



**Multivariate  
Analysis**

## MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Multivariate Data:- Investigators seeking to understand social or physical phenomena generally to collect simultaneous measurements on many variables (characters) for each distinct individual, <sup>because</sup> social or physical phenomena are complex in nature. The measurements are all recorded for each distinct individual. For example, the data may relate to the scores obtained by each of a number of students in three subjects: Math, Physics and Statistics. Another example, the data consists of rating over a course of treatment for patients undergoing radiotherapy; variables rated include sore throat, sleep, food consumption, appetite, skin-reaction. Data of this type are called multivariate data because they are simultaneous measurements on many variables. Like bivariate case, multivariate data may also be arranged into a frequency distribution for  $p$  variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$  with  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_p$  classes, respectively, the joint frequency distribution will have  $k_1 \times k_2 \times \dots \times k_p$  cell frequency; the frequency in a cell being the number of individuals belonging simultaneously to the corresponding  $x_1$ -class,  $x_2$ -class,  $\dots$ ,  $x_p$ -class. From this joint distr. of  $p$ -variables, we can obtain the marginal distr. of any  $p_1$  variables ( $1 \leq p_1 \leq p-1$ ) and the conditional distribution of any  $p_1$  variables for given values  $p_2$  of the other variables  $\{(p_1, p_2 \geq 1) \text{ and } (p_1 + p_2) \leq p\}$ . These marginal and conditional distr.s can be obtained in a way similar to that in the bivariate case.

Suppose  $x_{i\alpha}$  denotes the value of the variable  $x_i$  on the individual  $\alpha$ ,  $i=1, 2, \dots, p$ ,  $\alpha=1, 2, \dots, n$ . These  $n$  multivariate observations can be displayed as a data matrix  $X$  of  $p$  rows and  $n$  columns, i.e.  $X = ((x_{i\alpha}))_{p \times n}$ .

The useful descriptive statistics measuring location, dispersion and correlation are:

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{i\alpha}$$

$$s_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) & \text{for } i \neq j \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)^2 & \text{for } i = j \end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) & \text{for } i \neq j \\ \text{Var}(x_i) & \text{for } i = j \end{cases}$$

$$r_{ij} = \frac{s_{ij}}{\sqrt{s_{ii} s_{jj}}} = \frac{\text{Cov}(x_i, x_j)}{\text{s.d.}(x_i) \text{s.d.}(x_j)}$$

(2)

We can represent the statistics as:

$$\bar{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}_1 \\ \bar{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{x}_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{p \times p} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{13} & \dots & s_{1p} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ s_{p1} & s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and}$$

$$R_{p \times p} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ r_{31} & r_{32} & \dots & r_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ r_{p1} & r_{p2} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{pmatrix}.$$

$\bar{x}_{p \times 1}$ ,  $S_{p \times p}$  and  $R_{p \times p}$  are called mean vector, variance-covariance (dispersion) matrix and correlation matrix, respectively, of the variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$ .

Result:- A variance-covariance matrix is non-negative definite.

Proof:- Let  $S_{p \times p} = (s_{ij})$  be the variance-covariance matrix of the variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$  with the mean vector  $\bar{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{x}_p \end{pmatrix}$ . To prove that  $S_{p \times p}$  is non-negative definite, we are to show that  $\bar{l}' S_{p \times p} \bar{l} > 0$  for every vector  $\bar{l} = \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_p \end{pmatrix}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now, } \bar{l}' S_{p \times p} \bar{l} &= \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p s_{ij} l_i l_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p l_i l_j \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p l_i l_j (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left( \sum_{i=1}^p l_i (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^p (x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left( \sum_{i=1}^p l_i (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left( \bar{l}' (z_{\alpha} - \bar{z}) \right)^2, \quad \alpha = 1(1)n. \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n z_{\alpha}^2, \\ &\geq 0 \text{ for every } \bar{l} \quad \text{--- (1)} \end{aligned}$$

Now from ①,

$$\underline{l}' S \underline{l} = 0 \text{ for some } \underline{l} \neq \underline{0}$$

iff  $\underline{l}' (\underline{x}_\alpha - \bar{x}_\alpha) = 0$  for some  $\underline{l} \neq \underline{0}$  and  $\forall \alpha = 1(1)n$ .

i.e. iff  $(\underline{x}_\alpha - \bar{x}_\alpha)' \underline{l} = 0$  for some  $\underline{l} \neq \underline{0}$  and  $\forall \alpha = 1(1)n$ .

i.e. iff 
$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} - \bar{x}_1 & x_{21} - \bar{x}_2 & x_{31} - \bar{x}_3 & \dots & x_{p1} - \bar{x}_p \\ x_{12} - \bar{x}_1 & x_{22} - \bar{x}_2 & x_{32} - \bar{x}_3 & \dots & x_{p2} - \bar{x}_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{1n} - \bar{x}_1 & x_{2n} - \bar{x}_2 & x_{3n} - \bar{x}_3 & \dots & x_{pn} - \bar{x}_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ \vdots \\ l_p \end{pmatrix} = \underline{0} \text{ for some } \underline{l} \neq \underline{0}.$$

i.e. iff The columns of the matrix  $((x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i))$  are linearly dependent.

i.e. iff  $\exists$  some deviation  $(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)$  which is a linear combination of the other  $(p-1)$  deviations (over the  $n$  observations).

i.e. iff  $\exists$  some variable which is an exact linear function of the other  $(p-1)$  variables  $x_i$  over the  $n$  observations  $\{x_{i\alpha}; \alpha = 1(1)n\}$ .

Fact:- A covariance matrix is positive semidefinite.

Proof:- Let  $\Sigma$  be the covariance matrix of a random vector  $\underline{X}$  with mean vector  $\underline{\mu}$ . Then  $\Sigma = E[(\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})(\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})']$

Now, let  $\underline{v}$  be any vector. We have to show that  $\underline{v}' \Sigma \underline{v} \geq 0$ .

But 
$$\begin{aligned} \underline{v}' \Sigma \underline{v} &= \underline{v}' E[(\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})(\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})'] \underline{v} \\ &= E[\underline{v}' (\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})(\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})' \underline{v}] = E[Y^2] \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where,  $Y = \underline{v}' (\underline{X} - \underline{\mu})$ .

'=' holds iff  $Y^2 = 0$  with probability 1.

i.e. iff  $\underline{v}' (\underline{X} - \underline{\mu}) = 0$ , or,  $\underline{v}' \underline{X} = \underline{v}' \underline{\mu}$ .

i.e. iff  $\exists$  a linear combination of the elements of  $\underline{X}$  which is equal to its mean with probability 1,

i.e. iff there is a variate which is degenerate in this sense of being a constant random variable.

Except when this happens, the covariance matrix is positive definite, not just positive semidefinite.

## MULTIVARIATE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Multivariate Data:- In some investigations, data may be collected for the given set of individuals, on a no. of variables at the same time. Suppose we have 'p' variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$ . The values of the variables for the  $\alpha$ th individual may be denoted by  $x_{1\alpha}, x_{2\alpha}, \dots, x_{p\alpha}, \alpha = 1(1)n$ .

Notations:- Let the vector variable be

$$\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p)'$$

Then,  $\bar{\underline{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_p)'$  is called the mean vector of  $\underline{x}$  and

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{i\alpha}$$

Define, 
$$s_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j)$$

and 
$$S_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j), & i \neq j \\ \text{var}(x_i), & i = j \end{cases}$$

Then  $S = ((S_{ij}))_{p \times p}$  is called the 'variance-covariance matrix of  $\underline{x}$ ' or 'dispersion matrix of  $\underline{x}$ '. The matrix  $nS = ((s_{ij}))_{p \times p}$  is called the 'SSSP matrix' (sum of squares and sum of product matrix).

Theorem 1:- Every dispersion matrix is non-negative definite.

Proof:- Note that,  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \{ a_1(x_{1\alpha} - \bar{x}_1) + a_2(x_{2\alpha} - \bar{x}_2) + \dots + a_p(x_{p\alpha} - \bar{x}_p) \}^2 \geq 0$ , for all  $a_i (i=1(1)p)$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \frac{1}{n} a_i^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)^2 \right\} + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^p a_i a_j \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \right\} \geq 0 \quad \forall a_i$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p a_i^2 \cdot s_{ii} + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^p a_i a_j \cdot s_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall a_i$$

$$\Rightarrow \underline{a}' S \underline{a} \geq 0 \quad \forall \underline{a}, \text{ where } \underline{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p)'$$

and  $S = ((S_{ij}))_{p \times p}$  is the dispersion matrix.

$\therefore S$  is n.n.d.

Corollary:-

(1) When  $S$  is p.s.d., then  $\exists$  a non-null  $\underline{a} \ni \underline{a}'S\underline{a} = 0$   
 $\Leftrightarrow$  for some  $\underline{a} \neq \underline{0}$ ,  
 $a_1(x_{1\alpha} - \bar{x}_1) + a_2(x_{2\alpha} - \bar{x}_2) + \dots + a_p(x_{p\alpha} - \bar{x}_p) = 0 \quad \forall \alpha = 1(1)n.$   
 $\Leftrightarrow$  for some  $\underline{a}' = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p) \neq \underline{0}'$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = 0, \alpha = 1(1)n.$   
 $\Leftrightarrow$  variables are linearly related. [Here,  $r(S) < p$ ]

(2) When  $S$  is p.d., then  $\nexists$  a non null  $\underline{a} \ni \underline{a}'S\underline{a} = 0$   
 $\Leftrightarrow$  ~~for some~~  $\nexists \underline{a} \neq \underline{0} \ni \sum_{i=1}^p a_i(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = 0, \alpha = 1(1)n.$   
 $\Leftrightarrow \nexists \underline{a} \neq \underline{0}, b \neq 0$  (a constant)  $\ni \sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_{i\alpha} = b, \alpha = 1(1)n.$   
 [Here  $r(S) = p$ .]

(3) Consider the matrix  $((x_{i\alpha}))_{i=1,2,\dots,p}$ . Define ~~the  $p \times p$  matrix~~  
 $\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{i\alpha}$  and  $S_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j)$ . Then the  $p \times p$   
 matrix  $((S_{ij}))$  is:

- (i) p.d. when the rank  $((x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)) = p$ .
- (ii) p.s.d. when the rank  $((x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)) < p$ , in which case  $\exists$  constants  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p \ni \sum_{i=1}^p a_i(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = 0, \alpha = 1(1)n.$

Multiple Regression: — The theory of regression is concerned with the prediction of one or more variables  $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r)$  on the basis of information provided by either measurements on concomitant variables  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p) = \underline{x}'$ . It is customary to call the latter independent or predictor variables and the former dependent or criterion variables. Prediction is needed in several ~~practical~~ practical situations. A meteorologist wants to forecast weather several hours ahead on the basis of suitable atmosphere measurements taken at a point in time.

In all these situations, the criteria are some variables in the future which we sought to be predicted by the available measurements for taking decisions. How should the predictors be chosen?

In probabilistic approach, the conditional mean of  $y$  given  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p)$  is called the regression equation. (6)

Notations:- Let,  $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p)'$   
 $= (x^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(2)})'$

and mean vector  $\bar{\underline{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_p)'$   
 $= (\bar{x}_1, \bar{\underline{x}}^{(2)})'$

The dispersion matrix is

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & \dots & s_{1p} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{31} & s_{32} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p1} & s_{p2} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \quad [ \text{where, } s_{ij} = s_{ji} \forall i, j ]$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & \underline{s}'^{(1)} \\ \underline{s}^{(1)} & S_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Clearly,  $S_2$  is the dispersion mtr of  $(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p)$  and it is assumed to be non-singular (p.d.).

The correlation matrix is  $R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{12} & 1 & \dots & r_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{1p} & r_{2p} & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Note that both the matrices  $S$  and  $R$  are symmetric.

Note that  $R = DSD$ , where  $D = \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{11}}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{22}}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{pp}}} \right)$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{11}}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{22}}} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{pp}}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & \dots & s_{1p} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p1} & s_{p2} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{11}}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{22}}} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{pp}}} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\therefore |R| = |D||S||D| = |D|^2 |S|$$

$$\Rightarrow |S| = s_{11} s_{22} \dots s_{pp} \cdot |R|$$

when the regression function is linear, in predictor variables, it has been studied extensively.

(7)  
 [ In probabilistic approach,  $E(X_1 | X_2^{(2)}) = M(X_2^{(2)})$ , is called the conditional mean of  $X_1$  given  $X_2^{(2)}$ , is also called the regression function. The regression is said to be linear or non-linear according as the function  $M(\cdot)$  is linear or non-linear. ]

Let us assume that the regression of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  is linear whether the true regression is linear or not, i.e., assuming the regression equation as:

$$f(x_2^{(2)}) = a + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + \dots + b_p x_p$$

Since the MSE is minimum, i.e.,

$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \{x_{1\alpha} - f(x_{2\alpha}, x_{3\alpha}, \dots, x_{p\alpha})\}^2$  is minimum when  $f(x_2^{(2)})$  is the regression function, hence the constants  $a, b_2, \dots, b_p$  are determined by minimising

$$S^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})^2 \text{ w.r.t. } a, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_p$$

The Normal equations are:

$$0 = \frac{\partial S^2}{\partial a} = (-2) \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial S^2}{\partial b_i} = (-2) \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha}) x_{i\alpha}, \quad i=2(1)p$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha}) = 0 \\ \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha}) x_{i\alpha} = 0 \quad \forall i=2(1)p. \end{cases}$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \bar{x}_1 = a + b_2 \bar{x}_2 + \dots + b_p \bar{x}_p \\ \Leftrightarrow a = \bar{x}_1 - (b_2 \bar{x}_2 + b_3 \bar{x}_3 + \dots + b_p \bar{x}_p) \\ = \bar{x}_1 - \underset{\sim}{b}' \underset{\sim}{x}^{(2)}, \text{ where } \underset{\sim}{b}' = (b_2, b_3, \dots, b_p) \end{cases}$$

$$\sum_{\alpha} x_{1\alpha} x_{i\alpha} = a \sum_{\alpha} x_{i\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{i\alpha} + \dots + b_i \sum_{\alpha} x_{i\alpha}^2 + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} x_{i\alpha}, \quad \forall i=2(1)p.$$



$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \bar{x}_1 = a + b_2 \bar{x}_2 + \dots + b_p \bar{x}_p \\ \sum_{\alpha} x_{1\alpha} x_{i\alpha} = \left\{ \bar{x}_1 - (b_2 \bar{x}_2 + \dots + b_p \bar{x}_p) \right\} \sum_{\alpha} x_{i\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{i\alpha} \\ \quad + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} x_{i\alpha}, \forall i=2(1)p. \end{cases}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - \bar{x}_1)(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = b_2 \sum_{\alpha} (x_{2\alpha} - \bar{x}_2)(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} (x_{p\alpha} - \bar{x}_p)(x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) \quad \forall i=2(1)p$$

$$\Rightarrow s_{1i} = b_2 s_{2i} + b_3 s_{3i} + \dots + b_p s_{pi}, \forall i=2(1)p.$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{aligned} s_{12} &= b_2 s_{22} + b_3 s_{32} + \dots + b_p s_{p2} \\ s_{13} &= b_2 s_{23} + b_3 s_{33} + \dots + b_p s_{p3} \\ &\vdots \\ s_{1p} &= b_2 s_{2p} + b_3 s_{3p} + \dots + b_p s_{pp} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \underline{s}_{\tilde{2}}(1) = \begin{pmatrix} s_{22} & s_{32} & \dots & s_{p2} \\ s_{23} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{p3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{2p} & s_{3p} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_2 \\ b_3 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \underline{s}_{\tilde{2}}(1) = S_2 \underline{b}$$

or,  $\underline{b} = S_2^{-1} \underline{s}_{\tilde{2}}(1)$ , since  $S_2$  is assumed to be non-singular.

