## Statistics: Homework 4

1. (a) Given  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  denote the probability of choosing box 1 and 2 respectively if the ball color chosen is i where  $i = \{B, W, G\}$ , denoting the three different colors. With the given information of the number of different color balls in the different boxes,

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathbb{P}(B|1) = 4/10 & \mathbb{P}(B|2) = 3/10 & \mathbb{P}(B|3) = 2/10 \\ \mathbb{P}(W|1) = 2/10 & \mathbb{P}(W|2) = 6/10 & \mathbb{P}(W|3) = 0 \\ \mathbb{P}(G|1) = 4/10 & \mathbb{P}(G|2) = 1/10 & \mathbb{P}(G|3) = 8/10 \end{array}$$

The risk function is represented by,

$$R(\theta, \hat{\theta}_{p,q}) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}(|\theta^2 - \hat{\theta}_{p,q}|^2)$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_{\theta}\left(\sum_{i \in \{B,W,G\}} L(\theta, \hat{\theta}_{p,q}(i)) \mathbb{P}(i|\theta)\right)$$

where  $L(\theta, \hat{\theta}_{p,q}(i)) = L(\theta, 1)p_i + L(\theta, 2)q_i + L(\theta, 3)(1 - p_i - q_i)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{split} R(1,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) &= [q_B + 4(1-p_B-q_B)]\frac{4}{10} + [q_W + 4(1-p_W-q_W)]\frac{2}{10} + [q_G + 4(1-p_G-q_G)]\frac{4}{10} \\ R(2,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) &= [9p_B + 4q_B + 49(1-p_B-q_B)]\frac{3}{10} + [9p_W + 4q_W + 49(1-p_W-q_W)]\frac{6}{10} \\ &+ [9p_G + 4q_G + 49(1-p_G-q_G)]\frac{1}{10} \end{split}$$

(b) Bayes risk is given by

$$r(f,\theta) = \int R(\theta,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) f(\theta) d\theta$$

but since our scenario is discrete, we instead have

$$\begin{split} r(f,\theta) &= \sum_{\theta=1,2} R(\theta,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) \mathbb{P}(\theta) \\ &= \lambda R(1,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) + (1-\lambda) R(2,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) \end{split}$$

where  $R(1, \hat{\theta}_{p,q})$  and  $R(2, \hat{\theta}_{p,q})$  are the values are from (a).

(c) Given  $\lambda = 1/2$ , we have

$$r(f,\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left( R(1,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) + R(2,\hat{\theta}_{p,q}) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 16.3 - 13.6p_B - 14.7q_B - 24.8p_W - 27.6q_W - 5.6p_G - 5.6q_G \right)$$

