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")</pre>
## 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))
#MLE for Gamma
llgamma <- function(data, par, neg=F){</pre>
 alpha <- exp(par[1])</pre>
 beta <- exp(par[2])
 loglik <- sum(log(dgamma(x=data, shape=alpha, rate=beta)), na.rm=T)</pre>
```

- (b) Compute the MLEs for these data using the Log-Normal distribution.
- (c) Compute the likelihood ratio to compare the Weibull and the Gamma distribution. Which has a better fit according to the likelihood ratio?

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

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

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

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

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

- 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.