Hence,  $f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = a + \underline{b}' \underline{x}^{(2)}$ , where  $a = \bar{x}_1 - \underline{b}' \underline{\bar{x}}^{(2)}$  and  $\underline{b} = S_2^{-1} \cdot \underline{s}_{\tilde{2}}(1)$  is the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\underline{x}^{(2)} = (x_2, \dots, x_p)'$

Define,  $X_{1.23\dots p} = a + \underline{b}' \underline{x}^{(2)}$   
 $= a + b_2 x_2 + \dots + b_p x_p$ , as the part of  $x_1$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p)$ .

Then we write  $x_1 = X_{1.23\dots p} + e_{1.23\dots p}$ , where  $e_{1.23\dots p}$  is the residual part of  $x_1$  corresponding to its multiple linear regression.

For the  $\alpha$ th individual,

$$x_{1\alpha} = X_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} + e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha}$$

Theorem 1:-  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^n e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} = 0$  and  $e_{1.23\dots p}$  is uncorrelated with every predictor variable and hence with multiple linear regression equation.

Proof:- Note that, 
$$e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} = x_{1\alpha} - X_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} = x_{1\alpha} - (a + b_2 x_{2\alpha} + \dots + b_p x_{p\alpha})$$

From the 1st Normal equation, we have,

$$\sum_{\alpha} (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha}) = 0$$
$$\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha} e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} = 0.$$

From the other normal equations,

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} \cdot x_{i\alpha} = 0, \forall i=2(1)p$$
$$\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha=1}^n e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = 0 \forall i=2(1)p$$
$$\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha} - \bar{e}_{1.23\dots p}) (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i) = 0 \forall i=2(1)p$$
$$\Rightarrow \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p, \alpha}, x_{i\alpha}) = 0 \forall i=2(1)p$$

Again, 
$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p}) &= \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, a + \sum_{i=2}^p b_i x_i) \\ &= 0 + \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, \sum_{i=2}^p b_i x_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^p b_i \cdot \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, x_i) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the residual is uncorrelated with the multiple linear regression.

Theorem 2. Variance  $(e_{1.23 \dots p}) = \delta_{11} - \underline{\delta}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \underline{\delta}_{(1)}$   
 $= \frac{|S|}{|S_2|} = \frac{1}{\delta_{11}} = \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \delta_{11} = \frac{\delta_{11}}{r_{11}}$

where  $S^{-1} = ((\delta_{ij}))$ ;  $R_{11} = \text{cofactor of } r_{11} \text{ in } R$ ;  
 $R^{-1} = ((r_{ij}))$

[ The symbols have their usual meaning ]

Proof:-  $\text{Var}(e_{1.23 \dots p})$   
 $= \text{Cov}(e_{1.23 \dots p}, e_{1.23 \dots p})$   
 $= \text{Cov}(e_{1.23 \dots p}, x_1 - x_{1.23 \dots p})$   
 $= \text{Cov}(e_{1.23 \dots p}, x_1)$ , since  $\text{Cov}(e_{1.23 \dots p}, x_{1.23 \dots p}) = 0$ .  
 $= \text{Cov}(x_1 - x_{1.23 \dots p}, x_1)$   
 $= \text{Cov}(x_1, x_1) - \text{Cov}(x_1, x_{1.23 \dots p})$   
 $= \text{Var}(x_1) - \text{Cov}(x_1, a + \sum_{i=2}^p b_i x_i)$   
 $= \delta_{11} - \sum_{i=2}^p b_i \cdot \text{Cov}(x_1, x_i)$   
 $= \delta_{11} - \sum_{i=2}^p b_i \cdot \delta_{1i}$   
 $= \delta_{11} - \underline{b}' \underline{\delta}_{(1)}$   
 $= \delta_{11} - \underline{\delta}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \underline{\delta}_{(1)}$ , since we have from normal equations  $S_2 \underline{b} = \underline{\delta}_{(1)}$  and  $S_2$  being symmetric,  
 $(S_2^{-1})' = S_2^{-1}$ .

Note that,  $S = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{11} & \underline{\delta}'_{(1)} \\ \underline{\delta}_{(1)} & S_2 \end{pmatrix}$

and  $|S| = |S_2| (\delta_{11} - \underline{\delta}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \underline{\delta}_{(1)})$ , since we have assumed that  $S_2$  is non-singular.

$\therefore |S| = |S_2| \cdot \text{Var}(e_{1.23 \dots p})$   
 $\Rightarrow \text{Var}(e_{1.23 \dots p}) = \frac{|S|}{|S_2|}$   
 $= \frac{|S|}{\text{cofactor of } \delta_{11} \text{ in } S} = \frac{1}{\delta_{11}}$ ,

where  $S^{-1} = \left( \left( \frac{\text{cofactor of } \delta_{ji}}{|S|} \right) \right)$   
 $= ((\delta_{ij}))$ , say.

We have  $|S| = \delta_{11} \delta_{22} \dots \delta_{pp} |R|$ ; Again  $|S_2| = \delta_{22} \delta_{33} \dots \delta_{pp} \cdot R_{11}$ , where  $R_{11}$  is the cofactor of  $r_{11}$  in  $R$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \text{Var}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p) &= \frac{|S_1|}{|S_2|} \\ &= \frac{s_{11} s_{22} \dots s_{pp}}{s_{22} s_{33} \dots s_{pp}} \cdot \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \\ &= \frac{s_{11} |R|}{R_{11}} = \frac{s_{11}}{R_{11}/|R|} \\ &= \frac{s_{11}}{r_{11}}, \text{ where } R^{-1} = ((r_{ij})), \text{ say.} \end{aligned}$$

Problems:-

(1) If  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$  are  $p$  variables & the correlation coefficient between each pair of components is  $r$ . s.t.  $-\frac{1}{p-1} \leq r \leq 1$ .

ANS:- The correlation matrix is

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r & r & \dots & r \\ r & 1 & r & \dots & r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r & r & r & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{p \times p}$$

clearly,  $R$  is n.n.d.

$$\left[ \text{Var} \left( \sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_i \right) \geq 0 \quad \forall a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p) \right]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_i \sum_j a_i a_j \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_i \sum_j a_i a_j r_{ij} \sqrt{s_{ii}} \sqrt{s_{jj}} \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_i \sum_j r_{ij} u_i u_j \geq 0, \text{ where } u_i = a_i \sqrt{s_{ii}}, u_j = a_j \sqrt{s_{jj}}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow u' R u \geq 0 \quad \forall u$$

$$\Leftrightarrow R \text{ is n.n.d.}]$$

$\therefore$  All principle minors are  $\geq 0$

$$\therefore \begin{vmatrix} 1 & r \\ r & 1 \end{vmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} 1 & r & r \\ r & 1 & r \\ r & r & 1 \end{vmatrix} \geq 0, \dots, \quad \begin{vmatrix} 1 & r & r & \dots & r \\ r & 1 & r & \dots & r \\ r & r & 1 & \dots & r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r & r & r & \dots & 1 \end{vmatrix}_{p \times p} \geq 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now, } \begin{vmatrix} 1 & r \\ r & 1 \end{vmatrix} \geq 0 &\Rightarrow 1 - r^2 \geq 0 \\ &\Rightarrow r^2 \leq 1 \\ &\Rightarrow -1 \leq r \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (1-r)^{p-1} [1 + (p-1)r] \geq 0 \\ &\Rightarrow 1 + (p-1)r \geq 0 \quad [ \because (1-r) \geq 0 ] \\ &\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{p-1} \leq r \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore -\frac{1}{p-1} \leq r \leq 1, \text{ (Proved)}$$

Problem(2):- If  $R = ((r_{ij}))$  is the correlation matrix of  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p)$ ,  
 s.t.  $|R| \leq 1$ .

Ans:- the correlation matrix is

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{p1} & r_{p2} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{21} & 1 & \dots & r_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{p1} & r_{p2} & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho'(1) \\ \rho'(1) & R_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore |R| &= |R_2| (1 - \rho'(1) R_2^{-1} \rho'(1)) \\ &\leq |R_2| \quad , \text{ since } R \text{ is p.d.} \\ &\Rightarrow R_2 \text{ is p.d.} \\ &\Rightarrow R_2^{-1} \text{ is p.d.} \\ &\Rightarrow \rho'(1) \cdot R_2^{-1} \cdot \rho'(1) \geq 0 \quad \forall \rho'(1) \\ \Rightarrow |R| &\leq |R_2| = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \rho'(2) \\ \rho'(2) & R_3 \end{vmatrix} \\ &\leq |R_3| \dots \dots \leq \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{vmatrix} = 1 - \rho^2 \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

or,  $|R| \leq 1$  (Proved)

Remark:- It can be shown that  $|S| \leq s_{11} s_{22} \dots s_{pp}$

$$\left[ \because |R| = \frac{|S|}{s_{11} s_{22} \dots s_{pp}} \text{ and } |R| \leq 1. \right]$$

Problem(3):- Each of the variables  $x, y, z$  has mean 0, variance 1 while  $ax + by + cz = 0$ . Show that  $a^4 + b^4 + c^4 \leq 2(b^2c^2 + c^2a^2 + a^2b^2)$   
 Also obtain the dispersion matrix.

Solution:- We have  $ax + by + cz = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow ax + by &= -cz \\ \Rightarrow \text{Var}(ax + by) &= \text{Var}(-cz) \\ \Rightarrow a^2 \text{Var}(x) + b^2 \text{Var}(y) + 2ab \text{Cov}(x, y) &= c^2 \text{Var}(z) \\ \Rightarrow a^2 + b^2 + 2ab r_{xy} &= c^2 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{c^2 - (a^2 + b^2)}{2ab} &= r_{xy} \\ \Rightarrow \left[ \frac{c^2 - (a^2 + b^2)}{2ab} \right]^2 &= r_{xy}^2 \leq 1. \\ \Rightarrow c^4 + (a^2 + b^2)^2 - 2a^2(a^2 + b^2) &\leq 4a^2b^2 \\ \Rightarrow c^4 + a^4 + b^4 + 2a^2b^2 - 2c^2a^2 - 2c^2b^2 &\leq 4a^2b^2 \\ \Rightarrow a^4 + b^4 + c^4 &\leq 2(a^2b^2 + b^2c^2 + c^2a^2) \end{aligned}$$

(Proved)

Multiple Regression: — In many practical cases, predicted values of a response (dependent) variable obtained from a single predictor (independent) variable, via a regression model, are too imprecise to be useful. The main reason is that the single predictor (independent) variable is one of the many potential predictor variables offering the response variable in important ways. In such a situation, a model containing important predictor variables will be more useful because it will predict the values of the response variable more precisely. For example, in predicting the rainfall at a place in a year, it is appropriate to include three or four things as the predictor variables.

Suppose one of the  $p$  variables,  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$ ; say,  $x_1$ , is the response variable of interest and the others are the predictor variables. We are to predict a value of  $x_1$  for given values of  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  via a regression model. We assume that the relationship between  $x_1$  and the set  $\{x_2, \dots, x_p\}$  is, at least in an approximate sense, represented by a linear equation of the form

$$x_1 = a + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + \dots + b_p x_p, \dots \dots \dots \text{--- ①}$$

where,  $a$  and  $b_i$ 's are unknown coefficients.

We determine the unknowns  $a, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_p$  on the basis of the  $n$  multivariate observations  $(x_{1\alpha}, x_{2\alpha}, \dots, x_{p\alpha})$ ;  $\alpha = 1(1)n$ , by the method of least squares. In this method,  $a, b_2, \dots, b_p$  are determined so that the error sum of squares

$$S^2(a, b_2, \dots, b_p) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})^2 \text{ is minimum.}$$

The normal equations, obtained by equating the partial derivatives of  $S^2(a, b_2, \dots, b_p)$  with respect to  $a, b_2, \dots, b_p$  to zero, are

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha} x_{1\alpha} &= n a + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} + b_3 \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha} + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha}, \\ \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{1\alpha} &= a \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha}^2 + b_3 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{3\alpha} + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{p\alpha}, \\ \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha} x_{1\alpha} &= a \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha} x_{2\alpha} + b_3 \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha}^2 + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{3\alpha} x_{p\alpha}, \\ &\vdots \\ \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} x_{1\alpha} &= a \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} x_{2\alpha} + b_3 \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha} x_{3\alpha} + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{p\alpha}^2. \end{aligned} \right\} \text{--- ②}$$

(14)

The first equation gives, on being divided by  $n$ ,

$$\bar{x}_1 = a + b_2 \bar{x}_2 + b_3 \bar{x}_3 + \dots + b_p \bar{x}_p, \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

which shows incidentally that the mean point  $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_p)$  necessarily satisfies the prediction equation.

Multiplying (3) by  $n\bar{x}_2, n\bar{x}_3, \dots, n\bar{x}_p$  and subtracting the result from the second, third,  $\dots$ ,  $p$ th equation, respectively, of the system (2), we have  $(p-1)$  equations determining the  $b$ 's, viz.

$$\left. \begin{aligned} S_{21} &= b_2 S_{22} + b_3 S_{23} + \dots + b_p S_{2p}, \\ S_{31} &= b_2 S_{32} + b_3 S_{33} + \dots + b_p S_{3p}, \\ &\vdots \\ S_{p1} &= b_2 S_{p2} + b_3 S_{p3} + \dots + b_p S_{pp}, \end{aligned} \right\} \longrightarrow (4)$$

where,  $S_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha} x_{i\alpha} x_{j\alpha} - n \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_j = \sum_{\alpha} (x_{i\alpha} - \bar{x}_i)(x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j)$ .

