

Variable selection

STAT 401 - Statistical Methods for Research Workers

Jarad Niemi

Iowa State University

November 1, 2013

Why choose a subset of the explanatory variables?

1. Adjusting for a large set of explanatory variables
2. Fishing for explanation
3. Prediction

Reasons 1 and 3 have little to no interpretation of the resulting parameters and their significance. Yet, often, interpretation of all parameters is performed and importance is placed on the included explanatory variables. Great restraint should be exercised.

Model selection criteria

- Criteria for linear regression, i.e. the data are normal
 - R^2 : always increases as parameters are added
 - Adjusted R^2 : “generally favors models with too many variables”
 - F -test: statistical test for normal, nested models
 - Mallows's C_p : $(n - p)\hat{\sigma}^2 / \hat{\sigma}_{full}^2 + 2p - n$
- More general criteria
 - Akaike's information criterion (AIC): $n \log(\hat{\sigma}^2) + 2p$
 - Bayesian information criterion (BIC): $n \log(\hat{\sigma}^2) + \log(n)p$
 - Cross validation

Approach

- If the models can be enumerated,
choose a criterion and calculate it for all models
- If the models cannot be enumerated,
 1. choose a criterion and
 2. perform a stepwise variable selection procedure:
 - forward: start from null model and add explanatory variables
 - backward: start from full model and remove explanatory variables
 - stepwise: start from any model and use both forward and backward steps

AIC stepwise model selection in R

```
> step(lm(sat~log(takers)+income+years+public+expend+rank,d), direction="both")
```

```
Start:  AIC=327.8
```

```
sat ~ log(takers) + income + years + public + expend + rank
```

	Df	Sum of Sq	RSS	AIC
- public	1	25.0	26610	325.85
- income	1	47.0	26632	325.89
<none>			26585	327.80
- rank	1	1672.2	28257	328.85
- log(takers)	1	3589.6	30175	332.14
- years	1	4588.8	31174	333.77
- expend	1	6264.4	32850	336.38

```
Step:  AIC=325.85
```

```
sat ~ log(takers) + income + years + expend + rank
```

	Df	Sum of Sq	RSS	AIC
- income	1	26.6	26637	323.90
<none>			26610	325.85
- rank	1	1918.1	28528	327.33
+ public	1	25.0	26585	327.80
- log(takers)	1	4249.6	30860	331.26
- years	1	5452.8	32063	333.17
- expend	1	7430.3	34040	336.16

AIC stepwise model selection in R

Step: AIC=323.9

sat ~ log(takers) + years + expend + rank

	Df	Sum of Sq	RSS	AIC
<none>			26637	323.90
+ income	1	26.6	26610	325.85
+ public	1	4.6	26632	325.89
- rank	1	2225.4	28862	325.91
- log(takers)	1	5071.4	31708	330.62
- years	1	5743.5	32380	331.66
- expend	1	9065.8	35703	336.55

Call:

lm(formula = sat ~ log(takers) + years + expend + rank, data = d)

Coefficients:

(Intercept)	log(takers)	years	expend	rank
388.426	-38.015	17.857	2.423	4.004

Healthy skepticism

Data simulated from the following model:

$$Y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} N(\mu_i, 1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i = & 10X_{i,1} + 10X_{i,2} + 10X_{i,3} \\ & + X_{i,4} + X_{i,5} + X_{i,6} \\ & + 0.1X_{i,7} + 0.1X_{i,8} + 0.1X_{i,9} \end{aligned}$$

where $X_{i,j} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 200$ and $j = 1, \dots, 100$.

Simulated model

```
# Simulated model
set.seed(1)
p = 100
n = 200
b = c(10,10,10,1,1,1,.1,.1,.1, rep(0,91))
x = matrix(rnorm(n*p), n, p)
y = rnorm(n,x%%b)
d = data.frame(y=y,x=x)
mod = lm(y~.,d)
summary(mod)
mod.aic = step(mod)
mod.bic = step(mod, k=log(n))
```



```
> summary(mod.aic)
```

```
...
```

```
Coefficients:
```

