2022-1 – Upstart – Research Scientist Phone Interview

Question 1.
When doing the multiple linear regression problem, one column B is wrongly copied as column A. What is the consequence?

Table 1 has the results with correct parameters and Table 2 has the results with incorrect parameter, Administration = Marketing Spend.
Coefficients on Table 2 of columns A and B are very closed to each other, but not identical.
Notice the variance matrix has the smallest eigenvalue closed to zero, that means there exists strong multicollinearity.

Table 1.

```
runfile('/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression/multiple_linear_regression.py',
wdir='/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression')
Intercept:
 42554.16761773238
Coefficients:
 [ 7.73467193e-01  3.28845975e-02  3.66100259e-02 -9.59284160e+02
  6.99369053e+02]
```

                        OLS Regression Results
==

Dep. Variable:	Profit	R-squared:	0.950
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.943
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	129.7
Date:	Fri, 07 Jan 2022	Prob (F-statistic):	3.91e-21
Time:	21:36:42	Log-Likelihood:	-421.10
No. Observations:	40	AIC:	854.2
Df Residuals:	34	BIC:	864.3
Df Model:	5		
Covariance Type:	nonrobust		

===

	coef	std err	t	P>|t|	[0.025	0.975]
const	4.255e+04	8358.538	5.091	0.000	2.56e+04	5.95e+04
R&D Spend	0.7735	0.055	14.025	0.000	0.661	0.886
Administration	0.0329	0.066	0.495	0.624	-0.102	0.168
Marketing Spend	0.0366	0.019	1.884	0.068	-0.003	0.076
Florida	-959.2842	4038.108	-0.238	0.814	-9165.706	7247.138

New York	699.3691	3661.563	0.191	0.850	-6741.822	8140.560

===

Omnibus:	15.823	Durbin-Watson:	2.468
Prob(Omnibus):	0.000	Jarque-Bera (JB):	23.231
Skew:	-1.094	Prob(JB):	9.03e-06
Kurtosis:	6.025	Cond. No.	1.49e+06

===

Warnings:
[1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.
[2] The condition number is large, 1.49e+06. This might indicate that there are
strong multicollinearity or other numerical problems.

Table 2.

runfile('/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression/multiple_linear_regression.py',
wdir='/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression')
Intercept:
 46329.06017854024
Coefficients:
 [7.85141717e-01 1.69781929e-02 1.69782094e-02 -8.26468159e+02
  5.54657333e+02]

OLS Regression Results

===

Dep. Variable:	Profit	R-squared:	0.950
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.944
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	165.6
Date:	Fri, 07 Jan 2022	Prob (F-statistic):	3.19e-22
Time:	21:37:55	Log-Likelihood:	-421.24
No. Observations:	40	AIC:	852.5
Df Residuals:	35	BIC:	860.9
Df Model:	4		
Covariance Type:	nonrobust		

===
=====

	coef	std err	t	P>|t|	[0.025	0.975]
const	4.633e+04	3375.873	13.724	0.000	3.95e+04	5.32e+04
R&D Spend	0.7851	0.049	15.924	0.000	0.685	0.885
Administration	0.0170	0.009	1.839	0.074	-0.002	0.036
Marketing Spend	0.0170	0.009	1.838	0.075	-0.002	0.036
Florida	-826.4682	3985.466	-0.207	0.837	-8917.395	7264.459

New York	554.6573	3610.268	0.154	0.879	-6774.576	7883.891

==

Omnibus:	14.873	Durbin-Watson:	2.511
Prob(Omnibus):	0.001	Jarque-Bera (JB):	21.150
Skew:	-1.038	Prob(JB):	2.56e-05
Kurtosis:	5.895	Cond. No.	1.11e+16

==

Warnings:
[1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.
[2] The smallest eigenvalue is 3.82e-20. This might indicate that there are strong multicollinearity problems or that the design matrix is singular.

Question 2.
When doing the linear regression, if the dataset is wrongly copied twice. What is the consequence?

The estimated parameter won't change but the confidence interval (or the c.i. range) could shrink by approx sqrt(2). In addition, the R squared won't change but the adjusted R squared changes.

