Lab 5 Logistic Regression

1 Linear Discriminant Analysis

Now we will perform LDA on the Smarket data. In R, we fit an LDA model using the lda() function, which is part of the MASS library. Notice that the syntax for the lda() function is identical to that of lm(), and to that of glm() except for the absence of the family option. We fit the model using only the observations before 2005.

lda()

```
> library(MASS)
> lda.fit=lda(Direction~Lag1+Lag2,data=Smarket,subset=train)
> lda.fit
Call:
lda(Direction \sim Lag1 + Lag2, data = Smarket, subset = train)
Prior probabilities of groups:
Down Up
0.492 0.508
Group means:
      Lag1 Lag2
Down 0.0428 0.0339
Up -0.0395 -0.0313
Coefficients of linear discriminants:
Lag1 -0.642
Lag2 -0.514
> plot(lda.fit)
```

The LDA output indicates that $\hat{\pi}_1 = 0.492$ and $\hat{\pi}_2 = 0.508$; in other words, 49.2% of the training observations correspond to days during which the market went down. It also provides the group means; these are the average of each predictor within each class, and are used by LDA as estimates of μ_k . These suggest that there is a tendency for the previous 2 days' returns to be negative on days when the market increases, and a tendency for the previous days' returns to be positive on days when the market declines. The coefficients of linear discriminants output provides the linear combination of Lag1 and Lag2 that are used to form the LDA decision rule. In other words, these are the multipliers of the elements of X = x

$$\delta_k(x) = x^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \mu_k - \frac{1}{2} \mu_k^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \mu_k + \log \pi_k$$

If $-0.642 \times \text{Lag1} - 0.514 \times \text{Lag2}$ is large, then the LDA classifier will

predict a market increase, and if it is small, then the LDA classifier will predict a market decline. The plot() function produces plots of the *linear discriminants*, obtained by computing $-0.642 \times \text{Lag1} - 0.514 \times \text{Lag2}$ for each of the training observations.

The predict() function returns a list with three elements. The first element, class, contains LDA's predictions about the movement of the market. The second element, posterior, is a matrix whose kth column contains the posterior probability that the corresponding observation belongs to the kth class, computed from $\pi_k f_k(x)$

 $\Pr(Y = k | X = x) = \frac{\pi_k f_k(x)}{\sum_{l=1}^{K} \pi_l f_l(x)}.$

Finally, x contains the linear discriminants, described earlier.

```
> lda.pred=predict(lda.fit, Smarket.2005)
> names(lda.pred)
[1] "class" "posterior" "x"
```

The LDA and logistic regression predictions are almost identical.

Applying a 50% threshold to the posterior probabilities allows us to recreate the predictions contained in lda.pred\$class.

```
> sum(lda.pred$posterior[,1]>=.5)
[1] 70
> sum(lda.pred$posterior[,1]<.5)
[1] 182</pre>
```

Notice that the posterior probability output by the model corresponds to the probability that the market will *decrease*:

```
> lda.pred$posterior[1:20,1]
> lda.class[1:20]
```

If we wanted to use a posterior probability threshold other than 50% in order to make predictions, then we could easily do so. For instance, suppose that we wish to predict a market decrease only if we are very certain that the market will indeed decrease on that day—say, if the posterior probability is at least 90%.

```
> sum(lda.pred$posterior[,1]>.9)
[1] 0
```

No days in 2005 meet that threshold! In fact, the greatest posterior probability of decrease in all of 2005 was 52.02%.

2 Quadratic Discriminant Analysis

We will now fit a QDA model to the Smarket data. QDA is implemented in R using the qda() function, which is also part of the MASS library. The syntax is identical to that of lda().

qda()

The output contains the group means. But it does not contain the coefficients of the linear discriminants, because the QDA classifier involves a quadratic, rather than a linear, function of the predictors. The predict() function works in exactly the same fashion as for LDA.

Interestingly, the QDA predictions are accurate almost $60\,\%$ of the time, even though the 2005 data was not used to fit the model. This level of accuracy is quite impressive for stock market data, which is known to be quite hard to model accurately. This suggests that the quadratic form assumed by QDA may capture the true relationship more accurately than the linear forms assumed by LDA and logistic regression. However, we recommend evaluating this method's performance on a larger test set before betting that this approach will consistently beat the market!