Lecture 9

September 19, 2018

▶ In the last class, we started the study of hypothesis testing in linear regression under the assumption of normality.

In the last class, we started the study of hypothesis testing in linear regression under the assumption of normality. We assumed that $Y \sim N_n(X\beta, \sigma^2 I)$ (or equivalently that $e \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I)$.

- In the last class, we started the study of hypothesis testing in linear regression under the assumption of normality. We assumed that $Y \sim N_n(X\beta, \sigma^2 I)$ (or equivalently that $e \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I)$.
- ► Two consequences of the normality assumption are that $\hat{\beta} \sim N(\beta, \sigma^2(X^TX)^{-1})$ and that $RSS/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p-1}$.

- In the last class, we started the study of hypothesis testing in linear regression under the assumption of normality. We assumed that $Y \sim N_n(X\beta, \sigma^2 I)$ (or equivalently that $e \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I)$.
- ▶ Two consequences of the normality assumption are that $\hat{\beta} \sim N(\beta, \sigma^2(X^TX)^{-1})$ and that $RSS/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p-1}$.
- ▶ Moreover, $\hat{\beta}$ and *RSS* are statistically independent.

• We started by testing the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_i = 0$.

▶ We started by testing the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. We saw the t-test for testing this. The t-test is based on the statistic:

$$\frac{\hat{eta}_j}{s.e(\hat{eta}_j)}$$

which is distributed according to the t-distribution with n-p-1 degrees of freedom.

▶ We started by testing the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. We saw the t-test for testing this. The t-test is based on the statistic:

$$\frac{\hat{eta}_j}{s.e(\hat{eta}_j)}$$

which is distributed according to the t-distribution with n-p-1 degrees of freedom.

▶ The *p*-value for testing H_0 : $\beta_i = 0$ can then be got by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|t_{n-r}|>\left|\frac{\hat{eta}_j}{s.e(\hat{eta}_j)}
ight|
ight).$$

▶ We started by testing the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. We saw the t-test for testing this. The t-test is based on the statistic:

$$\frac{\hat{eta}_j}{s.e(\hat{eta}_j)}$$

which is distributed according to the t-distribution with n - p - 1 degrees of freedom.

▶ The *p*-value for testing $H_0: \beta_i = 0$ can then be got by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|t_{n-r}\right| > \left|\frac{\hat{\beta}_j}{s.e(\hat{\beta}_j)}\right|\right).$$

Note that when n - r is large, the *t*-distribution is almost the same as a standard normal distribution.

The p-value above is for the two-sided alternative $H_1: \beta_i \neq 0$.

The p-value above is for the two-sided alternative $H_1: \beta_j \neq 0$. If you want to test against one-sided alternatives $H_1: \beta_j > 0$ or $\beta_j < 0$, then just divide the above p-value by 2.

There is another way of testing the null hypothesis that $H_0: \beta_j = 0$.

There is another way of testing the null hypothesis that $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. This turns out to be identical to the *t*-test but can be generalized more easily to other tests.

- There is another way of testing the null hypothesis that $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. This turns out to be identical to the *t*-test but can be generalized more easily to other tests.
- ▶ The F-test for $H_0: \beta_j = 0$ is based on the following idea. The null hypothesis H_0 says that the explanatory variable x_j can be dropped from the linear model. Let us call this reduced model m.

- There is another way of testing the null hypothesis that $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. This turns out to be identical to the *t*-test but can be generalized more easily to other tests.
- ▶ The F-test for $H_0: \beta_j = 0$ is based on the following idea. The null hypothesis H_0 says that the explanatory variable x_j can be dropped from the linear model. Let us call this reduced model m.
- Also, let us call the original model M (this is the full model: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$).

- There is another way of testing the null hypothesis that $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. This turns out to be identical to the *t*-test but can be generalized more easily to other tests.
- The F-test for H_0 : $\beta_j = 0$ is based on the following idea. The null hypothesis H_0 says that the explanatory variable x_j can be dropped from the linear model. Let us call this reduced model m.
- Also, let us call the original model M (this is the full model: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$).
- ▶ The model *m* is a *submodel* of *M*.

▶ The following presents another natural test for H_0 . Let the Residual

▶ The following presents another natural test for H_0 . Let the Residual Sum of Squares in the model m be denoted by RSS(m) and let the RSS in the full model be RSS(M).

- ▶ The following presents another natural test for H_0 . Let the Residual Sum of Squares in the model m be denoted by RSS(m) and let the RSS in the full model be RSS(M).
- ▶ It is always true that $RSS(M) \leq RSS(m)$.

