Michael Velez 11:59PM March 10, 2021

fitting an appropriate lm and then using the predict function to verify.

mean(iris\$Petal.Length[iris\$Species == "versicolor"])

mean(iris\$Petal.Length[iris\$Species == "virginica"])

predict(mod, data.frame(Species = c("setosa")))

predict(mod, data.frame(Species = c("versicolor")))

predict(mod, data.frame(Species = c("virginica")))

Construct the design matrix with an intercept, X, without using model.matrix.

X <- cbind(1, iris\$Species == "versicolor", iris\$Species == "virginica" )</pre>

Verify this hat matrix is symmetric using the expect\_equal function in the package testthat.

Verify this hat matrix is idempotent using the expect\_equal function in the package testthat.

It turns out the trace of a hat matrix is the same as its rank! But we don't have time to prove these interesting and useful facts..

Using the hat matrix, compute the  $\hat{y}$  vector and using the projection onto the residual space, compute the e vector and verify they are orthogonal

mean(iris\$Petal.Length[iris\$Species == "setosa"])

mod = lm(Petal.Length ~ Species, iris)

data(iris)

## [1] 1.462

## [1] 4.26

## [1] 5.552

## 1.462

## 4.26

## 5.552

head(X)

## [1,] ## [2**,**] **##** [3,] ## [4,]

## [1] 3

#head(H)

## [1] FALSE

## attr(,"tol")

## [1] 3.330669e-14

pacman::p\_load(testthat)

expect\_equal(H, t(H))

expect\_equal(H, H%\*%H)

#trace same as the rank

y = iris\$Petal.Length

I = diag(nrow(iris))

[1,] -0.062[2,] -0.062[3,] -0.162[4,] 0.038 [5,] -0.062[6,] 0.238 [7,] -0.062[8,] 0.038 [9,] -0.062[10,] 0.038 [11,] 0.038

**##** [12,] 0.138 ## [13,] -0.062 ## [14,] -0.362 ## [15,] -0.262 **##** [16,] 0.038 ## [17,] -0.162 ## [18,] -0.062 **##** [19,] 0.238 **##** [20,] 0.038 **##** [21,] 0.238 **##** [22,] 0.038 ## [23,] -0.462 **##** [24,] 0.238 **##** [25,] 0.438 **##** [26,] 0.138 **##** [27,] 0.138 **##** [28,] 0.038 ## [29,] -0.062 **##** [30,] 0.138 **##** [31,] 0.138 **##** [32,] 0.038 ## [33,] 0.038 ## [34,] -0.062 **##** [35,] 0.038 ## [36,] -0.262 ## [37,] -0.162 ## [38,] -0.062 ## [39,] -0.162 **##** [40,] 0.038 ## [41,] -0.162 ## [42,] -0.162 ## [43,] -0.162 **##** [44,] 0.138 ## [45,] 0.438 ## [46,] -0.062 **##** [47,] 0.138 ## [48,] -0.062 **##** [49,] 0.038 ## [50,] -0.062 **##** [51,] 0.440 **##** [52,] 0.240 **##** [53,] 0.640 ## [54,] -0.260