Taking  $s_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \times S_{ij} = \begin{cases} \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) & \forall i \neq j \\ \text{Var}(x_i) & \forall i = j \end{cases}$

Then (4) reduces to,

$$\begin{pmatrix} s_{21} \\ s_{31} \\ \vdots \\ s_{p1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_2 \\ b_3 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow (5)$$

The  $p \times p$  matrix  $S = \begin{pmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix}$  is non-singular (i.e. is of rank  $p$ , i.e. full rank)

and  $S = (s_{ij})_{p \times p}$  is called variance-covariance (or, dispersion) matrix of  $x_1, \dots, x_p$ . This non-singularity of the dispersion matrix implies that the system of equation (5) has the unique solution

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_2 \\ b_3 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} s_{21} \\ s_{31} \\ \vdots \\ s_{p1} \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow (6)$$

or that  $b_j = s_{21} s_{j2} + s_{31} s_{j3} + \dots + s_{p1} s_{jp}$

Alternatively, we can write (for  $j=2,3,\dots,p$ )

$$b_j \text{ as } \rightarrow \begin{vmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2(j-1)} & s_{21} & s_{2(j+1)} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3(j-1)} & s_{31} & s_{3(j+1)} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{p(j-1)} & s_{p1} & s_{p(j+1)} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{vmatrix}$$

(by  
Cramer's Rule)

$$b_j = (-1)^{j-2} \begin{vmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2(j-1)} & s_{2(j+1)} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{31} & s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3(j-1)} & s_{3(j+1)} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{p1} & s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{p(j-1)} & s_{p(j+1)} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{vmatrix}$$

[ putting the column  $\begin{pmatrix} s_{21} \\ s_{31} \\ \vdots \\ s_{p1} \end{pmatrix}$  in the 1st place introduces or removes  $(j-2)$  inversions ]

$$= (-1)^{j-2} \times \frac{s_{1j}}{s_{jj}} \begin{vmatrix} r_{21} & r_{22} & r_{23} & \dots & r_{2(j-1)} & r_{2(j+1)} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ r_{31} & r_{32} & r_{33} & \dots & r_{3(j-1)} & r_{3(j+1)} & \dots & r_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ r_{p1} & r_{p2} & r_{p3} & \dots & r_{p(j-1)} & r_{p(j+1)} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} r_{22} & r_{23} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ r_{32} & r_{33} & \dots & r_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ r_{p2} & r_{p3} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{vmatrix} \dots (*)$$

as  $s_{ij} = r_{ij} \cdot s_i \cdot s_j$ ;  $s_i, s_j$  being the s.d. of  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  respectively and  $r_{ij}$  being correlation coefficient of  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ .

$$= (-1)^{j-2} \cdot \frac{s_{1j}}{s_{jj}} \times \frac{(-1)^{j+1} R_{1j}}{R_{11}} = (-1)^{2j-1} \times \frac{s_{1j}}{s_{jj}} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}}$$

$$= - \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \times \frac{s_{1j}}{s_{jj}} \text{ for } j=2,3,\dots,p;$$

where,  $R_{1j}$  is the co-factor of  $r_{1j}$  in the correlation matrix  $R = (r_{ij})_{p \times p}$  of the  $p$ -values  $x_1, \dots, x_p$ .



We see that the determinant in the numerator of <sup>(6)</sup>(\*) is the minor of  $r_{ij}$  in  $R = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{p1} & r_{p2} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{pmatrix}$  and hence is  $(-1)^{i+j}$  co-factor of  $r_{ij}$ , while the determinant in the denominator is the minor of  $r_{11}$ .

Putting these  $b_j$  values in (3), we get,

$$a = \bar{x}_1 + \sum_{j=2}^p \left( \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \right) \bar{x}_j$$

Thus the prediction equation (called the multiple regression equation of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$ ) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} x_{1.23\dots p} &= \bar{x}_1 + \sum_{j=2}^p \left( \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \right) \bar{x}_j - \sum_{j=2}^p \left( \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \right) x_j \\ &= \bar{x}_1 - \sum_{j=2}^p \left( \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \right) (x_j - \bar{x}_j) \quad \dots \dots \dots (7) \end{aligned}$$

The co-efficient  $b_j = -\frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}}$  is ~~in~~ in (7) gives the amount by which the predicted value  $x_{1.23\dots p}$  increases when  $x_j$  is increased by a unit amount, the other independent variable being kept fixed. The coefficient  $b_j$  is called the partial regression coefficient of  $x_1$  on  $x_j$ , and usually written as  $b_{1j.23\dots j-1 j+1\dots p}$ .

Some useful Results:-

(1)  $\bar{x}_{1.23\dots p} = \bar{x}_1$ , where  $\bar{x}_{1.23\dots p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{1.23\dots p\alpha}$  being the sample mean of the predicted values of  $x_1$ .

Proof:- We have

$$x_{1.23\dots p} = \bar{x}_1 - \sum_{j=2}^p \left( \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \right) (x_j - \bar{x}_j);$$

giving

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_{1.23\dots p} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{1.23\dots p\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left[ \bar{x}_1 - \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} (x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \right] \\ &= \bar{x}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{s_1}{s_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) \\ &= \bar{x}_1, \text{ because } \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{j\alpha} - \bar{x}_j) = 0 \quad \forall j=2(1)p. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary:  $\Rightarrow$  This result implies that the means of the residual term  $\alpha_{1.23\dots p} = \alpha_1 - X_{1.23\dots p}$  is  $\bar{\alpha}_{1.23\dots p} = \bar{\alpha}_1 - \bar{X}_{1.23\dots p} = 0$ . (17)

$$(2) \text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) = \sigma_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{|R|}{R_{11}}\right)$$

Proof:-  $\text{Cov}(\alpha_1, X_{1.23\dots p})$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \text{Cov}(X_{1.23\dots p} + \alpha_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) + \text{Cov}(\alpha_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}); \text{ because } \end{aligned}$$

$$n \text{Cov}(\alpha_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p})$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (\alpha_{1.23\dots p\alpha} (X_{1.23\dots p\alpha} - \bar{X}_{1.23\dots p}))$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n X_{1.23\dots p\alpha} \alpha_{1.23\dots p\alpha} - \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \bar{X}_{1.23\dots p} \alpha_{1.23\dots p\alpha}$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n X_{1.23\dots p\alpha} \alpha_{1.23\dots p\alpha}, \text{ because } \bar{X}_{1.23\dots p} = 0.$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (a + b_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} + \dots + b_p \alpha_{p\alpha}) (\alpha_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p \alpha_{p\alpha})$$

~~Proof~~

$$\begin{aligned} &= a \sum_{\alpha} (\alpha_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p \alpha_{p\alpha}) + b_2 \left( \sum_{\alpha} \alpha_{2\alpha} (\alpha_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p \alpha_{p\alpha}) \right) \\ &\quad + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} \alpha_{p\alpha} (\alpha_{1\alpha} - a - b_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p \alpha_{p\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

= 0, as the  $i^{\text{th}}$  term in the sum is zero for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  normal equation  $\forall i = 2, 3, \dots, p$ .

$$\text{Now, } \text{Cov}(\alpha_1, X_{1.23\dots p}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (\alpha_{1\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_1) (\alpha_{1.23\dots p\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_1) \text{ as}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (\alpha_{1\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_1) \left\{ (-1) \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} (\alpha_{j\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_j) \right\} \quad \bar{\alpha}_1 = \bar{X}_{1.23\dots p}$$

$$= (-1) \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (\alpha_{1\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_1) (\alpha_{j\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}_j)$$

$$= (-1) \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \cdot \delta_{1j} \quad [\because \delta_{ij} = r_{ij} \cdot \delta_i \delta_j]$$

$$= (-1) \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \cdot r_{1j} \cdot \delta_1 \delta_j = (-1) \frac{\delta_1^2}{R_{11}} \sum_{j=2}^p R_{1j} r_{1j}$$

$$= (-1) \frac{\delta_1^2}{R_{11}} (|R| - r_{11} R_{11}) \quad [\because |R| = \sum_{j=1}^p R_{1j} r_{1j}]$$

$$= \sigma_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{|R|}{R_{11}}\right) \quad [\because r_{11} = 1]$$

### Best Linear Predictor:

Theorem: The multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is the linear function having maximum correlation with  $x_1$  among all the linear functions of  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$ .

Proof: Let us consider a class of linear functions of  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  as:

$$\left\{ L(\tilde{x}^{(2)}): L(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) = l_0 + \tilde{l}' \tilde{x}^{(2)} = l_0 + \sum_{i=2}^p l_i x_i \right\}$$

Now,

$$r^2(x_1, L(\tilde{x}^{(2)})) = \frac{[\text{cov}(x_1, L(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))]^2}{\text{Var}(x_1) \cdot \text{Var}(L(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))}$$

$$= \frac{[\text{cov}(x_1, l_0 + \sum_{i=2}^p l_i x_i)]^2}{\text{Var}(l_0 + \sum_{i=2}^p l_i x_i)}$$

$$= \frac{[\sum_{i=2}^p l_i \cdot \text{cov}(x_1, x_i)]^2}{\text{Var}(l_0 + \sum_{i=2}^p l_i x_i)}$$

$$= \frac{[\sum_{i=2}^p l_i \cdot \text{cov}(x_1, x_i)]^2}{s_{11} \cdot \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{j=2}^p l_i \cdot l_j \cdot \text{cov}(x_i, x_j)}$$

$$= \frac{(\sum_{i=2}^p l_i s_{1i})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{j=2}^p l_i l_j s_{ij}}$$

$$= \frac{(\tilde{l}' \tilde{s}_{(1)})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{l}}$$

$$= \frac{(\tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{b})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{l}}$$

$$= \frac{(\tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{b})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{l}}$$

$$= \frac{(\tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{b})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{l}}$$

$$= \frac{(\tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{b})^2}{s_{11} \cdot \tilde{l}' \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{l}}$$

[ Since we have  $\tilde{S}_2 \tilde{b} = \tilde{s}_{(1)}$ , from normal equations ]

(1)

Note that,  $S_2$  is p.d. matrix.

Thus, for some non-singular matrix  $P$ , we can write  $S_2 = PP^T$ .

$$\therefore (\underline{l}' S_2 \underline{b})^2 = (\underline{l}' PP' \underline{b})^2 = (\underline{u}' \underline{v})^2, \text{ where } \underline{u} = P' \underline{l} \text{ and } \underline{v} = P' \underline{b}.$$

$$\leq (\underline{u}' \underline{u})(\underline{v}' \underline{v}) \quad [\text{From Cauchy-Schwarz inequality}]$$

$$\Rightarrow (\underline{l}' S_2 \underline{b})^2 \leq (\underline{l}' PP' \underline{l})(\underline{b}' PP' \underline{b})$$

$$= (\underline{l}' S_2 \underline{l})(\underline{b}' S_2 \underline{b})$$

$$\text{From (1), we can write } r^2(\alpha_1, L(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \leq \frac{\underline{b}' S_2 \underline{b}}{s_{11}} \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

Note that,

$$r^2(\alpha_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) = r^2(\alpha_1, a + \underline{b}' \underline{x}^{(2)}), \text{ where}$$

$$M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = a + \underline{b}' \underline{x}^{(2)}$$

$$= a + \sum_{i=2}^p b_i x_i$$

is the multiple linear regression equation.

$$= \frac{(\underline{b}' S_2 \underline{b})^2}{s_{11} \cdot (\underline{b}' S_2 \underline{b})}$$

$$= \frac{\underline{b}' S_2 \underline{b}}{s_{11}} \quad [\text{From (1)}]$$

$$\text{From (2), } r^2(\alpha_1, L(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \leq r^2(\alpha_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)})).$$

Hence, the multiple linear regression equation  $M(\underline{x}^{(2)})$  has the maximum correlation with  $\alpha_1$ .

Multiple correlation coefficient: the maximum correlation coefficient between any linear function of  $x_1$  and  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is known as the multiple correlation coefficient between  $x_1$  and  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  and is denoted by

$$r_{1,2,3,\dots,p} = + \sqrt{r^2(x_1, M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))}$$

$$\text{Now, } r_{1,2,3,\dots,p} = + \sqrt{r^2(x_1, M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))}$$

$$= + \sqrt{\frac{b' S_2 b}{s_{11}}}$$

$$= + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}(M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))}{\text{Var}(x_1)}}$$

$$= \frac{\text{s.d.}(M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))}{\text{s.d.}(x_1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{s.d.}(X_{1,2,3,\dots,p})}{\text{s.d.}(x_1)} \geq 0$$

Clearly,  $0 \leq r_{1,2,3,\dots,p} \leq 1$ , since  $r_{1,2,3,\dots,p}^2$  is nothing but the product moment correlation coefficient between  $x_1$  and  $M(\tilde{x}^{(2)})$ , hence  $r_{1,2,3,\dots,p}^2 \leq 1$ .

Theorem: Define  $\text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = s_{1.23\dots p}^2$ . Then,

$$r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{s_{1.23\dots p}^2}{s_{11}}$$

Proof:

$$r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = r^2(x_1, M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))$$

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1 - e_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1) + \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) - 2\text{Cov}(x_1, e_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1) + \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) - 2\text{Cov}(x_1 - X_{1.23\dots p}, e_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

[ Since  $e_{1.23\dots p}$  is uncorrelated with the multiple linear regression equation  $X_{1.23\dots p}$  ]

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1) + \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) - 2 \cdot \text{Cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, e_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1) - \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{s_{1.23\dots p}^2}{s_{11}}$$

Remark: 1.  $s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = s_{11} - \tilde{x}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \tilde{x}_{(1)}$ , then

$$r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{s_{11} - \tilde{x}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \tilde{x}_{(1)}}{s_{11}}$$

$$= \frac{\tilde{x}'_{(1)} S_2^{-1} \tilde{x}_{(1)}}{s_{11}}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{r_{11}^2}$$

$$2. s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = s_{11} (1 - r_{1.23\dots p}^2)$$

$$3. r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 \text{ iff } s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 0$$

i.e., iff  $\text{var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$

i.e.,  $x_1$  is totally explained by the multiple linear regression equation

$$\text{and, } r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 0 \text{ iff } \frac{\tilde{b}' S_2 \tilde{b}}{s_{11}} = 0$$

i.e., iff  $k = 0$

i.e., the multiple linear regression equation fails to predict  $x_1$ .  $\left[ M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) = a + \tilde{0}' \tilde{x}^{(2)} = a \right]$

Note that,  $r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = \frac{\text{var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{var}(x_1)}$  is the proportion

of variability of  $x_1$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$ .

