

Basic Stats

Bill Last Updated:

18 March, 2020

Contents

Preface: Motivation	1
1 443	3
1.1 Some basic concepts	3
1.2 Discrete Random Variables	4
1.3 Continuous Random Variables	4
1.4 Large Sample Theory	5
2 556	9
2.1 Statistics and Sampling Distributions	9
2.2 Point Estimation	12
2.3 Sufficient and completeness	18
3 Logit and Probit	19
3.1 Logit	19
3.2 Probit	21
4 Normal distribution	25
4.1 Basics	25
4.2 Confidence intervals for normal distributions	26
4.3 Percentile	26

5	MLE	29
5.1	Basic idea of MLE	29
5.2	Coin flip example, probit, and logit	30
5.3	Further on logit	32
5.4	References	33
6	Score, Gradient and Jacobian	35
6.1	Score	35
6.2	Fisher scoring	36
6.3	Gradient and Jacobian	36
6.4	Hessian and Fisher Information	37
7	Canonical link function	39
8	Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)	41
8.1	Taylor series	43
8.2	References	43
9	Cholesky decomposition	45
9.1	Example 1	45
9.2	Example 2	46
9.3	Example 3	48

Preface: Motivation

All the notes I have done here are about basic stats. While I have tried my best, probably there are still some typos and errors. Please feel free to let me know in case you find one. Thank you!

Chapter 1

443

1.1 Some basic concepts

1.1.1 Permutation

An ordered arrangement of a set of objects is known as a permutation.

e.g., The number of permutations of n distinguishable objects is $n!$. e.g., The number of permutations of n distinct objects taken r at a time is

$${}_nP_r = \frac{n!}{(n-r)!}$$

1.1.2 Combinations

If the order of the objects is not important, then one may simply be interested in the number of combinations.

$$\binom{n}{r} = \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$$

1.1.3 Partitioning

The number of ways of partitioning a set of n objects into k cells with r_1 objects into the first cell, r_2 in the second cell, and so forth is

$$\frac{n!}{r_1!r_2!\dots r_k!}$$

1.2 Discrete Random Variables

1.2.1 Binomial

$$X \sim \text{BIN}(n, p)$$

$$\binom{n}{x} P^x (1 - P)^{n-x}$$

mean: np

variance: npq

(Note that, Bernoulli is written as $\text{BIN}(1, p)$)

1.2.2 Poisson

$$X \sim \text{POI}(\mu)$$

$$\frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^x}{x!}$$

mean: μ

variance: μ

1.3 Continuous Random Variables

1.3.1 Uniform

$$X \sim \text{UNIF}(a, b)$$

$$\frac{1}{b - a}$$

Mean: $\frac{a+b}{2}$

Variance: $\frac{(b-a)^2}{12}$

1.3.2 Exponential

$$X \sim EXP(\theta)$$

$$\frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$$

Mean: θ

Variance: θ^2

1.3.3 Normal

$$X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2}$$

Mean: μ

Variance: σ^2

1.4 Large Sample Theory

1.4.1 Convergence in distribution

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_large_numbers

$$\bar{X} \rightarrow \mu \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

$$Var(\bar{X}) = Var\left(\frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} Var(X_1 + \dots + X_n) = \frac{n\sigma^2}{n^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

1.4.2 Weak law

There are two different versions of the Law of Large Numbers: Strong law of large numbers and Weak law of large numbers.

The weak law of large numbers: The sample average converges in probability towards the expected value.

$$\bar{X}_n \xrightarrow{p} \mu \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

This, for any positive number ϵ

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(|\bar{X}_n - \mu| > \epsilon) = 0$$

1.4.3 Strong law

$$\bar{X}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mu \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

This is,

$$\Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{X}_n = \mu) = 1$$

1.4.4 Central limit theorem

If X_1, \dots, X_n is a random sample from a distribution with mean μ and variance $\sigma^2 < \infty$, then the limiting distribution of

$$Z_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - n\mu}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}$$

is the standard normal, $Z_n \xrightarrow{d} Z \sim N(0, 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

1.4.4.1 Bernoulli law of large number

\hat{p}_n converges stochastically to p as n approaches infinity. For example, if a coin is tossed repeatedly, and $A = \{H\}$, then the successive relative frequencies of A correspond to a sequence of random variables that will converge stochastically to $p = 1/2$.

1.4.4.2 Normal approximation to Binomial

$$Z_n = \frac{Y_n - np}{\sqrt{npq}} \xrightarrow{d} Z \sim N(0, 1)$$

Example: The probability that a basketball player hits a shot is $p = 0.5$. If he takes 20 shots, what is the probability that he hits at least 9?

$$\begin{aligned}
P[Y_{20} \geq 9] &= 1 - P[Y_{20} < 8] \\
&= 1 - \sum_{y=0}^8 \binom{20}{y} 0.5^y 0.5^{20-y} \\
&= 0.7483
\end{aligned}$$

A normal approximation is

$$\begin{aligned}
P[Y_{20} \geq 9] &= 1 - P[Y_{20} < 8] \\
&= 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{8 - 10}{\sqrt{5}}\right) \\
&= 0.8133
\end{aligned}$$

1.4.4.3 Normal approximation to Poisson

$$\begin{aligned}
P[10 \leq Y_{20} \leq 30] &= P[Y_{20} \leq 30] - P[Y_{20} \leq 10] \\
&= \Phi\left[\frac{30.5 - 20}{\sqrt{20}}\right] - \Phi\left[\frac{9.5 - 20}{\sqrt{20}}\right] \\
&= 0.981
\end{aligned}$$

1.4.5 Poisson approximation to binomial

We know that the mean for binomial is

$$\mu = np \rightarrow p = \frac{\mu}{n}$$

The moment generating function for Binomial is

$$\begin{aligned}
M_n(t) &= (1 - p + pe^t)^n = \left(1 + \frac{\mu(e^t - 1)}{n}\right)^n \\
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n(t) &= e^{\mu(e^t - 1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the MGF for Poisson is as follows.

$$POI(\lambda) : e^{\lambda(e^t - 1)}$$

Thus,

$$Y_n \rightarrow Y \sim POI(\mu)$$

Chapter 2

556

2.1 Statistics and Sampling Distributions

2.1.1 Statistics

2.1.1.1 Definition of Statistic

P.264

A function of observable random variables, $T = t(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, which does not depend on any unknown parameters is called statistic.

