1.(a) Since A is nonnegative definite (semipositive definite) matrix, we know by definition that

$$y^T A y \ge 0$$
 for any vector y .

For any vector $\underset{\sim}{z}$, let $\underset{\sim}{y} = P \underset{\sim}{z}$. Then,

$$z^{T} P^{T} A P z = (P z)^{T} A (P z) = y^{T} A y \ge 0 \quad \text{for any vector} \quad z \\ \sim z = y^{T} A y \ge 0 \quad \text{for any vector} \quad z \ge 0$$

Consequently, $P^T A P$ satisfies the definition of a nonnegative definite matrix. This result holds even when P is a singual matrix.

(b) For this result, we will make use of the condition that P is a nonsingular matrix. Since A is a postive definite matrix, we have by definition that $y^T A y > 0$ for every $y \neq 0$. For any vector z, let y = P z. Then,

$$z_{\sim}^{T} P^{T} A P z_{\sim} = (P z)^{T} A (P z) = y_{\sim}^{T} A y > 0 \quad \text{for every vector} \quad y_{\sim} = P z_{\sim} \neq 0.$$

Since P is nonsingular, the columns of P are linearly independent and y = Pz = 0 only if z = 0. Consequently, $P^T A P$ satisfies the definition of a positive definite matrix.

- **2.(a)** For B to satisfy the definition of a generalized inverse of A, we must have ABA = A. Although this simple example could be done by hand, to review some Splus we can do the following:
 - > b <- matrix(c(1,0,0,0),ncol=4)
 > a <- matrix(c(1,2,5,-2),ncol=1)
 > a %*% b %*% a
 [,1]
 [1,] 1
 [2,] 2
 [3,] 5
 [4,] -2
 - (b) Two other generalized inverses for A are the following

 $G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \frac{1}{5} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$ Check in each case that $AG_i A = A$.

3.(a) and **(b)** By the definition of an eigenvector, x is an eigenvector for $I - x(x^T x)^{-1} x^T$ if there is a scalar λ such that

$$(I - \underset{\sim}{x} (\underset{\sim}{x}^T \underset{\sim}{x})^{-1} \underset{\sim}{x}^T) \underset{\sim}{x} = \lambda \underset{\sim}{x}$$

Note that

$$I - \underbrace{x(x^T x)^{-1} x^T}_{\sim} \underbrace{x}_{\sim} = \underbrace{(x - \underbrace{x(x^T x)^{-1} (x^T x)}_{\sim} = \underbrace{x - x}_{\sim} = \underbrace{0}_{\sim}$$

Consequently, $\underset{\sim}{x}$ is an eigenvector of $(I - \underset{\sim}{x} (\underset{\sim}{x^T} x)^{-1} \underset{\sim}{x^T})$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda = 0$.

(c) Since $\underset{\sim}{x^T u} = 0$, we have $(I - \underset{\sim}{x} (\underset{\sim}{x^T x})^{-1} \underset{\sim}{x^T}) \underset{\sim}{u} = \underset{\sim}{u}$.

Therefore, $\underset{\sim}{u}$ is an eigenvector of $(I - \underset{\sim}{x}(\underset{\sim}{x^T}x)^{-1}\underset{\sim}{x^T})$ corresponding to an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 1$.

(d) From part (b) the eigenvalue associated with x is 0. Furthermore, x is the basis for a one dimensional space (a line). The space orthogonal to x has dimension n-1 and we can find a set of vectors u_{n-1} , \dots, u_{n-1} that provide a basis for that space, are orthogonal to each other and are also orthogonal to x. Each of these vectors corresponds to and eigenvalue of 1. Hence, $I - x(x^T x)^{-1}x^T$ has one zero eigenvalue and the other n-1 eigenvalues are all 1. Furthermore,

$$rank(I - \underset{\sim}{x}(\underset{\sim}{x}^T \underset{\sim}{x})^{-1}\underset{\sim}{x}^T) = n - 1,$$

the number of non-zero eigenvalues.

5.) Since A is an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix with rank(A) = r, we can use the spectral decomposition to write A as

$$\begin{split} A_{n \times n} &= \underset{n \times n}{L} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_r & \mathbf{0} \\ & r \times (n-r) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ (n-r) \times r & (n-r) \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L^T \\ & n \times n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} L_1 & L_2 \\ & n \times r & p \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_r & \mathbf{0} \\ & r \times (n-r) \\ \mathbf{0} \\ (n-r) \times r & (n-r) \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_1^T \\ & r \times n \\ L_2^T \\ & L_2^T \\ (n-r) \times n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \underset{n \times r}{L} \underset{r \times n}{\Delta_r} L_1^T \\ \end{split}$$

Note that

$$\begin{split} & \underset{n \times n}{G} = \underset{n \times n}{L} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_r^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ & r \times (n-r) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ (n-r) \times r & (n-r) \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L^T \\ n \times n \\ & n \times n \\ \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} L_1 & L_2 \\ n \times r & n \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_r^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ & r \times (n-r) \\ \mathbf{0} \\ (n-r) \times r & (n-r) \times (n-r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_1^T \\ r \times n \\ L_2^T \\ n \\ L_1^T \\ n \\ n \\ x \\ n \\ \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \underset{n \times r}{L}_1 \Delta_r^{-1} L_1^T \\ & r \times n \\ \end{bmatrix}$$

Now show that the four properties of the Moore-Penrose inverse are satisfied.

