

SIII lectures

Week 12

The Geometry of Least Squares

- The discussion of linear models so far has been formulated in terms of matrices.
- This is adequate from a computational perspective.
- But there is an important logical gap to be filled.
- We know the same model can be specified with different model matrices.
- For example, when dealing with factors, we can use different constraints and we showed that the models were equivalent.

The Geometry of Least Squares

We need to answer the question:

What is the unique definition of a linear model?

Overview

- In this section, we use concepts of linear algebra and, in particular, vector subspaces to provide a precise specification of the linear model.
- Hypothesis testing and the analysis of variance will be described in terms of linear algebra.
- We will consider only n -dimensional Euclidean space.
- Much of the theory extends to abstract vector spaces, but this is not considered here.

Subspaces

\mathbb{R}^n

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \left\{ \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} : x_i \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Vector Addition

$$\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_1 \\ x_2 + y_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n + y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

for

$$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Scalar Multiplication

$$a\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} ax_1 \\ ax_2 \\ \vdots \\ ax_n \end{bmatrix}$$

for

$$a \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The dot product

The **dot product** or **inner product** of two vectors is defined in the usual way.

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i.$$

The norm

The dot product can be used to define distances, via the **norm**,

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2},$$

so that the **Euclidean distance** between two points is

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|.$$

Orthogonal vectors

The dot product is also used to define the angle, θ between vectors via the relation

$$\frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{y}\|} = \cos \theta.$$

The vectors \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} are said to be **orthogonal** or **perpendicular** if

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0.$$

In this case, we write

$$\mathbf{x} \perp \mathbf{y}.$$

Definition 12.1: Vector Subspaces

A set

$$\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

is said to be a **vector subspace** if

$$a\mathbf{x} + b\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

□

Example 1

$$\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$$

defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{ \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Example 2

Let X be an $n \times p$ matrix and let

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} \text{ for } \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p\}.$$

Definition 12.2: Span

Let

$$\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

be a set of vectors.

The **span** is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{y} = a_1\mathbf{x}_1 + a_2\mathbf{x}_2 + \dots + a_p\mathbf{x}_p\}$$

for

$$a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p \in \mathbb{R}.$$

□

The span,

$$\mathcal{S}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\},$$

is always a vector subspace.

The vectors

$$\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p$$

is said to span the subspace \mathcal{M} if

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\}.$$

Basis

Recall that a set of vectors,

$$\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

is said to be linearly independent if

$$\sum_{i=1}^p a_i \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0} \Rightarrow a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_p = 0.$$

Definition 12.3

Let

$$\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

be a vector subspace.

A set of linearly independent vectors,

$$\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\},$$

such that

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\}$$

is said to form a **basis** for \mathcal{M} .

□

Example 1

The two vectors

$$\left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{x}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

form a basis for \mathcal{M}_1 .

Example 2

If the columns

$$\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p$$

of the matrix, X , are **linearly independent**, then they form a basis for \mathcal{M}_2 .

Alternative Bases

The basis of a vector subspace is not unique. In our two examples:

- The two vectors

$$\left\{ \mathbf{y}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{y}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

form a basis for \mathcal{M}_1 . - For any $p \times p$ invertible matrix, A , the columns of the matrix XA form a basis for \mathcal{M}_2 , provided the columns of X are linearly independent.

Theorem 12.1: Dimension of a subspace

Suppose

$$\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p\}$$

and

$$\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$$

are bases for the vector subspace \mathcal{M} . The $r = p$.

□

Definition 12.4

The the vector subspace, \mathcal{M} , is said to have dimension, p , if any basis for \mathcal{M} has p elements.

□

Linear Models

Linear Models

Consider data $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ and the statistical model,

$$\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{e}$$

where e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n are such that

$$E(\mathbf{e}) = 0 \text{ and } \text{Var}(\mathbf{e}) = \sigma^2 I.$$

A model of the form,

$$\mathcal{M} : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{M}$$

where $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a linear model.

Linear Models

A linear model is specified at the most fundamental level by the subspace \mathcal{M} .

In practice, linear models can be specified by a model matrix, X , such that

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{M} \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\eta} = X\boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

That is, where the columns of X form a basis for \mathcal{M} .

We have seen previously examples where the same model can be specified with different model matrices.

In general two models of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\eta} = X^*\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$$

will be equivalent when the columns of X and X^* are bases for the same subspace \mathcal{M} .

The projection matrix

In the matrix treatment of the linear model, the projection matrix

$$P = X(X^T X)^{-1} X^T$$

plays a key role.

P can also be defined as a projection operator on the underlying subspace without reference to a model matrix.

This is an important result because it implies that the projection P obtained from X and X^* is the same.

Definition 12.5 Orthogonal Complement

The **orthogonal complement** of the vector subspace \mathcal{M} is the set

$$\mathcal{M}^\perp = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{v} \perp \mathbf{x} \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

□

Theorem 12.2

If \mathcal{M} is a vector subspace of dimension p , then \mathcal{M}^\perp is a vector subspace of dimension $n - p$.