For example, let X_1, \dots, X_n represent a random sample from a population with *pdf* $f(x)$. The sample mean provides an example of a statistic with the function

$$t(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1 + \dots + x_n)/n$$

This statistic usually is denoted by

$$\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i}{n}$$

When a random sample is observed, the value of \bar{X} , computed from the data, usually is denoted by lower case \bar{x} .

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{n}$$

2.1.1.2 Sample and parameters

P.265

If X_1, \dots, X_n denotes a random sample from $f(x)$ with $E(X) = \mu$ and $var(X) = \sigma^2$, then

$$E(\bar{X}) = \mu$$

$$Var(\bar{X}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

For example, a random sample of size n from a Bernoulli distribution $X_i \sim BIN(1, p)$. We know Bernoulli has $\mu = p$ and $\sigma^2 = pq$. In this case, the sample mean is

$$\bar{X} = Y/n = \hat{p}$$

Thus,

$$E(\hat{p}) = p$$

$$Var(\hat{p}) = \frac{pq}{n}$$

Thus, sample mean is the unbiased estimate for the population mean. However, you can not use sample mean's variance to estimate population variance. That lead to definition of sample variance.

P.266

Sample variance:

$$S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$$

$$E(S^2) = \sigma^2$$

2.1.2 $\chi^2, t, F, \text{beta}$ **2.1.2.1** χ^2

Always square from standard normal, and the standardization can be using μ or \bar{X} .

$$\frac{(n-1)S_n^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2(n-1)$$

(Thus, we can see this is a bit weird, as the numerator is \bar{X} is from the sample, whereas σ^2 is from the population.)

Thus, we can

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2(n-1)$$

(You can compare \bar{X} with μ , we can see the only difference is that the χ^2 has one less degree of freedom because we use this degree of freedom to calculate the mean.)

For the mean and variance of χ^2 :

Assume that

$$X \sim \chi^2(v)$$

$$\text{mean} : v$$

$$\text{variance} : 2v$$

2.1.2.2 t

Definition

$$t(k) = \frac{N(0,1)}{\sqrt{\frac{\chi^2(k)}{k}}}$$

Property 1

t distribution is symmetrical

Given that t distribution is symmetrical, we can get

$$H(-c) = 1 - H(c)$$

Property 2

t distribution has heavier tails than the normal.

My note: t distribution only has a parameter of k , which is determined by the χ^2 's degree of freedom. Of course, χ^2 also only has one parameter, namely the degree of freedom.

2.1.2.3 F

If $V_1 \sim \chi^2(v_1)$ and $V_2 \sim \chi^2(v_2)$ are independent, then the random variable

$$\frac{V_1/v_1}{V_2/v_2} \sim F(v_1, v_2)$$

2.1.2.4 Beta

If $X \sim F(v_1, v_2)$

$$Y = \frac{(v_1/v_2)X}{1 + (v_1/v_2)X} \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$$

2.1.3 Large-sample approximations

P.280

If $Y_v \sim \chi^2(v)$, then

$$Z_v = \frac{Y_v - v}{\sqrt{2v}} \xrightarrow{d} Z \sim N(0, 1)$$

(The proof is based on CLT.)

2.2 Point Estimation**2.2.1 Method of moments estimators****2.2.1.1 Definition**

The joint MGF of (X_1, \dots, X_n) is defined as $M(t_1, \dots, t_n) = E(e^{\sum_{i=1}^n t_i X_i})$

When X_1, \dots, X_n are independent if and only if

$$M(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n M_{X_i}(t_i)$$

where $M_{X_i}(t_i)$ is the MGF of X_i

2.2.1.2 Well-known MGF

- (1) Bernoulli with success probability p : $1 - p + pe^t$
- (2) Binomial $\text{Bin}(n, p)$: $(1 - p + pe^t)^n$
- (3) Poisson $\text{POI}(\lambda)$: $e^{\lambda(e^t - 1)}$
- (4) Normal $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$: $e^{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t^2}$
- (5) Gamma $\text{GAM}(\theta, k)$: $(1 - \theta t)^{-k}$

Two special cases:

- (6) Chi-square $\chi^2(v) = \text{GAM}(2, \frac{v}{2})$: $(1 - 2t)^{-\frac{v}{2}}$
- (7) Exponential $\text{EXP}(\theta) = \text{GAM}(\theta, 1)$: $(1 - \theta t)^{-1}$

2.2.2 least squares estimators

2.2.3 likelihood function and maximum likelihood estimators

2.2.3.1 Likelihood function

P.293

The joint density function of n random variables X_1, \dots, X_n evaluated at x_1, \dots, x_n , say $f(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta)$, is referred to as a *likelihood function*.

2.2.3.2 Maximum likelihood estimators

P.294

Let $L(\theta) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta)$, $\theta \in \Omega$, be the joint pdf of X_1, \dots, X_n . For a given set of observations, (x_1, \dots, x_n) , a value $\hat{\theta}$ in Ω at which $L(\theta)$ is a maximum is called a *maximum likelihood estimate (MLE)* of θ . That is $\hat{\theta}$ is a value of θ that satisfies

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta) = \text{MAX}_{\theta \in \Omega} f(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta)$$

2.2.4 Invariance property of MLEs

p296

If $\hat{\theta}$ is the MLE of θ and if $u(\theta)$ is a function of θ , then $u(\hat{\theta})$ is an MLE of $u(\theta)$.

