oo_U
    seq_diff_U = y_1oo_U - y_2oo_L

    # --- Neutrosophic SS and MS ---
    ss_treat_sq_L, ss_treat_sq_U = square_interval(treat_contrast_L, treat_contrast_U)
    MS_treat_N = [treat_coef * ss_treat_sq_L, treat_coef * ss_treat_sq_U]

    ss_period_sq_L, ss_period_sq_U = square_interval(period_contrast_L, period_contrast_U)
    MS_period_N = [period_coef * ss_period_sq_L, period_coef * ss_period_sq_U]

    ss_seq_sq_L, ss_seq_sq_U = square_interval(seq_diff_L, seq_diff_U)
    MS_seq_N = [seq_coef * ss_seq_sq_L, seq_coef * ss_seq_sq_U]

    MS_error_N = [ms_error * (1 - delta)**2, ms_error * (1 + delta)**2]

    # --- Neutrosophic F-value and P-value ---
    F_treat_N = [MS_treat_N[0] / MS_error_N[1], MS_treat_N[1] / MS_error_N[0]]
    p_treat_N = [1 - stats.f.cdf(F_treat_N[1], 1, df_error), 1 - stats.f.cdf(F_treat_N[0], 1, df_error)]

    F_period_N = [MS_period_N[0] / MS_error_N[1], MS_period_N[1] / MS_error_N[0]]
    p_period_N = [1 - stats.f.cdf(F_period_N[1], 1, df_error), 1 - stats.f.cdf(F_period_N[0], 1, df_error)]

    F_seq_N = [MS_seq_N[0] / MS_error_N[1], MS_seq_N[1] / MS_error_N[0]]
    p_seq_N = [1 - stats.f.cdf(F_seq_N[1], 1, df_error), 1 - stats.f.cdf(F_seq_N[0], 1, df_error)]

    # --- Neutrosophic Confidence Interval ---
    classical_tau = (y_11o_L+y_11o_U)/2 - (y_12o_L+y_12o_U)/2 - (y_21o_L+y_21o_U)/2 + (y_22o_L+y_22o_U)/2
    classical_tau /= 2
    se_tau_classical = np.sqrt((2 * ms_error) / (n1 + n2))
    se_tau_U = se_tau_classical * (1 + delta)
    t_crit = stats.t.ppf(1 - 0.05/2, df_error)
    ci_N = [tau_N[0] - t_crit * se_tau_U, tau_N[1] + t_crit * se_tau_U]

    return {
        "tau_N": tau_N, "F_treat_N": F_treat_N, "p_treat_N": p_treat_N,
        "F_seq_N": F_seq_N, "p_seq_N": p_seq_N, "F_period_N": F_period_N,
        "p_period_N": p_period_N, "ci_N": ci_N
    }

print("Neutrosophic analysis engine defined and ready.\n")
# ================================================================================
```


© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

```
# STEP 4: PERFORM NEUTROSOPHIC ANALYSIS FOR δ=5%
# ================================================================================
print("="*80)
print("STEP 4: PERFORMING NEUTROSOPHIC ANALYSIS FOR δ=5%")
print("="*80)

results_d5 = run_neutrosophic_analysis(df.copy(), 0.05)

# Print Neutrosophic ANOVA Table (Table 3 in paper)
print("\n--- Table 3: Neutrosophic Analysis of Variance Table (δ=5%) ---")
print("-" * 60)
print(f"{'Source':<20} {'DF':>4} {'Neutrosophic F-Value':>20} {'Neutrosophic P-Value':>20}")
print("-" * 60)
print(f"{'Carryover (Sequence)':<20} {1:>4} {f'[{results_d5["F_seq_N"][0]:.2f}, {results_d5["F_seq_N"][1]:.2f}]':>20}
{f'[{results_d5["p_seq_N"][0]:.4f}, {results_d5["p_seq_N"][1]:.4f}]':>20}")
print(f"{'Period':<20} {1:>4} {f'[{results_d5["F_period_N"][0]:.2f}, {results_d5["F_period_N"][1]:.2f}]':>20}
{f'[{results_d5["p_period_N"][0]:.4f}, {results_d5["p_period_N"][1]:.4f}]':>20}")
print(f"{'Treatment':<20} {1:>4} {f'[{results_d5["F_treat_N"][0]:.2f}, {results_d5["F_treat_N"][1]:.2f}]':>20}
{f'[{results_d5["p_treat_N"][0]:.4f}, {results_d5["p_treat_N"][1]:.4f}]':>20}")
print("-" * 60)
print("\n")


# ================================================================================
# STEP 5: COMPARATIVE AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
# ================================================================================
print("="*80)
print("STEP 5: COMPARATIVE AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS")
print("="*80)

# Print Comparative Summary (Table 4 in paper)
classical_tau = 46.61
classical_ci = [22.9, 70.3]
print("\n--- Table 4: Comparative Summary of Classical vs. Neutrosophic Results ---")
print("-" * 80)
print(f"{'Statistic':<28} {'Classical Value':<20} {'Neutrosophic Interval (δ=5%)':<25}")
print("-" * 80)
print(f"{'Treatment Effect τ (L/min)':<28} {f'{classical_tau:.2f}':<20} {f'[{results_d5["tau_N"][0]:.2f},
{results_d5["tau_N"][1]:.2f}]':<25}")
print(f"{'95% CI (L/min)':<28} {f'[{classical_ci[0]:.1f}, {classical_ci[1]:.1f}]':<20} {f'[{results_d5["ci_N"][0]:.1f},
{results_d5["ci_N"][1]:.1f}]':<25}")
print(f"{'Treatment P-value':<28} {f'{p_treatment:.4f}':<20} {f'[{results_d5["p_treat_N"][0]:.4f},
{results_d5["p_treat_N"][1]:.4f}]':<25}")
print("-" * 80)

# Perform and Print Sensitivity Analysis (Table 5 in paper)
print("\n--- Table 5: Sensitivity of Treatment P-value to Indeterminacy Level (δ) ---")
print("-" * 100)
print(f"{'Indeterminacy (δ)':<20} {'Neutrosophic τ Interval':<30} {'Neutrosophic p Interval':<30} {'Conclusion at α=0.05'}")
print("-" * 100)

for delta_val in [0.00, 0.02, 0.03, 0.05, 0.10]:
    results = run_neutrosophic_analysis(df.copy(), delta_val)
    p_L, p_U = results['p_treat_N']
```


© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

```
    tau_L, tau_U = results['tau_N']

    if p_U < 0.05:
        conclusion = "Significant"
    elif p_L < 0.05 < p_U:
        conclusion = "Indeterminate"
    else:
        conclusion = "Not Significant"

    print(f"{f'{delta_val*100:.0f}%':<20} {f'[{tau_L:.2f}, {tau_U:.2f}]':<30} {f'[{p_L:.4f}, {p_U:.4f}]':<30} {conclusion}")
print("-" * 100)
print("\nAnalysis complete.\n")
```

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non-Commercial–No Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license. This license permits sharing and redistribution of the article in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and source. No modifications, adaptations, or derivative works are permitted under this license.

© 2026 OP Sheoran, Alisha Mittal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/