- ▶ The following presents another natural test for H_0 . Let the Residual Sum of Squares in the model m be denoted by RSS(m) and let the RSS in the full model be RSS(M).
- ▶ It is always true that $RSS(M) \leq RSS(m)$.
- Now if RSS(M) is much smaller than RSS(m), it means that the explanatory variable x_j contributes a lot to the regression and hence cannot be dropped i.e., we reject the null hypothesis H_0 .

- ▶ The following presents another natural test for H_0 . Let the Residual Sum of Squares in the model m be denoted by RSS(m) and let the RSS in the full model be RSS(M).
- ▶ It is always true that $RSS(M) \leq RSS(m)$.
- Now if RSS(M) is much smaller than RSS(m), it means that the explanatory variable x_j contributes a lot to the regression and hence cannot be dropped i.e., we reject the null hypothesis H_0 .
- ▶ On the other hand, if RSS(M) is only a little smaller than RSS(m), then x_j does not really contribute a lot in predicting y and hence can be dropped i.e., we do not reject H_0 .

▶ Therefore one can test H_0 via the test statistic:

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M)$$
.

▶ Therefore one can test H_0 via the test statistic:

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M)$$
.

We would reject the null hypothesis if this is large. How large?

▶ Therefore one can test H_0 via the test statistic:

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M)$$
.

- We would reject the null hypothesis if this is large. How large?
- ▶ To answer this, we need to look at the **null distribution** of RSS(m) RSS(M).

▶ Therefore one can test H_0 via the test statistic:

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M)$$
.

- We would reject the null hypothesis if this is large. How large?
- ➤ To answer this, we need to look at the **null distribution** of RSS(m) - RSS(M).
- ► We will show later today that

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_1^2$$

under the null hypothesis.

▶ Therefore one can test H_0 via the test statistic:

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M)$$
.

- We would reject the null hypothesis if this is large. How large?
- To answer this, we need to look at the null distribution of RSS(m) - RSS(M). whether use M or m to estimate
- ▶ We will show later today that sigma square?

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_1^2$$

under the null hypothesis.

Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by the square of the residual standard error:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n-p-1}$$
, independent of RSS(m)-RSS(M

This one is RSS(m)-RSS(M)

Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by the square of the residual standard error:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n-p-1},$$

to obtain the test statistic:

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by the square of the residual standard error:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n-p-1},$$

to obtain the test statistic:

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

The numerator and the denominator are independent (to be shown later). This independence will not hold if the denominator were RSS(m)/(n-p).

Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by the square of the residual standard error:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n-p-1},$$

to obtain the test statistic:

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

- ▶ The numerator and the denominator are independent (to be shown later). This independence will not hold if the denominator were RSS(m)/(n-p).
- ► Thus under the null hypothesis

$$\frac{RSS(m)-RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-m)}\sim F_{1,n-p-1}.$$

Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by the square of the residual standard error:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n - p - 1},$$

to obtain the test statistic:

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

- ▶ The numerator and the denominator are independent (to be shown later). This independence will not hold if the denominator were RSS(m)/(n-p).
- ► Thus under the null hypothesis

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-m)} \sim F_{1,n-p-1}.$$

p-value can therefore be got by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{1,n-p-1} > \frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}\right).$$

► This is the p-value for the two-sided alternative. For the one-sided alternative, divide by two.

Equivalence of These Two Tests

It turns out that these two tests for testing H_0 : $\beta_j = 0$ are equivalent in the sense that they give the same p-value.

Equivalence of These Two Tests

- It turns out that these two tests for testing H_0 : $\beta_j = 0$ are equivalent in the sense that they give the same p-value.
- ► This is because

$$\left(\frac{\hat{\beta}_j}{s.e(\hat{\beta}_j)}\right)^2 = \frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

This is not very difficult to prove but we shall skip its proof.

General Linear Hypothesis Testing via the F-test

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

which has p explanatory variables.

General Linear Hypothesis Testing via the F-test

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

which has p explanatory variables. Let r denote the rank of X in this full model.

General Linear Hypothesis Testing via the F-test

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

which has p explanatory variables. Let r denote the rank of X in this full model.

Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M.

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

which has p explanatory variables. Let r denote the rank of X in this full model.

Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

- Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:
 - 1. For the constraint $\beta_1 = 0$, the model m becomes: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

- Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:
 - 1. For the constraint $\beta_1 = 0$, the model m becomes: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 2. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, the model m becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

- Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:
 - 1. For the constraint $\beta_1 = 0$, the model m becomes: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 2. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, the model m becomes $v_i = \beta_0 + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 3. For $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$, the model m becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$.

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

- Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:
 - 1. For the constraint $\beta_1 = 0$, the model m becomes: $\mathbf{v}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_n \mathbf{x}_{in} + \mathbf{e}_i$.
 - 2. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, the model m becomes $v_i = \beta_0 + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 3. For $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$, the model m becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$.
 - 4. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, the model *m* becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(x_{i1} + x_{i2}) + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \dots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.