For instance ,

We know that the *pdf* of exponential distribution ($X \sim EXP(\theta)$) is as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\theta} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}$$

Thus, its likelihood function is as follows

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} e^{-\frac{\sum x_i}{\theta}}$$

Thus, log-likelihood is as follows.

$$\ln L(\theta) = -n \ln(\theta) - \frac{\sum X_i}{\theta}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \ln L(\theta) = -n \frac{1}{\theta} + \frac{\sum X_i}{\theta^2}$$

Thus, we can get the *MLE* for θ is $\hat{\theta} = \bar{x}$.

If we want to estimate $\tau(\theta) = P(X \geq 1)$:

$$\tau(\theta) = P(X \geq 1) = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}} dx = - \int_1^{\infty} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}} d\left(-\frac{x}{\theta}\right) = -[e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}]_1^{\infty} = -[0 - e^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}] = e^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}$$

Thus, based on the invariance property, we know that the *MLE* for $\tau(\theta)$ is as follows.

$$e^{-\frac{1}{\bar{x}}}$$

2.2.5 Unbiased estimators

An estimator T is said to be an unbiased estimator of $\tau(\theta)$ if

$$E(T) = \tau(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \Omega$. Otherwise, we said that T is biased estimator of $\tau(\theta)$.

For instance, if we want to estimate a percentile, say the 95th percentile of $N(\mu, 9)$. Note that the percentiles that we know are about standardized normal (i.e., $N(0, 1)$). Thus, we need to have some calculation to get the non-standard one.

$$\frac{X_{95 \text{ percentile}} - \mu}{\sigma} = 1.645$$

Thus, we can get

$$X_{95 \text{ percentile}} = 1.645 \times \sigma + \mu$$

We know that \bar{X} is the unbiased estimate for μ . Thus, we can get

$$X_{95 \text{ percentile}} = 1.645 \times \sigma + \mu = 4.94 + \mu$$

We know that

$$E(T) = E(\bar{X} + 4.94) = \mu + 4.94$$

Thus, $T = \bar{X} + 4.94$ is the unbiased estimator of $\tau(\mu) = \mu + 4.94$.

2.2.6 Unbiased estimators vs. Invariance property of MLEs

___Do not apply “Invariance property of MLEs” to the Unbiased estimators.

P.303

For example, consider a random sample of size n from an exponential distribution, $X_i \sim EXP(\theta)$, with parameter θ . We know that, \bar{X} is unbiased for θ (which is the mean of an exponential distribution).

If we want to estimate $\tau(\theta) = \frac{1}{\theta}$, then by the invariance property of MLE is $T_1 = \frac{1}{\bar{X}}$.

However, T_1 is a biased estimator of $\frac{1}{\theta}$. Specifically,

We know that if $X \sim Gam(\theta, k)$, then $Y = \frac{2X}{\theta} \sim x^2(2k)$. We know that exponential distributions are a special case of Gamma distribution, $EXP(\theta) = Gam(\theta, 1)$, thus we get the following,

$$Y = \frac{2n\bar{X}}{\theta} = \frac{2n}{\theta} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 2X_i}{\theta} \sim \sum_{i=1}^n x^2(2 \cdot 1) = \sum_{i=1}^n x^2(2) = x^2(2n)$$

We further know that if $Y \sim x^2(v)$, $E(Y^r) = 2^r \frac{\Gamma(v/2+r)}{\Gamma(v/2)}$. Thus, we know that,

$$E(Y^{-1}) = 2^{-1} \frac{\Gamma(2n/2-1)}{\Gamma(2n/2)} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1}$$

Thus,

$$E(Y^{-1}) = E\left(\frac{\theta}{2n\bar{X}}\right) = \frac{\theta}{2n} E\left(\frac{1}{\bar{X}}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1}$$

Thus.

$$E\left(\frac{1}{\bar{X}}\right) = \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{n}{\theta} = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{1}{\theta}$$

Thus,

$$E\left(\frac{n-1}{n} \frac{1}{\bar{X}}\right) = \frac{1}{\theta}$$

Conclusion

$\frac{1}{\bar{X}}$ is not the unbiased estimator for $\frac{1}{\theta}$. However, we can adjust it to $\frac{n-1}{n} \frac{1}{\bar{X}}$, which is the unbiased estimator for $\frac{1}{\theta}$. When the sample size is big enough, we know that $\frac{n-1}{n}$ will be close to 1.

2.2.7 UMVUE and Cramer-Rao lower bound

2.2.7.1 UMVUE

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be a random sample of size n from $f(x; \theta)$. An estimator T^* of $\tau(\theta)$ is called a *uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimator* (UMVUE) of $\tau(\theta)$ if

1. T^* is unbiased for $\tau\theta$
2. For any other unbiased estimator T of $\tau(\theta)$, $Var(T^*) \leq Var(T)$ for all $\theta \in \Omega$.

2.2.7.2 Cramer-Rao lower bound

If T is an unbiased estimator of $\tau(\theta)$, then the Cramer-Rao lower bound (CRLB), based on a random sample, is

$$Var(T) = \frac{[\tau'(\theta)]^2}{nE[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \ln f(X; \theta)]^2}$$

For instance, consider a random sample from an exponential distribution, $X_i \sim Exp(\theta)$. Because

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}$$

Thus,

$$\ln(f(x; \theta)) = -\frac{x}{\theta} - \ln\theta$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \ln(f(X; \theta)) = \frac{X}{\theta^2} - \frac{1}{\theta} = \frac{X - \theta}{\theta^2}$$

Thus,

$$E[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \ln(f(X; \theta))]^2 = E[\frac{(X - \theta)^2}{\theta^4}] = \frac{1}{\theta^4} E(X - \theta)^2 = \frac{1}{\theta^4} Var(X) = \frac{\theta^2}{\theta^4} = \frac{1}{\theta^2}$$

Thus, the CRLB for $\tau(\theta) = \theta$ is as follows.

$$Var(T) \geq \frac{[\tau'(\theta)]^2}{nE[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \ln f(X; \theta)]^2} = \frac{[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} \theta]^2}{n \frac{1}{\theta^2}} = \frac{1^2}{\frac{n}{\theta^2}} = \frac{\theta^2}{n}$$

We know that the variance for exponential distribution

$$Var(\bar{X}) = \frac{Var(X)}{n} = \frac{\theta^2}{n}$$

We know that θ is the mean for exponential distribution. We also know that sample mean \bar{X} is the unbiased estimator for population mean.