thus to the infimum of Bayes risk is when  $q_B = q_W = q_G = 1$ .

```
library(survey)
library(dplyr)
# read csv file into dataframe car
car <- read.csv('carmpgdat.csv')</pre>
# (a) Fitting a mulitple linear regression model
# generate a linear model with normally distributed noise with the model MPG~VOL+HP+SP+WT
# covariates <-cbind('VOL','HP','SP','WT')</pre>
lm_car <- lm(MPG~VOL+HP+SP+WT, data = car)</pre>
# estimated regression function and residual sum of squares
coefficients(lm_car)
# MPG = 192.43775332 - 0.01564501 * VOL + 0.39221231 * HP - 1.29481848 * SP - 1.85980373 * WT
RSS = sum(lm_car$residuals^2)
\# RSS = 1027.381
# (b) Mallows's Cp
# Since the AIC criterion is equivalent to Mallows's Cp,
# (i) Forward
base <- lm(MPG~WT, data = car)</pre>
step(base, scope = list(upper = lm_car, lower=~1), direction = 'forward', trace = TRUE)
# Start: AIC=378.69
# MPG ~ 1
# Df Sum of Sq RSS
                    AIC
# + WT 1 6641.5 1466.0 240.45
# + HP 1 5058.0 3049.4 300.51
# + SP 1 3842.6 4264.9 328.02
# + VOL 1 1101.6 7005.9 368.72
# <none>
                   8107.5 378.69
# Step: AIC=240.45
# MPG ~ WT
# Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC
# + SP 1 82.981 1383.0 237.68
# + HP 1 35.380 1430.6 240.45
             1466.0 240.45
# <none>
# + VOL 1 3.883 1462.1 242.24
# Step: AIC=237.68
# MPG ~ WT + SP
# Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC
# + HP 1 349.37 1033.7 215.80
# + VOL 1 45.97 1337.0 236.90
# <none>
                  1383.0 237.68
# Step: AIC=215.8
\# MPG \sim WT + SP + HP
# Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC
# <none>
            1033.7 215.8
# + VOL 1 6.2685 1027.4 217.3
# Call:
# lm(formula = MPG ~ WT + SP + HP, data = car)
# Coefficients:
```

```
# (Intercept)
# 194.1296 -1.9221 -1.3200 0.4052
# (ii) Backward
step(lm_car,direction = 'backward', trace = TRUE)
# Start: AIC=217.3
# MPG ~ VOL + HP + SP + WT
# Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC
# - VOL 1 6.27 1033.7 215.80
# <none>
              1027.4 217.30
# - HP 1 309.67 1337.0 236.90
# - SP 1 373.36 1400.7 240.72
# - WT 1 1013.76 2041.2 271.59
# Step: AIC=215.8
# MPG ~ HP + SP + WT
# Df Sum of Sq RSS AIC
# <none>
                  1033.7 215.80
# - HP 1
           349.37 1383.0 237.68
# - SP 1 396.97 1430.6 240.45
# - WT 1 1322.87 2356.5 281.37
# Call:
# lm(formula = MPG ~ HP + SP + WT, data = car)
# Coefficients:
# (Intercept)
                      HP
# 194.1296 0.4052 -1.3200 -1.9221
# Both forward and backward stepwise approach give the same submodel to be selected.
\mbox{\tt\#} The selected submodel is MPG \mbox{\tt ^{-}} HP + SP + WT with the regression formula:
# MPG = 194.1296 + HP * 0.4052 - SP * 1.3200 - WT * 1.9221
%# For the forward stepwise approach, the base model is important
%# as it will change the outcome. For example for this, if we were
%# to start with VOL instead of any of the other covariates, we
	fmu\# will end up with also the VOL covariate. By not starting with with
%# the VOL covariate we will end up with a model without VOL which
\%# corresponds to the backward stepwise approach and also the
\%# Zheng-Loh model selection. As for the backward stepwise approach
\%# we do not have such a problem as we start the model with all the
%# covariates and reduce it down by computing the AIC of the model
%# with different covariate missing then remove the covariate that
%# gives the smallest AIC when removed.
# (c) Zheng-Loh Model Selection
# Wald test for the covariates
regTermTest(lm_car, 'VOL', null=NULL,df=Inf, method = "Wald")
regTermTest(lm_car, 'HP', null=NULL,df=Inf, method = "Wald")
regTermTest(lm_car, 'SP', null=NULL,df=Inf, method = "Wald")
regTermTest(lm_car, 'WT', null=NULL,df=Inf, method = "Wald")
# Wald test for VOL
# in lm(formula = MPG ~ VOL + HP + SP + WT, data = car)
# Chisq = 0.4698075 on 1 df: p= 0.49308
# Wald test for HP
# in lm(formula = MPG ~ VOL + HP + SP + WT, data = car)
```

```
# Chisq = 23.20929 on 1 df: p= 1.4529e-06
# Wald test for SP
# in lm(formula = MPG ~ VOL + HP + SP + WT, data = car)
# Chisq = 27.98266 on 1 df: p= 1.2241e-07
# Wald test for WT
# in lm(formula = MPG ~ VOL + HP + SP + WT, data = car)
\# Chisq = 75.97941 on 1 df: p= < 2.22e-16
# Arranging in descending order we have:
# WT > SP > HP > VOL
\mbox{\tt\#} We can do this as the Chisq test statistic is just the square
# of the test statistic of the Wald test.
\# Let lm_{j} be the linear model with the jth largest Wald test statistic
n <- nrow(car)
lm_1 \leftarrow lm(MPG \sim WT, data = car)
jhat_1 = sum(lm_1\$residuals^2) + (1 * RSS/(n-4) * log(n))
print (jhat_1)
# jhat_1 = 1524.045
lm_2 \leftarrow lm(MPG \sim WT + SP, data = car)
jhat_2 = sum(1m_2\$residuals^2) + (2 * RSS/(n-4) * log(n))
print (jhat_2)
# jhat_2 = 1499.108
lm_3 \leftarrow lm(MPG \sim WT + SP + HP, data = car)
jhat_3 = sum(lm_3\$residuals^2) + (3 * RSS/(n-4) * log(n))
print (jhat_3)
# jhat_3 = 1207.78
jhat_4 = RSS + (4 * RSS/(n-4) * log(n))
print (jhat_4)
# jhat_4 = 1259.555
# Thus the Zheng-Loh model selection method will select WT, SP and HP
# as the covariates for predicting the MPG. Comparing it to (b), we see
# that the Zheng-Loh model selection method gives similar outcome to using
# Mallows's Cp model forward and backward stepwise to selecting a model.
```

```
library(dplyr)
library (magrittr)
# Reading data with separator tab
raw_riasec <- read.csv('RIASEC.csv',sep = '\t')</pre>
# (a) CLEANING UP
# List of realistic traits
realistic_trait <- c('R1','R2','R3','R4','R5','R6','R7','R8')</pre>
# Extracting out the realistic traits
raw_realistic <- raw_riasec[,realistic_trait]</pre>
# Removing rows with -1 from the dataframe
# realistic <- raw_realistic[raw_realistic != -1, ]</pre>
realistic <- raw_realistic %>%
 filter(R1 > 0 & R2 > 0 & R3 > 0 & R4 > 0 & R5 > 0 & R6 > 0 & R7 > 0 & R8 > 0)
# (b) MODEL SELECTION
\mbox{\#} Computing the score for the R trait
realistic <- realistic %>%
  rowwise() %>%
  mutate(Rscore = mean(c(R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8)))
# Generating the training and validation set
tr_realistic <- realistic[1:6500,]</pre>
val_realistic <- realistic[-(1:6500),]</pre>
# Building the linear model
lm_riasec <- lm(Rscore~R1, data = tr_realistic)</pre>
RSS_tr = sum(lm_riasec$residuals^2)
print(RSS_tr)
\# RSS_{tr} = 2902.039
# estimated regression function and residual sum of squares
print(lm_riasec$coefficients)
# R1 = 1.0181052 + 0.4235993 * R1
# (c) VALIDATION
reg.fn <- function(x) 1.0181052 + 0.4235993 * x
val_realistic %<>%
 mutate(pred_Rscore = reg.fn(R1),
        residuals = reg.fn(R1) - Rscore )
avg_RSS_tr = mean(lm_riasec$residuals^2)
avg_RSS_val = mean(val_realistic$residuals^2)
print (avg_RSS_tr) # 0.4464676
print (avg_RSS_val) # 0.5201091
# The residual sum of squares for the validation set using the regression function
# is larger than the residual sum of square for the training set but are of the
# same order. Thus the model generalizes well.
```