(i) AGA = A.

$$\begin{aligned} AGA &= \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r^{-1} \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \right) \\ &= \begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1^T \, L_1 \\ r \times n n \times r \end{array} \right) \Delta_r^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} L_1^T \, L_1 \\ r \times n n \times r \end{array} \right) \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ &= \begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \, \Delta_r^{-1} \, \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \quad \text{since} \ L_1^T \, L_1 = I_r \text{ and } L_1^T \, L_1 = I_r. \\ &= \begin{array}{c} L_1 \, \Delta_r \, L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{array} \quad \text{since} \ \Delta_r \, \Delta_r^{-1} = I_r. \\ &= A \end{aligned}$$

(ii) GAG = G. The proof is similar to (i).

(iii) AG is symmetric. i.e. $(AG)^T = AG$.

$$AG = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 \Delta_r L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} L_1 \Delta_r^{-1} L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} L_1 \Delta_r \begin{pmatrix} L_1^T L_1 \\ r \times n n \times r \end{pmatrix} \Delta_r^{-1} L_1^T \\ r \times n \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} L_1 \Delta_r \Delta_r^{-1} L_1^T \\ n \times r \end{pmatrix} \Delta_r^{-1} L_1^T \quad since \ L_1^T L_1 = I_r.$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} L_1 L_1^T \\ n \times r r \times n \end{pmatrix} since \ \Delta_r \Delta_r^{-1} = I_r.$$
Then (1)

$$(AG)^T = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 L_1^T \\ n \times r_{r \times n} \end{pmatrix}^T = \begin{pmatrix} L_1^T \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} L_1 \\ n \times r \end{pmatrix}^T = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 L_1^T \\ n \times r_{r \times n} \end{pmatrix}^T = AG.$$

(iv) GA is symmetric. i.e. $(GA)^T = GA$. The proof is similar to (iii).

```
5.(a) > V <- matrix(c(3,-1,1,-1,5,-1,1,-1,3),ncol=3,byrow=T)
    > V
         [,1] [,2] [,3]
    [1,]
           3
               -1
                    1
                5
    [2,]
                    -1
           -1
               -1
                     3
    [3,]
           1
    > eigen(V)
    $values:
    [1] 6 3 2
    $vectors:
               [,1]
                        [,2]
                                     [,3]
    [1,] 0.4082483 0.5773503 7.071068e-001
    [2,] -0.8164966 0.5773503 3.764350e-016
    [3,] 0.4082483 0.5773503 -7.071068e-001
 > # Function: spectral
    > #
           input: V = Symmetric matrix
    > #
                 p = Power(e.g. -1 -> inverse matrix
    > #
                               -1/2 -> inv. squart root matrix
    > #
          output: inverse or inverse square root matrix
    > spectral <- function(V,p)</pre>
    + {
    +
            eigen.V <- eigen(V)</pre>
                   <- eigen.V$values
    +
            eval
    +
            evec
                   <- eigen.V$vectors
            spec.V <- evec %*% diag(eval^p) %*% t(evec)</pre>
    +
    +
            return(spec.V)
    + }
 (c) > VV <- spectral(V, -1/2)
    > VV
                         [,2]
                                    [,3]
               [,1]
    [1.] 0.61404486 0.05636733 -0.09306192
    [2,] 0.05636733 0.46461562 0.05636733
    [3,] -0.09306192 0.05636733 0.61404486
    # The following should be an identity matrix
    > VV %*% V %*% VV
```

[,1] [,2] [,3] [1,] 1.000000e+000 -1.943094e-018 8.010899e-017 [2,] 1.100126e-017 1.000000e+000 -3.498043e-016 [3,] 1.587679e-016 -3.041323e-016 1.000000e+000

(d)
$$V^{-1/2} = UD^{-1/2}U^T$$
, where $U = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 & u_3 \\ \sim & \sim & \sim \end{bmatrix}$ and $D = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \lambda_2 & \\ & & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}$.
Then, for $Z_{\sim} = V^{-1/2}Y_{\sim}$ we have

$$E(Z) = E(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}Y) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}}E(Y) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}}0 = 0$$

$$Var(Z) = Var(V^{-\frac{1}{2}}Y) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}}Var(Y)[V^{-\frac{1}{2}}]^{T} = V^{-\frac{1}{2}}VV^{-\frac{1}{2}} = I$$