Thus,

\bar{X} is the UMVUE of θ .

2.2.8 Best linear unbiased estimation (BLUE or MVLUE)

2.2.9 Rao-Blackwell theorem

2.2.10 Consistency, asymptotic unbiasedness

2.2.11 Efficiency, asymptotic efficiency

P.308

The relative efficiency of an unbiased estimator T of $\tau(\theta)$ to another unbiased estimator T^* of $\tau(\theta)$ is given by

$$re(T, T^*) = \frac{Var(T^*)}{Var(T)}$$

An unbiased estimator T^* of $\tau(\theta)$ is said to be efficient if $re(T, T^*) \leq 1$ for all unbiased estimators T of $\tau(\theta)$, and all $\theta \in \Omega$. The efficiency of an unbiased estimator T of $\tau(\theta)$ is given by

$$e(T) = re(T, T^*)$$

if T^* is an efficient estimator of $\tau(\theta)$.

Thus, an efficient estimator is just a UMVUE.

2.2.12 Asymptotic properties of MLEs

2.3 Sufficient and completeness

2.3.1 Sufficiency and minimal sufficiency

2.3.2 Neyman factorization theorem, minimal sufficiency of MLEs

2.3.3 completeness, Lehmann-Scheffe completeness theorem

2.3.4 Exponential class, complete sufficient statistics

Chapter 3

Logit and Probit

3.1 Logit


$$f(x) = \log\left(\frac{p(y=1)}{1-p(y=1)}\right)$$

The basic idea of logistic regression:

$$p(y=1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}} = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}$$

Thus, $\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n$ can be from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, and $p(y=1)$ will be always within the range of $(0, 1)$.

```
f<-function(x){exp(x)/(1+exp(x))}  
data<-seq(-10,10,1)  
plot(data,f(data),type = "b")
```



We can also write the function into another format as follows:

$$\log \frac{p(y=1)}{1-p(y=1)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n$$

Thus, we know that the regression coefficients of β_i actually change the “log-odds” of the event. Of course, note that the magnitude of β_i is dependent upon the units of x_i .

The following is an example testing whether that home teams are more likely to win in NFL games. The results show that the odd of winning is the same for both home and away teams.

```
mydata = read.csv(url('https://raw.githubusercontent.com/nfl-football-ops/Big-Data-Bowling/master/data/nfl_games.csv'))
mydata$result_new<-ifelse(mydata$HomeScore>mydata$VisitorScore,1,0)
summary(mydata$result_new)
```

```
##      Min. 1st Qu.  Median    Mean 3rd Qu.    Max.
## 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.4945 1.0000 1.0000
```

```
mylogit1 = glm(result_new~1, family=binomial, data=mydata)
summary(mylogit1)
```

```
##
## Call:
```




```
## glm(formula = result_new ~ 1, family = binomial, data = mydata)
##
## Deviance Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -1.168  -1.168  -1.168   1.187   1.187
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
## (Intercept) -0.02198    0.20967  -0.105   0.917
##
## (Dispersion parameter for binomial family taken to be 1)
##
##      Null deviance: 126.14  on 90  degrees of freedom
## Residual deviance: 126.14  on 90  degrees of freedom
## AIC: 128.14
##
## Number of Fisher Scoring iterations: 3
```

3.2 Probit

As noted above, logit $f(x) = \log\left(\frac{p(y=1)}{1-p(y=1)}\right)$ provides the resulting range of $(0, 1)$. Another way to provide the same range is through the cdf of normal distribution. The following R code is used to illustrate this process.

```
data2<-seq(-5,5,1)
plot(data2,pnorm(data2),type = "b")
```



Thus, the cdf of normal distribution can be used to indicate the probability of $p(y = 1)$.

$$\Phi(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n) = p(y = 1)$$

Similar to logit model, we can also write the inverse function of the cdf to get the function that can be from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$.

$$\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n = \Phi^{-1}(p(y = 1))$$

Thus, for example, if $X\beta = -2$, based on $\Phi(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n) = p(y = 1)$ we can get that the $p(y = 1) = 0.023$.

In contrast, if $X\beta = 3$, the $p(y = 1) = 0.999$.

```
pnorm(-2)
```

```
## [1] 0.02275013
```

```
pnorm(3)
```

```
## [1] 0.9986501
```

Let's assume that there is a latent variable called Y^* such that

$$Y^* = X\beta + \epsilon, \epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$$

You could think of Y^* as a kind of “proxy” between $X\beta + \epsilon$ and the observed $Y(1 \text{ or } 0)$. Thus, we can get the following. Note that, it does not have to be zero, and can be any constant.

$$Y^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y_i^* \leq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \end{cases}$$

Thus,

$$y_i^* > 0 \Rightarrow \beta' X_i + \epsilon_i > 0 \Rightarrow \epsilon_i > -\beta' X_i$$

Thus, we can write it as follows. Note that $\frac{\epsilon_i}{\sigma} \sim N(0, 1)$

$$p(y = 1|x_i) = p(y_i^* > 0|x_i) = p(\epsilon_i > -\beta' X_i) = p\left(\frac{\epsilon_i}{\sigma} > \frac{-\beta' X_i}{\sigma}\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{\beta' X_i}{\sigma}\right)$$

We thus can get:

$$p(y = 0|x_i) = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\beta' X_i}{\sigma}\right)$$

For $p(y = 1|x_i) = \Phi\left(\frac{\beta' X_i}{\sigma}\right)$, we can not really estimate both β and σ as they are in a ratio. We can assume $\sigma = 1$, then $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$. We know y_i and x_i since we observe them. Thus, we can write it as follows.

$$p(y = 1|x_i) = \Phi(\beta' X_i)$$

Chapter 4

Normal distribution

4.1 Basics

μ and σ determine the center and spread of the distribution.




