

## STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF LEAST SQUARES ESTIMATORS

### Situation:

Assumption:  $E(Y|x) = \eta_0 + \eta_1 x$  (linear mean function)

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

Least squares estimator:  $\hat{E}(Y|x) = \hat{\eta}_0 + \hat{\eta}_1 x$ , where

$$\hat{\eta}_1 = \frac{SXY}{SXX} \quad \hat{\eta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\eta}_1 \bar{x}$$

$$SXX = \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 = \sum x_i (x_i - \bar{x})$$

$$SXY = \sum (x_i - \bar{x}) (y_i - \bar{y}) = \sum (x_i - \bar{x}) y_i$$

**Comment:** If we also assume  $e|x$  (equivalently,  $Y|x$ ) is normal with constant variance, then the least squares estimates are the same as the maximum likelihood estimates of  $\eta_0$  and  $\eta_1$ .

### Properties of $\hat{\eta}_0$ and $\hat{\eta}_1$ :

$$1) \hat{\eta}_1 = \frac{SXY}{SXX} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}) y_i}{SXX} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{SXX} y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i$$

where  $c_i = \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{SXX}$

Thus: If the  $x_i$ 's are fixed (as in the blood lactic acid example), then  $\hat{\eta}_1$  is a linear combination of the  $y_i$ 's.

Note: Here we want to think of each  $y_i$  as a random variable with distribution  $Y|x_i$ . Thus, if the  $y_i$ 's are independent and each  $Y|x_i$  is normal, then  $\hat{\eta}_1$  is also normal. If the  $Y|x_i$ 's are not normal but  $n$  is large, then  $\hat{\eta}_1$  is approximately normal. This will allow us to do inference on  $\hat{\eta}_1$ . (Details later.)

$$2) \sum c_i = \sum \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{SXX} = \frac{1}{SXX} \sum (x_i - \bar{x}) = 0 \text{ (as seen in establishing the alternate expression for SXX)}$$

$$3) \sum x_i c_i = \sum x_i \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{SXX} = \frac{1}{SXX} \sum x_i (x_i - \bar{x}) = \frac{SXX}{SXX} = 1.$$

*Remark:* Recall the somewhat analogous properties for the residuals  $\hat{e}_i$ .

4)  $\hat{\eta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\eta}_1 \bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i \bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} - c_i \bar{x}\right) y_i$ , also a linear combination of the  $y_i$ 's, hence ...

5) The sum of the coefficients in (4) is  $\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} - c_i \bar{x}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) - \bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i = n\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) - \bar{x} \cdot 0 = 1$ .

### Sampling distributions of $\hat{\eta}_0$ and $\hat{\eta}_1$ :

Consider  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  as fixed (i.e., condition on  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ ).

*Model Assumptions ("The" Simple Linear Regression Model Version 3):*

- $E(Y|x) = \eta_0 + \eta_1 x$  (linear mean function)
- $\text{Var}(Y|x) = \sigma^2$  (Equivalently,  $\text{Var}(e|x) = \sigma^2$ ) (constant variance)
- (NEW)  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  are independent observations. (independence)

The new assumption means we can consider  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  as coming from  $n$  independent random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ , where  $Y_i$  has the distribution of  $Y|x_i$ .

*Comment:* We do *not* assume that the  $x_i$ 's are distinct. If, for example,  $x_1 = x_2$ , then we are assuming that  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  are independent observations from the same conditional distribution  $Y|x_1$ .

Since  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  are random variables, so is  $\hat{\eta}_1$  -- but it depends on the choice of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , so we can talk about the conditional distribution  $\hat{\eta}_1|x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

*Expected value of  $\hat{\eta}_1$  (as the  $y$ 's vary):*

$$\begin{aligned} E(\hat{\eta}_1|x_1, \dots, x_n) &= E\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i | x_1, \dots, x_n\right) \\ &= \sum c_i E(y_i|x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &= \sum c_i E(y_i|x_i) && \text{(since } y_i \text{ depends only on } x_i\text{)} \\ &= \sum c_i (\eta_0 + \eta_1 x_i) && \text{(model assumption)} \\ &= \eta_0 \sum c_i + \eta_1 \sum c_i x_i \\ &= \eta_0 \cdot 0 + \eta_1 \cdot 1 = \eta_1 \end{aligned}$$

**Thus:**  $\hat{\eta}_1$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\eta_1$ .

*Variance of  $\hat{\eta}_1$  (as the  $y$ 's vary):*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\hat{\eta}_1|x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i | x_1, \dots, x_n\right) \\ &= \sum c_i^2 \text{Var}(y_i|x_1, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum c_i^2 \text{Var}(y_i|x_i) && \text{(since } y_i \text{ depends only on } x_i\text{)} \\
&= \sum c_i^2 \sigma^2 \\
&= \sigma^2 \sum c_i^2 \\
&= \sigma^2 \sum \left( \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{SXX} \right)^2 && \text{(definition of } c_i\text{)} \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{(SXX)^2} \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{SXX}
\end{aligned}$$

