

In lecture 16, we looked at precipitation amounts in Madison County (at Morrisville station). We found that the Weibull distribution had a good fit to the monthly precipitation amounts.

We found that the MLEs for the Weibull distribution were

$$\hat{a} = 2.1871$$

$$\hat{\sigma} = 3.9683$$

and

$$-\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x}) = 2166.496$$

is the realized negative log-likelihood. Note this means that the log-likelihood is

$$\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x}) = -2166.496,$$

and the usual likelihood is

$$L(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x}) = e^{[\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})]} \approx e^{-2166.496},$$

which R cannot differentiate from 0.

1. Someone asked “why Weibull?” in class. That is, why wouldn’t we use another right-skewed distribution like the Gamma (see Lecture 15), or the Log-Normal (see Lecture 17).
 - (a) Compute the MLEs for these data using a Gamma distribution.

```
library(tidyverse)

#Data and Data Cleaning
data <- read_csv("agacis.csv")

## Rows: 115 Columns: 14
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ", "
## chr (13): Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Annual
## dbl (1): Year
##
## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.
data.long <- data |>
  dplyr::select(-Annual) |> # Remove annual column
  pivot_longer(cols = c(Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec), # pivot the column data into one col
               values_to = "Precipitation", # store the values in Precipitation
               names_to = "Month") |> # store the months in Month
  mutate(Precipitation = case_when(Precipitation == "M" ~ NA_character_,
                                   TRUE ~ Precipitation)) |>
  mutate(Precipitation = as.numeric(Precipitation))

#MLE for Gamma
llgamma <- function(data, par, neg=F){
  alpha <- exp(par[1])
  beta <- exp(par[2])

  loglik <- sum(log(dgamma(x=data, shape=alpha, rate=beta)), na.rm=T)
```

```

    return(ifelse(neg, -loglik, loglik))
  }
mle_gamma <- optim(par = c(1,1),
                  fn = llgamma,
                  data=data.long$Precipitation,
                  neg=T)
alpha=mle_gamma$par[1]
beta=mle_gamma$par[2]

```

- (b) Compute the MLEs for these data using the Log-Normal distribution.

```

library(tidyverse)

#Data and Data Cleaning
data <- read_csv("agacis.csv")

## Rows: 115 Columns: 14
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ", "
## chr (13): Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Annual
## dbl (1): Year
##
## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.

data.long <- data |>
  dplyr::select(-Annual) |> # Remove annual column
  pivot_longer(cols = c(Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec), # pivot the column data into one col
               values_to = "Precipitation", # store the values in Precipitation
               names_to = "Month") |> # store the months in Month
  mutate(Precipitation = case_when(Precipitation == "M" ~ NA_character_,
                                   TRUE ~ Precipitation)) |>
  mutate(Precipitation = as.numeric(Precipitation))

#MLE for lognormal
n=1380 #1380 observations
lognorm.mu.hat.mle <- mean(log(data.long$Precipitation), na.rm = T)
lognorm.sigma.hat.mle <-sqrt(sum((log(data.long$Precipitation) - lognorm.mu.hat.mle)^2, na.rm =

```

- (c) Compute the likelihood ratio to compare the Weibull and the Gamma distribution. Which has a better fit according to the likelihood ratio?

$$Q = \frac{L(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})}{L(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}\}|\mathbf{x})} = e^{[\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}\}|\mathbf{x})]}$$

```

#Data and Data Cleaning
data <- read_csv("agacis.csv")

## Rows: 115 Columns: 14
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ", "
## chr (13): Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Annual
## dbl (1): Year
##

```

```

## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.

data.long <- data |>
  dplyr::select(-Annual) |>          # Remove annual column
  pivot_longer(cols = c(Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec), # pivot the column data into one col
    values_to = "Precipitation",    # store the values in Precipitation
    names_to = "Month") |>         # store the months in Month
  mutate(Precipitation = case_when(Precipitation == "M" ~ NA_character_,
    TRUE ~ Precipitation))|>
  mutate(Precipitation = as.numeric(Precipitation))

#MLE for Gamma
llgamma <- function(data, par, neg=F){
  alpha <- exp(par[1])
  beta <- exp(par[2])

  loglik <- sum(log(dgamma(x=data, shape=alpha, rate=beta)), na.rm=T)

  return(ifelse(neg, -loglik, loglik))
}
mle_gamma <- optim(par = c(1,1),
  fn = llgamma,
  data=data.long$Precipitation,
  neg=T)

# Log-Likelihood for Weibull
loglik_weibull <- -2166.496

# Log-Likelihood for Gamma
loglik_gamma <- -mle_gamma$value # Negative of the value from optim()

# Likelihood Ratio for Weibull vs Gamma
likelihood_ratio_gamma <- exp(loglik_weibull - loglik_gamma)
likelihood_ratio_gamma

```

Since the likelihood ratio is 2.16133×10^{-7} , it suggests that the Gamma Distribution fits the data better than the Weibull Distribution.

