# Stat 306: Finding Relationships in Data. Lecture 5 Section 2.5 (continued)

# linear regression



PREDICTOR variable





**RESPONSE** variable



### Sample, n=9

Population parameters  $\beta_0$  ,  $\beta_1$  ,  $\sigma^2$ 

Hypothesis Test  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$  Sample statistics  $b_0 = 17.7$   $b_1 = 0.55$  s = 15.5 $R^2 = 0.49$ 

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036



Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>o</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$
$\beta_1$	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$
$\sigma^2$	S <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ]	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s <sup>2</sup> )	C.I. for $\sigma^2$
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_{m{Y}}(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

<b>Step 0:</b> From θ, definestimator, $\hat{\theta}$	he Step 1: Consider the statistic, $\hat{\theta}$ random va	the sample , as a riable $\hat{\Theta}$	tep 2: etermine $\left[\hat{\Theta}\right]$ (to confirm it's unbiased) $ar[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to calculate se)	Step 3: Define $se(\hat{\theta}) =$ estimate of $\sqrt{2}$	Var ( $\hat{\Theta}$ )	tep 4: Define $1-\alpha)$ % C.I. = $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$
Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$
$\beta_1$	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$
σ <sup>2</sup>	s <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ]	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s²)	C.I. for $\sigma^2$
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

## Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate" $\beta_0$ $\beta_1$ $\sigma^2$ $\mu_Y(x)$

The simple linear regression model:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

where the  $\epsilon_i$ 's are independent normal random variables with mean 0 and variance  $\sigma^2$ Therefore:

$$Y_i \sim N(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i, \sigma^2)$$

subpopulation mean:

$$\mathbf{E}[Y|X=x] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$$



$$egin{aligned} & p = ar{y} - b_1 ar{x} \ & 1 = r_{xy} rac{s_y}{s_x} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i & ext{, where: } a_i = rac{(x_i - ar{x})}{(n-1)s_x^2} \ & 2 = rac{\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^2}{n-2} \ & r(x) &= b_0 + b_1 x = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i & ext{, where: } \ & c_i = n^{-1} + a_i (x - ar{x}) = n^{-1} + rac{(x - ar{x})(x_i - ar{x})}{(n-1)s_x^2} \ & \end{array}$$

-  $\overline{x}$ )





Preview from section 2.6...

$$\hat{B}_1 \sim N\left(\beta_1, \sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}\right),\,$$

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}} \sim N(0, 1).$$



$$B_{0} = \overline{Y} - B_{1}\overline{x}$$

$$E[B_{0}] = E[\overline{Y} - B_{1}\overline{X}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E[\sum_{i=1}^{n}Y_{i}] - \beta_{1}\overline{X}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\beta_{0} + \beta_{1}X_{i}) - \beta_{1}\overline{X}$$

$$= \beta_{0} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_{1}X_{i} - \beta_{1}\overline{X}$$

$$= \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i} - \beta_{1}\overline{X}$$

$$= \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}\overline{X} - \beta_{1}\overline{X}$$

$$= \beta_{0}$$

Therefore  $b_0$  is "unbiased".



Therefore  $b_1$  is "unbiased".



Therefore s<sup>2</sup> is "unbiased".

credit: https://web.njit.edu/~wguo/Math644\_2012/Math644\_Chapter%201\_part2.pdf



Therefore the subpopulation mean" is "unbiased".

<b>Step 0:</b> From θ, defir estimator, $\hat{\theta}$	he Step 1: Consider the statistic, $\hat{\theta}$ random va	the sample , as a riable $\hat{\Theta}$	Step 2: Determine $E[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to confirm it's unbiased) $Var[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to calculate se)		
Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ] <i>unbiased</i>	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	
β1	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ] <i>unbiased</i>	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	
$\sigma^2$	S <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ] <i>unbiased</i>	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x))$ <i>unbiased</i>	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	









$$Var(B_{0}) = \sigma^{2}\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow se(b_{0}) = s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)}$$

$$Var[B_{0}] = se(b_{0}) = S\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)}$$

$$Var[B_{1}] = se(b_{1})$$

$$Var[A_{1}] = Se(b_{1})$$

$$Va$$

$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{B}_{1}) = \frac{\sigma^{2}}{(n-1)s_{x}^{2}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1}s_{x}}$$

$$(2.46)$$

$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{B}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1}s_{x}}$$

