Homework 4

Shuhei Kaneko

2022-11-02

```
library(tidyverse)
library(tidymodels)
library(MASS)
library(discrim)
```

Question 1

Check the dimension of training and testing data.

```
dim(titanic_train)
```

```
## [1] 712 12
dim(titanic_test)
```

```
## [1] 179 12
```

Question 2

```
titanic_folds <- vfold_cv(titanic_train, v = 10)
titanic_folds</pre>
```

```
## # 10-fold cross-validation
## # A tibble: 10 x 2
## splits id
## tist> <chr>
## 1 <split [640/72]> Fold01
## 2 <split [640/72]> Fold02
## 3 <split [641/71]> Fold03
```

```
## 4 <split [641/71]> Fold04
## 5 <split [641/71]> Fold05
## 6 <split [641/71]> Fold06
## 7 <split [641/71]> Fold07
## 8 <split [641/71]> Fold08
## 9 <split [641/71]> Fold09
## 10 <split [641/71]> Fold10
```

Question 3

In the previous question, the entire training data were randomly divided into 10 groups with equal size.

K-Hold cross validation: (K-1)/K of the sample will be used for training and the remained 1/K of the sample will be used for assessment.

If we simply fit and test its performance on the entire set, the resulting model would be overfitting the training data. By employing K-hold cross validation, we can discount the performance of the overfitted model.

If we did use the entire training set, this method would be called hold-out method.

Question 4

Recipe is identical with Homework 3

```
titanic_recipe <- recipe(survived ~ pclass + sex + age + sib_sp + parch + fare, data = titanic_train) %
  step_impute_linear(age) %>%
  step_dummy(all_nominal_predictors()) %>%
  step_interact(terms = ~ starts_with("sex"):fare) %>%
  step_interact(terms = ~ age:fare)
```

Set up the workflow

(i) Logistic regression

```
log_reg <- logistic_reg() %>%
  set_engine("glm") %>%
  set_mode("classification")

# Workflow
log_wkflow <- workflow() %>%
  add_model(log_reg) %>%
  add_recipe(titanic_recipe)
```

(ii) Linear discriminant analysis

```
# Engine
lda <- discrim_linear() %>%
  set_engine("MASS") %>%
  set_mode("classification")

# Workflow
lda_wkflow <- workflow() %>%
  add_model(lda) %>%
  add_recipe(titanic_recipe)
```

(iii) Quadratic discriminant analysis

```
# Engine
qda <- discrim_quad() %>%
```

```
set_engine("MASS") %>%
set_mode("classification")

# Workflow
qda_wkflow <- workflow() %>%
add_model(qda) %>%
add_recipe(titanic_recipe)
```

(Number of models) * (Number of Folds) = 3 * 10 = 30

We fit 30 models to the training data.

Question 5

```
tune_log <- tune_grid(object = log_wkflow,
    resamples = titanic_folds)

tune_lda <- tune_grid(object = lda_wkflow,
    resamples = titanic_folds)

tune_qda <- tune_grid(object = qda_wkflow,
    resamples = titanic_folds)

save(tune_log, tune_lda, tune_qda,
    file = "k_fold_cv.rda")

load(file = "k_fold_cv.rda")</pre>
```

Question 6

```
collect_metrics(tune_log)
## # A tibble: 2 x 6
##
    .metric .estimator mean
                                n std_err .config
    <chr>
            <chr>
                       <dbl> <int> <dbl> <chr>
                             10 0.0137 Preprocessor1_Model1
## 1 accuracy binary
                       0.812
                       0.849
                               10 0.0153 Preprocessor1_Model1
## 2 roc_auc binary
collect_metrics(tune_lda)
## # A tibble: 2 x 6
##
    .metric .estimator mean
                                n std_err .config
    <chr>
            <chr> <dbl> <int> <dbl> <chr>
## 1 accuracy binary
                       0.798 10 0.0136 Preprocessor1_Model1
## 2 roc_auc binary
                       0.849
                               10 0.0146 Preprocessor1_Model1
collect_metrics(tune_qda)
## # A tibble: 2 x 6
    .metric .estimator mean
                              n std_err .config
    <chr> <chr> <chr> <dbl> <int> <dbl> <chr>
                       0.785 10 0.0103 Preprocessor1_Model1
## 1 accuracy binary
## 2 roc_auc binary
                       0.832
                               10 0.0155 Preprocessor1_Model1
```

Logistic regression has the highest mean prediction accuracy. The standard error of the accuracy of logistic regression and LDA is pretty similar, while that of QDA is slightly lower.

It implies that QDA is superior in terms of the variance of prediction accuracy. However, compared to the difference of mean accuracy (between logistic and QDA), the difference in standard error is very tiny. Judging from the above observations, I decide that logistic regression is the best model in this case.

Question 7

```
log_fit_alltrain <- fit(log_wkflow, titanic_train)
log_acc <- augment(log_fit_alltrain, new_data = titanic_train) %>%
    accuracy(truth = survived, estimate = .pred_class)
log_acc
```

Question 8

```
pred_log_test <- predict(log_fit_alltrain, new_data = titanic_test, type = "prob")

log_test_acc <- augment(log_fit_alltrain, new_data = titanic_test) %>%
    accuracy(truth = survived, estimate = .pred_class)

log_test_acc
```

Question 9

OLS estimate of β can be derived by solving the following minimization problem:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \beta)^2$$

By taking first order derivative wrt β , we can derive that

$$\frac{1}{n} * \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i - \hat{\beta} = 0 \hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{n} * \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i = \bar{Y}$$

Question 10 Using the formula derived in the previous question, we can find

$$\hat{\beta}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{n-1} (Y_2 + Y_3 + \dots, Y_n) \hat{\beta}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n-1} (Y_1 + Y_3 + \dots, Y_n)$$

The covariance of the above two is:

$$Cov(\hat{\beta}^{(1)}, \hat{\beta}^{(2)}) = Cov(\frac{1}{n-1}(Y_2 + Y_3 + \dots, Y_n), \frac{1}{n-1}(Y_1 + Y_3 + \dots, Y_n))$$
$$= \frac{n-2}{(n-1)^2}\sigma^2$$