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	0.18492	0.06404	2.888	0.004395	**
x.1	10.10298	0.06939	145.601	< 2e-16	***
x.2	10.04751	0.06394	157.142	< 2e-16	***
x.3	10.04937	0.06018	167.000	< 2e-16	***
x.4	0.94539	0.05740	16.469	< 2e-16	***
x.5	0.95183	0.05752	16.549	< 2e-16	***
x.6	1.06018	0.06335	16.735	< 2e-16	***
x.9	0.27968	0.05936	4.712	5.15e-06	***
x.16	-0.24460	0.05935	-4.121	5.92e-05	***
x.18	-0.14809	0.06648	-2.228	0.027241	*
x.19	0.13453	0.06275	2.144	0.033493	*
x.21	0.10957	0.06849	1.600	0.111505	
x.22	0.08906	0.06248	1.425	0.155893	
x.27	0.19548	0.06842	2.857	0.004819	**

```
... 31,32,34,35,38,40,44,45,49 are included ...
```

x.50	-0.13274	0.06931	-1.915	0.057178	.
x.61	0.10487	0.06581	1.594	0.112922	
x.68	0.14039	0.06764	2.076	0.039471	*
x.72	0.08631	0.06472	1.334	0.184134	
x.78	-0.10080	0.06324	-1.594	0.112849	
x.81	0.12723	0.06201	2.052	0.041749	*
x.84	0.23409	0.06506	3.598	0.000422	***
x.86	0.10954	0.06351	1.725	0.086446	.
x.90	-0.15650	0.06607	-2.369	0.018993	*
x.93	0.09983	0.05896	1.693	0.092263	.

```
Residual standard error: 0.8417 on 167 degrees of freedom
```

```
Multiple R-squared: 0.9981, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9977
```

```
F-statistic: 2745 on 32 and 167 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

```
> summary(mod.bic)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = y ~ x.1 + x.2 + x.3 + x.4 + x.5 + x.6 + x.9 + x.16 +  
    x.27 + x.84, data = d)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.5419	-0.5243	0.1222	0.6292	2.5151

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	0.14420	0.06673	2.161	0.031967 *
x.1	10.03241	0.07132	140.673	< 2e-16 ***
x.2	10.00679	0.06484	154.324	< 2e-16 ***
x.3	10.05523	0.06155	163.378	< 2e-16 ***
x.4	0.99144	0.06031	16.438	< 2e-16 ***
x.5	0.98504	0.06144	16.033	< 2e-16 ***
x.6	1.05357	0.06607	15.946	< 2e-16 ***
x.9	0.20230	0.06038	3.351	0.000974 ***
x.16	-0.15225	0.06108	-2.493	0.013543 *
x.27	0.18068	0.07120	2.538	0.011966 *
x.84	0.17341	0.06718	2.581	0.010598 *

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

Residual standard error: 0.9184 on 189 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9974, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9973

F-statistic: 7373 on 10 and 189 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Cross validation

- ① Randomly split the data into:
 - training
 - testing
- ② Use stepwise selection to find a model using the training data
- ③ Fit that model again on the testing data to obtain the final model

Approaches that improve on this basic idea:

- Leave-one-out cross-validation
- k -fold cross-validation

Cross validation

```
testing.indices = sample(n,n*.25)
training        = d[setdiff(1:200,testing.indices),]
testing         = d[testing.indices,]
mod             = lm(y~., training)
mod.training    = step(mod, k=log(nrow(training)))
keep           = as.numeric(gsub("[^0-9]", "", names(mod.training$coefficients)[-1]))
mod.testing     = step(lm(y~., testing[,c(1,1+keep)]), k=log(nrow(testing)))
```

Cross validation

```
> summary(mod.testing)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = y ~ x.1 + x.2 + x.3 + x.4 + x.5 + x.6 + x.16 + x.64,
    data = testing[, c(1, 1 + keep)])
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-1.8349	-0.5965	0.1962	0.6256	1.6548

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	0.2833	0.1301	2.177	0.0353 *
x.1	9.9088	0.1417	69.941	< 2e-16 ***
x.2	9.8353	0.1319	74.552	< 2e-16 ***
x.3	10.0542	0.1132	88.838	< 2e-16 ***
x.4	0.8640	0.1138	7.591	2.45e-09 ***
x.5	0.9291	0.1372	6.773	3.45e-08 ***
x.6	1.1560	0.1461	7.915	8.70e-10 ***
x.16	-0.2889	0.1141	-2.532	0.0153 *
x.64	0.3453	0.1277	2.705	0.0099 **

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

Residual standard error: 0.8621 on 41 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9975, Adjusted R-squared: 0.997

F-statistic: 2024 on 8 and 41 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Alternatives to variable selection

- Keep all models and calculate their posterior probability

$$p(M_j|D) = p(M_j) \frac{e^{-BIC_j}}{SUM}$$

where

$$SUM = \sum_{j=1}^J e^{-BIC_j}.$$

- Keep all variables, but shrink them toward zero
 - Lasso
 - Ridge regression
 - Elastic net