$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{B}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1}s_{x}}$$

where:

$$\hat{\sigma} = s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i^2}{n-2}}$$

Step 3:  
Define  
se(
$$\hat{\theta}$$
) =  
estimate of  $\sqrt{Var(\hat{\Theta})}$ Step 4:  
Define  
 $(1-\alpha)\%$  C.I. =  
 $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$ Variance  
of the  
estimatorStandard  
Error of  
estimatorConfidence  
IntervalVar[B\_0]se(b\_0)C.I. for  $\beta_0$ Var[B\_1]se(b\_1)C.I. for  $\beta_1$ Var[S^2]se(s^2)C.I. for  $\sigma^2$ Var  $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$  $se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$ C.I. for  
 $\mu_Y(x)$ 

Step 3: Define $se(\hat{\theta}) =$ estimate of $\chi$	$\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\Theta})}$	Step 4: Define $1-\alpha)$ % C.I. = $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$
Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval
Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$
Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$
Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s²)	C.I. for $\sigma^2$
Var $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

 $\implies$  We will skip this....

A confidence interval for a parameter  $\theta$  commonly has the form

$$\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta}),$$

$$\begin{split} b_{0} &= \overline{y} - b_{1}\overline{x} \\ se(b_{0}) &= s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)} \\ se(b_{0}) &= s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)} \\ g5\% \text{ C.I. for } \beta_{0} &= \\ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \overline{y} - b_{1}\overline{X} - t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)} \\ \overline{y} - b_{1}\overline{X} + t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}\right)} \end{array} \right] \\ \hline se(b_{1}) \\ se(s^{2}) \\ c.l. \text{ for } \beta_{1} \\ se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \\ c.l. \text{ for } \gamma^{2} \\ se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \\ c.l. \text{ for } \gamma^{2} \\ \mu_{Y}(x) \\ \hline se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \\ c.l. \text{ for } \gamma^{2} \\ \mu_{Y}(x) \\ \hline se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \\ c.l. \text{ for } \gamma^{2} \\ \mu_{Y}(x) \\ \hline se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \\$$



$$se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1} s_{x}}$$

$$se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1} s_{x}}$$

$$se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1} s_{x}}$$

$$se(b_{0}) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \beta_{0}$$

$$se(b_{1}) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \beta_{0}$$

$$se(b_{1}) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \beta_{1}$$

$$se(b_{1}) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \beta_{1}$$

$$se(s^{2}) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \beta_{1}$$

$$se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) \qquad C.I. \text{ for } \sigma^{2}$$

St De (1 θ	ep 4: efine $-\alpha$ )% C.I. = $\pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$
Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval
se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$
se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$
se(s <sup>2</sup> )	C.I. for $\sigma^2$
$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

We will skip this....

		Ste Def $(1-\alpha)$ $\hat{\theta} =$	<b>p 4:</b> ine x)% C.I. = $c \times se(\hat{\theta})$
$\beta_0 + \beta_1 x$ is	Standard Error of estimator		Confidence Interval
	se(b <sub>0</sub> )		C.I. for $\beta_0$
(2.43)	se(b <sub>1</sub> )		C.I. for $\beta_1$
	se(s²)		C.I. for $\sigma^2$
	$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$		C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

The 95% confidence interval for subpopulation mean  $\mu_Y(x) = \beta_0$ 

$$\hat{\mu}_Y(x) \pm t_{n-2,0.975} \times se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x)),$$

where:

$$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x)) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x-\overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}}$$

and:

$$\hat{\mu}_Y(x) = \hat{eta}_0 + \hat{eta}_1 x.$$
  
and:  
 $\hat{\sigma} = s = \sqrt{rac{\sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2}{n-2}}$ 

