## Nested Model Comparison in General and Generalized Linear Models

Mark Andrews Psychology Department, Nottingham Trent University

mark.andrews@ntu.ac.uk

#### What are nested models

- Model  $M_0$  is nested in model  $M_1$  if the parameter space of  $M_0$  is a subset of the parameter space of  $M_1$ .
- ightharpoonup For example, if  $M_0$  is the following linear model:

for 
$$i \in 1...n$$
,  $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \varepsilon_i$ ,  $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,

its parameter space is  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\sigma^2$ .

▶ If  $M_1$  is the following linear model:

for 
$$i \in 1...n$$
,  $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \epsilon_i$ ,  $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,

its parameter space is  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ ,  $\sigma^2$ .

- Any set of values of  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\sigma^2$  in  $M_0$  is a point in the parameter space of  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ ,  $\sigma^2$  of  $M_1$  if we simply set  $\beta_2 = 0$ .
- ▶ In other words, we can make  $M_0$  with any given values of  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\sigma^2$  from  $M_1$  by setting  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\sigma^2$  in  $M_1$  to these same values and setting  $\beta_2 = 0$ .

- ▶ We can compare nested normal linear models using F tests.
- Assume  $M_0$  and  $M_1$  are normal linear models, with  $M_0$  nested in  $M_1$ .
- We calculate RSS<sub>0</sub> and RSS<sub>1</sub>, the residual sums of squares of  $M_0$  and  $M_1$ , respectively.
- ightharpoonup RSS<sub>0</sub> will be greater than or equal to RSS<sub>1</sub>.
- ► Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{proportional increase in error} &= \frac{\text{change in error (from } M_0 \text{ to } M_1)}{\text{minimal error}}, \\ &= \frac{\text{RSS}_0 - \text{RSS}_1}{\text{RSS}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

```
M1 <- lm(Fertility ~ Agriculture + Education + Catholic, data = M0 <- lm(Fertility ~ Agriculture + Education, data = swiss)

RSS_0 <- sum(residuals(M0)^2)
RSS_1 <- sum(residuals(M1)^2)

c(RSS_0, RSS_1)
#> [1] 3953.270 2567.884

(RSS_0 - RSS_1)/RSS_1
#> [1] 0.5395049
```

In other words,  $RSS_0$  is 1.54 greater than  $RSS_1$ .

► The F ratio is

$$\text{F} = \underbrace{\frac{RSS_0 - RSS_1}{RSS_1}}_{\text{effect size}} \times \underbrace{\frac{df_1}{df_0 - df_1}}_{\text{sample size}} \ = \frac{(RSS_0 - RSS_1)/(df_0 - df_1)}{RSS_1/df_1}.$$

where  $df_1$  is  $N - (K_1 + 1)$ , where  $K_1$  is number of (predictor; excluding intercept) coefficients in  $M_1$ .

```
df_0 <- MO$df.residual
df_1 <- M1$df.residual
c(df_0, df_1, df_0 - df_1, df_1/(df_0 - df_1))
#> [1] 44 43 1 43
```

```
RSS 0
#> [1] 3953.27
RSS_1
#> [1] 2567.884
RSS 0 - RSS 1
#> [1] 1385.386
df_0 - df_1
#> [1] 1
df 1
#> [1] 43
(RSS_0 - RSS_1)/(df_0 - df_1)
#> [1] 1385.386
RSS 1/df 1
#> [1] 59.71823
((RSS \ 0 - RSS_1)/(df_0 - df_1))/(RSS_1/df_1)
#> \[ 17 \ 23.19871
```

```
drop1(MO, scope = ~ Education + Agriculture, test = 'F')
#> Single term deletions
#>
#> Model:
#> Fertility ~ Agriculture + Education
           Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC F value Pr(>F)
#>
#> <none>
                          3953.3 214.31
#> Education 1 2329.85 6283.1 234.09 25.9312 7.105e-06 ***
#> Agriculture 1 61.97 4015.2 213.04 0.6897 0.4108
#> ---
#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ''
```

## $R^2$

▶ If we have two models,  $M_0$  and  $M_1$ , with  $M_0$  nested in  $M_1$ , and with residual sums of squares  $RSS_0$  and  $RSS_1$ , respectively, we can calculate:

proportional decrease in error 
$$= \frac{\text{change in error (from $M_0$ to $M_1$)}}{\text{error in $M_0$}},$$
 
$$= \frac{RSS_0 - RSS_1}{RSS_0},$$
 
$$= R^2$$

```
(RSS_0 - RSS_1) / RSS_0
#> [1] 0.3504405
```

▶ In other words, the reduction in error from  $M_0$  to  $M_1$  is 0.35 of the error of  $M_0$ .