- (d) Compute the likelihood ratio to compare the Weibull and the Log-Normal distribution. Which has a better fit according to the likelihood ratio?

$$Q = \frac{L(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})}{L(\{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})} = e^{[\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{a}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})]}$$

```

#Data and Data Cleaning
data <- read_csv("agacis.csv")

## Rows: 115 Columns: 14
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ", "
## chr (13): Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Annual
## dbl (1): Year

```

```
##
## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.
data.long <- data |>
  dplyr::select(-Annual) |> # Remove annual column
  pivot_longer(cols = c(Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, # pivot the column data into one col
                        May, Jun, Jul, Aug,
                        Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec),
               values_to = "Precipitation", # store the values in Precipitation
               names_to = "Month") |> # store the months in Month
  mutate(Precipitation = case_when(Precipitation == "M" ~ NA_character_,
                                   TRUE ~ Precipitation))|>
  mutate(Precipitation = as.numeric(Precipitation))

# Log-Likelihood for Weibull
loglik_weibull <- -2166.496

# Log-Likelihood for Lognormal
loglik_lognormal <- sum(-log(data.long$Precipitation) - 0.5 * log(2 * pi * lognorm.sigma.hat.m

# Likelihood Ratio for Weibull vs Lognormal
likelihood_ratio_lognormal <- exp(loglik_weibull - loglik_lognormal)
likelihood_ratio_lognormal
```

Since the likelihood ratio is very large, 8.112098×10^{20} , it suggests that the Weibull distribution fits the data a lot better than the Lognormal distribution.

- (e) Compute the likelihood ratio to compare the Gamma and the Log-Normal distribution. Which has a better fit according to the likelihood ratio?

$$Q = \frac{L(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}\}|\mathbf{x})}{L(\{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})} = e^{[\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}\}|\mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}\}|\mathbf{x})]}$$

```
#Data and Data Cleaning
data <- read_csv("agacis.csv")

## Rows: 115 Columns: 14
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ","
## chr (13): Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Annual
## dbl (1): Year
##
## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.
data.long <- data |>
  dplyr::select(-Annual) |> # Remove annual column
  pivot_longer(cols = c(Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, # pivot the column data into one col
                        May, Jun, Jul, Aug,
                        Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec),
               values_to = "Precipitation", # store the values in Precipitation
               names_to = "Month") |> # store the months in Month
```

```

mutate(Precipitation = case_when(Precipitation == "M" ~ NA_character_,
                                TRUE ~ Precipitation))|>
mutate(Precipitation = as.numeric(Precipitation))

# Log-Likelihood for Gamma
loglik_gamma <- -mle_gamma$value # Negative of the value from optim()

# Log-Likelihood for Lognormal
loglik_lognormal <- sum(-log(data.long$Precipitation) - 0.5 * log(2 * pi * lognorm.sigma.hat.m))

# Likelihood Ratio for Gamma vs Lognormal
likelihood_ratio_gamma_lognormal <- exp(loglik_gamma - loglik_lognormal)
likelihood_ratio_gamma_lognormal

## [1] 3.75329e+27

```

Since the likelihood ratio is very large, 3.75329×10^{27} , the Gamma distribution fits the data better for this model.

2. Optional Coding Challenge. Choose the “best” distribution and refit the model by season.
 - (a) Fit the Distribution for Winter (December-February).
 - (b) Fit the Distribution for Spring (March-May).
 - (c) Fit the Distribution for Summer (June-August).
 - (d) Fit the Distribution for Fall (September-November).
 - (e) Plot the four distributions in one plot using **cyan3** for Winter, **chartreuse3** for Spring, **red3** for Summer, and **chocolate3** for Fall. Note any similarities/differences you observe across the seasons.