

### Question 11.1

Using the crime data set `uscrime.txt` from Questions 8.2, 9.1, and 10.1, build a regression model using:

1. Stepwise regression
2. Lasso
3. Elastic net

For Parts 2 and 3, remember to scale the data first – otherwise, the regression coefficients will be on different scales and the constraint won't have the desired effect.

For Parts 2 and 3, use the `glmnet` function in R.

### Answer 11.1

# Clear global environment, load and preview dataset

```
> rm(list=ls())
> df1 <- read.table("/Users/.../uscrime.txt", header = T, stringsAsFactors = F)
> head(df1, 1)
  M So  Ed Po1 Po2  LF M.F Pop  NW  U1  U2 Wealth Ineq
1 15.1 1 9.1 5.8 5.6 0.51 95 33 30.1 0.108 4.1 3940 26.1
  Prob  Time Crime
1 0.084602 26.2011 791
```

# Perform stepwise regression on the full dataset using both AIC and BIC. The summary of AIC result suggests 8 predictors are used after stepwise selection, whereas the summary of BIC suggests only 6 predictors are used with the absence of variables 'M.F' and 'U1'. Given both models yield similar  $R^2$  values, model with BIC criterion seems to be more preferable with fewer factors.

```
> model1 <- lm(Crime~., data = df1)
> model2 <- step(model1, trace = F)
> model3 <- step(model1, k = log(47), trace = F)
> coefficients(model2)
(Intercept)      M      Ed      Po1      M.F
-6426.10102  93.32155 180.12011 102.65316 22.33975
      U1      U2      Ineq      Prob
-6086.63315 187.34512 61.33494 -3796.03183
> coefficients(model3)
(Intercept)      M      Ed      Po1      U2
-5040.50498 105.01957 196.47120 115.02419 89.36604
      Ineq      Prob
67.65322 -3801.83628
> summary(model2)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = Crime ~ M + Ed + Po1 + M.F + U1 + U2 + Ineq + Prob,
    data = df1)
```

Residuals:

```
   Min    1Q  Median    3Q   Max
-444.70 -111.07   3.03 122.15 483.30
```

Coefficients:

```
      Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -6426.10   1194.61 -5.379 4.04e-06 ***
M            93.32     33.50  2.786 0.00828 **
Ed           180.12     52.75  3.414 0.00153 **
Po1          102.65     15.52  6.613 8.26e-08 ***
M.F          22.34     13.60  1.642 0.10874
U1          -6086.63   3339.27 -1.823 0.07622 .
U2           187.35     72.48  2.585 0.01371 *
Ineq         61.33     13.96  4.394 8.63e-05 ***
Prob        -3796.03   1490.65 -2.547 0.01505 *
```

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 195.5 on 38 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.7888, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7444  
F-statistic: 17.74 on 8 and 38 DF, p-value: 1.159e-10

```
> summary(model3)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = Crime ~ M + Ed + Po1 + U2 + Ineq + Prob, data = df1)
```

Residuals:

```
      Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max
-470.68 -78.41 -19.68  133.12  556.23
```

Coefficients:

```
      Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -5040.50   899.84 -5.602 1.72e-06 ***
M            105.02     33.30  3.154 0.00305 **
Ed           196.47     44.75  4.390 8.07e-05 ***
Po1          115.02     13.75  8.363 2.56e-10 ***
U2           89.37     40.91  2.185 0.03483 *
Ineq         67.65     13.94  4.855 1.88e-05 ***
Prob        -3801.84   1528.10 -2.488 0.01711 *
```

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 200.7 on 40 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.7659, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7307  
F-statistic: 21.81 on 6 and 40 DF, p-value: 3.418e-11

## # Scale dataset to use for Lasso and Elastic net.

```
> scaled <-
cbind(as.data.frame(scale(df1[,1])),as.data.frame(df1[,2]),as.data.frame(scale(df1[,c(3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15)])),as.data.f
rame(df1[,16]))
> colnames(scaled) = colnames(df1)
> head(scaled,1)
      M So   Ed   Po1   Po2   LF   M.F
1 0.988693 1 -1.30851 -0.9085105 -0.8666988 -1.266746 -1.120605
      Pop   NW   U1   U2   Wealth   Ineq   Prob
1 -0.09500679 1.943739 0.695106 0.831368 -1.361609 1.679364 1.649763
      Time Crime
1 -0.05599367 791
> library(glmnet)
```