(23)

Multiple Correlation:— Having a fitted multiple regression equation of the response variation  $x_1$  on the predictor variables  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  we may be interested in studying the precision of the predicted values of  $x_1$ . Common sense indicates that the smaller the prediction errors, the higher the correlation between the observed and predicted values of  $x_1$  and vice versa. It is to be noted that higher joint influence of  $x_2, \dots, x_p$  on  $x_1$ , means smaller prediction errors. So, we may consider the product moment correlation coefficient between  $x_1$  and  $X_{1.23\dots p}$  as a measure of the joint influence of  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  on  $x_1$  via linear regression. This measure is called the multiple correlation coefficient of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  and is denoted by  $r_{1.23\dots p}$ , giving

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1.23\dots p} &= \frac{\text{Cov}(x_1, X_{1.23\dots p})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(x_1)} \sqrt{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}} \\ &= \frac{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(x_1)} \sqrt{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) / \text{Var}(x_1)} \\ &= s_1 \left(1 - \frac{|R_1|}{R_{11}}\right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{s_1}, \text{ as } \text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) = s_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{|R_1|}{R_{11}}\right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{|R_1|}{R_{11}}\right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Some Useful Results:—

$$(1) \quad 0 \leq r_{1.23\dots p} \leq 1.$$

Proof:— The coefficient  $r_{1.23\dots p}$ , being the product moment correlation coefficient between  $x_1$  and  $X_{1.23\dots p}$ , must lie between  $-1$  and  $+1$ . But the covariance between  $x_1$  and  $X_{1.23\dots p}$  is equal to the variance of  $X_{1.23\dots p}$ , giving that the covariance  $(x_1, X_{1.23\dots p})$  is a non-negative quantity. Hence, we always have

$$0 \leq r_{1.23\dots p} \leq 1$$



(2)

(24)

$\text{Cov}(x_i, x_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$  for  $i=2,3,\dots,p$ , giving that

$$\text{Cov}(x_{1.23\dots p}, x_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$$

Proof:- Consider

$$\begin{aligned} n \text{Cov}(x_2, x_{1.23\dots p}) &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{2\alpha} \cdot x_{1.23\dots p\alpha} \text{ as } \bar{x}_{1.23\dots p} = 0 \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_{2\alpha} (x_{1\alpha} - x_{1.23\dots p\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} \left\{ x_{1\alpha} - (a + b_2 x_{2\alpha} + b_3 x_{3\alpha} + \dots + b_p x_{p\alpha}) \right\},$$

$a$  and  $b_i$  are the solutions of the normal equation in (2).

$$= \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{1\alpha} - \left[ a \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} + b_2 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha}^2 + b_3 \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{3\alpha} + \dots + b_p \sum_{\alpha} x_{2\alpha} x_{p\alpha} \right]$$

$$= 0, \text{ because of the 2nd normal equation in (2).}$$

Similarly, for other  $i=3,\dots,p$ , giving that the residual part  $x_{1.23\dots p}$  is uncorrelated with each of the predictor variables  $x_i, i=2,3,\dots,p$ . So,  $x_{1.23\dots p}$  being a linear function of  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$ , itself is uncorrelated with  $x_{1.23\dots p}$ .

$$(3) \quad s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = (1 - r_{1.23\dots p}^2) s_1^2, \text{ where } s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = \text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p}).$$

Proof:- We have  $x_1 = x_{1.23\dots p} + x_{1.23\dots p}$ , giving

$$\text{Var}(x_1) = \text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p}) + \text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p}); \text{ because}$$

$$\text{or, } s_1^2 = s_{1.23\dots p}^2 + s_{1.23\dots p}^2 \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} x_{1.23\dots p} \text{ and } x_{1.23\dots p} \text{ are uncorrelated} \\ \text{or, } s_1^2 = s_1^2 \left( 1 - \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \right) + s_{1.23\dots p}^2 \end{array} \right]$$

$$\text{or, } s_{1.23\dots p}^2 = \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} s_1^2 \quad \left[ \because r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = \left( 1 - \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \right)^{1/2} \right]$$

$$= (1 - r_{1.23\dots p}^2) s_1^2$$

The equation indicates that the residual variance  $s_{1.23\dots p}^2$  is a strictly decreasing function of the multiple correlation coefficient  $r_{1.23\dots p}$  that ranges from 0 to 1.

(25)

When  $r_{1.23\dots p} = 1$ ,  $S_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 0$ , implying that  $x_{1\alpha} = X_{1.23\dots p}\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$  and in this case the multiple regression equation may be viewed as a perfect predicting formula.

When  $r_{1.23\dots p} = 0$ , then  $S_{1.23\dots p}^2 = S_1^2$ , giving that  $\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$ , which indicates that  $X_{1.23\dots p}\alpha = \bar{x}_1$  for each  $\alpha$ , an equation independent of  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  and hence the equation fails completely as a predicting formula.

Conclusion:— So,  $r_{1.23\dots p}^2$  may be used as a measure of the efficiency of the multiple regression equation in predicting  $x_1$ . The quantity  $r_{1.23\dots p}^2$ , which is called the coefficient of determination for the regression equation, may also be taken as such a measure.

$$(4) \quad r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)}$$

Proof:— We have already proved that  $\text{Cov}(x_1, X_{1.23\dots p}) = \text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})$  which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1.23\dots p}^2 &= \frac{\text{Var}(X_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)} \\ &= \frac{\text{Var}(x_1) - \text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(x_{1.23\dots p})}{\text{Var}(x_1)} \end{aligned}$$

## Partial Correlation: —

(26)

Sometimes two variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are correlated due to the effect of a 3rd variable  $x_3$  on either or both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . In these cases to study the relationship between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , it may be desirable to calculate the correlation between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  after eliminating (or partialling out) the effect of the third variable  $x_3$ .

This correlation is called 'Partial Correlation' (or, net correlation) between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  eliminating the effect of  $x_3$ . As an example, to understand whether the relationship between sales and advertising-expenditure is strong or not, one may calculate the partial correlation between sales and advertising-expenditure eliminating the effect of price. We generalise this notion for  $p$  variables, and consider that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are correlated due to the influence of a group of  $(p-2)$  variables  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$ , on both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . And study the partial correlation between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , eliminating the effects  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$ .

Considering the least-square regression equation of  $x_1$  on  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$  and that of  $x_2$  on  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$ ; we may write:

$$x_1 = X_{1.34\dots p} + x_{1.34\dots p}$$

$$\text{and, } x_2 = X_{2.34\dots p} + x_{2.34\dots p}$$

Here,  $X_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $X_{2.34\dots p}$  are predicted values and  $x_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $x_{2.34\dots p}$  are errors in prediction. As both  $x_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $x_{2.34\dots p}$  are uncorrelated with the predictor variables  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$ ; these errors may be looked upon as the parts of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , respectively, which are free from the influence of the group of variables  $x_3, \dots, x_p$ . Hence the simple correlation coefficient between  $x_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $x_{2.34\dots p}$  may be considered as a measure of partial correlation between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , eliminating the effect of  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$ . It is known as Partial Correlation coefficient and is denoted by

$$r_{12.34\dots p}$$

Thus, assuming  $\text{Var}(x_{1.34\dots p}) > 0$  and  $\text{Var}(x_{2.34\dots p}) > 0$ , so that  $R_{11}$  and  $R_{22}$  are both positive definite, we have

$$r_{12.34\dots p} = \frac{\text{Cov}(x_{1.34\dots p}, x_{2.34\dots p})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(x_{1.34\dots p}) \text{Var}(x_{2.34\dots p})}} \quad \text{--- (1)}$$

According to our notation,

$$x_{1.34\dots p} = x_1 - X_{1.34\dots p} = (x_1 - \bar{x}_1) + \sum_{j=3}^p \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{1j}^{(2)}}{R_{11}^{(2)}} (x_j - \bar{x}_j);$$

where,  $R_{ij}^{(2)}$  is the co-factor of  $r_{ij}$  in  $R^{(2)}$ , the determinant obtained from  $R$  by deleting the 2nd row and the 2nd column.

$$\therefore \text{Cov}(x_{1.34\dots p}, x_{2.34\dots p}) = \text{Cov}(x_1, x_{2.34\dots p}) + 0 \text{ as } \text{Cov}(x_j, x_{2.34\dots p}) = 0 \text{ for } j=3,4,\dots,p.$$

$$= \text{Cov}(x_1, x_2) + \sum_{j=3}^p \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{2j}^{(1)}}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \cdot \text{Cov}(x_1, x_j)$$

$$= r_{12} \delta_1 \delta_2 + \sum_{j=3}^p \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_j} \times \frac{R_{2j}^{(1)}}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \times r_{1j} \cdot \delta_1 \delta_j$$

$$= \delta_1 \delta_2 \left( r_{12} + \sum_{j=3}^p r_{1j} \cdot \frac{R_{2j}^{(1)}}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \right)$$

$$= \frac{\delta_1 \delta_2}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \left( \sum_{j=2}^p r_{1j} R_{2j}^{(1)} \right)$$

$$= -\delta_1 \delta_2 \cdot \frac{R_{12}}{R_{22}^{(1)}}; \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

because,  $\sum_{j=2}^p r_{1j} R_{2j}^{(1)}$  = determinant of the matrix obtained from  $R^{(1)}$  by replacing its first row by  $(r_{12}, r_{13}, \dots, r_{1p})$

$$= \begin{vmatrix} r_{12} & r_{13} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{32} & r_{33} & \dots & r_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ r_{p2} & r_{p3} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \text{Minor of } r_{21} \text{ in } R$$

$$= \text{Minor of } r_{12} \text{ in } R$$

$$= -R_{12}$$

Further, similar to the result

we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p) &= \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \cdot \sigma_1^2, \\ \text{Var}(x_1, x_3, \dots, x_p) &= \frac{|R^{(2)}|}{R_{11}^{(2)}} \cdot \sigma_1^2 \text{ and} \\ \text{Var}(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p) &= \frac{|R^{(1)}|}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \cdot \sigma_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad \text{--- (3)}$$

From (1), (2), (3); we get  $\rightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned} r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} &= -\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \frac{R_{12}}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \times \left( \frac{R_{11}^{(2)} R_{22}^{(1)}}{|R^{(2)}| |R^{(1)}|} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \\ &= -\frac{R_{12}}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \times \left( \frac{R_{22}^{(1)} R_{22}^{(1)}}{R_{11} R_{22}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= -\frac{R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}} \end{aligned}$$

as  $|R^{(1)}| = R_{11}$ ,  $|R^{(2)}| = R_{22}$ ,  $R_{11}^{(2)} = R_{22}^{(1)}$ .

Unlike the multiple correlation coefficient  $r_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}$ , the partial correlation coefficient  $r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}$  lies in  $[-1, 1]$ .

Particular Case:- ( $p=3$ )

For 3 variables,

$$R_{3 \times 3} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{13} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & r_{23} \\ r_{31} & r_{32} & r_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ which gives}$$

$$-R_{12} = \begin{vmatrix} r_{21} & r_{23} \\ r_{31} & r_{33} \end{vmatrix} = r_{12} - r_{13} r_{23},$$

$$R_{11} = r_{22} - r_{23}^2 = 1 - r_{23}^2$$

and,  $R_{22} = 1 - r_{13}^2$

So,

$$r_{12 \cdot 3} = \frac{r_{12} - r_{13} r_{23}}{\sqrt{1 - r_{13}^2} \sqrt{1 - r_{23}^2}}$$

Some Useful Results:-

(a)  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{\delta_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}}{\delta_{2 \cdot 134 \dots p}}$ ,

Proof:- We know that

$$b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = -\frac{R_{12}}{R_{11}} \times \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}$$

$$r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = \frac{-R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}}$$

$$\delta_{1 \cdot 234 \dots p}^2 = \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} \cdot \delta_1^2$$

$$\delta_{2 \cdot 134 \dots p}^2 = \frac{|R|}{R_{22}} \cdot \delta_2^2$$

Hence,  $r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{\delta_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}}{\delta_{2 \cdot 13 \dots p}} = -\frac{R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}} \times \frac{|R|^{1/2} \delta_1}{R_{11}^{1/2}} \times \frac{R_{22}^{1/2}}{|R|^{1/2} \delta_2}$   
 $= -\frac{R_{12}}{R_{11}} \times \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2} = b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}$

(b)  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \times \frac{\delta_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{\delta_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}}$

[It is a relation of the same form as  $b_{12} = r_{12} \cdot \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}$ .]

Proof:- As  $\delta_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2 = \frac{|R^{(2)}|}{R_{11}^{(2)}} \delta_1^2$  and

$$\delta_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2 = \frac{|R^{(1)}|}{R_{22}^{(1)}} \delta_2^2,$$

$$r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \times \frac{\delta_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{\delta_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}} = -\frac{R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}} \times \frac{|R^{(2)}|^{1/2}}{(R_{11}^{(2)})^{1/2}} \cdot \delta_1 \times \frac{(R_{22}^{(1)})^{1/2}}{|R^{(1)}|^{1/2} \delta_2}$$

$$= -\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2} \times \frac{R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}} \times \frac{R_{22}^{1/2}}{R_{11}^{1/2}}$$

$$= -\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2} \times \frac{R_{12}}{R_{11}}$$

$$= b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}$$

(30)

because,  $|R^{(1)}| = R_{11}$ ,  $|R^{(2)}| = R_{22}$ ,  $R_{11}^{(2)} = R_{22}^{(1)}$

Note:- This result may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} &= r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}} \\
 &= \frac{\text{Cov}(\alpha_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}, \alpha_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p})}{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}} \times \frac{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}} \\
 &= \frac{\text{Cov}(\alpha_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}, \alpha_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p})}{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

or,  $\text{Cov}(\alpha_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}, \alpha_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}) = s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2 \cdot b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}$

(c)  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot b_{21 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2$ , similar to the result  
 $b_{12} b_{21} = r_{12}^2$

Proof:- We have already proved that

$$b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}}$$

This implies,  $b_{21 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}$

Then,  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot b_{21 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2$

Here  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}$ ,  $b_{21 \cdot 34 \dots p}$  and  $r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2$  have the same sign.