Figure 4.1: Normal

The empirical rule holds for all normal distributions:

- (1) 68% of the area under the curve lies between $(\mu - \sigma, \mu + \sigma)$.
- (2) 95% of the area under the curve lies between $(\mu - 2\sigma, \mu + 2\sigma)$.
- (3) 99.7% of the area under the curve lies between $(\mu - 3\sigma, \mu + 3\sigma)$.

4.2 Confidence intervals for normal distributions

$$\bar{X} \pm Z \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where,

\bar{X} is the mean

Z is the Z value (see the table below)

σ is the standard deviation

n is the number of observations

(We can see the connection between this formula and information shown in the *Basics* section.)

<i>Confidence Levels</i>	<i>Z</i>
80	1.282
85	1.440
90	1.645
95	1.960
99	2.576
99.5	2.807
99.9	3.291

4.3 Percentile

A percentile is a measure used in statistics indicating the value below which a given percentage of observations in a group of observations falls.

For example, the 20th percentile is the value (or score) below which 20% of the observations may be found.

For normal distribution,

-3σ is the 0.13th percentile (i.e., $\frac{100-99.7}{2} = 0.15$);

-2σ is the 2.28th percentile ((i.e., $\frac{100-95}{2} = 2.50$));

-1σ is the 15.87th percentile (i.e., $\frac{100-68}{2} = 16$);

0σ is 50th percentile.

$+2 \sigma$ is the 97.72nd percentile (i.e., $100 - \frac{100-95}{2} = 100 - 2.5 = 97.50$);

$+3 \sigma$ is the 99.87th percentile (i.e., $100 - \frac{100-99.70}{2} = 100 - 0.15 = 99.85$).

This is related to the 68-95-99.7 rule or the three-sigma rule.

(Note that, it is *related*, not *direct* 68-95-99.7 rule, which is about symmetric situations. See the figure above)

<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Z</i>
90	1.282
—	1.440
95	1.645
—	1.960
—	2.576
—	2.807
99.9	3.000

Chapter 5

MLE

5.1 Basic idea of MLE

Suppose that we flip a coin, $y_i = 0$ for tails and $y_i = 1$ for heads. If we get p heads from n trials, we can get the proportion of heads is p/n , which is the sample mean. If we do not do any further calculation, this is our best guess.

Suppose that the true probability is ρ , then we can get:

$$\mathbf{L}(y_i) = \begin{cases} \rho & y_i = 1 \\ 1 - \rho & y_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

Thus, we can also write it as follows.

$$\mathbf{L}(y_i) = \rho^{y_i} (1 - \rho)^{1-y_i}$$

Thus, we can get:

$$\prod \mathbf{L}(y_i|\rho) = \rho^{\sum y_i} (1 - \rho)^{\sum (1-y_i)}$$

Further, we can get a log-transformed format.

$$\log(\prod \mathbf{L}(y_i|\rho)) = \sum y_i \log \rho + \sum (1 - y_i) \log(1 - \rho)$$

To maximize the log-function above, we can calculate the derivative with respect to ρ .

$$\frac{\partial \log(\prod \mathbf{L}(y_i|\rho))}{\partial \rho} = \sum y_i \frac{1}{\rho} - \sum (1 - y_i) \frac{1}{1 - \rho}$$

Set the derivative to zero and solve for ρ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum y_i \frac{1}{\rho} - \sum (1 - y_i) \frac{1}{1 - \rho} = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow (1 - \rho) \sum y_i - \rho \sum (1 - y_i) = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \sum y_i - \rho \sum y_i - n\rho + \rho \sum y_i = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \sum y_i - n\rho = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \rho = \frac{\sum y_i}{n} = \frac{p}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can see that the ρ maximizing the likelihood function is equal to the sample mean.

5.2 Coin flip example, probit, and logit

In the example above, we are not really trying to estimate a lot of regression coefficients. What we are doing actually is to calculate the sample mean, or intercept in the regression sense. What does it mean? Let's use some data to explain it.

Suppose that we flip a coin 20 times and observe 8 heads. We can use the R's `glm` function to estimate the ρ . If the result is consistent with what we did above, we should observe that the *cdf* of the estimate of β_0 (i.e., intercept) should be equal to $8/20 = 0.4$.

```
coins<-c(rep(1,times=8),rep(0,times=12))
table(coins)
```

```
## coins
##  0  1
## 12  8
```

```
coins<-as.data.frame(coins)
```

5.2.1 Probit

```
probitresults <- glm(coins ~ 1, family = binomial(link = "probit"), data = coins)
probitresults
```

```
##
## Call:  glm(formula = coins ~ 1, family = binomial(link = "probit"),
##       data = coins)
##
## Coefficients:
## (Intercept)
##      -0.2533
##
## Degrees of Freedom: 19 Total (i.e. Null);  19 Residual
## Null Deviance:      26.92
## Residual Deviance: 26.92    AIC: 28.92
```

```
pnorm(probitresults$coefficients)
```

```
## (Intercept)
##           0.4
```

As we can see the intercept is -0.2533 , and thus $\Phi(-0.2533471) = 0.4$

5.2.2 Logit

We can also use logit link to calculate the intercept as well. Recall that

$$p(y = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}} = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}$$

Thus,

$$p(y = 1) = \frac{e^{\beta_0}}{1 + e^{\beta_0}}$$

```
logitresults <- glm(coins ~ 1, family = binomial(link = "logit"), data = coins)
logitresults$coefficients
```

```
## (Intercept)
##  -0.4054651
```

```
exp(logitresults$coefficients)/(1+exp(logitresults$coefficients))
```

```
## (Intercept)
##           0.4
```

Note that, the default link for the binomial in the glm function is logit.