# Perform Lasso regression on scaled dataset with nfolds set to 5. Coefficients of the model4 result suggests variables 'Po2' 'LF' and 'Time' are insignificant, and thus the other 12 factors are used to fit model5.

```
> model4 <- cv.glmnet(x = as.matrix(scaled[, -16]), y = as.matrix(scaled$Crime), alpha = 1, nfolds = 5, type.measure = "mse", family = "gaussian")
```

```
> summary(model4)
```

```
      Length Class Mode
lambda    88  -none- numeric
cvm       88  -none- numeric
cvstd     88  -none- numeric
cvup      88  -none- numeric
cvlo      88  -none- numeric
nzzero    88  -none- numeric
call      7   -none- call
name      1   -none- character
glmnet.fit 12  elnet list
lambda.min 1   -none- numeric
lambda.1se 1   -none- numeric
```

```
> coefficients(model4, s = model4$lambda.min)
```

```
16 x 1 sparse Matrix of class "dgCMatrix"
```

```
      1
(Intercept) 891.752783
M           96.902732
So          39.163699
Ed          156.006320
Po1         299.188384
Po2         .
LF          .
M.F         55.288423
Pop         -5.980508
NW          9.834701
U1         -53.668780
U2          93.430232
Wealth      27.692490
Ineq        218.418342
Prob        -85.783159
Time        .
```

# Result from Lasso regression consists of 12 factors as opposed to stepwise AIC method with 8 factors  
Summary of the model5 suggests there are presence of variables whose p-value is well above .05 threshold, so model6 was built using significant variables in model5.

```
> model5 <- lm(Crime~M+So+Ed+Po1+M.F+Pop+NW+U1+U2+Wealth+Ineq+Prob, data = scaled)
```

```
> summary(model5)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = Crime ~ M + So + Ed + Po1 + M.F + Pop + NW + U1 +
    U2 + Wealth + Ineq + Prob, data = scaled)
```

Residuals:

```
      Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max
-434.18 -107.01  18.55  115.88  470.32
```

Coefficients:

```
      Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)  897.29      51.91  17.286 < 2e-16 ***
M           112.71      49.35   2.284  0.02876 *
```

So	22.89	125.35	0.183	0.85621
Ed	195.70	62.94	3.109	0.00378 **
Po1	293.18	64.99	4.511	7.32e-05 ***
M.F	48.92	48.12	1.017	0.31656
Pop	-33.25	45.63	-0.729	0.47113
NW	19.16	57.71	0.332	0.74195
U1	-89.76	65.68	-1.367	0.18069
U2	140.78	66.77	2.108	0.04245 *
Wealth	83.30	95.53	0.872	0.38932
Ineq	285.77	85.19	3.355	0.00196 **
Prob	-92.75	41.12	-2.255	0.03065 *

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 202.6 on 34 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.7971, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7255  
F-statistic: 11.13 on 12 and 34 DF, p-value: 1.52e-08

# Model6 is fitted using 6 factors. Summary of the model suggests all factors are significant with  $R^2$  value similar to previous models. Notice that the result from model6 is identical to the result in stepwise BIC method.

```
> model6 <- lm(Crime~M+Ed+Po1+U2+Ineq+Prob, data = scaled)
> summary(model6)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = Crime ~ M + Ed + Po1 + U2 + Ineq + Prob, data = scaled)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-470.68	-78.41	-19.68	133.12	556.23

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	905.09	29.27	30.918	< 2e-16 ***
M	131.98	41.85	3.154	0.00305 **
Ed	219.79	50.07	4.390	8.07e-05 ***
Po1	341.84	40.87	8.363	2.56e-10 ***
U2	75.47	34.55	2.185	0.03483 *
Ineq	269.91	55.60	4.855	1.88e-05 ***
Prob	-86.44	34.74	-2.488	0.01711 *

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 200.7 on 40 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.7659, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7307  
F-statistic: 21.81 on 6 and 40 DF, p-value: 3.418e-11

# Perform Elastic net on scaled dataset.

```
> r2=c()
> for (i in 0:100) {
+   model7 = cv.glmnet(x = as.matrix(scaled[,-16]), y = as.matrix(scaled$Crime), alpha = i/100, nfolds = 5, type.measure =
+ "mse", family = "gaussian")
+ m = which(model7$glmnet.fit$lambda == model7$lambda.min)
+ r2 = cbind(r2, model7$glmnet.fit$dev.ratio[m])
+ }
> r2
      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6]
```