- **6.(a)** Let $\underline{b} = (X^T X)^- X^T \underline{Y}$ for some generalized inverse $(X^T X)^-$ of $X^T X$. Then $X^T X \underline{b} = X^T X (X^T X)^- X^T \underline{Y} = X^T \underline{Y}$ because $X (X^T X)^- X^T X = P_X X = X$. (Some students based their argument on an incorrect claim that $P_X Y = Y$.)
 - (b) The answer to the first question is yes if X has full column rank. The answer is no if X does not have full column rank. Let $\underline{b}^* = (X^T X)^- X^T \underline{Y} + \underline{a}$ for some generalized inverse $(X^T X)^-$ of $X^T X$. Then, $X^T X \underline{b}^* = X^T X (X^T X)^- X^T \underline{Y} + X^T X \underline{a} = X^T \underline{Y} + X^T X \underline{a}$. This is a solution to the normal equations if $X^T X \underline{a} = 0$. If X does not have full column rank, the columns of X are linearly dependent and there is at least one $\underline{a} \neq 0$ for which $X \underline{a} = 0$. Consequently, $X^T X \underline{a} = 0$ for that \underline{a} . If X has full column rank, then $X^T X$ is a non-singular matrix and there is no $\underline{a} \neq \underline{0}$ for which $X^T X \underline{a} = 0$. (Some students failed to provide a correct derivation and wrongly argued that $X^T X \underline{a} = 0$ only if $X^T X$ is a matrix of zeros. Note that the diagonal elements of $X^T X$ are sums of the squared elements in the columns of X which could not be zeros unless X is a matrix of zeros.)
 - (c) It is easy to show that $b = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \underline{Y}$ is a solution to the normal equations. Suppose there exits another solution to the normal equations, let's say \underline{b}^* . We can write $\underline{b}^* = \underline{b} + \underline{a} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \underline{Y} + \underline{a}$, for some $\underline{a} \neq 0$. Since, rank $(X^T X)$ =rank(X) and X has full column rank, $X^T X$ also has full column rank and the columns of $X^T X$ are linearly independent. Therefore, it is impossible to have $X^T X \underline{a} = 0$, for some $\underline{a} \neq 0$. Consequently, $\underline{b} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \underline{Y}$ is the unique solution to the normal equations.

7.(a)

```
# Enter the data into a data frame.
>biomass <- read.table("c:/st511/biomass.txt",header=T)</pre>
>biomass
#
   Compute correlations and round the results
   to four significant digits
#
> round(cor(biomass[-(1:2)]),4)
   Create a scatterplot matrix
#
> splom(~biomass[,3:8],aspect="fill")
  Create a scatterplot matrix with smooth
#
   curves. Unix users should first use motif()
#
   to open a graphics wundow
points.lines <- function(x, y)</pre>
  {
```

points(x, y)
lines(loess.smooth(x, y, 0.90))
}

```
par(din=c(7,7), pch=18, mkh=.15, cex=1.2, lwd=3)
pairs(biomass[,-(1:2)], panel=points.lines)
```



There seems to be a positive linear relationship between Y and pH and a negative linear relationship between Y and Zn. The other three variables appear to be at more weakly correlated with the response Y, but Y seems to be lower for larger values of K and Na. With the exception of one potentially influencial case, it appears that K and Na have a strong positive correlation. There appears to be a negative association between levels of pH and Zn in the soil.

(b) The model matrix has full column rank.

Construct the response vector and model matrix

```
> Y<-as.matrix(biomass[,3])
> X<-as.matrix(biomass[,4:8])
> X0 <- rep(1, length(Y))
> X<-cbind(X0,X)
# Check the rank of the model matrix</pre>
```

```
> qr(X)$rank
[1] 6
```

```
(c) > b <- solve(t(X)%*%X) %*% t(X) %*% Y
   > b
                       [,1]
         X0 1.252455e+003
   salinity -3.028491e+001
         pH 3.054880e+002
          K -2.852645e-001
         Na -8.665809e-003
         Zn -2.067677e+001
(d) > yhat <- X %*% b
   > yhat
            [,1]
    1 724.1509
    2 739.6501
    3 690.9358
    4 814.6608
    5 1063.5814
    6 957.8484
    7 527.0257
         .
   42 1297.8306
   43 1401.3330
   44 1305.8814
   45 1265.4053
   > e <- Y - yhat
   > e
               [,1]
        -48.150889
    1
    2
      -223.650127
       361.064216
    3
    4
         53.339248
    5
        -55.581358
    6
      -521.848358
    7
         16.974252
             .
   42
        -65.830647
   43
         -1.332987
   44
        314.118581
   45
        294.594716
   The motif() function shown below opens a graphics window on UNIX workstations. It should not be used in
   a Windows version of S-PLUS.
   > motif()
   # Plot residuals against fitted values #
```

```
# Specify plotting symbol and size of graph in inches.
# fin=c(w,h) specifies a plot that is w inches wide
# and h inches high, not including labels
# pch=18 requests a filled diamond as a plotting
# symbol
# mkh=b requests plotting symbols that are b
# inches high
# cex=c requests that the size of characters used to print
# labels are c times the default for the printer
```