5.3 Further on logit

The probability of $y = 1$ is as follows:

$$p = p(y = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}} = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}$$

Thus, the likelihood function is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \prod p^{y_i} (1-p)^{1-y_i} = \prod \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}} \right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}} \right)^{1-y_i} \\ &= \prod (1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)})^{-y_i} (1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n})^{-(1-y_i)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the log-likelihood is as follows:

$$\log L = \sum (-y_i \cdot \log(1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}) - (1 - y_i) \cdot \log(1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}))$$

Typically, optimisers minimize a function, so we use negative log-likelihood as minimising that is equivalent to maximising the log-likelihood or the likelihood itself.

#Source of R code: <https://www.r-bloggers.com/logistic-regression/>

```
mle.logreg = function(fmla, data)
{
  # Define the negative log likelihood function
  logl <- function(theta,x,y){
    y <- y
    x <- as.matrix(x)
    beta <- theta[1:ncol(x)]

    # Use the log-likelihood of the Bernoulli distribution, where p is
    # defined as the logistic transformation of a linear combination
    # of predictors, according to logit(p)=(x%*%beta)
    loglik <- sum(-y*log(1 + exp(-(x%*%beta))) - (1-y)*log(1 + exp(x%*%beta)))
    return(-loglik)
  }

  # Prepare the data
  outcome = rownames(attr(terms(fmla),"factors"))[1]
  dfrTmp = model.frame(data)
  x = as.matrix(model.matrix(fmla, data=dfrTmp))
}
```

```

y = as.numeric(as.matrix(data[,match(outcome,colnames(data))]))

# Define initial values for the parameters
theta.start = rep(0,(dim(x)[2]))
names(theta.start) = colnames(x)

# Calculate the maximum likelihood
mle = optim(theta.start,logl,x=x,y=y, method = 'BFGS', hessian=T)
out = list(beta=mle$par,vcov=solve(mle$hessian),ll=2*mle$value)
}

mydata = read.csv(url('https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stat/data/binary.csv'))
mylogit1 = glm(admit~gre+gpa+as.factor(rank), family=binomial, data=mydata)

mydata$rank = factor(mydata$rank) #Treat rank as a categorical variable
fmla = as.formula("admit~gre+gpa+rank") #Create model formula
mylogit2 = mle.logreg(fmla, mydata) #Estimate coefficients

print(cbind(coef(mylogit1), mylogit2$beta))

##                [,1]      [,2]
## (Intercept)    -3.989979073 -3.772676422
## gre            0.002264426  0.001375522
## gpa            0.804037549  0.898201239
## as.factor(rank)2 -0.675442928 -0.675543009
## as.factor(rank)3 -1.340203916 -1.356554831
## as.factor(rank)4 -1.551463677 -1.563396035

```

5.4 References

http://www.columbia.edu/~so33/SusDev/Lecture_9.pdf

Chapter 6

Score, Gradient and Jacobian

6.1 Score

The score is the gradient (the vector of partial derivatives) of $\log L(\theta)$, with respect to an m -dimensional parameter vector θ .

$$S(\theta) = \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta}$$

Typically, they use ∇ to denote the partial derivative.

$$\nabla \ell$$

Such differentiation will generate a $m \times 1$ row vector, which indicates the sensitivity of the likelihood.

Quote from Steffen Lauritzen's slides: "Generally the solution to this equation must be calculated by iterative methods. One of the most common methods is the Newton–Raphson method and this is based on successive approximations to the solution, using Taylor's theorem to approximate the equation."

For instance, using logit link, we can get the first derivative of log likelihood logistic regression as follows. We can not really find β easily to make the equation to be 0.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \beta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^T \left[y_i - \frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^T [y_i - \hat{y}_i]\end{aligned}$$

6.2 Fisher scoring

[I will come back to this later.]

<https://www2.stat.duke.edu/courses/Fall00/sta216/handouts/diagnostics.pdf>

<https://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/176351/implement-fisher-scoring-for-linear-regression>

6.3 Gradient and Jacobian

Remarks: This part discusses gradient in a more general sense.

When $f(x)$ is only in a single dimension space:

$$\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\nabla f(x) = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right]$$

When $f(x)$ is only in a m-dimension space (i.e., Jacobian): $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$

$$Jac(f) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_2} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_3} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_3} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_2} & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_3} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

For instance,

$$\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}:$$

$$f(x, y) = x^2 + 2y$$

$$\nabla f(x, y) = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right] = [2x, 2]$$

$$\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$$

$$f(x, y) = (x^2 + 2y, x^3)$$

$$Jac(f) = \begin{bmatrix} 2x & 2 \\ 2x^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

6.4 Hessian and Fisher Information

Hessian matrix or Hessian is a square matrix of second-order partial derivatives of a scalar-valued function, or scalar field.

$$\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$Hessian = \nabla^2(f) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n} \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2^2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_n} \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_3 \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_3 \partial x_2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_3^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_3 \partial x_n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

As a special case, in the context of logit:

Suppose that the log likelihood function is $\ell(\theta)$. θ is a m dimension vector.

$$\theta = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \theta_3 \\ \theta_4 \\ \cdots \\ \theta_m \end{bmatrix}$$

$$Hessian = \nabla^2(\ell) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_m} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_2 \partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_2^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_2 \partial \theta_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_2 \partial \theta_m} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_3 \partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_3 \partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_3^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_3 \partial \theta_m} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_m \partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_m \partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_m \partial \theta_3} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta_m \partial \theta_m} \end{bmatrix}$$

“In statistics, the observed information, or observed Fisher information, is the negative of the second derivative (the Hessian matrix) of the “log-likelihood” (the logarithm of the likelihood function). It is a sample-based version of the Fisher information.” (Direct quote from Wikipedia.)

