sign up log in tour help

Mathematics Stack Exchange is a question and answer site for people studying math at any level and professionals in related fields. It's 100% free, no registration required.

Take the 2-minute tour

×

Prove SST = SSE + SSR

Prove

$$SST = SSE + SSR$$

I start with

$$SST = \Sigma (y_i - ar{y})^2 = \ldots = SSE + SSR + \Sigma 2(y_i - y_i^*)(y_i^* - ar{y})$$

and I don't know how to prove that $\Sigma 2(y_i - y_i^*)(y_i^* - \bar{y}) = 0$

a note on notation: the residuals e_i is $e_i = y_i - y_i^*$. A more common notation is \hat{y} .

(statistics) (regression)

edited Mar 12 '14 at 12:33

asked Mar 12 '14 at 12:07



What is y_i^* ? And I assume that \bar{y} is the average of the observations y_1,\ldots,y_n , but please write such things explicitly in your post. — Stefan Hansen Mar 12 '14 at 12:16

 y^* is my notation of the often used \hat{y} – jacob Mar 12 '14 at 12:26

In a nutshell, you have to use the fact that $\sum e_i=0$ and $\sum \hat{y}_ie_i=0$ (see lectures 3 and 6 at robots.ox.ac.uk/~fwood/w4315_fall2010/Lectures) – Brad S. Mar 15 '14 at 19:14

@BradS. Can't see on what slide# - jacob Mar 16 '14 at 12:57

@jacob Sorry, I should have been more specific. In lecture 3

(robots.ox.ac.uk/~fwood/w4315_fall2010/Lectures/lecture-3/...), he derives the equations for the parameter estimates in simple linear regression and then in lecture 6

(robots.ox.ac.uk/~fwood/w4315_fall2010/Lectures/lecture-6/...) he directly addresses SST = SSR + SSE . In essence, the two fact I mentioned in my previous comment fall out of the minimization he does on the very first (non-title) page of lecture 3. — Brad S. Mar 16 '14 at 16:22

2 Answers

The principle underlying least squares regression is that the sum of the squares of the errors is minimized. We can use calculus to find equations for the parameters β_0 and β_1 that minimize the sum of the squared errors.

Let
$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (e_i)^2 = \sum (y_i - \hat{y_i})^2 = \sum (y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i)^2$$

We want to find β_0 and β_1 that minimize the sum, S. We start by taking the partial derivative of S with respect to β_0 and setting it to zero.

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta_0} = \sum 2(y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i)^1 (-1) = 0$$

notice that this says,

$$egin{aligned} \sum \left(y_i - eta_0 - eta_1 x_i
ight) &= 0 \ &\sum \left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (eqn. \, 1)$$

Hence, the sum of the residuals is zero (as expected). Rearranging and solving for β_0 we arrive at.

$$\sum eta_0 = \sum y_i - eta_1 \sum x_i
onumber \ neta_0 = \sum y_i - eta_1 \sum x_i
onumber \ eta_0 = rac{1}{n} \sum y_i - eta_1 rac{1}{n} \sum x_i
onumber \ x_i$$

now taking the partial of S with respect to β_1 and setting it to zero we have,

$$rac{\partial S}{\partial eta_1} = \sum 2(y_i - eta_0 - eta_1 x_i)^1 (-x_i) = 0$$

and dividing through by -2 and rearranging we have,

$$\sum x_i \left(y_i - eta_0 - eta_1 x_i
ight) = 0$$
 $\sum x_i \left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) = 0$

but, again we know that $\hat{y_i}=\beta_0+\beta_1x_i$. Thus, $x_i=\frac{1}{\beta_1}(\hat{y_i}-\beta_0)=\frac{1}{\beta_1}\hat{y_i}-\frac{\beta_0}{\beta_1}$. Substituting this into the equation above gives the desired result.

$$\sum x_i \left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) = 0$$
 $\sum \left(rac{1}{eta_1}\hat{y_i} - rac{eta_0}{eta_1}
ight)\left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) = 0$ $rac{1}{eta_1}\sum \hat{y_i}\left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) - rac{eta_0}{eta_1}\sum \left(y_i - \hat{y_i}
ight) = 0$

Now, the second term is zero (by eqn. 1) and so, we arrive immediately at the desired result:

$$\sum \hat{y_i} \left(y_i - \hat{y_i} \right) = 0 \qquad (eqn. \, 2)$$

Now, let's use eqn. 1 and eqn. 2 to show that $\sum (\hat{y_i} - \bar{y_i}) (y_i - \hat{y_i}) = 0$ - which was your original question.

$$\sum \left(\hat{y_i} - \bar{y_i}\right)\left(y_i - \hat{y_i}\right) = \sum \hat{y_i}\left(y_i - \hat{y_i}\right) - \bar{y_i}\sum \left(y_i - \hat{y_i}\right) = 0$$

edited Mar 18 '14 at 16:07

answered Mar 17 '14 at 23:10 Brad S.

Thank you for a detailed answer! A small error: you say "with respect to β_1 and setting it to zero we have..." but you write β_0 in the partial. I stopped reading there since your answer was very long and the risk for small errors is big. Is the rest correct? — jacob Mar 18 '14 at 14:38

@jacob - good catch. I've corrected the typo. The rest is/was correct. - Brad S. Mar 18 '14 at 16:07

Perfect answer! - jacob Mar 18 '14 at 16:18

$$egin{aligned} 2 \sum (y_i - y_i^*)(y_i^* - ar{y}) \ &= 2 \sum [y_i(y_i^* - ar{y}) - y_i^*(y_i^* - ar{y})] \ &= 2 \sum Y e_i - 2 ar{Y} \sum e_i \ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

answered Mar 12 '14 at 17:14



I realised I do not get why y_i turns into a random variable Y. Also, how could y_i^* turn into the very same random variable Y? – jacob Mar 14 '14 at 19:35