Special Case #1: h(Mi)=Mi i.e. SD[Yi] & Mi

Standard deviation of the response is proportional to the mean.

$$g'(\mu i) = \frac{1}{h(\mu i)} = \frac{1}{\mu i}$$

$$g(\mu s) = \log (\mu s)$$

Thus glyilz log(yi) is the response transformation that stabilizes this sort of non-constant variance

Special Case #2: h(µi) = Jµi i.e., Vor[yi] < µi varience of the response is proportional

to the mean  $g'(\mu_i) = \frac{1}{h(\mu_i)} = \frac{1}{J\mu_i}$ 

Thus gly: 1= Ty; is the response transformation that stabilizes this sort of non-constant variance.

Alternatively we could the more general class of transformations called the Box-Cox Transformations (aka, "power transformations"):

$$g(y_i) = \underbrace{y_i^{\lambda} - 1}_{\lambda} \quad \text{for } \lambda = 0$$

$$log(y_i) \quad \text{for } \lambda = 0$$

$$notional$$

\* all of the transformations we've discussed arise as special cases of this: · 1= = (squar root)

· 1= 0 (natural-leg)  $-\lambda = -1$  (reciprocal)

\* An optimal value of I can be found algorithmically by choosing the value that maximizes the likelihood corresponding to the model with the transformed response. The Box-Cox transformation is very effective, but if we core about interpretation then the log-transformation

is more appropriate. LP The issue is that B; is interpretted as the expected difference between

Interpreting this on the response scale is not possible in general. Hower when  $g(\cdot) = \log(\cdot)$ then we have

$$= D \quad \beta_j = E \left[ \log \left( \frac{y_i | x_j = x_{i-1}}{y_i | x_j = x_{i-1}} \right) \right]$$

i. ePi is interpretted as the expected multiplicative change in yi when xj is increased by I unit lall elected equal) Multicollinearity

A common issue in linear regression is when two or more explanatory variables are linearly related to one another leither exactly or approximately).
i.e. Given explanatory verialles  $x_1, x_2, x_3$ 

> $x_1 = a + b \times z$ or a, ≈atbxz

> > $x_1 \approx \alpha + bx_2 + cx_3$

This is the problem of multicollinearity. If the linear

X=a+bxz+cx3 or

relationship is exact, then the columns of X are linearly dependent and we cannot invert XTX (and hence estimate the B's). If the linear relationship is approximate, then the columns of X ar close to linearly dependent and the resulting problem is one of rariance inflation.

This is manifested by inflated Vor [Bi] when x; is in the model with other multicellear x's, vs. when these other x's are not in the model.