(d) (i)  $s_{1.23...p}^2 = (1 - r_{1p.23...p-1}^2) \cdot s_{1.23...p-1}^2$

(ii)  $r_{1.23...p} > r_{1.23...p-1}$

(iii)  $1 - r_{1.23...p}^2 = (1 - r_{12}^2)(1 - r_{13.2}^2) \dots (1 - r_{1p.23...p-1}^2)$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(x_{1.23...p}) &= \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p}, x_{1.23...p}) \\ &= \text{Cov} \left[ x_{1.23...p-1} - \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} C_j (x_j - \bar{x}_j) - b_{1p.23...p-1} (x_p - \bar{x}_p), x_{1.23...p} \right], \\ &\quad \text{where } C_j = b_{1j.23...j-1 j+1...p} - b_{1j.23...j-1 j+1...p-1} \\ &= \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_{1.23...p}) \text{ as } \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p}, x_j) = 0 \forall j=2(1)p. \\ &= \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_{1.23...p-1}) - b_{1p.23...p-1} \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_p) \\ &\quad \text{as } \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_j) = 0 \forall j=2(1)p-1. \\ &= \text{Var}(x_{1.23...p-1}) - b_{1p.23...p-1} \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_{p.23...p-1}), \\ &\quad \text{as } x_{p.23...p-1} = (x_p - \bar{x}_p) + \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} b_{pj.23...j-1 j+1...p-1} (x_j - \bar{x}_j) \\ &\quad \text{giving } \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_{p.23...p-1}) = \text{Cov}(x_{1.23...p-1}, x_p) \\ &= \text{Var}(x_{1.23...p-1}) - b_{1p.23...p-1} b_{p1.23...p-1} \cdot s_{1.23...p-1}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore s_{1.23...p}^2 &= s_{1.23...p-1}^2 - r_{1p.23...p-1}^2 \cdot s_{1.23...p-1}^2 \\ &= (1 - r_{1p.23...p-1}^2) s_{1.23...p-1}^2 \quad \text{--- (1)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence (i) is proved.



Equation ① gives:—

$$s^2_{1.23\dots p} \leq s^2_{1.23\dots p-1} \quad \text{--- ②, because } 0 \leq r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1} \leq 1.$$

on,  $(1-r^2_{1.23\dots p}) s^2_1 \leq (1-r^2_{1.23\dots p-1}) s^2_1$ , because

$$\text{on, } r^2_{1.23\dots p} \geq r^2_{1.23\dots p-1} \quad \text{--- } s^2_{1.23\dots p} = (1-r^2_{1.23\dots p}) s^2_1$$

on,  $r_{1.23\dots p} \geq r_{1.23\dots p-1}$  because  $0 \leq r_{1.23\dots p} \leq 1$

Hence, (ii) is proved. --- ③

Note:- Inequalities ② & ③ indicate that by introducing an addition predictor variable in the multiple regression equation, one may expect to improve its usefulness as a predicting formula.

Applying ① successively to  $s^2_{1.23\dots p-1}, s^2_{1.23\dots p-2}, \dots, s^2_{1.2}$ ; we get

$$\begin{aligned} s^2_{1.23\dots p} &= (1-r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1}) s^2_{1.23\dots p-1} \\ &= (1-r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1}) (1-r^2_{1p-1.23\dots p-2}) s^2_{1.23\dots p-2} \\ &\vdots \\ &= (1-r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1}) (1-r^2_{1p-1.23\dots p-2}) \dots (1-r^2_{13.2}) s^2_{1.2} \\ &= (1-r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1}) (1-r^2_{1p-1.23\dots p-2}) \dots (1-r^2_{13.2}) (1-r^2_{12}) s^2_1 \end{aligned}$$

on,  $(1-r^2_{1.23\dots p}) = (1-r^2_{12}) (1-r^2_{13.2}) \dots (1-r^2_{1p-1.23\dots p-2}) (1-r^2_{1p.23\dots p-1})$

Hence (iii) is proved.

(e) If  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \dots + a_px_p = k$ , then what will be the partial correlation coefficient of  $(p-2)$  orders? What will be the multiple correlation coefficient  $r_{1.23\dots p}$ ?

[ The variables, being linearly related,  $S$  is singular (p.s.d.)  
 i.e.  $|S| = 0$ .  
 $\Rightarrow r_{1.23\dots p} = 1 - \frac{|S|}{|S_2|} = 1$  ]

Partial correlation: In multivariate data analysis, the study of the degree to which two variables, say  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , may be related when the influence of the other variables,  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$  is eliminated from both of them is of interest. Though the study is concerned about two primary variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  but the other  $p-2$  variables are also taken into consideration because of their possible relationship with  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . In practice, we usually eliminate the linear effect of  $(x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p)$  from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

Let us define,  $X_{1.34\dots p}$  be the part of  $x_1$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $(x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p)$  and  $X_{2.34\dots p}$  be the part of  $x_2$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_2$  on  $(x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p)$ . We denote

$$\tilde{x}^{px1} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p)' = (x_1, x_2, \tilde{x}^{(3)})', \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\bar{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \tilde{\bar{x}}^{(3)})'$$

Dispersion matrix  $(s) = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & \tilde{s}'_{(13)} \\ s_{12} & s_{22} & \tilde{s}'_{(23)} \\ \tilde{s}'_{(13)} & \tilde{s}'_{(23)} & s_3 \end{pmatrix}$

Again, let  $X_{1.34\dots p} = a + \tilde{b}' \tilde{x}^{(3)}$ ; where  $a = \bar{x}_1 - \tilde{b}' \tilde{\bar{x}}^{(3)}$ ,  
 $b = s_3^{-1} \tilde{s}'_{(13)}$

also let  $X_{2.34\dots p} = a^* + \tilde{b}^* \tilde{x}^{(3)}$ ; where  $a^* = \bar{x}_2 - \tilde{b}^* \tilde{\bar{x}}^{(3)}$ ,  
 $b^* = s_3^{-1} \tilde{s}'_{(23)}$ .

It may be noted that the residuals  $e_{1.34\dots p} = x_1 - X_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $e_{2.34\dots p} = x_2 - X_{2.34\dots p}$  may be regarded as the parts of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  uninfluenced by  $\tilde{x}^{(3)}$ , the reason is:

$$\text{Cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, x_j) = 0 \quad \forall j = 3(1)p$$

$$\text{Cov}(e_{2.34\dots p}, x_j) = 0 \quad \forall j = 3(1)p.$$

Definition: The product moment correlation coefficient between  $e_{1.34\dots p}$  and  $e_{2.34\dots p}$  is called the partial correlation coefficient of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , eliminating the linear effect of  $x^{(3)}$  from both of them and denoted by  $r_{12.34\dots p}$ .

$$\text{Thus, by definition, } r_{12.34\dots p} = \frac{\text{Cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, e_{2.34\dots p})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(e_{1.34\dots p})} \sqrt{\text{Var}(e_{2.34\dots p})}}$$

$$\text{We note that } \text{Var}(e_{1.34\dots p}) = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} s_{11} & s'_{(13)} \\ s_{(13)} & s_3 \end{vmatrix}}{|S_3|}$$

$$= \frac{\text{co-factor of } s_{22} \text{ in } S}{|S_3|}$$

$$\text{and, } \text{Var}(e_{2.34\dots p}) = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} s_{22} & s'_{(23)} \\ s_{(23)} & s_3 \end{vmatrix}}{|S_3|}$$

$$= \frac{\text{co-factor of } s_{11} \text{ in } S}{|S_3|}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now, } \text{Cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, e_{2.34\dots p}) &= \text{Cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, x_2 - X_{2.34\dots p}) \\ &= \text{Cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, x_2) = \text{Cov}(x_1 - X_{1.34\dots p}, x_2) \\ &= \text{Cov}(x_1, x_2) - \text{Cov}(x_2, X_{1.34\dots p}) \\ &= \text{Cov}(x_1, x_2) - \text{Cov}(x_2, a + b' x^{(3)}) \\ &= s_{12} - \sum_{i=3}^p b_i \cdot \text{Cov}(x_i, x_2) \\ &= s_{12} - \sum_{i=3}^p b_i s_{i2} \\ &= s_{12} - b' s'_{(23)} = s_{12} - s'_{(13)} s_3^{-1} s_{(23)} \\ &= \frac{\begin{vmatrix} s_{12} & s'_{(23)} \\ s_{(23)} & s_3 \end{vmatrix}}{|S_3|} \\ &= (-1)^{2+1} \cdot \frac{\text{co-factor of } s_{21} \text{ in } S}{|S_3|} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \therefore r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} &= \frac{- \text{cofactor of } s_{21} \text{ in } S}{\sqrt{(\text{cofactor of } s_{22} \text{ in } S) \cdot (\text{cofactor of } s_{11} \text{ in } S)}} \\
 &= \frac{- s_{21}}{\sqrt{s_{11} \cdot s_{22}}}, \text{ where } s_{ij} \text{ is the cofactor of } s_{ij} \text{ in } S. \\
 &= - \frac{s_{21}/|S|}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{11}}{|S|} \cdot \frac{s_{22}}{|S|}}} \\
 &= - \frac{s^{21}}{\sqrt{s^{11} \cdot s^{22}}}, \text{ where } S^{-1} = \left( (s^{ij}) \right) = \left( \left( \frac{s_{ij}}{|S|} \right) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Problem: Let  $\alpha$  be a vector variable with mean  $\bar{\alpha}$  and dispersion matrix  $S$ ,

$$S = s^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n & n & \dots & n \\ n & 1 & n & \dots & n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ n & n & n & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{p \times p}$$

Show that for any  $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (\alpha_{1\alpha} - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - \beta_p \alpha_{p\alpha})^2 \geq s^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{n^2(p-1)}{1 + (p-2)n} \right]$$

Solution:  $\text{var}(e_{1,2,3 \dots p}) = s^2_{1,2,3 \dots p} = \frac{|S|}{|S_2|}$

and  $|S| = (s^2)^p (1-n)^{p-1} \{ 1 + (p-1)n \}$

$$S_2 = s^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n & n & \dots & n \\ n & 1 & n & \dots & n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ n & n & n & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{(p-1) \times (p-1)} \quad \therefore |S_2| = (s^2)^{p-1} (1-n)^{p-2} \{ 1 + (p-2)n \}$$

By definition of multiple linear regression,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_{1\alpha} - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \alpha_{2\alpha} - \dots - \beta_p \alpha_{p\alpha})^2 &\geq s^2_{1,2,3 \dots p} \\
 &\geq \frac{s^2 (1-n) \{ 1 + (p-1)n \}}{\{ 1 + (p-2)n \}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Problem: Let  $\tilde{x}^{p \times 1}$  be a vector variable with mean vector  $\bar{\tilde{x}}$  and correlation matrix  $R$ . Then show that for any  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_p)$ ,

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - b_1 - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})^2 \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - \bar{x}_1)^2}{r''},$$

where  $r''$  is the  $(1, 1)^{th}$  element of  $R^{-1}$  (see next page),

Hints: Consider any linear function  $L(\tilde{x}^{(3)}) = b_1 + b_2 x_2 + \dots + b_p x_p$ ,  $b_i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i$ .

Note that, the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(3)}$  is obtained by minimizing

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left\{ x_{1\alpha} - L(x_{2\alpha}, x_{3\alpha}, \dots, x_{p\alpha}) \right\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - b_1 - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})^2 \end{aligned}$$

By definition of multiple linear regression,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - b_1 - b_2 x_{2\alpha} - \dots - b_p x_{p\alpha})^2 \\ & \geq \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_{1\alpha} - x_{1.23\dots p, \alpha})^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$= n \cdot \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p})$$

$$= n \cdot s_{1.23\dots p}^2$$

$$= n \cdot \frac{s_{11}}{r''}$$

Problem: Find the value of  $r_{1.23\dots p}$  if the independent variables are pairwise uncorrelated.

Solution:- Here, the independent variables are  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$ .  
 Since  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  are pairwise uncorrelated then

$$r_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall \quad i \neq j = 2(1)p.$$

The correlation matrix is given by

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{13} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{12} & r_{22} & r_{23} & \dots & r_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{1p} & r_{2p} & r_{3p} & \dots & r_{pp} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{12} & r_{13} & \dots & r_{1p} \\ r_{12} & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{1p} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \tilde{r}'(1) \\ \tilde{r}(1) & I_{(p-1)} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } \tilde{r}'(1) = (r_{12}, r_{13}, \dots, r_{1p})$$

$$\therefore |R| = |I| |1 - \tilde{r}'(1) \cdot I^{-1} \tilde{r}(1)|$$

$$= 1 - \tilde{r}'(1) \tilde{r}(1)$$

$$= 1 - \sum_{i=2}^p r_{1i}^2$$

$$\therefore r_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{\frac{R_{11}}{|R|}}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{1 / \left[ 1 - \sum_{i=2}^p r_{1i}^2 \right]}$$

$$\text{on, } r_{1.23\dots p} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^p r_{1i}^2}$$

Partial Regression Coefficient:- If the multiple regression equation of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p$  is  $X_{1.23\dots p} = a + b_2 x_2 + \dots + b_p x_p$ , a linear function of  $\tilde{x}^{(2)} = (x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p)$ , then  $a = X_{1.23\dots p}$  when  $\tilde{x}^{(2)} = \underline{0}$  and  $b_j$  is the amount by which  $X_{1.23\dots p}$  increases for a unit increment in the value of  $x_j$ , the other variables  $x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_p$  being kept fixed;  $b_j$  is called the partial regression coefficient of  $x_1$  on  $x_j$  for fixed  $x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_p$ .

$$\left[ \begin{aligned} X_{1.23\dots p} &= a, \text{ when } \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \underline{0} \\ &= a + b_j, \text{ when } \tilde{x}^{(2)} = (x_2, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_p) = (0, 0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \end{aligned} \right]$$

Notation: 'b<sub>j</sub>' is often written more explicitly as  $b_{j.23\dots(j-1)(j+1)\dots p}$

Formula for b<sub>j</sub>: Normal equation;  $S_2 \tilde{b} = \tilde{s}^{(1)}$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} s_{22} & s_{23} & \dots & s_{2p} \\ s_{32} & s_{33} & \dots & s_{3p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{p2} & s_{p3} & \dots & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_2 \\ b_3 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{12} \\ s_{13} \\ \vdots \\ s_{1p} \end{pmatrix}$$

We have  $b_2 s_{j2} + b_3 s_{j3} + \dots + b_p s_{jp} = s_{1j} \quad \forall j = 2(1)p$  ①

Note that,

$$s_{11} s_{j1} + s_{12} s_{j2} + s_{13} s_{j3} + \dots + s_{1p} s_{jp} = 0, \quad j = 2(1)p,$$

where  $s_{ij}$  is the cofactor of  $s_{ij}$  in  $S$ .

i.e.,  $\left(-\frac{s_{12}}{s_{11}}\right) s_{j2} + \left(-\frac{s_{13}}{s_{11}}\right) s_{j3} + \dots + \left(-\frac{s_{1p}}{s_{11}}\right) s_{jp} = s_{1j}$  ②

Combining (1) and (2), we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_j &= - \frac{s_{1j}}{s_{11}} \\
 &= \frac{-\sqrt{s_{11}} s_{22} \dots s_{(j-1)(j-1)} \sqrt{s_{jj}} s_{(j+1)(j+1)} \dots s_{pp}}{s_{22} \dots s_{jj} \dots s_{pp}} R_{1j} \\
 &= - \frac{R_{1j}}{R_{11}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{s_{11}}{s_{jj}}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Result 1. Show that  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{1 \cdot 234 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 134 \dots p}}$ .