#	mar	mar=c(5,5,4,2) defines the number of lines of
#		text allowed on each side of the figure,
#		starting on the bottom and moving clockwise.

```
> par(fin=c(8.0,8.0),pch=18,mkh=.1,cex=1.3,mar=c(5,5,4,2))
```

```
> plot(yhat,e,xlab="Predicted Values",
    ylab="Residuals", main="Residual Plot")
```



To some students this plot

suggested that the assumption of constant variance does not hold. It is difficult to tell because there are only a few points on the right side of the plot. Another possibility is that the specified regression model is not a good approximation to the true model.

```
(e) > plot(biomass$salinity,e,
```

```
+ xlab="Salinity",ylab="Residuals",main="Residual Plot")
```

```
> lines(loess.smooth(biomass$salinity, e, 0.90))
```



- + xlab="pH",ylab="Residuals",main="Residual Plot")
- > lines(loess.smooth(biomass\$pH, e, 0.90))



> plot(biomass\$K,e,

- + xlab="Potassium",ylab="Residuals",main="Residual Plot")
- > lines(loess.smooth(biomass\$K, e, 0.90))



```
> plot(biomass$Na,e,
```

- + xlab="Sodium",ylab="Residuals",main="Residual Plot")
- > lines(loess.smooth(biomass\$Na, e, 0.90))



```
> plot(biomass$Zn,e,
```

- + xlab="Zinc",ylab="Residuals",main="Residual Plot")
- > lines(loess.smooth(biomass\$Zn, e, 0.90))



Based on the respective plots, the variance does not appear to be constant with respect to some of the explanatory variables, supporting our conclusion in part(d). There may be a curved effect of some of the variables on the mean response.



Based on this plot, the distribution of the random errors appears to be skewed to the right. This could be a result of non-homogeneous error variances or failure to incorporate curved relationships into the model.

```
(g) > SSE <- crossprod(e,e)
   > SSE
            [,1]
   [1,] 6186015
   > MSE <- SSE/(length(Y)-length(b))</pre>
   > MSE
             [,1]
   [1,] 158615.8
(h) > Covb <- as.vector(MSE)*solve(t(X)%*%X)</pre>
   > Covb
                         XO
                                   salinity
                                                         pН
              1524509.10834 -27237.9322767 -91209.1728455
         XO
   salinity
               -27237.93227
                               577.4385457
                                              1276.4382277
         рH
               -91209.17286
                              1276.4382280
                                              7723.0703457
          Κ
                 -134.26839
                                  2.5498036
                                                 3.7084102
         Na
                    7.40833
                                 -0.1655202
                                                -0.3417675
         Zn
               -16373.54466
                               257.3248227
                                              1104.7023266
                          Κ
                                                       Zn
                                       Na
                             7.408329862 -1.637354e+004
         X0 -134.268394262
   salinity
                2.549803557 -0.165520186 2.573248e+002
                3.708410204 -0.341767495 1.104702e+003
         pН
                0.121317254 -0.004495673 1.000216e+000
          Κ
               -0.004495673 0.000253753 -8.119987e-002
         Na
                1.000215850 -0.081199866 2.266258e+002
         Zn
      Compute standard errors
   #
```

> stderrb <- sqrt(diag(Covb))</pre>

```
> coef <- c("Intercept", "Salinity", "pH", "K", "Na", "Zn")</pre>
> heading <- c("Estimate","Std. Error")</pre>
> tempb <- cbind(b, stderrb)</pre>
> dimnames(tempb) <- list(coef, heading)</pre>
> round(tempb,4)
            Estimate Std. Error
           1252.4546
                      1234.7101
Intercept
Salinity
            -30.2849
                         24.0300
            305.4880
                         87.8810
       pН
        Κ
             -0.2853
                          0.3483
             -0.0087
       Na
                          0.0159
             -20.6768
                         15.0541
       Zn
# Write the estimates and standard errors to a file
> write.matrix(tempb,file="c:/courses/st511/hw/tempb.out")
```

(i) In Splus, a dataframe is a tow dimensional object that is similar to a matrix in appearance, both have rows and columns. All entries in a matrix must be of the same type, i.e., all entries are double precision numeric values, or all entries are character values. The columns of a data frame, on the other hand, correspond to set of vectors of the same length but possibly of *different* types, 1.e., one column can be a vector of character values and another column can be a vector of numeric values.