For short:  $\text{Var}(\hat{\eta}_1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{SXX}$

$$\therefore \text{s.d.}(\hat{\eta}_1) = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{SXX}}$$

*Comments:* This is vaguely analogous to the sampling standard deviation for a mean  $\bar{y}$ :

$$\text{s.d. (estimator)} = \frac{\text{population standard deviation}}{\sqrt{\text{something}}}$$

However, here the "something," namely  $SXX$ , is more complicated. However, we can still analyze this formula to see how the standard deviation varies with the conditions of sampling. For  $\bar{y}$ , the denominator is the square root of  $n$ , so we see that as  $n$  becomes larger, the sampling standard deviation of  $\bar{y}$  gets smaller. Here, recalling that

$SXX = \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2$ , we reason that:

- If the  $x_i$ 's are far from  $\bar{x}$ ,  $SXX$  is \_\_\_\_\_, so  $\text{s.d.}(\hat{\eta}_1)$  is \_\_\_\_\_.
- If the  $x_i$ 's are close to  $\bar{x}$ ,  $SXX$  is \_\_\_\_\_, so  $\text{s.d.}(\hat{\eta}_1)$  is \_\_\_\_\_.

Thus if you are designing an experiment, choosing the  $x_i$ 's to be \_\_\_\_\_ from their mean will result in a more precise estimate of  $\hat{\eta}_1$ . (Assuming the linear model fits!)

*Expected value and variance of  $\hat{\eta}_0$ :*

Using the formula  $\hat{\eta}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{n} - c_i \bar{x} \right) y_i$ , calculations (left to the interested student) similar to those for  $\hat{\eta}_1$  will show:

- $E(\hat{\eta}_0) = \eta_0$  (So  $\hat{\eta}_0$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\eta_0$ .)
- $\text{Var}(\hat{\eta}_0) = \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{SXX} \right)$ , so

$$\text{s.d.}(\hat{\eta}_0) = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{SXX}}$$

Analyzing the variance formula:

- A larger  $\bar{x}$  gives a \_\_\_\_\_ variance for  $\hat{\eta}_0$ .  
→ Does this agree with intuition?
- A larger sample size tends to give a \_\_\_\_\_ variance for  $\hat{\eta}_0$ .
- The variance of  $\hat{\eta}_0$  is (except when  $\bar{x} < 1$ ) \_\_\_\_\_ than the variance of  $\hat{\eta}_1$ .  
→ Does this agree with intuition?
- The spread of the  $x_i$ 's affects the variance of  $\hat{\eta}_0$  in the same way it affects the variance of  $\hat{\eta}_1$ .

*Covariance of  $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$* : Similar calculations (left to the interested student) will show

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\eta}_0, \hat{\eta}_1) = -\sigma^2 \frac{\bar{x}}{SXX}$$

Thus:

- $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$  are not independent (except when \_\_\_\_\_ )  
→ Does this agree with intuition?
- The sign of  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\eta}_0, \hat{\eta}_1)$  is opposite that of  $\bar{x}$ .  
→ Does this agree with intuition?

*Estimating  $\sigma^2$* : To use the variance formulas above for inference, we need to estimate  $\sigma^2$  (=  $\text{Var}(Y|x_i)$ , the same for all  $i$ ).

First, some plausible reasoning: *If* we had lots of observations  $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_m}$  from  $Y|x_i$ , then we could use the univariate standard deviation

$$\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^m (y_{i_j} - \bar{y}_i)^2$$

of these  $m$  observations to estimate  $\sigma^2$ . (Here  $\bar{y}_i$  is the mean of  $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_m}$ , which would be our best estimate of  $E(Y|x_i)$  just using  $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_m}$  )

We don't typically have lots of  $y$ 's from one  $x_i$ , so we might try (reasoning that  $\hat{E}(Y|x_i)$ ) is our best estimate of  $E(Y|x_i)$ )

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [y_i - \hat{E}(Y|x_i)]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{e}_i^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \text{RSS}. \end{aligned}$$

However (just as in the univariate case, we need a denominator  $n-1$  to get an unbiased estimator), a lengthy calculation (omitted) will show that

$$E(RSS | x_1, \dots, x_n) = (n-2) \sigma^2$$

(where the expected value is over all samples of the  $y_i$ 's with the  $x_i$ 's fixed)

Thus we use the estimate

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-2} RSS$$

to get an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ :

$$E(\hat{\sigma}^2 | x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sigma^2.$$

[If you like to think heuristically in terms of losing one degree of freedom for each calculation from data involved in the estimator, this makes sense: Both  $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$  need to be calculated from the data to get RSS.]

*Standard Errors for  $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$ :* Using

$$\hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{RSS}{n-2}}$$

as an estimate of  $\sigma$  in the formulas for s.d ( $\hat{\eta}_0$ ) and s.d( $\hat{\eta}_1$ ), we obtain the *standard errors*

$$\text{s.e.}(\hat{\eta}_1) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{SXX}}$$

and

$$\text{s.e.}(\hat{\eta}_0) = \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{SXX}}$$

as estimates of s.d ( $\hat{\eta}_1$ ) and s.d ( $\hat{\eta}_0$ ), respectively.