4. (a)
# (a) Using Monte Carlo method with N samples

N <- 100000
I <- function(u){X = rgamma(1.5,2.3,n = N); return(sum(1<X & X<2)/N)}
I\_hat <- I

# I\_hat = 0.17552

# Estimated standard error by resampling Monte Carlo 10000 times.
se\_mc <- sqrt(var(sapply(1:N,I)))

# se\_mc = 0.001204692

# Estimated standard error using 10000 bootstrap samples.
B <- 10000
base\_sample <- rgamma(1.5,1/2.3,n = N)
I\_bootstrap <- function(u){X = sample(base\_sample, N, replace = TRUE);return(sum(1<X & X<2)/N)}
se\_bootstrap <- sqrt(var(sapply(1:B,I\_bootstrap)))

# se\_bootstrap = 0.001286245</pre>

(b) We see that we can rewrite I as the following,

$$I = \int_{1}^{2} f(x|1.5, 2.3) dx = \int_{0}^{\infty} h(x) f(x|1.5, 2.3) dx$$

where  $h(x) = \mathbb{1}(1 \le x \le 2)$ , an indicator function that is 1 when  $1 \le x \le 2$  and 0 otherwise. Thus we can use the following estimator  $\hat{I}$  for I where  $X_i \sim \text{Gamma}(1.5, 2.3)$ ,

$$\hat{I} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} h(X_i)$$

Hence by viewing  $h(X) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ , where  $p = \mathbb{P}(1 \leq X \leq 2)$  for  $X \sim \text{Gamma}(1.5, 2.3)$  the standard error is given by

$$Var(\hat{I}) = \frac{p(1-p)}{N}$$

where we sourced for the value of p from the website thus getting

$$\mathbb{P}(1 \le X \le 2) = \int_0^2 f(x|1.5, 2.3) \, dx - \int_0^1 f(x|1.5, 2.3) \, dx = 0.97325 - 0.79645$$

Evaluating the value of the standard error we get se = 0.0012064069