

## Lecture 3: January 23

*Lecturer: Ramesh Sridharan and George Chen**Notes by: William Li*

**Disclaimer:** *These notes have not been subjected to the usual scrutiny reserved for formal publications. They may be distributed outside this class only with the permission of the Instructor.*

### 3.1 Linear Regression

Be sure to visualize! Recall Anscombe's Quartet.

Goal of linear regression: fit a line,  $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$  to data

$y$ : dependent variable/response variable

$\beta_0$ : intercept

$\beta_1$ : slope (e.g. spring constant in Hooke's law)

$x$ : independent variable/predictor variable

Slope close to 0: little/no relationship between  $x$  and  $y$

### 3.2 Probabilistic Model

Observe  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$

Assume:

$$y_i(x_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i$$

$\epsilon_i$ : normally distributed with mean 0, variance  $\sigma^2$  ( $N(0, \sigma^2)$ )

$\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  are fixed but unknown.

Under this model, there is a "good" way of to estimate  $\beta_0, \beta_1$ :

$$\min_{\beta_0, \beta_1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i))^2$$

(This is called least-squares linear regression)

Solution:

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - \frac{1}{n} (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i) (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2}$$

$$\text{Correlation coefficient: } r = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{s_x s_y}$$

where  $s_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$

$r^2$  is called the “coefficient of determination”,  $-1 \leq r \leq 1$

Correlation does not imply causation, e.g. sun cycles was correlated with the number of Republicans in the Senate in the 1980s

### 3.3 Hypothesis Testing

Warning: Everything here assumes that the above probabilistic model is true

#### 3.3.1 Slope

$$t_{\beta_1} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1}{s_{\beta_1}} \sim t_{n-2} \text{ (t distributed with } n-1 \text{ degrees of freedom)}$$

$$s_{\beta_1} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\hat{y}_i - y_i)^2}{n-2}$$

Let's break down these terms:

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}: \text{How close together the } x_i \text{'s are}$$

Intuition:

When the  $x_i$  values are very close together, it's hard to fit a line. This makes  $s_{\beta_1}$  large. This makes  $t_{\beta_1}$  smaller (closer to 0). For a null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) of  $\beta_1 = 0$ , there will be more area outside of  $[-t_{\beta_1}, t_{\beta_1}]$ , which means that your statistical significance will go down. (Your p-value will be higher, or it will be harder to achieve your threshold of statistical significance).

When there is a large error in fit, the term  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  will be large. This makes  $s_{\beta_1}$  large... your statistical significance will go down (following the line of reasoning above).

#### 3.3.2 Intercept

$$t_{\beta_0} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0}{s_{\beta_0}} \sim t_{n-2}$$

$$s_{\beta_0} = \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}}$$

If the  $x_i$ 's are close together, then the  $s_{\beta_0}$  will be big. Then  $t_{\beta_0}$  will be small. For a null hypothesis of  $\beta_0 = 0$ , there will be more area outside of  $[-t_{\beta_0}, t_{\beta_0}]$ , which means that your statistical significance will go down (your p-value will be higher).

Bonferroni correction: divide the p-value threshold by 2 to see if you have significance at  $p=0.05$  (i.e. is

pi0.025 for both of them?)

### 3.3.3 Correlation Coefficient

$$t_r = \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1-r^2}} \sim t_{n-2}$$

### 3.3.4 Prediction

What can we say about a new point generated from same probabilistic model with x-value  $x^*$ ?

$$\hat{y}(x^*) = \beta_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x^*$$

$$\text{var}[\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x^* + \epsilon] = \text{var}[\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x^*] + \text{var}[\epsilon]$$

The first term is estimated with  $\hat{\sigma}^2 [\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \bar{x})^2}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}]$  — this is the variance in the mean estimate of the line at  $x^*$

The second term is estimated with  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  — it is variance introduced by extra noise

### 3.3.5 Multiple linear regression

$((x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p), y) \dots$  — there are  $p$  predictors for each  $y$

Probabilistic model:

$$y = \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_p x_p + \epsilon$$

Why not use a very high degree polynomial? It will overfit.

### 3.3.6 Matrix Form

Solve:

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

Solution:

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

## 3.4 Model Evaluation

$$y_i - \bar{y} = (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y}) + (y_i - \hat{y}_i)$$

First term: difference explained by the model Second term: difference not explained by the model

Residual:  $\hat{y}_i - y_i$ : Visualizing this is important

With a bit of algebra:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 = \sum (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 + \sum (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

SST = SSM + SSE (sum of squares total) = ( sum of squares model) + sum of squares error

(sum of squares model) / (sum of squares total) is exactly  $r^2$ !

We want SSM/SSE to be large

$$\text{MSM} = \text{SSM} / p - 1$$

$$\text{MSE} = \text{SSE} / n - p$$

For technical reasons, instead look at:  $\text{MSM}/\text{MSE} \sim F_{p-1, n-p}$