Let *M* denote the full regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$$

- Let m denote a sub-model of M that is obtained by a linear constraint on the parameter $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_p)$ of M. Examples include:
 - 1. For the constraint $\beta_1 = 0$, the model m becomes: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 2. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, the model m becomes $v_i = \beta_0 + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 3. For $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$, the model m becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$.
 - 4. For $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, the model *m* becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(x_{i1} + x_{i2}) + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.
 - 5. For $\beta_1 = 3$, the model *m* becomes $y_i = \beta_0 + 3x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + e_i$.

▶ How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?

- ▶ How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?
- This test can be carried out by noting that if RSS(m) RSS(M) is large, then m is not a good model for the data and we therefore reject H_0 .

- ► How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?
- ▶ This test can be carried out by noting that if RSS(m) RSS(M) is large, then m is not a good model for the data and we therefore reject H_0 . On the other hand, if RSS(m) RSS(M) is small, we do not reject H_0 .

- ► How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?
- ▶ This test can be carried out by noting that if RSS(m) RSS(M) is large, then m is not a good model for the data and we therefore reject H_0 . On the other hand, if RSS(m) RSS(M) is small, we do not reject H_0 .
- ▶ The test is therefore based on RSS(m) RSS(M).

- ► How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?
- ▶ This test can be carried out by noting that if RSS(m) RSS(M) is large, then m is not a good model for the data and we therefore reject H_0 . On the other hand, if RSS(m) RSS(M) is small, we do not reject H_0 .
- ▶ The test is therefore based on RSS(m) RSS(M).
- What is the distribution of this quantity under the null hypothesis?

- ► How do we test the hypothesis H_0 : m against H_1 : M?
- This test can be carried out by noting that if RSS(m) RSS(M) is large, then m is not a good model for the data and we therefore reject H_0 . On the other hand, if RSS(m) RSS(M) is small, we do not reject H_0 .
- ▶ The test is therefore based on RSS(m) RSS(M).
- What is the distribution of this quantity under the null hypothesis?
- We will show that

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{p-q}^2$$

where q is the number of explanatory variables in m and p is the number of explanatory variables in M. Let us now prove this fact.

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively.

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$ so that

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^{T}(H(M) - H(m))Y.$$

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$ so that

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^{T}(H(M) - H(m))Y.$$

▶ We need the null distribution of RSS(m) - RSS(M).

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$ so that

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^{T}(H(M) - H(m))Y.$$

▶ We need the null distribution of RSS(m) - RSS(M). So we shall assume that $Y = X(m)\beta(m) + e$ (where X(m) is the X-matrix in the model m). Why?

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$ so that

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^{T}(H(M) - H(m))Y.$$

We need the null distribution of RSS(m) - RSS(M). So we shall assume that $Y = X(m)\beta(m) + e$ (where X(m) is the X-matrix in the model m). Why? It is important to realize that H(m)X(m) = X(m) and also H(M)X(m) = X(m).

Let the hat matrices in the two models be denoted by H(m) and H(M) respectively. Write

$$RSS(m) = Y^{T}(I-H(m))Y$$
 and $RSS(M) = Y^{T}(I-H(M))Y$ so that

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^{T}(H(M) - H(m))Y.$$

We need the null distribution of RSS(m) - RSS(M). So we shall assume that $Y = X(m)\beta(m) + e$ (where X(m) is the X-matrix in the model m). Why? It is important to realize that H(m)X(m) = X(m) and also H(M)X(m) = X(m). So Plug in $Y = X(m)\beta(m) + e$

$$RSS(m) - RSS(M) = e^{T}(H(M) - H(m))e.$$

► H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. Prove it by taking square and see if we can get the same matrix

▶ H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. To see that H(M) - H(m) is idempotent notice that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^{2} = H(M) + H(m) - 2H(M)H(m).$$
 (1)

▶ H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. To see that H(M) - H(m) is idempotent notice that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^{2} = H(M) + H(m) - 2H(M)H(m).$$
 (1)

Now H(M)H(m) = H(m).

▶ H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. To see that H(M) - H(m) is idempotent notice that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^{2} = H(M) + H(m) - 2H(M)H(m).$$
 (1)

Now H(M)H(m) = H(m). To see this, it is enough to show that H(M)H(m)v = H(m)v for every vector v.

► H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. To see that H(M) - H(m) is idempotent notice that

Take transpose

$$(H(M) - H(m))^2 = H(M) + H(m) - 2H(M)H(m).$$
 (1)

- Now H(M)H(m) = H(m). To see this, it is enough to show that H(M)H(m)v = H(m)v for every vector v.
- Now recall that H(m)v denotes the projection of v onto the column space of X(m). And H(M)H(m)v projects H(m)v projects onto the column space of X(M) (which equals the original X matrix).