Thus, the observed information matrix:

$$-Hessian = -\nabla^2(\ell)$$

Expected (Fisher) information matrix:

$$E[-\nabla^2(\ell)]$$

Chapter 7

Canonical link function

Inspired by a Stack Exchange post, I created the following figure:

$$\frac{\text{Paramter}}{\theta} \longrightarrow \gamma'(\theta) = \mu \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Mean}}{\mu} \longrightarrow g(\mu) = \eta \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Linearpredictor}}{\eta}$$

For the case of n time Bernoulli (i.e., Binomial), its canonical link function is logit. Specifically,

$$\frac{\text{Paramter}}{\theta = \beta^T x_i} \longrightarrow \gamma'(\theta) = \frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}} \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Mean}}{\mu = \frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}}} \longrightarrow g(\mu) = \log \frac{\frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}}}{1 - \frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}}} \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Linearpredictor}}{\eta = \beta^T x_i}$$

Thus, we can see that,

$$\theta \equiv \eta$$

The link function $g(\mu)$ relates the linear predictor $\eta = \beta^T x_i$ to the mean μ .

Remarks:

- (1) Parameter is $\theta = \beta^T x_i$ (Not μ !).
- (2) $\mu = p(y = 1) = \frac{e^{\beta^T x_i}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x_i}}$ (Not logit!).
- (3) Link function (i.e., $g(\mu)$) = logit = logarithm of odds = $\log \frac{\text{Event-Happened}}{\text{Event-Not-Happened}}$.
- (4) $g(\mu) = \log \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} = \beta^T x_i$. Thus, link function = linear predictor = log odds!

- (5) Quote from the Stack Exchange post “Newton Method and Fisher scoring for finding the ML estimator coincide, these links simplify the derivation of the MLE.”

(Recall, we know that μ or $p(y = 1)$ is the mean function. Recall that, n trials of coin flips, and get p heads. Thus $\mu = \frac{p}{n}$.)

Chapter 8

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)

Suppose we have n observation, and m variables.

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & \dots & x_{1m} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} & \dots & x_{2m} \\ \dots & & & & \\ x_{n1} & x_{n2} & x_{n3} & \dots & x_{nm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, we can write it as the following n equations.

$$y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{11} + \beta_2 x_{12} + \dots + \beta_m x_{1m}$$

$$y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{21} + \beta_2 x_{22} + \dots + \beta_m x_{2m}$$

$$y_3 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{31} + \beta_2 x_{32} + \dots + \beta_m x_{3m}$$

...

$$y_n = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{n1} + \beta_2 x_{n2} + \dots + \beta_m x_{nm}$$

We can combine all the n equations as the following one:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \dots + \beta_m x_{im} (i \in [1, n])$$

We can further rewrite it as a matrix format as follows.

$$y = X\beta$$

Where,

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \\ y_4 \\ \dots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & \dots & x_{1m} \\ 1 & x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} & \dots & x_{2m} \\ \dots & & & & & \\ 1 & x_{n1} & x_{n2} & x_{n3} & \dots & x_{nm} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\beta = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \dots \\ \beta_m \end{bmatrix}$$

Since later we need the inverse of X , we need to make it into a square matrix.

$$X^T y = X^T X \hat{\beta} \Rightarrow \hat{\beta} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T y$$

We can use R to implement this calculation. As we can see, there is no need to do any iterations at all, but rather just pure matrix calculation.

```
X<-matrix(rnorm(1000),ncol=2) # we define a 2 column matrix, with 500 rows
X<-cbind(1,X) # add a 1 constant
beta_true<-c(2,1,2) # True regression coefficients
beta_true<-as.matrix(beta_true)
y=X%%beta_true+rnorm(500)

transposed_X<-t(X)
beta_hat<-solve(transposed_X%%X)%%transposed_X%%y
beta_hat

##           [,1]
## [1,] 1.965891
## [2,] 1.059079
## [3,] 1.952932
```

Side Notes The function of `as.matrix` will automatically make `c(2,1,2)` become the dimension of 3×1 , you do not need to transpose the β .

8.1 Taylor series

$$\begin{aligned} f(x)|_a &= f(a) + \frac{f'(a)}{1!}(x-a) + \frac{f'(a)}{2!}(x-a)^2 + \frac{f''(a)}{3!}(x-a)^3 + \dots \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^n(a)}{n!}(x-a)^n \end{aligned}$$

For example:

$$\begin{aligned} e^x|_{a=0} &= e^a + \frac{e^a}{1!}(x-a) + \frac{e^a}{2!}(x-a)^2 + \dots + \frac{e^a}{n!}(x-a)^n \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{1!}x + \frac{1}{2!}x^2 + \dots + \frac{1}{n!}x^n \end{aligned}$$

if $x = 2$

$$e^2 = 7.389056$$

$$e^2 \approx 1 + \frac{1}{1!}x = 1 + \frac{1}{1!}2 = 3$$

$$e^2 \approx 1 + \frac{1}{1!}x + \frac{1}{2!}x^2 = 1 + \frac{1}{1!}2 + \frac{1}{2!}2 = 5 \dots$$

$$e^2 \approx 1 + \frac{1}{1!}x + \frac{1}{2!}x^2 + \frac{1}{3!}x^2 + \frac{1}{4!}x^2 + \frac{1}{5!}x^2 = 7.2666\dots$$

8.2 References

1. Steffen Lauritzen's slides:

<http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/~steffen/teaching/bs2HT9/scoring.pdf>

2. The Stack Exchange post:

<https://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/40876/what-is-the-difference-between-a-link-function-and-a-canonical-link-function>

3. Wikipedia for OLS

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordinary_least_squares

4. Gradient and Jacobian

<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/1519367/difference-between-gradient-and-jacobian>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3xVMVT-2_t4

<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/661195/what-is-the-difference-between-the-gradient-and-the-directional-derivative>

5. Hessian

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hessian_matrix

6. Observed information

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Observed_information

7. Fisher information

https://people.missouristate.edu/songfengzheng/Teaching/MTH541/Lecture%20notes/Fisher_info.pdf

8. Link function

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generalized_linear_model#Link_function

<https://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/40876/what-is-the-difference-between-a-link-function-and-a-canonical-link-function>

Chapter 9

Cholesky decomposition

9.1 Example 1

Use Cholesky decomposition to generate 1,000 trivariate normal deviates X_1, \dots, x_{1000} with mean $\mu = (-2, 4, 3)$ and covariance matrix