Table 1.

runfile('/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression/multiple_linear_regression.py',
wdir='/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression')
Intercept:
 45299.49140836343
Coefficients:
 [0.51986565]

OLS Regression Results

==

Dep. Variable:	Profit	R-squared:	0.111
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.087
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	4.726
Date:	Fri, 07 Jan 2022	Prob (F-statistic):	0.0360
Time:	21:50:10	Log-Likelihood:	-478.74
No. Observations:	40	AIC:	961.5
Df Residuals:	38	BIC:	964.9
Df Model:	1		
Covariance Type:	nonrobust		

```
========================================================================
====
                coef    std err      t    P>|t|    [0.025    0.975]
------------------------------------------------------------------------
const        4.53e+04  3.02e+04    1.502   0.141   -1.57e+04   1.06e+05
Administration  0.5199    0.239    2.174   0.036    0.036     1.004
========================================================================
Omnibus:              0.124   Durbin-Watson:           1.946
Prob(Omnibus):        0.940   Jarque-Bera (JB):        0.070
Skew:                -0.081   Prob(JB):                0.966
Kurtosis:             2.874   Cond. No.              6.14e+05
========================================================================
```

Warnings:
[1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.
[2] The condition number is large, 6.14e+05. This might indicate that there are
strong multicollinearity or other numerical problems.

Table 2.

runfile('/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression/multiple_linear_regression.py',
wdir='/Users/zli/Desktop/Multiple-Linear-Regression')
Intercept:
 45299.491408363414
Coefficients:
 [0.51986565]
                OLS Regression Results
```
========================================================================
Dep. Variable:         Profit   R-squared:              0.111
Model:                   OLS   Adj. R-squared:          0.099
Method:         Least Squares   F-statistic:            9.700
Date:          Fri, 07 Jan 2022  Prob (F-statistic):    0.00258
Time:                21:51:41   Log-Likelihood:        -957.48
No. Observations:         80   AIC:                     1919.
Df Residuals:             78   BIC:                     1924.
Df Model:                  1
Covariance Type:     nonrobust
========================================================================
====
                coef    std err      t    P>|t|    [0.025    0.975]
------------------------------------------------------------------------
const        4.53e+04   2.1e+04    2.153   0.034   3403.607   8.72e+04
```

| Administration | 0.5199 | 0.167 | 3.115 | 0.003 | 0.188 | 0.852 |

==

Omnibus:	0.109	Durbin-Watson:	1.976
Prob(Omnibus):	0.947	Jarque-Bera (JB):	0.140
Skew:	-0.081	Prob(JB):	0.932
Kurtosis:	2.874	Cond. No.	6.14e+05

==

Warnings:
[1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.
[2] The condition number is large, 6.14e+05. This might indicate that there are
strong multicollinearity or other numerical problems.

2022-3-17 Meta 买它 infra research data scientist 电面

ML/STATISTICS: credit fraud,

Q1: given amount and distance as features, what algorithm you will use?

Answer: Build a classification model to predict probability of fraud.

Q2: what other algorithms you can think of and what are the pro and cons compared to the one you proposed in Q1.

Answer:
2 features -> desicion tree/boosting/deep learning is not adequate.

Decision Tree:
        * Not be efficient because lots of data but very few features

KNN:
        * Frauds change over time, not a good patterns as new tech used in the new fraud cases
        * Save all the data but not training needed

Anormaly Dection (to be reviewed):
        * Distribution of individual features

Logistic regression:
        * Good interpretability
        * Score fast
        * Training is relatively slow
        * Its relative simplicity makes it a high-bias and low-variance model, so it may not performance well when the decision boundary is not linear.

Q3: coefficient of amount to fraudulence if 0.10 with standard error 0.02, what's the relationship between amount and fraudulence? Is it statistically significant? How do you prove it?

Answer: (See ESL Page 124) Each unit increase in the distance accounts for *an increase in the odds of fraudulence of exp(0.10)~=1.105 or 10.5% (alternatively the increase in the log-odds of*

fraud of 0.1 or 10%). The Z score is 0.10/0.02=5 which means the coefficient is significant. The is proved by the CLT.