# Assessing accuracy of the LSR line

Feb 13, 2025

Chris Cornwell



Assuming the data does have a linear relationship



Assuming the data does have a linear relationship

# **Underlying assumption**

Modeled points in a plane as being from a line, but with noise in the y-coordinate direction. In other words, we assumed an underlying relationship

$$y = mx + b + \varepsilon$$

for some m and b, and a random variable  $\varepsilon^1$  that has expected value 0. Alternatively, among the "entire population" there is an LSR line mx+b.

 $<sup>^{1}\</sup>varepsilon$  is called the error term.

# **Underlying assumption**

Modeled points in a plane as being from a line, but with noise in the y-coordinate direction. In other words, we assumed an underlying relationship

$$y = mx + b + \varepsilon$$

for some m and b, and a random variable  $\varepsilon^1$  that has expected value 0. Alternatively, among the "entire population" there is an LSR line mx+b.

Assumption:  $\varepsilon$  is independent of x.

When we have a data set  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ , from the population, our procedure determines an LSR line  $\hat{m}x + \hat{b}$ . However,  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  are not the slope and intercept for the population curve m and b.

 $<sup>^{1}\</sup>varepsilon$  is called the error term.

Simulate noisy linear data: make 30 points, using a standard deviation  $\sigma=0.5$ . We'll use slope -1.6 and intercept 0.8.

Simulate noisy linear data: make 30 points, using a standard deviation  $\sigma=0.5$ . We'll use slope -1.6 and intercept 0.8.

Simulate noisy linear data: make 30 points, using a standard deviation  $\sigma=0.5$ . We'll use slope -1.6 and intercept 0.8.

```
1  | x = np.random.uniform(0, 2, size=30)
2  |
3  | def simulate_data(x, std):
4  | return -1.6*x + 0.8 + np.random.normal(0, std, size=len(x))
5  | y = simulate_data(x, 0.5)
```

In groups, compute slope and intercept of the LSR line for a size 30 simulated data set; store  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  (in two lists). Iterate this 1000 times  $\rightarrow$  a list of 1000 slopes and intercepts.

Simulate noisy linear data: make 30 points, using a standard deviation  $\sigma=0.5$ . We'll use slope -1.6 and intercept 0.8.

```
1  x = np.random.uniform(0, 2, size=30)
2
3  def simulate_data(x, std):
4    return -1.6*x + 0.8 + np.random.normal(0, std, size=len(x))
5  y = simulate_data(x, 0.5)
```

In groups, compute slope and intercept of the LSR line for a size 30 simulated data set; store  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  (in two lists). Iterate this 1000 times  $\rightarrow$  a list of 1000 slopes and intercepts.

What is the mean of the slopes and of the intercepts?

# Sample statistic, relation to population statistic

This fundamental to statistics.

Say that a sample of 2000 people are selected from around the country and their height is measured. Mean of these 2000 heights: sample mean.

# Sample statistic, relation to population statistic

#### This fundamental to statistics.

- Say that a sample of 2000 people are selected from around the country and their height is measured. Mean of these 2000 heights: sample mean.
- Sample mean differs from the true mean height of the entire population of the country. (Perhaps, not by much.)
  - ▶ Weak Law of Large Numbers: if s random samples of 2000 people taken, and each sample mean calculated, as  $s \to \infty$ , mean of the sample means limits to population mean.

# Sample statistic, relation to population statistic

#### This fundamental to statistics.

- Say that a sample of 2000 people are selected from around the country and their height is measured. Mean of these 2000 heights: sample mean.
- Sample mean differs from the true mean height of the entire population of the country. (Perhaps, not by much.)
  - ▶ Weak Law of Large Numbers: if s random samples of 2000 people taken, and each sample mean calculated, as  $s \to \infty$ , mean of the sample means limits to population mean.
- Analogous thing happens with data from linear relationship with noise think of parameters  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  as sample statistics (like sample mean).

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

**Standard error (SE):** Suppose that for our error term  $\pmb{\varepsilon}$ , we have  $\mathrm{Var}(\pmb{\varepsilon}) = \pmb{\sigma}^2$ . Sample size: n.

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

**Standard error (SE):** Suppose that for our error term  $\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(oldsymbol{arepsilon}) = \sigma^2$$
. Sample size:  $n$ .

Using  $\bar{x}$  for the average of  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ ,

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{SE}(\hat{m})^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2};\\ \mathrm{SE}(\hat{b})^2 &= \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right). \end{split}$$

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

**Standard error (SE):** Suppose that for our error term  $\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(oldsymbol{arepsilon}) = \sigma^2$$
. Sample size:  $n$ .

Using  $\bar{x}$  for the average of  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ ,

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{SE}(\hat{m})^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}; \\ \mathrm{SE}(\hat{b})^2 &= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right). \end{split}$$

Roughly, these are the amount, on average, that  $\hat{m}$  (resp.  $\hat{b}$ ) differs from true slope m (resp. true intercept b).

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

**Standard error (SE):** Suppose that for our error term  $\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(oldsymbol{arepsilon}) = \sigma^2$$
. Sample size:  $n$ .

Using  $\bar{x}$  for the average of  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ ,

$$\begin{split} \text{SE}(\hat{m})^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}; \\ \text{SE}(\hat{b})^2 &= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right). \end{split}$$

Roughly, these are the amount, on average, that  $\hat{m}$  (resp.  $\hat{b}$ ) differs from true slope m (resp. true intercept b).

 $\sigma$  is unknown, but can estimate it with **residual standard error**:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = RSE^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n-2}.$$

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

Formulae:

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{SE}(\hat{\mathbf{m}})^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})^2}; \\ \mathrm{SE}(\hat{b})^2 &= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})^2} \right). \end{split}$$

Estimate:

$$\sigma^2 \approx \mathsf{RSE}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n-2}.$$

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ 95% of the time, these intervals contain m, b.

How close do we suspect  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to be to the "true" (population) slope and intercept?

Formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{SE}(\hat{m})^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}; \\ \mathrm{SE}(\hat{b})^2 &= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Estimate:

$$\sigma^2 \approx RSE^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n-2}.$$

Can get (roughly) 95% confidence interval<sup>2</sup> with  $\pm 2SE$ :

$$(\hat{m} - 2SE(\hat{m}), \hat{m} + 2SE(\hat{m}))$$

and

$$(\hat{b} - 2SE(\hat{b}), \hat{b} + 2SE(\hat{b})).$$

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ 95% of the time, these intervals contain m, b.