▶ H(M) - H(m) is a symmetric and idempotent $n \times n$ matrix of rank p - q. To see that H(M) - H(m) is idempotent notice that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^2 = H(M) + H(m) - 2H(M)H(m).$$
 (1)

Why $H(m)H(M) = H(m)^T$?

- Now H(M)H(m) = H(m). To see this, it is enough to show that H(M)H(m)v = H(m)v for every vector v.
- Now recall that H(m)v denotes the projection of v onto the column space of X(m). And H(M)H(m)v projects H(m)v projects onto the column space of X(M) (which equals the original X matrix).
- ▶ But because the column space of X(m) is contained in the column space of X(M), it follows that H(m)v is already contained in the column space of X(M). Thus its projection onto the column space of X(M) equals itself. So H(M)H(m)v = H(m)v.

▶ Because H(M)H(m) = H(m), it follows from (1) that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^2 = H(M) - H(m).$$

▶ Because H(M)H(m) = H(m), it follows from (1) that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^2 = H(M) - H(m).$$

► Therefore, under the null hypothesis

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{\sigma^2} = \left(\frac{e}{\sigma}\right)^T (H(M) - H(m)) \frac{e}{\sigma} \sim \chi_{p-q}^2.$$

▶ Because H(M)H(m) = H(m), it follows from (1) that

$$(H(M) - H(m))^2 = H(M) - H(m).$$

► Therefore, under the null hypothesis

trace(H(M)-H(m)) = rank of
it because symmetric and
idempotent

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{\sigma^2} = \left(\frac{e}{\sigma}\right)^T (H(M) - H(m)) \frac{e}{\sigma} \sim \chi_{p-q}^2.$$

▶ Since we do not know σ^2 , we estimate it by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(M)}{n-p-1},$$

to obtain the test statistic:

$$\frac{RSS(m) - RSS(M)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}$$

► The numerator and the denominator are independent because $RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^T(H(M) - H(m))Y$ and $RSS(M) = Y^T(I - H(M))Y$ and the product of the matrices

$$(H(M) - H(m)) (I - H(M)) = H(M) - H(M)^{2} - H(m) + H(m)H(M)$$

► The numerator and the denominator are independent because $RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^T(H(M) - H(m))Y$ and $RSS(M) = Y^T(I - H(M))Y$ and the product of the matrices

$$(H(M) - H(m))(I - H(M)) = H(M) - H(M)^{2} - H(m) + H(m)H(M)$$

► Thus under the null hypothesis

$$\frac{(RSS(m) - RSS(M))/(p-q)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)} \sim F_{p-q,n-p-1}.$$

▶ The numerator and the denominator are independent because $RSS(m) - RSS(M) = Y^T(H(M) - H(m))Y$ and $RSS(M) = Y^T(I - H(M))Y$ and the product of the matrices

$$(H(M) - H(m))(I - H(M)) = H(M) - H(M)^{2} - H(m) + H(m)H(M)$$

Thus under the null hypothesis

$$\frac{(RSS(m) - RSS(M))/(p-q)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)} \sim F_{p-q,n-p-1}.$$

p-value can therefore be got by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{p-q,n-p-1} > \frac{(RSS(m) - RSS(M))/(p-q)}{RSS(M)/(n-p-1)}\right).$$

If the null hypothesis can be written in terms of a single linear function of β , such as $H_0: \beta_1 + 5\beta_3 = 5$. Then it can also be tested via the *t*-test; using the statistic:

$$\frac{\hat{\beta}_1 + 5\hat{\beta}_3 - 5}{s.e(\hat{\beta}_1 + 5\hat{\beta}_3)}$$

which has the *t*-distribution with n-p-1 degrees of freedom under H_0 . This test and the corresponding F-test will have the same p-value.

▶ How do we test $H_0: \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$ against its complement?

- ► How do we test $H_0: \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$ against its complement?
- ▶ Just take m to be the model $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$.

- ► How do we test $H_0: \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$ against its complement?
- ▶ Just take m to be the model $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$. In this case, RSS(m) = TSS and q = 0 and RSS(M) = RSS.

- ▶ How do we test $H_0: \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$ against its complement?
- ▶ Just take m to be the model $y_i = \beta_0 + e_i$. In this case, RSS(m) = TSS and q = 0 and RSS(M) = RSS.
- ► Thus the *p*-value is

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{F_{p,n-p-1} > \frac{(TSS - RSS)/p}{RSS/(n-p-1)}\right\}.$$