Proof:

$$b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = - \frac{s_{12}}{\sqrt{s_{11} s_{22}}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{s_{22}}{s_{11}}}$$

$$= r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \sqrt{\frac{s_{22}/|s|}{s_{11}/|s|}}$$

$$= r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \sqrt{\frac{|s|/s_{11}}{|s|/s_{22}}}$$

$$= r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{1 \cdot 234 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 134 \dots p}}$$

Result 2. Show that  $b_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = r_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{s_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{s_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}}$ .

Proof: Try yourself.



Problem:— Show that  $r_{12}, r_{23}, r_{13}$  must satisfy the inequality  
 $r_{12}^2 + r_{13}^2 + r_{23}^2 - 2r_{12}r_{13}r_{23} \leq 1.$

Solution:

We know that  $|R| \geq 0$

$$\Delta \begin{vmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{13} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & r_{23} \\ r_{31} & r_{32} & r_{33} \end{vmatrix} \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{vmatrix} 1 & r_{12} & r_{13} \\ r_{12} & 1 & r_{23} \\ r_{13} & r_{23} & 1 \end{vmatrix} \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow 1(1 - r_{23}^2) - r_{12}(r_{12} - r_{13}r_{23}) + r_{13}(r_{12}r_{23} - r_{13}) \geq 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow 1 - r_{23}^2 - r_{12}^2 + r_{12}r_{13}r_{23} + r_{12}r_{13}r_{23} - r_{13}^2 \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow r_{12}^2 + r_{13}^2 + r_{23}^2 - 2r_{12}r_{13}r_{23} \leq 1. \quad (\text{Proved})$$

Problem:— Suppose  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  satisfy the relation  
 $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 = k.$   
 State what partial correlation coefficient will be?

Solution:— Let  $\text{Var}(x_i) = \delta_i^2, i=1,2,3.$

$$\text{Now } a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 = k$$

$$\text{or, } a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = k - a_3x_3$$

$$\text{or, } \text{Var}(a_1x_1 + a_2x_2) = \text{Var}(k - a_3x_3)$$

$$\Rightarrow a_1\delta_1^2 + a_2\delta_2^2 + 2a_1a_2r_{12}\delta_1\delta_2 = a_3^2\delta_3^2$$

$$\Rightarrow r_{12} = \frac{a_3^2\delta_3^2 - a_1^2\delta_1^2 - a_2^2\delta_2^2}{2a_1a_2\delta_1\delta_2}$$

$$\text{Similarly, } r_{13} = \frac{a_2^2\delta_2^2 - a_1^2\delta_1^2 - a_3^2\delta_3^2}{2a_1a_3\delta_1\delta_3}$$

$$r_{23} = \frac{a_1^2\delta_1^2 - a_2^2\delta_2^2 - a_3^2\delta_3^2}{2a_2a_3\delta_2\delta_3}$$

Notes  $r_{12.3}$  = the product moment correlation coefficient between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  after eliminating the linear effect of  $x_3$  from both of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

= the product moment correlation coefficient between the  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  where  $x_3$  is fixed and  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 = k$ .

=  $\frac{Cov(x_1, x_2)}{\sqrt{Var(x_1)}\sqrt{Var(x_2)}}$ , where  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 = k$   
 $\Rightarrow a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = k - a_3x_3$   
 $\Rightarrow a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = k^*$  (say)

=  $\frac{Cov(x_1, \frac{k^*}{a_2} - \frac{a_1}{a_2}x_1)}{\sqrt{Var(x_1)}\sqrt{Var(\frac{k^*}{a_2} - \frac{a_1}{a_2}x_1)}}$

=  $\frac{-(\frac{a_1}{a_2})Var(x_1)}{|\frac{a_1}{a_2}|Var(x_1)}$

=  $\begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } a_1, a_2 \text{ are of same sign.} \\ +1 & \text{if } a_1, a_2 \text{ are of opposite sign.} \end{cases}$

$\therefore$  Partial correlation coefficient are  $\pm 1$  if  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  are of the same sign.

\* ————— \*

## Multi-variate Analysis.

(1)

Multivariate analysis is a branch of Statistics where we study several variables simultaneously.

### Notions of Multivariate dist<sup>n</sup>s.

Here, a  $p$ -dimensional random variable  $\underline{X}$  is a vector:

$$\underline{X} = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_p \end{pmatrix}$$

whose elements are unidimensional r.v.'s and  $\underline{x}$ , a realization of  $\underline{X}$ ,  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

Here  $\underline{X}$  is discrete, continuous or mixed.

iii) If  $\underline{X}$  is discrete, the  $j$ <sup>th</sup> pmf of  $X_1, \dots, X_p$  is given by

$$P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_p = x_p) = p(x_1, \dots, x_p) \text{ or } p(\underline{x}), \text{ say.}$$

A function  $p(\underline{x})$  satisfying the conditions

a)  $p(\underline{x}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

b)  $\sum_{\underline{x}} p(\underline{x}) = 1$ .

is called the pmf of  $\underline{X}$ .

The marginal pmf of  $(X_1, \dots, X_{p_1})$ ,

$p_1 < p$  is

$$q(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}) = \sum p(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)$$

where the sum is taken over all possible values of  $x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p$ .

The conditional pmf of  $(X_1, \dots, X_{p_1})$  given  $X_{p_1+1} = x_{p_1+1}, \dots, X_p = x_p$ , is.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{p_1} = x_{p_1} \mid X_{p_1+1} = x_{p_1+1}, \dots, X_p = x_p) \\
 &= \frac{p(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)}{q(x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)} \\
 &= h(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1} \mid x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p).
 \end{aligned}$$

(i) If  $\underline{x}$  is continuous, then the joint pdf of  $X_1, \dots, X_p$  is  $f(x_1, \dots, x_p)$  say, which satisfies

a)  $f(\underline{x}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

b)  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} f(\underline{x}) d\underline{x} = 1.$

The marginal pdf of  $(X_1, \dots, X_{p_1})$ ,  $p_1 < p$ , is  $g(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}) = \int_{x_{p_1+1}=-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{x_p=-\infty}^{\infty} f(\underline{x}) dx_{p_1+1} \dots dx_p.$

The conditional pdf of  $(X_1, \dots, X_{p_1})$  given  $X_{p_1+1} = x_{p_1+1}, \dots, X_p = x_p$  is  $h(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1} \mid x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p) = \frac{f(\underline{x})}{g(x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)}$

(ii) The cdf of a random vector  $\underline{x}$  is

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_p) = P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_p \leq x_p).$$

$$= \begin{cases} \sum_{t_1=-\infty}^{x_1} \dots \sum_{t_p=-\infty}^{x_p} p(t_1, \dots, t_p) & \text{if } \underline{x} \text{ is discrete.} \\ \int_{-a}^{x_1} \dots \int_{-a}^{x_p} f(t_1, \dots, t_p) dt_p \dots dt_1 & \text{if } \underline{x} \text{ is continuous} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

is The marginal cdf of  $(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1})$ ,  $p_1 < p$

$$G(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1})$$

$$= \lim_{x_{p_1+1} \rightarrow \infty}$$

$$= \lim_{x_{p_1+1} \rightarrow \infty} \dots \lim_{x_p \rightarrow \infty} F(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)$$

$$= F(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, \infty, \dots, \infty)$$

If  $\underline{x}$  is absolutely continuous then

$$\frac{\partial^p F(x_1, \dots, x_p)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2 \dots \partial x_p} = f(x_1, \dots, x_p), \text{ if } F(\underline{x}) \text{ is continuous (almost everywhere)}$$

(iv) The set of variables  $(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1})$  is indept. to the set  $(x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)$  iff

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)$$

$$= F(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}, \infty, \infty, \dots, \infty) F(\infty, \dots, \infty, x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p)$$

## Moments of multidimensional variate Expectation:

Let  $\tilde{X}^{p \times 1}$  denote a column vector of random components  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1(1)p$ . Then the expectation of  $\tilde{X}$  is defined as.

$$E(\tilde{X}) = E \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ E(x_p) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_p \end{pmatrix} = \underline{\mu}, \text{ say.}$$

## Variance - covariance:-

Define  $\text{cov}(x_i, x_j) = E[(x_i - E(x_i))(x_j - E(x_j))]$

If  $i=j$   $\sigma_{ii} = \text{var}(x_i) = \sigma_{ij}$ , say.

We extend the variance notion to the  $p$ -dimensional random vector  $\tilde{X}$  by the following matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} & E [ (\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X})) (\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X}))^T ] \\ &= E [ (\tilde{X} - \underline{\mu}) (\tilde{X} - \underline{\mu})^T ] \\ &= E \left[ \begin{pmatrix} x_1 - \mu_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_p - \mu_p \end{pmatrix} (x_1 - \mu_1, \dots, x_p - \mu_p) \right] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} & \dots & \sigma_{1p} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} & \dots & \sigma_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{p1} & \sigma_{p2} & \dots & \sigma_{pp} \end{pmatrix} = \Sigma, \text{ say.} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we assume  $E((v_{ij})) = (E v_{ij})$

The symmetric matrix  $\Sigma$  is called the variance-covariance matrix or dispersion.

matrix of  $\underline{x}$ .

(3)

### Moments:

We define

$$E(h(x_1, \dots, x_p)) = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x_1, \dots, x_p) f(x_1, \dots, x_p) dx_1 \dots dx_p & \text{if } \underline{x} \text{ is continuous} \\ \sum_{x_1} \dots \sum_{x_p} h(x_1, \dots, x_p) p(x_1, \dots, x_p) & \text{if } \underline{x} \text{ is discrete} \end{cases}$$

⊗ Now, we find the mean & variance of a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_p$  —

$\underline{a}'\underline{x} = \sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_i$  is a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_p$ .

Now,  $E(\underline{a}'\underline{x})$

$$= E\left(\sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_i\right)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_i\right) f(x_1, \dots, x_p) dx_1 \dots dx_p$$

[assuming  $\underline{x}$  is continuous]

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p a_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_i f(x_1, \dots, x_p) dx_1 \dots dx_p$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p a_i E(x_i)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p a_i \mu_i$$

$$= \underline{a}'\underline{\mu}$$

[proof of the discrete case is similar]

Now,  $V(\underline{a}'\underline{x})$

$$= E(\underline{a}'\underline{x} - \underline{a}'\underline{\mu})^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E \left( \sum_{i=1}^p a_i (x_i - \mu_i) \right)^2 \\
&= E \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_i a_j (x_i - \mu_i) (x_j - \mu_j) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_i a_j E \{ (x_i - \mu_i) (x_j - \mu_j) \} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_i a_j \sigma_{ij} \\
&= \underline{a}' \Sigma \underline{a}
\end{aligned}$$

[ $\therefore E \left( \sum_{i=1}^p a_i x_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^p a_i E(x_i)$ ]

### Remarks:

① The covariance bet<sup>n</sup>  $\underline{a}'\underline{x}$  &  $\underline{b}'\underline{x}$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(\underline{a}'\underline{x}, \underline{b}'\underline{x}) &= \text{Cov}(\sum a_i x_i, \sum b_i x_i) \\
&= \sum_i \sum_j a_i b_j \sigma_{ij} = \underline{a}' \Sigma \underline{b}
\end{aligned}$$

② Consider the transformations

$$\underline{y} = \underline{A} \underline{x}, \quad \underline{z} = \underline{B} \underline{x}$$

$$\text{Disp}(\underline{y}) = \text{Cov}(\underline{y}, \underline{y}) = E \{ (\underline{y} - E(\underline{y})) (\underline{y} - E(\underline{y}))' \}$$

$$= E \{ (\underline{A}\underline{x} - \underline{A}\underline{\mu}) (\underline{A}\underline{x} - \underline{A}\underline{\mu})' \} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{Where } E(\underline{y}) \\ = E(\underline{A}\underline{x}) \\ = \underline{A}\underline{\mu} \text{ (prove it)} \end{array} \right]$$

$$= E \left[ \underline{A} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \underline{A}' \right]$$

$$= \underline{A} E \left[ (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \right] \underline{A}'$$

$$= \underline{A} \Sigma \underline{A}'$$

Similarly,  $\text{Disp}(\underline{z}) = \text{Cov}(\underline{z}, \underline{z}) = \underline{B} \Sigma \underline{B}'$



$$\text{Cov}(Y, Z)$$

$$= A \Sigma B' \quad (\text{prove it})$$

Correlation matrix:

Define  $\rho_{ij} = \frac{\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j)}{\sqrt{V(X_i) V(X_j)}}$

Then the matrix of correlation coeffs is

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_{12} & \dots & \rho_{1p} \\ \rho_{21} & 1 & \dots & \rho_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_{p1} & \rho_{p2} & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= D \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{ii}}} \right) \Sigma D \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{ii}}} \right)$$

where  $D \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{ii}}} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{11}}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{22}}} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{pp}}} \end{pmatrix}$

Theorem:

Any variance-covariance matrix is n.n.d, and every n.n.d matrix is the variance-covariance matrix of some random vector.

[CV]

proof: First part:

Let  $\Sigma^{p \times p} = (\sigma_{ij})$  be a the variance-covariance matrix of a random vector  $X^{p \times 1}$ .

Note that  $\forall (a'x) \geq 0 \quad \forall a$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_i \sum_j a_i a_j \sigma_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall a$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a' \Sigma a \geq 0 \quad \forall a$$

$\Rightarrow \Sigma$  is n.n.d.

Remark: ①  $\Sigma$  is psd.

$$\Leftrightarrow a' \Sigma a = 0 \text{ for some } a \neq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \text{Var}(a'x) = 0 \text{ for some } a \neq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a'x = c \text{ for some } a \neq 0, \text{ with probability unity}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a'(x - \mu) = 0 \text{ for some } a \neq 0, \text{ "}$$

$$[\because c = E(a'x) = a'\mu]$$

If  $\Sigma$  is p.d. then there do not exist  $a \neq 0$  &  $c$  such that  $a'x = c$ .

② If  $a'x = c$  for some  $a \neq 0$

then  $\Sigma$  is p.s.d  $\Rightarrow |\Sigma| = 0$  and the dist<sup>n</sup> is called a singular dist<sup>n</sup> is known as (in that case  $P(A) < p$ ).

If  $|\Sigma| \neq 0$ , the dist<sup>n</sup> is known as nonsingular dist<sup>n</sup>.

2nd part: Let  $\Sigma^{p \times p}$  be an n.n.d matrix.