V

<b>Step 0:</b> From θ, definestimator, $\hat{\theta}$	he Step 1: Consider the statistic, $\hat{\theta}$ random va	the sample , as a riable $\hat{\Theta}$	tep 2: etermine $[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to confirm it's unbiased) $ar[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to calculate se)	Step 3: Define $se(\hat{\theta}) =$ estimate of $\sqrt{2}$	Var ( $\hat{\Theta}$ )	Step 4: Define $1-\alpha$ )% C.I. = $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$
Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$
$\beta_1$	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$
σ <sup>2</sup>	s <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ]	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s <sup>2</sup> )	C.I. for $\sigma^2$
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$

• Questions?



```
> # Linear regression example
> # x and n are fixed values
> x <- c(82, 45, 71, 22, 29, 9, 12, 18, 24)
> n <- 9
> # y is a realization of the random variable "Y", i.e. "observed data":
> y <- c(71, 54, 43, 45, 21, 11, 30, 45, 10)
> plot(y~x, xlim=c(0,100), ylim=c(0,100), pch=20, cex=3)
> # beta0, beta1, and sigma2 are population parameters
> # let's pretend that we know the values of these parameters:
> beta0 <- 20
> beta1 <- 0.5
> sigma2 <- 100
```

We have plotted the "observed data" (i.e. one realization of the random vector **Y**):



```
> # Now we introduce the random variables:
>
> # epsilon (unknown) is a random variable
> epsilon <- rnorm(n, mean=0, sd=sqrt(sigma2))</pre>
>
> # Y (unknown) is a random variable
> Y <- beta0 + beta1*x + epsilon
>
> # Sample statistics (also known as "estimators")
> # can be considered as random variables:
>
> # sample means:
> xbar <- (1/n)*sum(x)
> ybar <- (1/n)*sum(Y)
>
> # sample standard deviations:
> sx <- sqrt( sum((x-xbar)^2)/(n-1) )
> sy <- sqrt( sum((Y-ybar)^2)/(n-1) )</pre>
>
> # sample covariance and sample correlation:
> sxy <- (1/(n-1))*sum((x-xbar)*(Y-ybar))</pre>
> rxy <- sxy/(sx*sy)</pre>
>
> # best estimators for beta0 and beta1 parameters
> beta1hat <- rxy*sy/sx</pre>
> beta0hat <- ybar-beta1hat*xbar</p>
```

```
> residuals <- y - beta0hat - beta1hat*x
> s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2))</pre>
```



- Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?
- > # Let's plot another a realization of the random variable "Y"
  >
  > points(x,Y,pch=20,cex=4, col=rgb(0.2,0.7,0.25,alpha=0.10))
- > abline(beta0hat, beta1hat, col=rgb(0,0,1,alpha=0.50), lwd=3)



- Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?
- > # Let's plot another a realization of the random variable "Y"
  >
- > points(x,Y,pch=20,cex=4, col=rgb(0.2,0.7,0.25,alpha=0.10))
- > abline(beta0hat, beta1hat, col=rgb(0,0,1,alpha=0.50), lwd=3)



- Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?
- > # Let's plot another a realization of the random variable "Y"
  >
- > points(x,Y,pch=20,cex=4, col=rgb(0.2,0.7,0.25,alpha=0.10))
- > abline(beta0hat, beta1hat, col=rgb(0,0,1,alpha=0.50), lwd=3)



- Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?
- > # Let's plot another a realization of the random variable "Y"
  >
- > points(x,Y,pch=20,cex=4, col=rgb(0.2,0.7,0.25,alpha=0.10))
  > abline(beta0hat, beta1hat, col=rgb(0,0,1,alpha=0.50), lwd=3)



- Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?
- > # Let's plot another a realization of the random variable "Y"
  > 
  > points(x,Y,pch=20,cex=4, col=rgb(0.2,0.7,0.25,alpha=0.10))
  > abline(beta0hat, beta1hat, col=rgb(0,0,1,alpha=0.50), lwd=3)



```
> # plot the 95% confidence interval for a series of subpopulation means:
> # this should look like a confidence interval for the regr
> for(myx in c(0,10,20,30,40,50,60,70,80,90,100)){
+ muhat_x <- beta0+beta1*myx
+ muhat_x
+ lowerCI <- muhat_x - qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + ((myx-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
+ upperCI <- muhat_x + qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + ((myx-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
+
+
+ points(myx, lowerCI, pch="-", cex=8, col="lightblue")
+ points(myx, upperCI, pch="-", cex=8, col="lightblue")
+ }
```



```
> # plot the variance for our different values of x:
> for(myx in x){
+ lines(c(myx,myx),c((beta0 + beta1*myx)-sqrt(sigma2),(beta0 + beta1*myx)
+sqrt(sigma2)),col="red",lwd=4)
+ }
```



```
> # plot the variance for our different values of x:
> for(myx in x){
+ lines(c(myx,myx),c((beta0 + beta1*myx)-sqrt(sigma2),(beta0 + beta1*myx)
+sqrt(sigma2)),col="red",lwd=4)
+ }
```



```
> # plot the variance for our different values of x:
> for(myx in x){
+ lines(c(myx,myx),c((beta0 + beta1*myx)-sqrt(sigma2),(beta0 + beta1*myx)
+sqrt(sigma2)),col="red",lwd=4)
+ }
```





#### Suppose we now want to make a prediction for a new value of x.

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged 50 years old (X=50) will have.



**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=50 years old will have.

this hypothetical new person aged 50 is sometimes called "an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ ", Where  $x^*=50$ .

Our best estimate, also known as the "point prediction", would be equal to  $b_0 + b_1(50) = 45.1$ 

```
> xstar <- 50
> point_prediction <- beta0hat + beta1hat*xstar
> point_prediction
[1] 45.07117
```

```
> # x and n are fixed values
> x <- c(82, 45, 71, 22, 29, 9, 12, 18, 24)
> n <- 9
> # y is a realization of the random variable "Y", i.e. "observed data":
> y <- c(71, 54, 43, 45, 21, 11, 30, 45, 10)
> xbar <- (1/n)*sum(x)
> ybar <- (1/n)*sum(y)
> sx <- sqrt( sum((x-xbar)^2)/(n-1) )
> sy <- sqrt( sum((y-ybar)^2)/(n-1) )</pre>
> sxy <- (1/(n-1))*sum((x-xbar)*(y-ybar))</pre>
> rxy <- sxy/(sx*sy)
> beta1hat <- rxy*sy/sx</p>
> beta0hat <- ybar-beta1hat*xbar</pre>
> residuals <- y - beta0hat - beta1hat*x</p>
> s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2))
> plot(y~x, xlim=c(0,100), ylim=c(0,100), pch=20, cex=3)
> abline(beta0hat, beta1hat)
                                                          100
> xstar <- 50
                                                          8
> point_prediction <- beta0hat + beta1hat*xstar</p>
                                                          00
> point_prediction
                                                         \sim
                                                          40
[1] 45.07117
> lines(x=c(xstar, xstar), c(0, 100))
                                                          20
```

0

20

40

60

х

80

100

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.

 $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

(2.67)  $\hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)]$ =  $(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*)$ 

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

This has variance (2.68)  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$ since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]=\operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x^{*})\right]$  from (2.66).

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error iS

$$\hat{\sigma} imes \sqrt{1 + rac{1}{n} + rac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}}$$
 ,

Note this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

$$\hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

Note this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\operatorname{se}(\mathsf{E}) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\operatorname{se}(\mathsf{E}) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

The 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for a unit (not in sample) with value  $x^*$ :

(2.44) 
$$\hat{Y}(x^*) \pm t_{n-2,0.975} \times se(E), \ \hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x^* = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*),$$

where  $E = \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*) - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x^* - \epsilon(x^*)$  is the prediction error.

> points(xstar, point\_prediction, col="pink", pch=18, cex=3)



```
> # 95% prediction interval:
> lowerPI <- point_prediction - qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + 1 + ((xstar-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
> upperPI <- point_prediction + qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + 1 + ((xstar-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
>
> c(lowerPI,upperPI)
[1] 5.61226 84.53007
>
> lines(x=c(xstar,xstar),y=c(lowerPI,upperPI), col="darkviolet",lwd=15)
```



#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of the data was done using <u>linear regression</u>. For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each

determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount

of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

the data was done using **linear regression**.

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each

determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount

of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

the data was done using **linear regression**.

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each

determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount

of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

the data was done using **linear regression**.

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each

determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount

of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

the data was done using **linear regression**.

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

• Questions?