```

[1,] 0.7743273 0.7084704 0.7559849 0.7388612 0.7378399 0.7633095
      [,7] [,8] [,9] [,10] [,11] [,12]
[1,] 0.7512885 0.7872388 0.721134 0.7616028 0.7781487 0.7701326
      [,13] [,14] [,15] [,16] [,17] [,18]
[1,] 0.7631761 0.7655552 0.7642482 0.754669 0.7677372 0.7720571
      [,19] [,20] [,21] [,22] [,23] [,24]
[1,] 0.770546 0.771746 0.8029381 0.7607435 0.7657714 0.7632132
      [,25] [,26] [,27] [,28] [,29] [,30]
[1,] 0.7453186 0.7521779 0.7105853 0.7634324 0.7887367 0.7391919
      [,31] [,32] [,33] [,34] [,35] [,36]
[1,] 0.7906996 0.7789005 0.7592952 0.6787222 0.7928193 0.7810653
      [,37] [,38] [,39] [,40] [,41] [,42]
[1,] 0.7623499 0.7935228 0.7824468 0.7939137 0.7871829 0.7915803
      [,43] [,44] [,45] [,46] [,47] [,48]
[1,] 0.7790571 0.7936687 0.7307044 0.7524547 0.788943 0.7536114
      [,49] [,50] [,51] [,52] [,53] [,54]
[1,] 0.7333959 0.760309 0.6974056 0.7612808 0.7665051 0.7508373
      [,55] [,56] [,57] [,58] [,59] [,60]
[1,] 0.7749513 0.7811466 0.7949608 0.7303755 0.7763342 0.7823801
      [,61] [,62] [,63] [,64] [,65] [,66]
[1,] 0.7870555 0.7930278 0.748668 0.7874556 0.7932021 0.6810646
      [,67] [,68] [,69] [,70] [,71] [,72]
[1,] 0.7184253 0.7906718 0.7358419 0.7908232 0.7882172 0.7793365
      [,73] [,74] [,75] [,76] [,77] [,78]
[1,] 0.7920349 0.7884898 0.8030258 0.7954808 0.7771676 0.7701247
      [,79] [,80] [,81] [,82] [,83] [,84]
[1,] 0.7774003 0.7775113 0.7890336 0.7939008 0.7613226 0.7416594
      [,85] [,86] [,87] [,88] [,89] [,90]
[1,] 0.7559768 0.778112 0.749483 0.7071762 0.7669546 0.7784631
      [,91] [,92] [,93] [,94] [,95] [,96]
[1,] 0.7896392 0.728912 0.7674452 0.646746 0.7936412 0.6967131
      [,97] [,98] [,99] [,100] [,101]
[1,] 0.7577722 0.7104765 0.7955081 0.7900626 0.7682853
> alpha = (which.max(r2)-1)/100
> alpha
[1] 0.74

```

# Result of the Elastic net model yielded 12 predictors which is identical to Lasso (12) but opposed to stepwise (8). Noting that the summary of the model still shows factors whose p-value is greater than .05 threshold. After removing these factors, the result would be identical to the result in previous model6 and stepwise BIC. Both elastic net and Lasso model has R<sup>2</sup> value of .7971, whereas stepwise AIC model has R<sup>2</sup> value of .7888. Given that the R<sup>2</sup> value for three models are similar, and stepwise model uses fewer factors for prediction, therefore stepwise model seems to perform better in the given dataset.

```

> model8 <- cv.glmnet(x=as.matrix(scaled[,-16]), y=as.matrix(scaled$Crime), alpha = alpha, nfolds = 5, type.measure = "mse",
family = "gaussian")

```

```

> coefficients(model8, s=model8$lambda.min)
16 x 1 sparse Matrix of class "dgCMatrix"

```

```

1
(Intercept) 892.17530
M          99.63993
So         37.92256
Ed         164.15544
Po1        292.56919
Po2         .
LF          .
M.F         56.02197
Pop        -11.77770
NW          14.97051

```

```

U1      -64.48262
U2      106.18145
Wealth   42.93804
Ineq     230.00920
Prob     -88.45140
Time     .
> model9 <- lm(Crime ~ M+So+Ed+Po1+M.F+Pop+NW+U1+U2+Wealth+Ineq+Prob, data = scaled)
> summary(model9)

```

Call:

```

lm(formula = Crime ~ M + So + Ed + Po1 + M.F + Pop + NW + U1 +
    U2 + Wealth + Ineq + Prob, data = scaled)

```

Residuals:

```

      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-434.18 -107.01  18.55  115.88  470.32

```

Coefficients:

```

              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)  897.29      51.91  17.286 < 2e-16 ***
M             112.71      49.35   2.284  0.02876 *
So            22.89     125.35   0.183  0.85621
Ed           195.70      62.94   3.109  0.00378 **
Po1          293.18      64.99   4.511  7.32e-05 ***
M.F           48.92      48.12   1.017  0.31656
Pop          -33.25      45.63  -0.729  0.47113
NW            19.16      57.71   0.332  0.74195
U1           -89.76      65.68  -1.367  0.18069
U2           140.78      66.77   2.108  0.04245 *
Wealth        83.30      95.53   0.872  0.38932
Ineq         285.77      85.19   3.355  0.00196 **
Prob         -92.75      41.12  -2.255  0.03065 *

```

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 202.6 on 34 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.7971, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7255  
F-statistic: 11.13 on 12 and 34 DF, p-value: 1.52e-08