Then there exists a matrix  $B^{k \times p}$  ( $k \leq p$ ) such that  $\Sigma = B^T B$

Consider a R.V.  $Y^{k \times 1}$  with  $E(Y) = 0$

&  $\text{disp}(Y) = I_k$ .

(5)

Then,  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} = \underline{\mu}^{p \times 1} + B^T \underline{y}$  has the mean vector as

$$E(\underline{x}) = \underline{\mu} + B^T E(\underline{y}) = \underline{\mu}$$

& the dispersion matrix

$$\text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \text{Disp}(\underline{\mu} + B^T \underline{y})$$

$$= \text{Disp}(B^T \underline{y}) \quad [\because \text{dispersion } \bullet \text{ is indept of origin}]$$

$$= B^T \text{Disp}(\underline{y}) B$$

$$= B^T I_k B$$

$$= B^T B$$

$$= \Sigma$$

[\*  $\underline{\mu}$  is unnecessary for the proof]

### Result ①:

Let  $\underline{x}$  be a R.V. with mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ ;  $A$  is a real ~~sq~~ matrix, then show that

$$E(\underline{x}' A \underline{x}) = \text{tr}(A \Sigma) + \underline{\mu}' A \underline{\mu}$$

proof:

$$E(\underline{x}' A \underline{x}) = E(\text{tr}(\underline{x}' A \underline{x}))$$

$$= E(\text{tr}(A \underline{x} \underline{x}')) \quad [\because \text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)]$$

$$= \text{tr}[A E(\underline{x} \underline{x}')] ]$$

$$= \text{tr}[A(\Sigma + \underline{\mu} \underline{\mu}')] ]$$

$$[\because \Sigma = E(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' = E(\underline{x} \underline{x}') - \underline{\mu} \underline{\mu}']$$

$$= \text{tr}(A \Sigma) + \text{tr}(A \underline{\mu} \underline{\mu}')$$

$$= \text{tr}(A \Sigma) + \text{tr}(\underline{\mu}' A \underline{\mu})$$

$$= \text{tr}(A \Sigma) + \underline{\mu}' A \underline{\mu}$$

□

Result 2: In some R.V.  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1}$ , [c.u.]

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left( (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \right) \\ &= E \left( \text{tr} \left\{ (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \right\} \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left[ \Sigma^{-1} E \left\{ (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \right\} \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[ \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma \right] = \text{tr} I_p = p \end{aligned}$$

Problem:

- ① S.T. all the characteristic roots of a dispersion matrix of a R.V. are nonnegative.
- ② S.T. any dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$  can be written as  $BB'$  where  $B$  is n.n.d.

Hint:  $\exists$  an orthogonal matrix  $P \in$

$$P' \Sigma P = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & & 0 \\ & d_2 & \\ 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & d_n \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Here } d_i \geq 0 \forall i \\ \because \Sigma \text{ is n.n.d.} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \Sigma &= P \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{d_1} & & 0 \\ & \sqrt{d_2} & \\ 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & \sqrt{d_n} \end{pmatrix} P' P \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{d_1} & & 0 \\ & \sqrt{d_2} & \\ 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & \sqrt{d_n} \end{pmatrix} P' \\ &= BB' \end{aligned}$$

where  $B = P \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{d_1} & & 0 \\ & \sqrt{d_2} & \\ 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & \sqrt{d_n} \end{pmatrix} P'$

$B$  is n.n.d. since  $P$  is n.s. &  $\sqrt{d_i} \geq 0 \forall i = 1, \dots, n$ .

## \* Regression theory:

(6)

### General concept of regression:

The concept of regression is concerned with the prediction of one or more variables  $(y_1, \dots, y_q)$  on the basis of the information provided by other measurements or concomitant variables  $(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ . It is customary to call the latter as indept or predictor variables & the former as dept or criterion variables.

We are naturally interested in the question "how should the predictors be chosen?"

Consider a single criterion variable  $x_1$  &  $p-1$  indept variables  $(x_2, \dots, x_p)' = \underline{x}^{(2)}$ .  
Let  $f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = f(x_2, \dots, x_p)$  be a predictor of  $x_1$ .

### (i) Minimum MSE predictor: (Theorem 2)

$$\text{Let } M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = E(x_1 | \underline{x}^{(2)})$$

Then  $E(x_1 - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))^2$  is minimized when

$$f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = M(\underline{x}^{(2)})$$

proof:  $E(x_1 - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))^2$

$$= E(x_1 - M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))^2 + E(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))^2$$

$$+ 2E\{(x_1 - M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))\}$$

Now,

$$E\{(x_1 - M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))\}$$

$$= E_{\underline{x}^{(2)}} E_{x_1 | \underline{x}^{(2)}} \{(x_1 - M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E_{\tilde{x}^{(2)}} \left[ (M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) - f(\tilde{x}^{(2)})) E_{x_1 | \tilde{x}^{(2)}} (x_1 - M(\tilde{x}^{(2)})) \right] \\
&= E_{\tilde{x}^{(2)}} \left[ (M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) - f(\tilde{x}^{(2)})) \underbrace{\left\{ E(x_1 | \tilde{x}^{(2)}) - M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) \right\}}_0 \right] \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\therefore E(x_1 - f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))^2 &= E(x_1 - M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))^2 + E(M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) - f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))^2 \\
&\geq E(x_1 - M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))^2
\end{aligned}$$

① The lower bound of  $E(x_1 - f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))^2$  is attained when  $f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) = M(\tilde{x}^{(2)})$ , so the best choice of the predictor which minimizes the MSE is  $M(\tilde{x}^{(2)})$ , the conditional mean of  $x_1$  given  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is called the regression of  $x_1$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$ .

② Predictor having maximum correlation with the criterion (Theorem 3):

Let  $M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) = E(x_1 | \tilde{x}^{(2)})$ .

Then  $\rho(x_1, M(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))$  is non-negative &  $\rho(x_1, M(\tilde{x}^{(2)})) \geq |\rho(x_1, f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))|$  for any  $f^n$   $f(\tilde{x}^{(2)})$ .

proof: For any  $f^n$   $f(\tilde{x}^{(2)})$ ,  
 $\text{Cov}(x_1, f(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))$

(7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E \left[ (x_1 - E(x_1)) (f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))) \right] \\
&= E \left[ \left\{ f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(f(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \right\} x_1 \right] \\
&= E_{\underline{x}^{(2)}} \left[ E_{x_1 | \underline{x}^{(2)}} \left[ \left\{ f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(f(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \right\} x_1 \right] \right] \\
&= E_{\underline{x}^{(2)}} \left[ \left\{ f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(f(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \right\} E_{x_1 | \underline{x}^{(2)}}(x_1) \right] \\
&= E_{\underline{x}^{(2)}} \left[ \left\{ f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(f(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \right\} M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) \right] \\
&= \text{Cov}(f(\underline{x}^{(2)}), M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) .
\end{aligned}$$

When  $f(\underline{x}^{(2)}) = M(\underline{x}^{(2)})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) &= \text{Cov}(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}), M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \\
&= \text{Var}(M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \\
&= \sigma_M^2 \quad (\text{say}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now,  $\rho^2(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$

$$= \frac{\text{Cov}(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))}{\sigma_{x_1} \sigma_M} = \frac{\sigma_M^2}{\sigma_{x_1} \sigma_M} = \frac{\sigma_M}{\sigma_{x_1}} \geq 0.$$

Again,  $\rho^2(x_1, f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$

$$= \frac{\text{Cov}^2(x_1, f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))}{\sigma_{x_1}^2 \sigma_f^2}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Cov}^2(f(\underline{x}^{(2)}), M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))}{\sigma_f^2 \sigma_M^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_M^2}{\sigma_{x_1}^2}$$

$$= \rho^2(f(\underline{x}^{(2)}), M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \cdot \rho^2(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$$

$$\leq \rho^2(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)})) \quad [\because \rho^2(f, M) \leq 1]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow |\rho(x_1, f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))| \leq \rho(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$$

Equality holds iff  $\rho^2(f, M) = 1$ ,

ie iff  $f(\underline{x}^{(2)})$  is a linear f<sup>n</sup> of  $M(\underline{x}^{(2)})$

Again, the regression of  $x_1$  on  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  is the answer.

The maximum correlation of  $\rho(x_1, f(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$ , ie  $\rho(x_1, M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))$  is called the correlation ratio & it is denoted by  $\eta_{x_1, \underline{x}^{(2)}}$ .

Clearly  $\eta_{x_1, \underline{x}^{(2)}} \leq 1$ .

We define  $\eta_{x_1, \underline{x}^{(2)}}^2 = \frac{\sigma_M^2}{\sigma_{x_1}^2}$  as the correlation ratio.

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{x_1}^2 &= E(x_1 - E(x_1))^2 \\ &= E(x_1 - M(\underline{x}^{(2)}))^2 + E(M(\underline{x}^{(2)}) - E(x_1))^2 \\ &= \sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2 + \sigma_M^2 \quad [\text{Prove it}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_{x_1, \underline{x}^{(2)}}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2}{\sigma_{x_1}^2} \leq 1$$

Clearly  $\eta_{x_1, \underline{x}^{(2)}}^2 \rightarrow 1$  as  $\sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2 \rightarrow 0$  (ie error variance  $\rightarrow 0$ ).



$\& \eta^2_{x_1 | x^{(2)}} = 0$ , when  $\sigma^2_{1.23\dots p} = \sigma^2_{x_1}$ , i.e. when there is no reduction in error due to the use of  $M(x^{(2)})$  as a predicting formula.

The conditional mean of  $x_1$  given  $x^{(2)}$  is called the regression of  $x_1$  on  $x^{(2)}$ . The regression is called linear or non linear according as the fn  $M(x^{(2)}) = E(x_1 | x^{(2)})$  is linear or not.

### Linear Regression:

Let  $x^{(p \times 1)}$  be a R.V. which is partitioned as  $\underline{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$  with mean  $E(\underline{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$

$$\& \text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} & \dots & \sigma_{1p} \\ \sigma_{12} & \sigma_{22} & \dots & \sigma_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1p} & \sigma_{2p} & \dots & \sigma_{pp} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \underline{\sigma}^{(1)} \\ \underline{\sigma}^{(1)} & \Sigma_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Assuming that dist<sup>n</sup> of  $x^{(2)}$  is nonsingular i.e.  $\text{Disp}(x^{(2)}) = \Sigma_2$  is p.d.

We approximate the regression of  $x_1$  on  $x^{(2)}$  as a linear fn assuming regression is linear whether the regression  $E(x_1 | x^{(2)})$  is actually linear or not.

Since  $E(x_1 - f(x^{(2)}))^2$  is minimum when  $f(x^{(2)}) = M(x^{(2)})$ , the regression of  $x_1$  on  $x^{(2)}$ , we can consider an arbitrary  $f$

$$\alpha + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_p x_p = \alpha + \beta' x^{(2)} \quad \text{where}$$

$\beta' = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)$ ; and determine the constants  $\alpha$  &  $\beta$  by minimizing  $E(x_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 x_2 - \dots - \beta_p x_p)^2 = S^2$ , say.

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \frac{\partial S^2}{\partial \alpha} = 0 &\Leftrightarrow E(x_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 x_2 - \dots - \beta_p x_p) = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mu_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 \mu_2 - \dots - \beta_p \mu_p = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \alpha = \mu_1 - \beta' \mu^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \& \frac{\partial S^2}{\partial \beta_j} &\Leftrightarrow E\{(x_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 x_2 - \dots - \beta_p x_p) x_j\} = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow E(x_1 x_j) = \alpha E(x_j) + \sum_{i=2}^p \beta_i E(x_i x_j) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \sigma_{1j} + \mu_1 \mu_j = (\mu_1 - \beta' \mu^{(2)}) \mu_j \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^p \beta_i (\sigma_{ij} + \mu_i \mu_j) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sigma_{1j} = \sum_{i=2}^p \beta_i \sigma_{ij} \quad , \quad j = 2(1)p$$

$$\therefore \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{13} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{1p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{22} & \sigma_{32} & \dots & \sigma_{p2} \\ \sigma_{23} & \sigma_{33} & \dots & \sigma_{p3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{2p} & \sigma_{3p} & \dots & \sigma_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_p \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sigma_{(1)} = \sum_2 \beta$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \hat{\beta} = \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_{21} \quad [ \because \Sigma_2 \text{ is pd} ]$$

Hence  $\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}' X^{(2)} = X_{1.23\dots p}$ , say; where  $\alpha = \mu_1 - \beta' \mu^{(2)}$

$\hat{\beta} = \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_{21}$ , is the multiple linear regression.

Here  $X_{1.23\dots p}$  is the part of  $X_1$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $X_1$  on  $X^{(2)}$ , we can define

$$X_1 = X_{1.23\dots p} + e_{1.23\dots p}$$

where  $e_{1.23\dots p}$  is the part of  $X_1$  remaining unexplained by the multiple linear regression.

