

Nguyen Xuan Binh 887799 Theory Exercise Week 2

Exercise 2.3: Considering the data set with 3 observations

$$y_1 = (y_{11}, y_{12}) = (1, 2) \quad y_2 = (y_{21}, y_{22}) = (3, 4) \quad y_3 = (y_{31}, y_{32}) = (5, 6)$$

a) Since second variables are permuted, there are $3! = 6$ distinct permutations

b) The distinct permutations are

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 2) \\ (3, 4) \\ (5, 6) \end{array} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 2) \\ (3, 6) \\ (5, 4) \end{array} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 4) \\ (3, 2) \\ (5, 6) \end{array} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 4) \\ (3, 6) \\ (5, 2) \end{array} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 6) \\ (3, 2) \\ (5, 4) \end{array} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 6) \\ (3, 4) \\ (5, 2) \end{array} \right\} \end{array}$$

c) Form 5 bootstrap samples: We have $n = 3$ is the size of original data $\Rightarrow n_{\text{boot}} = 3$

Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 2) \\ (1, 2) \\ (5, 6) \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (3, 4) \\ (5, 6) \\ (5, 6) \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (3, 4) \\ (1, 2) \\ (5, 6) \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (5, 6) \\ (1, 2) \\ (1, 2) \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (3, 4) \\ (3, 4) \\ (3, 4) \end{array} \right\}$

d) Bootstrap samples should contain only the members in the permutation sets in (b)

\Rightarrow Possible bootstrap samples are 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7

Exercise 2.4: Consider the following models

$$y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 z + v \quad (5)$$

where we have n observations for variables x, y, z

a) $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_i^2$ ($\hat{\varepsilon}$ and \hat{v} are estimated residuals)

We have $y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x + \varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 \\ \alpha_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_n \end{bmatrix} = X\alpha + \varepsilon \quad (4)$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 z + v = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_1 & z_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_n & z_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_n \end{bmatrix} = X\beta + v \quad (5)$$

We have $SSE_4 \geq SSE_5 \Rightarrow$ Model 5 is more accurate than model 4

\Rightarrow The claim is true in the case statement (5) is accurate model where z parameter has non-zero correlation with y

b) $\hat{\alpha}_1$ is statistically significant (5% significant level) but $\hat{\beta}_1$ is not

For this claim to be true, the null hypothesis $\beta_1 = 0$ and the alternate hypothesis $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ must hold true. Rewrite the models:

$$y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_2 z + v \quad (5)$$

For both models to be true $\Rightarrow \alpha_1$ and $\beta_2 \neq 0 \Rightarrow x$ and z are linearly dependent

Indeed, in $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 z + v \quad (5)$, since x and z are linearly dependent, the x -component isn't necessary \Rightarrow This claim is true in the case x and z parameters are linearly dependent

c) $\hat{\alpha}_1$ is not statistically significant (5% significant level), but $\hat{\beta}_1$ is

Null hypothesis: $\alpha_1 = 0$ and alternate hypothesis: $\beta_1 \neq 0$. Rewrite the models

$$y = \alpha_0 + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 z + v \quad (5)$$

From (4), we see that y can be modeled without effects from x and z . However in (5), x and z explanatory variables are significant in modeling $y \Rightarrow$ contrary: this claim is not true in any situation

d) R^2 of model (4) $>$ R^2 of model (5)

We have $R^2_{(4)} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}$ $R^2_{(5)} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}$

$$R^2_{(4)} > R^2_{(5)} \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 < \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_i^2 \Rightarrow SSE_4 < SSE_5$$

\Rightarrow This claim is true when the sole variable x can predict y better than linear combination of x and z . \Rightarrow There may be multi collinearity in (5) of x and z that makes the model less accurate. However, if that's the case, then the null hypothesis $\beta_2 = 0$ is true for model (5)

\Rightarrow If z has non-zero correlation with y , then this statement is not true in any situation