**##** [71,] 0.540 ## [72,] -0.260 **##** [73,] 0.640 **##** [74,] 0.440 **##** [75,] 0.040 **##** [76,] 0.140 **##** [77,] 0.540 **##** [78,] 0.740 **##** [79,] 0.240 ## [80,] -0.760 ## [81,] -0.460 ## [82,] -0.560 ## [83,] -0.360 ## [84,] 0.840 ## [85,] 0.240 ## [86,] 0.240 **##** [87,] 0.440 ## [88,] 0.140 ## [89,] -0.160 ## [90,] -0.260 **##** [91,] 0.140 **##** [92,] 0.340 ## [93,] -0.260 ## [94,] -0.960 ## [95,] -0.060 ## [96,] -0.060 ## [97,] -0.060 ## [98,] 0.040 ## [99,] -1.260 ## [100,] -0.160 **##** [101,] 0.448 ## [102,] -0.452 **##** [103,] 0.348 **##** [104,] 0.048 **##** [105,] 0.248 **##** [106,] 1.048 ## [107,] -1.052 **##** [108,] 0.748 **##** [109,] 0.248 **##** [110,] 0.548 ## [111,] -0.452 ## [112,] -0.252 ## [113,] -0.052 ## [114,] -0.552 ## [115,] -0.452 ## [116,] -0.252 ## [117,] -0.052 **##** [118,] 1.148 **##** [119,] 1.348 ## [120,] -0.552 ## [121,] 0.148 ## [122,] -0.652 **##** [123,] 1.148 ## [124**,**] -0.652 ## [125,] 0.148 **##** [126,] 0.448 ## [127,] -0.752 ## [128,] -0.652 **##** [129,] 0.048 **##** [130,] 0.248 **##** [131,] 0.548 **##** [132,] 0.848 **##** [133,] 0.048 ## [134,] -0.452 **##** [135,] 0.048 **##** [136,] 0.548 **##** [137,] 0.048 ## [138,] -0.052 ## [139,] -0.752 ## [140,] -0.152 **##** [141,] 0.048 ## [142,] -0.452 ## [143,] -0.452 **##** [144,] 0.348 **##** [145,] 0.148 ## [146,] -0.352 ## [147,] -0.552 ## [148**,**] -0.352 ## [149,] -0.152 ## [150,] -0.452

[,1]

y\_hat = H %\*% y

e = (I-H) %\*% y

For masters students: create a matrix  $X_1$ .

sum(diag(H))

## [1] 3

#TO-DO

to each other.

Using the diag function, find the trace of the hat matrix.

1

[,1] [,2] [,3]

Find the hat matrix H for this regression.

H = X % % solve(t(X) % % X) % % t(X)

## [5,] 1 0 0 ## [6,] 1 0 0

Matrix::rankMatrix(H)

## attr(,"method") ## [1] "tolNorm2" ## attr(,"useGrad")

Load up the famous iris dataset. We are going to do a different prediction problem. Imagine the only input x is Species and you are trying to

predict y which is Petal.Length. A reasonable prediction is the average petal length within each Species. Prove that this is the OLS model by

**##** [55,] 0.340 **##** [56,] 0.240 **##** [57,] 0.440 ## [58,] -0.960 **##** [59,] 0.340 ## [60,] -0.360 ## [61,] -0.760 ## [62,] -0.060 ## [63,] -0.260 ## [64,] 0.440 ## [65,] -0.660 **##** [66,] 0.140 **##** [67,] 0.240 ## [68,] -0.160 **##** [69,] 0.240 ## [70,] -0.360

> Rsq = 1 - SSE/SST[,1]**##** [1,] 0.9413717  $SSR = t(y_hat - y_bar) %*% (y_hat - y_bar)$ [,1] **##** [1,] 437.1028 expect\_equal(SSR + SSE, SST) Find the angle  $\theta$  between  $y - \bar{y}1$  and  $\hat{y} - \bar{y}1$  and then verify that its cosine squared is the same as the  $R^2$  from the previous problem.

Project the *y* vector onto each column of the *X* matrix and test if the sum of these projections is the same as yhat.

Find the OLS estimates using this design matrix. It should be the sample averages of the petal lengths within species.

Project the *y* vector onto each column of the *X* matrix and test if the sum of these projections is the same as yhat.

Project the y vector onto each column of the Q matrix and test if the sum of these projections is the same as yhat.

proj1 = ((X[,1] %\*% t(X[,1])) / as.numeric(t(X[,1]) %\*% X[,1])) %\*% yproj2 = ((X[,2] %\*% t(X[,2])) / as.numeric(t(X[,2]) %\*% X[,2])) %\*% yproj3 = ((X[,3] %\*% t(X[,3])) / as.numeric(t(X[,3]) %\*% X[,3])) %\*% y

proj1 = ((Q[,1] %\*% t(Q[,1])) / as.numeric(t(Q[,1]) %\*% Q[,1])) %\*% yproj2 = ((Q[,2] %\*% t(Q[,2])) / as.numeric(t(Q[,2]) %\*% Q[,2])) %\*% yproj3 = ((Q[,3] %\*% t(Q[,3])) / as.numeric(t(Q[,3]) %\*% Q[,3])) %\*% y

X\_2 = cbind(as.integer(iris\$Species == "setosa"), as.integer(iris\$Species == "versicolor"), as.integer(iris\$Speci

Verify the hat matrix constructed from this design matrix is the same as the hat matrix constructed from the design matrix with the intercept.