□

Example

Let \mathcal{M}_1 be as previously.

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{ \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1^\perp = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

$$\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{x} = x_1 v_1 + x_2 v_2 = 0 \text{ for all } x_1, x_2 \Leftrightarrow v_1 = v_2 = 0.$$

That is,

$$\mathcal{M}_1^\perp = \left\{ \mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} : v_3 \in \mathbb{R} \right\} = \mathcal{S} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

and $\dim(\mathcal{M}_1^\perp) = 1 = 3 - 2$ as required.

Orthogonal Projection

Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector subspace.

It can be proved that every $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be expressed **uniquely** as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} \text{ where } \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{M}^\perp.$$

Definition 12.6

The orthogonal projection P on the subspace \mathcal{M} is the linear mapping $P : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathcal{M}$ defined by

$$P\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u}.$$

□

Note $I - P$ is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M}^\perp .

Example

Let $\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be as before and let P be the orthogonal projection.

Consider

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

The unique decomposition of

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$$

is

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_1^\perp.$$

The orthogonal projection is

$$P\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem 12.3 The least squares property

Let P be the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M} and consider $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Then

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y}\|^2$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{w} = P\mathbf{y}$.

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y} + P\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 \\ &= \|(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w})\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w})\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 + 2\mathbf{v} \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}) \\ &= \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \|P\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y}\|^2 \\ &= \text{if and only if } P\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{w}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 12.4 The normal equations

The linear mapping P is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M} if and only if

$$P\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Note, the conditions

$$P\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are called the **normal equations**.

Proof

Recall the orthogonal projection is defined by

$$P\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u}$$

where $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ is the unique decomposition such that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$.

Hence, if $P\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the normal equations, it follows from **uniqueness** that $P\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u}$.

Conversely, if we take $P\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{u}$, it follows immediately that the normal equations are satisfied.

□

Theorem 12.5 Symmetry and Idempotence

Consider an $n \times n$ matrix, P . The mapping $P\mathbf{y}$ is the orthogonal projection on the range of P if and only if $P = P^2 = P^T$.

Proof

Suppose P is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M} .

Observe that $P\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Hence $P(P\mathbf{y}) = P\mathbf{y}$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that

$$(P - P^2)\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0} \text{ for all } \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \Rightarrow P = P^2.$$

Now consider

$$\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{u}_2 + \mathbf{v}_2 \text{ where } \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{M}, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$$

and observe

$$\mathbf{u}_1^T \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{u}_1^T \mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{y}_1^T \mathbf{u}_2 \Rightarrow \mathbf{y}_1^T P^T \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{y}_1^T P \mathbf{y}_2 \text{ for all } \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Hence, $P = P^T$.

Conversely, suppose $P = P^2 = P^T$ and let \mathcal{M} be the range of P .

To show that $P\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the normal equations, we need to check that $\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$.

Suppose $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}$. We need to show

$$(\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{w} = 0.$$

Since $\mathbf{w} = P\mathbf{w}$, we obtain

$$(\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{y} - P\mathbf{y})^T P\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{y}^T (I - P^T) P\mathbf{w} = 0$$

as required.

□

\end{flushright} \end{handout}

The matrix formulation

Consider the matrix formulation,

$$\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{e}$$

such that $E(\mathbf{e}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{Var}(\mathbf{e}) = \sigma^2 I$, and consider the linear model

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = X\boldsymbol{\beta}$$

where X an $n \times p$ matrix with linearly independent columns.

- Have seen previously that $P = X(X^T X)^{-1} X^T$ is symmetric and idempotent.
- Moreover the range of P is the column space of X , or the linear subspace \mathcal{M} .
- Least squares estimation is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M} .

Test of Hypotheses and ANOVA

Consider vector subspaces

$$\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

such that $p_0 = \dim(\mathcal{H}) < p = \dim(\mathcal{M}) < n$.

Consider the linear model

$$M : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{M}$$

and the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The ANOVA table

The analysis of variance table is

| Source | SS | DF | MS | F-ratio |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--|-------------------------|
| H_0 vs M | $\ (P - P_0)\mathbf{y}\ ^2$ | $p - p_0$ | $MS_H = \frac{\ (P - P_0)\mathbf{y}\ ^2}{p - p_0}$ | $F = \frac{MS_H}{MS_E}$ |
| Residual | $\ (I - P)\mathbf{y}\ ^2$ | $n - p$ | $MS_E = \frac{\ (I - P)\mathbf{y}\ ^2}{n - p}$ | |
| Total | $\ (I - P_0)\mathbf{y}\ ^2$ | $n - p_0$ | | |

} \end{center}

where P is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{M} and P_0 is the orthogonal projection on \mathcal{H} .

The expected mean squares

The key to understanding ANOVA lies in the expected value of the mean square entries.

Suppose the model \mathcal{M} holds.

We have

$$E(\|\mathbf{Y} - X\hat{\beta}\|^2) = E(\|(I - P)\mathbf{Y}\|^2) = (n - p)\sigma^2$$

so that

$$E(MS_E) = \sigma^2.$$

The expected mean squares

Consider now the hypothesis sum squares.