# $R^2$ : The coefficient of determination

▶ It can be shown that

$$\underbrace{\sum_{\mathfrak{t}=1}^{n}(y_{\mathfrak{t}}-\bar{y})^{2}}_{TSS} = \underbrace{\sum_{\mathfrak{t}=1}^{n}(\hat{y}_{\mathfrak{t}}-\bar{y})^{2}}_{ESS} + \underbrace{\sum_{\mathfrak{t}=1}^{n}(y_{\mathfrak{t}}-\hat{y}_{\mathfrak{t}})^{2}}_{RSS},$$

where TSS is *total* sum of squares, ESS is *explained* sum of squares, and RSS is *residual* sum of squares.

► The coefficient of determination R<sup>2</sup> is defined as

$$\begin{split} R^2 &= \frac{\mathrm{ESS}}{\mathrm{TSS}} = \text{Proportion of variation that is explained,} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \end{split}$$

- ▶ If  $M_0$  is a *null* model, i.e. no predictors, then TSS = RSS<sub>0</sub>.
- ▶ It can be shown that

$$\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}_{\text{RSS}_0} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2}_{\text{RSS}_0 - \text{RSS}_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}_{\text{RSS}_1}.$$

ightharpoonup As such,  $R^2$  is defined as

$$R^2 = \frac{RSS_0 - RSS_1}{RSS_0} = 1 - \frac{RSS_1}{RSS_0},$$

or 1 minus the error of  $M_1$  relative to  $M_0$ .

## $R^2$

```
M_null <- lm(Fertility ~ 1, data = swiss)
RSS_null <- sum(residuals(M_null)^2)
RSS_0 / RSS_null
#> [1] 0.5507516
1 - RSS_0 / RSS_null
#> [1] 0.4492484
(RSS_null - RSS_0) / RSS_null
#> [1] 0.4492484
summary(M0)$r.squared
#> [1] 0.4492484
```

# Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>

- ▶ By explaining proportion of variance explained, R<sup>2</sup> is used a *goodness of fit* measure.
- ► However, R<sup>2</sup> will always grow with K, the number of predictors.
- ▶ R<sup>2</sup> can be *adjusted* to counteract the artificial effect of increasing numbers of predictors as follows:

$$R_{Adj}^2 = \underbrace{1 - \frac{RSS}{TSS}}_{R^2} \underbrace{\frac{n-1}{n-K-1}}_{penalty},$$

where n is sample size.

 $Arr R_{Adj}^2$  is not identical to the proportion of variance explained in the *sample*, but is an unbiased measured of the population  $R^2$ .

# Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>

```
n <- nrow(M0$model)
K <- length(coef(M0)) - 1 # no. of predictor coefs
penalty <- (n - 1)/(n - K - 1)
1 - (RSS_0 / RSS_null) * penalty
#> [1] 0.4242143
summary(M0)$adj.r.squared
#> [1] 0.4242143
```

## Deviance

▶ The *deviance* of a model is defined

 $-2\log\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ 

where  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  is the likelihood of the model using the mle estimates.

- ▶ The better the model fit, the *lower* the deviance.
- ► This can be seen as equivalent to RSS for generalized linear models.

#### Deviance

```
swiss_df <- mutate(swiss, y = Fertility > median(Fertility))
M1 <- glm(y ~ Agriculture + Education + Catholic,
          data = swiss df, family = binomial())
MO <- glm(y ~ Agriculture + Education, data = swiss df,
          family = binomial())
D 0 <- deviance(MO)
D 1 <- deviance(M1)
c(D_0, D_1)
#> [1] 54.37716 40.70328
(D 0 - D 1) / D 1 # prop. incr. error
#> [1] 0.3359405
(D_0 - D_1) / D_0 \# equiv to R^2?
#> [1] 0.2514637
```

## Model comparison with deviance

- Let us assume we have two models:  $M_1$  and  $M_0$  where  $M_0$  is nested in  $M_1$ .
- ▶ The deviance of  $M_0$  minus the deviance of the  $M_1$  is

$$\Delta_D = D_0 - D_1.$$

▶ Under the null hypothesis,  $\Delta_D$  is distributed as  $\chi^2$  with  $K_1 - K_0$  df, where  $K_1$  is the number of parameters in  $M_1$  and  $K_0$  is the number of parameters in  $M_0$ .

## Model comparison with deviance

```
K_0 <- length(coef(M0))</pre>
K 1 <- length(coef(M1))</pre>
pchisq(D_0 - D_1,
      df = K 1 - K 0,
      lower.tail = F)
#> [1] 0.0002174578
anova(MO, M1, test = 'Chisq')
#> Analysis of Deviance Table
#>
#> Model 1: y ~ Agriculture + Education
#> Model 2: y ~ Agriculture + Education + Catholic
#> Resid. Df Resid. Dev Df Deviance Pr(>Chi)
#> 1
       44 54.377
#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ''
```