X = cbind(as.integer(iris\$Species == "setosa"), as.integer(iris\$Species == "versicolor"), as.integer(iris\$Species

theta =  $acos(t(y - y_bar) %*% (y_hat - y_bar) / sqrt(SST * SSR))$ 

proj1 = (X[,1] %\*% t(X[,1]) / as.numeric(t(X[,1]) %\*% X[,1])) %\*% yproj2 = (X[,2] %\*% t(X[,2]) / as.numeric(t(X[,2]) %\*% X[,2])) %\*% yproj3 = (X[,3] %\*% t(X[,3]) / as.numeric(t(X[,3]) %\*% X[,3])) %\*% y

Construct the design matrix without an intercept, X, without using model.matrix.

Compute SST, SSR and SSE and  $R^2$  and then show that SST = SSR + SSE.

SSE = t(e) %\*% e

**##** [1,] 27.2226

 $y_bar = mean(y)$ 

## [1,] 464.3254

theta \* (180 / pi)

## [1,] 14.01245

es == "virginica"))

## [1,] 1 0 0

## [3,] 1 0 0

## [5,] 1 0 0 ## [6,] 1 0 0

y = iris\$Petal.Length

[,1]

y\_hat = H %\*% y

unique(y\_hat)

## [1,] 1.462 ## [2,] 2.798 ## [3,] 4.090

== "virginica"))

y\_hat = H %\*% y

Q = qr.Q(qr(X))

for X?

Q\_mod

expect\_equal(H\_new, H)

[,1] [,2] [,3]

1 0 0

 $H = X_2 % % solve(t(X_2) % % X) % % t(X_2)$ 

(Fact: orthogonal projection matrices are unique).

 $H = X_2 \% \% solve(t(X_2) \% \% X) \% \% t(X_2)$  $H_new = X % % solve(t(X) % % X) % % t(X)$ 

expect equal(proj1 + proj2 + proj3, y hat)

Convert this design matrix into Q, an orthonormal matrix.

expect\_equal(proj1 + proj2 + proj3, y\_hat)

 $Q_{mod} = lm(Petal.Length \sim 0 + Q, iris)$ 

and the one created with Q as its design matrix.

unique(predict(first mod, data.frame(X)))

unique(predict(second\_mod, data.frame(Q)))

first mod =  $lm(y \sim 0 + X)$ 

## [1] 1.462 4.260 5.552

second mod =  $lm(y \sim 0 + Q)$ 

matrix\_p\_add\_one

## [1,] 22.5328063

crim

## [3,] 22.4856281 -0.3520783 0.11610909

## [2,] 24.0331062 -0.4151903

## [14,] 0.009311683 -0.5247584

**##** [1] **1.462 1.462 4.260 5.552** 

colnames(X) = c("setosa", "versicolor", "virginica")

matrix\_p\_add\_one[i,1:i] = solve(t(X\_i) %\*% X\_i) %\*% t(X\_i) %\*% y

zn

NA

## [5,] 27.1128031 -0.2287981 0.05928665 -0.44032511 6.894059

## [4,] 27.3946468 -0.2486283 0.05850082 -0.41557782

indus

## [6,] 29.4899406 -0.2185190 0.05511047 -0.38348055 7.026223 -5.424659 ## [7,] -17.9546350 -0.1769135 0.02128135 -0.14365267 4.784684 -7.184892 ## [8,] -18.2649261 -0.1727607 0.01421402 -0.13089918 4.840730 -4.357411 ## [9,] 0.8274820 -0.1977868 0.06099257 -0.22573089 4.577598 -14.451531

NA

 $head(X_2)$ 

## [2**,**]

## [4,]

[,1]

[,1]

 $SST = t(y - y_bar) %*% (y - y_bar)$ 

[,1]

