

Choosing the best model for prediction

Calculating the PRESS residuals $\delta_i^* = y_i - \hat{y}_{i,-i}$ is an

example of doing leave one out cross validation.

These residuals measure how well the i -th observation of the response can be estimated or predicted in terms of the other observations. The model with the best prediction ability should be the one that minimizes $\sum_{i=1}^n |\delta_i^*|$ or

$\sum_{i=1}^n (\delta_i^*)^2 = \text{PRESS}$, or eventually the one that maximizes

$$R_{\text{pred}}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\delta_i^*)^2}{SS_T}$$

Categorical or Indicator variables

Suppose $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 Z_i + \epsilon_i$

where Z is a categorical variable with l categories.

Such regression problems are normally best solved by introducing $l-1$ indicator variables.

For instance, with three different catalyst the regression model can be:

~~$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 Z_{i1} + \beta_4 Z_{i2} + \epsilon_i, \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m$$~~

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 Z_{i1} + \beta_4 Z_{i2} + \epsilon_i, \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m$$

Where the columns $\underline{Z}_1$ and $\underline{Z}_2$ are

$\underline{Z}_1$	$\underline{Z}_2$
1	0
...	...
1	0
0	1
0	...
0	0
...	...
0	0

The (1,0) combination correspond to catalyst 1, the (0,1) to catalyst 2 and the (0,0) to catalyst 3.

The model is then,

$$Y_i = (\beta_0 + \beta_3) + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \epsilon_i \quad \text{for catalyst 1}$$

$$Y_i = (\beta_0 + \beta_4) + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \epsilon_i \quad \text{--- u --- 2}$$

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} \quad \text{--- u --- 3}$$

It may happen that the coefficients for the continuous variables depend on the ~~level of~~ the category variables.

Suppose we construct the model

~~$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 Z_{i1} + \beta_4 Z_{i2} + \beta_5 X_{i1} Z_{i1} + \beta_6 X_{i2} Z_{i2} + \epsilon_i$$~~

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 Z_{i1} + \beta_4 Z_{i2} + \beta_5 X_{i1} Z_{i1} + \beta_6 X_{i2} Z_{i2} + \epsilon_i$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Then we have:

$$Y_i = (\beta_0 + \beta_3) + (\beta_1 + \beta_5) X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \epsilon_i \quad \text{catalyst 1}$$

$$Y_i = (\beta_0 + \beta_4) + \beta_1 X_{i1} + (\beta_2 + \beta_6) X_{i2} + \epsilon_i \quad \text{catalyst 2}$$

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \epsilon_i \quad \text{catalyst 3.}$$

Orthogonal columns in the Design matrix

Let the design matrix $\underline{X} = [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \dots, \underline{x}_k]$

If $\underline{x}_p^T \underline{x}_q = 0$ i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ip} x_{iq} = 0$, $p \neq q$ $\underline{x}_p$ and $\underline{x}_q$ are orthogonal

If all columns are orthogonal $\underline{X}^T \underline{X} = \begin{bmatrix} n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{x}_1^T \underline{x}_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \underline{x}_k^T \underline{x}_k \end{bmatrix}$

$$\text{and } \hat{\underline{\beta}} = (\underline{X}^T \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^T \underline{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & (\underline{x}_1^T \underline{x}_1)^{-1} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & (\underline{x}_k^T \underline{x}_k)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \\ \underline{x}_1^T \underline{y} \\ \vdots \\ \underline{x}_k^T \underline{y} \end{bmatrix}$$

The estimator for β_j will only depend on $\underline{x}_j$ and $\underline{y}$

$$\text{and } SS_R = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (b_0 + b_1 x_{i1} + \dots + b_k x_{ik} - b_0)^2$$

$$= b_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i1}^2 + b_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i2}^2 + \dots + b_k^2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ik}^2$$

$$= SS_R(\beta_1 | \beta_0) + SS_R(\beta_2 | \beta_0) + \dots + SS_R(\beta_k | \beta_0)$$

Testing a general linear hypothesis

Suppose $E[y] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3$ and we want to test,

$$H_0: \begin{cases} \beta_1 - \beta_2 = 0 \\ \beta_2 - \beta_3 = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta$$

Can be formulated as: $H_0: \underline{C} \underline{\beta} = \underline{0}$ $H_1: \underline{C} \underline{\beta} \neq \underline{0}$

$$\text{where } \underline{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \underline{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{C} \underline{\beta} = \underline{0} \Leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 - \beta_2 \\ \beta_2 - \beta_3 \end{bmatrix} = \underline{0}$$

We have r (in this case 2) constraints on $\underline{\beta}$.

$$\hat{\underline{\beta}} \sim N(\underline{\beta}, \sigma^2 (\underline{X}^T \underline{X})^{-1}) \Rightarrow \underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}} \sim N(\underline{C} \underline{\beta}, \sigma^2 \underline{C} (\underline{X}^T \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{C}^T)$$

Hence under H_0 $(\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}})^T (\sigma^2 \underline{C} (\underline{X}^T \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{C}^T)^{-1} (\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}}) \sim \chi^2_k$

Since $\hat{\underline{\beta}}$ and SS_E (full model) are independent and $\frac{SS_E}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{(n-k-1)}$

we get.

$$F = \frac{(\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}})^T (\underline{C} (\underline{X}^T \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{C}^T)^{-1} (\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}}) / \sigma^2 k}{SS_E / \sigma^2 (n-k-1)} \sim F_{k, n-k-1}$$

Under H_0 , Reject if, F is large.

Testing $H_0: \underline{C} \underline{\beta} = \underline{d}$ $H_1: \underline{C} \underline{\beta} \neq \underline{d}$

we just substitute $\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}}$ with $\underline{C} \hat{\underline{\beta}} - \underline{d}$ in F