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P - P_0)\mathbf{Y}\|^2 &= \|((P - P_0)(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + (P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta})\|^2 \\ &= \|((P - P_0)(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta}))\|^2 + \|(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\boldsymbol{\eta}^T(P - P_0)(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \end{aligned}$$

Since $P - P_0$ is the orthogonal projection on the vector subspace, $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{H}$,

$$E(\|(P - P_0)(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta})\|^2) = (p - p_0)\sigma^2.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a constant,

$$E(\|(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2) = \|(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2.$$

$$E(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T(P - P_0)(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta})) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^T(P - P_0)E(\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) = 0$$

Hence

$$E(MS_H) = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{p - p_0} \|(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2.$$

The expected mean squares

Observe that $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{H}$ is true if and only if $(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{0}$

Hence $\delta^2 = \frac{1}{p - p_0} \|(P - P_0)\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2$ is a measure of the magnitude of any departure from H_0 .

To summarise

$$E(MS_H) = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 & \text{if } H_0 \text{ holds} \\ \sigma^2 + \delta^2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The F-statistic

The F-statistic is the ratio

$$F = \frac{MS_H}{MS_E}.$$

- When H_0 is true, we would expect the F-statistic to be close to 1.
- When H_0 is not true, we expect the F-statistic to exceed 1.
- The greater the departure from H_0 , the larger we expect F-statistic to be.

This explains the logic of the F-test, where H_0 is rejected only for large values of the F-statistic.

It can also be proved that the null distribution of the F-statistic is $F_{p-p_0, n-p}$ but this is beyond the scope of the course.

Example

Consider the one-way layout with

r groups and n_k observations in group k for $k = 1, \dots, r$.

The usual model and hypothesis are

$$M : \eta_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i \text{ and } H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_r = 0.$$

The underlying subspaces can be specified by their bases.

In particular, \mathcal{M} is the r dimensional subspace with basis

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{Obs} & \mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{v}_r \\ (1, 1) & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ (1, 2) & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (1, n_1) & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ (2, 1) & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ (2, 2) & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (2, n_2) & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (r, 1) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ (r, 2) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (r, n_r) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

\mathcal{H} is the 1-dimensional space spanned by $\mathbf{1}$.

It can be shown that the corresponding ANOVA table is (as usual)

| Source | SS | DF |
|----------------|---|---------|
| Between Groups | $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i (y_{i\bullet} - y_{\bullet\bullet})^2$ | $r - 1$ |
| Within Groups | $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - y_{i\bullet})^2$ | $n - r$ |
| Total | $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - y_{\bullet\bullet})^2$ | $n - 1$ |

The mean-square entry for the within-group sum of squares is just σ^2 and for the between-group sum of squares we have,

$$MS = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{r-1} \sum_{i=1}^r n_i (\eta_{i\bullet} - \eta_{\bullet\bullet})^2.$$

Taking $\eta_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i$ we find

$$\eta_{i\bullet} = \mu + \alpha_i \text{ and } \eta_{\bullet\bullet} = \mu + \bar{\alpha}$$

where

$$\bar{\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r n_i \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=1}^r n_i}.$$

These calculations are often presented in the extended ANOVA table:

| Source | SS | DF | E(MS) |
|----------------|---|---------|---|
| Between Groups | $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i (y_{i\bullet} - y_{\bullet\bullet})^2$ | $r - 1$ | $\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{r-1} \sum_{i=1}^r n_i (\alpha_i - \bar{\alpha})^2$ |
| Within Groups | $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - y_{i\bullet})^2$ | $n - r$ | σ^2 |
| Total | $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - y_{\bullet\bullet})^2$ | $n - 1$ | |

}

Geometry of generalised least squares

Geometry of generalised least squares

Generalised least squares also has a geometrical interpretation.

The same theory applies but instead of using the standard inner product (dot product)

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_2 = \langle \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle = \mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_2$$

to define angle and distance, we use

$$\langle \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle_* = \mathbf{x}_1^T V^{-1} \mathbf{x}_2$$

Geometry of generalised least squares

The orthogonal_{*} projection

$$P = X(X^T V^{-1} X)^{-1} X^T V^{-1}$$

is idempotent, i.e. $P^2 = P$.

However, symmetry is generalised to the self-adjoint property,

$$\langle P\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle_* = \langle \mathbf{x}_1, P\mathbf{x}_2 \rangle_*$$

Geometry of generalised least squares

It can be checked that

$$P\mathbf{y} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{L}} \|\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_*^2$$

where \mathcal{L} is the column space of X and

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_*^2 = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_* = \mathbf{x}^T V^{-1} \mathbf{x}.$$

Geometry of generalised least squares

Finally, the definition of

$$P\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{v}$$

from the decomposition

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{v} + \boldsymbol{w}$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$$

is the same.

The only difference is that the space \mathcal{L}^\perp is orthogonal with respect to the $*$ inner product.