SSE

## Call: ## lm(formula = Petal.Length ~ 0 + Q, data = iris) ## Coefficients: Q1 Q2 ## -10.34 -30.12 -39.26

Use the predict function and ensure that the predicted values are the same for both linear models: the one created with X as its design matrix

Find the p=3 linear OLS estimates if Q is used as the design matrix using the 1m method. Is the OLS solution the same as the OLS solution

rm(list = ls())boston = MASS::Boston X = cbind(1, as.matrix(boston[,1:13])) y = boston[,14]p\_add\_one = ncol(X) matrix\_p\_add\_one = matrix(NA, nrow = p\_add\_one, ncol = p\_add\_one) colnames(matrix\_p\_add\_one) = c(colnames(boston[1:13]), "full OLS") for (i in 1:ncol(X)) {  $X_i = X[,1:i]$ 

chas

NA

nox

NA

NA

rm

NA

NA

NA

NA

Clear the workspace and load the boston housing data and extract X and y. The dimensions are n=506 and p=13. Create a matrix that is

regressed on the first column only and put that in the first entry. For the second row, find the OLS estimates of the y regressed on the first and

second and third columns of X only and put them in the first, second and third entries, etc. For the last row, fill it with the full OLS estimates.

second columns of X only and put them in the first and second entries. For the third row, find the OLS estimates of the y regressed on the first,

 $(p+1) \times (p+1)$  full of NA's. Label the columns the same columns as X. Do not label the rows. For the first row, find the OLS estimate of the y

## [10,] 0.1553915 -0.1780398 0.06095248 -0.21004328 4.536648 -13.342666 ## [11,] 2.9907868 -0.1795543 0.07145574 -0.10437742 4.110667 -12.591596 ## [12,] 27.1523679 -0.1840321 0.03909990 -0.04232450 3.487528 -22.182110 ## [13,] 20.6526280 -0.1599391 0.03887365 -0.02792186 3.216569 -20.484560 ## [14,] 36.4594884 -0.1080114 0.04642046 0.02055863 2.686734 -17.766611 dis age rad ptratio black **##** [1,] NANANA NA NA## [2,] **##** [3,] NANANANA ## [4,] NA NA NA NA NA**##** [5,] NA NA NA NA NA NANA **##** [6,] NANA NANA NA **##** [7,] 7.341586 NA NANA NA ## [8,] 7.386357 -0.0236248493 NA NA NA NA## [9,] 6.752352 -0.0556354540 -1.760312 NA NA## [10,] 6.791184 -0.0562612189 -1.748296 -0.04529059 NA## [11,] 6.664084 -0.0546675064 -1.727933 0.15926305 -0.01434060 ## [12,] 6.075744 -0.0451880522 -1.583852 0.25472196 -0.01221262 -0.9962062

Create a vector of length p + 1 and compute the R<sup>2</sup> values for each of the above models.  $Rsq\_vector = c(1:14)$ for (i in 1:ncol(X)) {  $mod = lm(y \sim X[, 1:i])$ Rsq\_vector[i] = summary(mod)\$r.squared Rsq\_vector

This is because as the amount of featurs goes up, the value of R^2 will increase (be more accurate).

## [13,] 6.123072 -0.0459320518 -1.554912 0.28157503 -0.01173838 -1.0142228 ## [14,] 3.809865 0.0006922246 -1.475567 0.30604948 -0.01233459 -0.9527472 lstat full OLS ## [1,] NANA **##** [2,] NA **##** [3,] NA ## [4,] NA **##** [5,] NA **##** [6,] NA **##** [7,] NA ## [8,] NA**##** [9,] NA **##** [10,] NA**##** [11,] NA **##** [12,] NA **##** [13,] 0.013620833

Why are the estimates changing from row to row as you add in more predictors? This is because each row is adding another feature which changes the estimates' value. ## [1] 0.0000000 0.1507805 0.2339884 0.2937136 0.3295277 0.3313127 0.5873770 ## [8] 0.5894902 0.6311488 0.6319479 0.6396628 0.6703141 0.6842043 0.7406427

Is R^2 monotonically increasing? Why?