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0.5 \\ -1 & 4 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 1 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$$

```
Nsim = 10
means = c(-2,4,3)
N_columns = 3

# Generating random standard normal distribution numbers
Generated_numbers = matrix(rnorm(N_columns * Nsim), nrow = N_columns)

# The provided covariance matrix
cov_matrix = rbind(c(2, -1, 0.5), c(-1, 4, 1), c(0.5, 1, 5))

# Cholesky decomposition
Cholesky_decom_results = chol(cov_matrix)

# Data is transformed using the Cholesky decomposition
adjusted_data = t(Generated_numbers) %*% Cholesky_decom_results

Final_data = t(t(adjusted_data) + means)
```

```
# calculating column means
colMeans(Final_data)
```

```
## [1] -2.271487  4.535922  3.058328
```

```
# calculating column variances
apply(Final_data,2,var)
```

```
## [1] 2.308942 5.466909 4.046096
```

```
# calculating covariance matrix
cov(Final_data)
```

```
##           [,1]      [,2]      [,3]
## [1,]  2.30894201 -1.484151  0.01330459
## [2,] -1.48415057  5.466909 -0.50988403
## [3,]  0.01330459 -0.509884  4.04609620
```

9.2 Example 2

AR(1) Covariance Matrix with Correlation Rho and Variance SigmaSq. Note that, there is only one individual or participant in this data simulation.

```
n = 10;
SigmaSq = 5;
Rho = 0.8;

V = matrix(rep(n*n,0),n,n);

for (i in 1:n)
{
  for (j in i:n)
  {
    V[i,j]=SigmaSq*Rho^(j-i)
    V[j,i]=V[i,j]
  }
}

set.seed(123)
random_normal<-rnorm(n,2,1)
#chol(V) %*% random_normal
```

```
#colSums (chol(V))
b2<-t(as.matrix(random_normal))%*%chol(V)

pi = exp(b2)/(1 + exp(b2));

y<-ifelse(pi>runif(1),1,0)

y
```

```
##      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6] [,7] [,8] [,9] [,10]
## [1,]    1    1    1    1    1    1    1    1    1    1
```

```
# The code above basically completes the generating job!
# The code below is to check
```

```
b = b2[2:n]
c = b2[1:(n-1)]
cor(b,c)
```

```
## [1] 0.8967058
```

```
sd(as.vector(b2))
```

```
## [1] 3.535119
```

```
# note that, you can not use var, as the mean is not zero, but rather it is 2
var(as.vector(b2))
```

```
## [1] 12.49707
```

```
#Not sure why the means are not the same ?
mean(as.vector(b2))
```

```
## [1] 10.01925
```

```
mean(random_normal)
```

```
## [1] 2.074626
```

9.3 Example 3

The following code very similar to the code shown above. However, it had only one observation. To illustrate the situation where there are more than one individual (or, participant), I did the code below.

```
n =25;    #the number of time points
m= 15;    # the number of participants or individuals, whichever ways you would like to
SigmaSq = 5;
Rho = 0.8;

filling_numbers<-rep(n*n,0)
V = matrix(filling_numbers,n,n);

for (i in 1:n)
{
  for (j in i:n)
  {
    V[i,j]=SigmaSq*Rho^(j-i)
    V[j,i]=V[i,j]
  }
}

set.seed(2345)
random_normal<-matrix(rnorm(m*n),nrow = m)
#chol(V) %%% random_normal
#colSums (chol(V))
b2<-random_normal%%chol(V)

pi = exp(b2)/(1 + exp(b2));

random_unfirom<-matrix(runif(m*n),nrow = m)

y<-ifelse(pi>random_unfirom,1,0)
y
```

```
##      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6] [,7] [,8] [,9] [,10] [,11] [,12] [,13]
## [1,]  0    0    0    0    0    0    1    1    1    1    1    0    1
## [2,]  0    1    1    1    1    1    0    1    0    0    0    0    0
## [3,]  1    0    0    0    0    1    0    1    0    1    1    0    0
## [4,]  1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    0    0    0
## [5,]  0    0    0    0    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    1
## [6,]  0    0    1    1    0    0    0    1    0    0    0    0    0
## [7,]  0    0    0    0    0    1    0    0    1    0    0    0    1
## [8,]  1    1    1    1    0    0    0    0    0    1    1    0    0
```

```
## [9,] 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0
## [10,] 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0
## [11,] 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0
## [12,] 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 0
## [13,] 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0
## [14,] 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0
## [15,] 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1
##      [,14] [,15] [,16] [,17] [,18] [,19] [,20] [,21] [,22] [,23] [,24] [,25]
## [1,] 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0
## [2,] 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 1
## [3,] 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1
## [4,] 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0
## [5,] 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1
## [6,] 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1
## [7,] 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0
## [8,] 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
## [9,] 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0
## [10,] 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
## [11,] 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0
## [12,] 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0
## [13,] 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1
## [14,] 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0
## [15,] 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1
```

The code above basically completes the generating job! The code below is to check

```
# The following calculates variance
# calculate variance of each column
mean(apply(b2, 2, var))
```

```
## [1] 4.330903
```

```
# calculate variance of each row
mean(apply(b2, 1, var))
```

```
## [1] 3.568107
```

```
# The whole table
var(as.vector(b2))
```

```
## [1] 4.299165
```

```

# The following code calculates the correlation
b = b2[,2:n]
c = b2[,1:(n-1)]

collected_cor<-rep(0,m-1) #creating an empty vector to collect correlation.
for (i in 1:(m-1))
{collected_cor[i]<-cor(b[i,],c[i,])}
collected_cor

## [1] 0.8473037 0.7065013 0.6376223 0.5481540 0.7851062 0.6576329 0.4844481
## [8] 0.6950847 0.6731673 0.6409116 0.7966547 0.7184030 0.8001861 0.7913736

mean(collected_cor)

## [1] 0.6987535

mean(y)

## [1] 0.456

log(mean(y)/(1-mean(y)))

## [1] -0.1764564

# It will always get a value close to zero, since we set the mean to be zero when simu

```