## Lab Report Ridgereg

Simon Jönsson, Fanny Karelius 2017-10-16

Here we instantiate the training and test data with the training data being 80% and test data being 20% of the data set.

We now fit the data to the models using linear regression and linear regression with forward selection on the covariates.

We evaluate the models with analyzing the RMSE and  $\mathbb{R}^2$  values.

linMod\$results\$RMSE

```
## [1] 54.07378
```

linFMod\$results\$RMSE

```
## [1] 57.07212 56.18481 54.11274
```

Analyzing the RMSE and the  $R^2$  of the models entails some information. Lower RMSE value would indicate a 'tighter fit' of the data and a higher  $R^2$  value indicates a measure of how well observed outcomes are replicated by the model, based on the proportion of total variation of outcomes explained by the model.

## [1] 10

```
## [1] 406.4993
We see from the code above that the best \lambda = 0.5 with the lowest RMSE of 1320.828.
# Acknowledgement to Eric Herwin and Albin Vasterlund
set.seed(theSeed)
fold_count <- 10
lambda <- seq(10,20,by=1)
fitControl <- caret::trainControl(method = "repeatedcv",
                                  number = fold_count,
                                   ## repeated ten times
                                  repeats = fold_count)
ridgeMod <- caret::train(form,</pre>
                         data = trainDat,
                         method = ridgeMod,
                         trControl = fitControl)
## Warning in nominalTrainWorkflow(x = x, y = y, wts = weights, info =
## trainInfo, : There were missing values in resampled performance measures.
ridgeMod
## 406 samples
## 13 predictor
## No pre-processing
## Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
## Summary of sample sizes: 366, 365, 364, 366, 366, 366, ...
## Resampling results across tuning parameters:
    lambda RMSE
##
                       Rsquared MAE
## 10
            410.1854 0.8887925 406.335
## 11
            410.1892 0.8887097 406.335
##
            410.1934 0.8886175 406.335
    12
##
    13
            410.1980 0.8885163 406.335
            410.2030 0.8884068 406.335
##
    14
##
            410.2084 0.8882895 406.335
    15
            410.2142 0.8881647 406.335
##
    16
##
     17
            410.2202 0.8880330 406.335
            410.2266 0.8878946 406.335
##
    18
## 19
            410.2333 0.8877500 406.335
## 20
            410.2402 0.8875995 406.335
##
## RMSE was used to select the optimal model using the smallest value.
## The final value used for the model was lambda = 10.
Last line says the best value for \lambda = 17. Which is the same as as we concluded above, though with different
RMSE. The interval for \lambda \in 10:20 is motivated by previous larger interval, but for output niceties we chose
to limit lambda.
lin <- list(RMSE = linMod$results$RMSE, RSquared = linMod$results$Rsquared)</pre>
linF <- list(RMSE = linFMod$results$RMSE[3], RSquared = linFMod$results$Rsquared[3])</pre>
ridgeM <- list(RMSE = ridgeMod$results$RMSE[7], RSquared = ridgeMod$results$Rsquared[7])</pre>
temp <- cbind(lin,linF,ridgeM)</pre>
colnames(temp) <- c("Lin. Reg", "Lin. Reg. F", "Ridge Reg.")</pre>
```

bestRMSE

## temp

## Lin. Reg Lin. Reg. F Ridge Reg. ## RMSE 54.07378 54.11274 410.2142 ## RSquared 0.8895151 0.8912715 0.8881647