Theorem 3':

$E(e_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$  & error is uncorrelated with the predictor variable & hence with the multiple linear regression.

proof: From 1st normal eq<sup>n</sup>,

$$E(X_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 X_2 - \dots - \beta_p X_p) = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow E(X_1 - X_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow E(e_{1.23\dots p}) = 0$$

Now,  $\text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, X_j) = E(e_{1.23\dots p} X_j) \quad j=2(1)p$

$$= E[(X_1 - \alpha - \beta_2 X_2 - \dots - \beta_p X_p) X_j]$$

$$= 0, \text{ by normal eq<sup>n</sup>s}$$

Again,  $\text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p})$   
 $= \text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, \alpha + \sum_{j=2}^p \beta_j X_j)$

$$= \beta_j \text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, X_j) = 0.$$

Theorem: 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) &= \sigma_{11} - \underline{\Sigma}'_{(1)} \underline{\Sigma}_2^{-1} \underline{\Sigma}_{(1)} \\ &= \frac{|\underline{\Sigma}|}{|\underline{\Sigma}_2|} = \frac{1}{\sigma''} = \frac{\sigma_{11} |R|}{R_{11}} = \frac{\sigma_{11}}{\rho''} \end{aligned}$$

(The symbols have usual meanings)

proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) &= \text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, e_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{cov}(X_1 - X_{1.23\dots p}, e_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{cov}(X_1, e_{1.23\dots p}) - \text{cov}(X_{1.23\dots p}, e_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{cov}(X_1, e_{1.23\dots p}) \quad [\because \text{errors uncorrelated with multiple regression}] \\ &= \text{cov}(X_1, X_1 - X_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \text{Var}(X_1) - \text{cov}(X_1, X_{1.23\dots p}) \\ &= \sigma_{11} - \text{cov}\left(X_1, \alpha + \sum_{j=2}^p \beta_j X_j\right) \\ &= \sigma_{11} - \sum_{j=2}^p \beta_j \text{cov}(X_1, X_j) \\ &= \sigma_{11} - \sum_{j=2}^p \beta_j \sigma_{1j} \\ &= \sigma_{11} - \underline{\Sigma}'_{(1)} \underline{\beta} \\ &= \sigma_{11} - \underline{\Sigma}'_{(1)} \underline{\Sigma}_2^{-1} \underline{\Sigma}_{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\underline{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \underline{\Sigma}'_{(1)} \\ \underline{\Sigma}_{(1)} & \underline{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}$

$$\Rightarrow |\underline{\Sigma}| = |\underline{\Sigma}_2| (\sigma_{11} - \underline{\Sigma}'_{(1)} \underline{\Sigma}_2^{-1} \underline{\Sigma}_{(1)})$$

$$\Rightarrow \Delta_{11} - \Delta_{(1)}' \Sigma_2^{-1} \Delta_{(1)} = \frac{|\Sigma|}{|\Sigma_2|}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = \frac{|\Sigma|}{|\Sigma_2|}$$

Define  $\Sigma^{-1} = ((\frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{|\Sigma|}))$  [where  $\Sigma_{ij}$  is the cofactor of  $\Delta_{ij}$  in  $\Sigma$   
 $= ((\Delta_{ij}^{ij}))$  &  $\Sigma_{ij} = \Sigma_{ji}$ ]

Here  $\Delta'' = \frac{\Sigma_{11}}{|\Sigma|} = \frac{|\Sigma_2|}{|\Sigma|}$

$$\therefore \text{var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = \frac{|\Sigma_2|}{|\Sigma|} = \frac{1}{\Delta''}$$

Note that

$$R = D \Sigma D \text{ where } D = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_{11}}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_{pp}}})$$

$$\Rightarrow |R| = |D|^p |\Sigma|$$

$$\Leftrightarrow |\Sigma| = \Delta_{11} \dots \Delta_{pp} |R|$$

Now,  $R_2 = D^* \Sigma_2 D^*$  where  $D^* = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_{22}}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_{pp}}})$

$$\Leftrightarrow |\Sigma_2| = \Delta_{22} \dots \Delta_{pp} |R_2| \text{ where } R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Delta_{(1)}' \\ \Delta_{(1)} & R_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\therefore \text{var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = \frac{|\Sigma|}{|\Sigma_2|} = \frac{\Delta_{11} |R|}{|R_2|}$$

$= \frac{\Delta_{11} |R|}{R_{11}}$  [  $R_{ij}$  = cofactor of  $(ij)$ th element in  $R$  ]

Define  $R^{-1} = ((\frac{R_{ij}}{|R|})) = ((\rho_{ij}))$ , say.

Then,  $\rho'' = \frac{R_{11}}{|R|}$

$$\therefore \text{var}(e_{1.23\dots p}) = \frac{\Delta_{11}}{\rho''}$$

Theorem 5:

The correlation coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $X_1$  & the multiple linear regression of  $X_1$  on  $\underline{X}^{(2)}$ , i.e.  $X_2, \dots, X_p$ , is the maximum among all linear f<sup>n</sup>s of  $\underline{X}^{(2)}$  like  $L(\underline{X}^{(2)}) = l_0 + l_2 X_2 + \dots + l_p X_p$ .

proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & R^2(X_1, L(\underline{X}^{(2)})) \\
 &= \frac{\text{cov}^2[X_1, l_0 + \sum_{j=2}^p l_j X_j]}{\text{var}(X_1) \text{var}(l_0 + \sum_{j=2}^p l_j X_j)} \\
 &= \frac{\left\{ \sum_{j=2}^p l_j \text{cov}(X_1, X_j) \right\}^2}{\sigma_{11} \cdot \underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l}} \\
 &= \frac{\left\{ \sum_{j=2}^p l_j \sigma_{1j} \right\}^2}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \quad [ \underline{l}' = (l_2, \dots, l_p) ] \\
 &= \frac{(\underline{l}' \underline{\sigma}_{(1)})^2}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \\
 &= \frac{(\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{\beta})^2}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \quad \dots \textcircled{*} \quad [ \underline{\sigma}_{(1)} = \Sigma_2 \underline{\beta} \text{ where } \\
 & \quad \quad \quad X_{1,2,3,\dots,p} = \alpha + \underline{\beta}' \underline{X}^{(2)} ] \\
 &= \frac{(\underline{l}' P P \underline{\beta})^2}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \quad [ \because \Sigma_2 \text{ is pd} ] \\
 &= \frac{\{ (P \underline{l})' (P \underline{\beta}) \}^2}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \\
 &\leq \frac{[(P \underline{l})' (P \underline{l})] [(P \underline{\beta})' (P \underline{\beta})]}{\sigma_{11} (\underline{l}' \Sigma_2 \underline{l})} \quad [ \text{By Cauchy inequality} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad |a \cdot b| \leq |a| |b| ]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\{\tilde{L}'(P'P)\tilde{L}\} \{\tilde{\beta}'(P'P)\tilde{\beta}\}}{\sigma_{11} (\tilde{L}'\Sigma_2\tilde{L})} \\
&= \frac{(\tilde{L}'\Sigma_2\tilde{L}) (\tilde{\beta}'\Sigma_2\tilde{\beta})}{\sigma_{11} (\tilde{L}'\Sigma_2\tilde{L})} \\
&= \frac{\tilde{\beta}'\Sigma_2\tilde{\beta}}{\sigma_{11}}
\end{aligned}$$

From (X),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho^2 (x_1, x_{1.23\dots p}) \\
&= \rho^2 (x_1, \alpha + \tilde{\beta}'\tilde{x}^{(2)}) \\
&= \frac{\tilde{\beta}'\Sigma_2\tilde{\beta}}{\sigma_{11}} \geq \rho^2(x_1, L(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))
\end{aligned}$$

Multiple correlation coeff:

The maximum correlation coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  & any linear f<sup>n</sup> of  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is defined as multiple correlation coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  and denoted by  $\rho_{1.23\dots p}$  & it is given by

$$\rho_{1.23\dots p} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\beta}'\Sigma_2\tilde{\beta}}{\sigma_{11}}} = \frac{SD(x_{1.23\dots p})}{SD(x_1)}$$

Where  $x_{1.23\dots p} = \alpha + \tilde{\beta}'\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is the multiple regression (linear) of  $x_1$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$ .

Clearly  $0 \leq \rho_{1.23\dots p} \leq 1$ .

Theorem 6:

$$\rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2}{\sigma_{11}}, \text{ where } \sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2 = V(e_{1.23\dots p})$$

proof:  $X_1 = X_{1.23\dots p} + e_{1.23\dots p}$

$$\therefore V(X_1) = V(X_{1.23\dots p}) + V(e_{1.23\dots p})$$

$$[\because \text{cov}(e_{1.23\dots p}, X_{1.23\dots p}) = 0]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 &= \frac{V(X_{1.23\dots p})}{V(X_1)} \\ &= 1 - \frac{V(e_{1.23\dots p})}{V(X_1)} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2}{\sigma_{11}} \end{aligned}$$

Remark: ① We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 &= 1 - \frac{|\Sigma|}{|\Sigma_1| \sigma_{11}} \\ &= \frac{\Sigma_{(1)} \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma_{(1)}}{\sigma_{11}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{11} \sigma_{11}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{|R|}{R_{11}} = 1 - \frac{1}{\rho_{11}} \end{aligned}$$

A measure of usefulness of the least square linear regression of  $X_1$  on  $X^{(2)}$

is  $\rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 = \frac{V(X_{1.23\dots p})}{V(X_1)}$

②  $\rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 1 \Leftrightarrow \sigma_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 0$

$\Leftrightarrow \text{var}(X_{1.23\dots p}) = \text{var}(X_1)$

$\Leftrightarrow$  The variability of  $X_1$  is completely explained by the multiple linear regression of  $X_1$  on  $X^{(2)}$



$$\Rightarrow \beta' \Sigma_2 \beta = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$\rho_{1.23\dots p}^2 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \underline{\beta} = \underline{0} \quad \text{Since } \Sigma_2 \text{ is pd.}$$

$\Leftrightarrow$  The multiple regression fails to predict  $x_1$ .

### Partial correlation coefficient:

Let

$$\underline{X}^{\text{px1}} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \underline{x}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \\ \underline{\mu}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} & \vdots & \sigma_{1(3)} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} & \vdots & \sigma_{2(3)} \\ \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \sigma_{(3)} & \sigma_{(23)} & \vdots & \Sigma_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Suppose, we wish to know the correlation bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$ , after eliminating the effect of  $\underline{x}^{(3)}$ . In practice, we eliminate the linear effect of  $\underline{x}^{(3)}$  from both of them.

Define  $x_{1.34\dots p}$  = the part of  $x_1$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\underline{x}^{(3)}$ .

&  $x_{2.34\dots p}$  = the part of  $x_2$  explained by the multiple linear regression of  $x_2$  on  $\underline{x}^{(3)}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then, } e_{1.34\dots p} &= x_1 - x_{1.34\dots p} \\ &= \text{part of } x_1 \text{ uninfluenced by } \underline{x}^{(3)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_{2.34\dots p} &= x_2 - x_{2.34\dots p} \\ &= \text{part of } x_2 \text{ uninfluenced by } \underline{x}^{(3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we define the partial correlation coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  after eliminating the linear effect of  $\underline{x}^{(3)}$  from both of them as

the correlation coeff betw  $e_{1.34\dots p}$  &  $e_{2.34\dots p}$ , i.e.

$$\rho_{12.34\dots p} = \frac{\text{cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, e_{2.34\dots p})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(e_{1.34\dots p}) \text{Var}(e_{2.34\dots p})}}$$

is the partial correl<sup>m</sup> coeff betw  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  after eliminating the (linear) effect of  $\tilde{x}^{(3)}$ .

Let  $x_{1.34\dots p} = \alpha + \beta' \tilde{x}^{(3)}$  where  $\alpha = \mu_1 - \beta' \mu^{(3)}$   
&  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{(13)} = \Sigma_3 \beta$

&  $x_{2.34\dots p} = \alpha^* + \beta^{*'} \tilde{x}^{(3)}$  where  $\alpha^* = \mu_2 - \beta^{*'} \mu^{(3)}$   
&  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{(23)} = \Sigma_3 \beta^{*'}$

Now,

$$\text{Var}(e_{1.34\dots p}) = \sigma_{11} - \tilde{\Sigma}'_{(13)} \Sigma_3^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}_{(13)} = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \tilde{\Sigma}_{(13)} \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_{(13)}' & \Sigma_3 \end{vmatrix}}{|\Sigma_3|} = \frac{\sigma_{22}}{|\Sigma_3|}$$

$$\& \text{Var}(e_{2.34\dots p}) = \sigma_{22} - \tilde{\Sigma}'_{(23)} \Sigma_3^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}_{(23)} = \frac{\sigma_{11}}{|\Sigma_3|}$$

$$\text{cov}(e_{1.34\dots p}, e_{2.34\dots p})$$

$$= \text{cov}(x_1 - x_{1.34\dots p}, e_{2.34\dots p})$$

$$= \text{cov}(x_1, e_{2.34\dots p})$$

[∵ error is uncorrelated with the multiple linear regression]

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{COV}(X_1, X_2 - X_{2.34 \dots p}) \\
&= \sigma_{12} - \text{COV}(X_1, \alpha^* + \beta^* X^{(3)}) \\
&= \sigma_{12} - \beta^{*'} \sigma_{(3)} \\
&= \sigma_{12} - \sigma_{(23)}' \Sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_{(3)} \\
&= - \frac{\Sigma_{12}}{|\Sigma_3|}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{12.34 \dots p} &= - \frac{\Sigma_{12}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{11} \Sigma_{22}}} \\
&= - \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{11} \sigma_{22}}} \\
&= - \frac{R_{12}}{\sqrt{R_{11} R_{22}}} \\
&= - \frac{\rho_{12}}{\sqrt{\rho_{11} \rho_{22}}}
\end{aligned}$$

In general,

$$\rho_{ij.12 \dots \bar{i-1} \bar{i+1} \dots \bar{j-1} \bar{j+1} \dots p} = - \frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{ii} \Sigma_{jj}}}$$

## Partial regression coeff:

If the multiple regression eq<sup>n</sup> of  $X_1$  on  $\tilde{X}^{(2)}$  is

$E(X_1 | \tilde{X}^{(2)}) = \alpha + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_p X_p$ , a linear fun of  $\tilde{X}^{(2)}$ , then

$$\alpha = E(X_1 | \tilde{X}^{(2)} = \tilde{0});$$

$$\alpha + \beta_j = E(X_1 | \tilde{X}^{(2)} = e_j),$$

ie  $\beta_j$  is the amount by which the conditional mean increases for a unit increment in  $X_j$ , keeping the other variables fixed.

$\beta_j$ , written more explicitly

$$\beta_{1j.23\dots j-1 j+1 \dots p}$$

is called the partial regression coeff of  $X_1$  on  $X_j$ , keeping the other variables fixed.

Then, the multiple linear regression of  $X_1$  on  $\tilde{X}^{(2)}$  is

$$X_{1.23\dots p} = \alpha + \tilde{\beta}' \tilde{X}^{(2)}$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{\nabla}_{(1)} = \sum_2 \tilde{\beta}$$

$$\text{and } \alpha = \mu_1 - \tilde{\beta}' \tilde{\mu}^{(2)}$$

Note that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_{(1)} = \sum_2 \tilde{\beta}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \nabla_{1i} = \beta_2 \nabla_{2i} + \beta_3 \nabla_{3i} + \dots + \beta_p \nabla_{pi} \quad ; \quad i = 2(1)p$$

Again,

$$\sigma_{11} \Sigma_{11} + \sigma_{21} \Sigma_{21} + \sigma_{31} \Sigma_{31} + \dots + \sigma_{p1} \Sigma_{p1} = 0$$

$\forall i = 2(1)p$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sigma_{11} = \left(-\frac{\Sigma_{21}}{\Sigma_{11}}\right) \sigma_{21} + \left(-\frac{\Sigma_{31}}{\Sigma_{11}}\right) \sigma_{31} + \dots + \left(-\frac{\Sigma_{p1}}{\Sigma_{11}}\right) \sigma_{p1}$$

Comparing, we get

$$\beta_j = -\frac{\Sigma_{ji}}{\Sigma_{11}}, \quad j = 2(1)p$$

$$= -\frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{\Sigma_{11}}$$

$$= -\frac{R_{ij} / \sqrt{\sigma_{11} \sigma_{jj}}}{R_{11} / \sigma_{11}}$$

$$= -\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{11}} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{11}}{\sigma_{jj}}}$$

Hence, the multiple linear regression of  $x_1$  on  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  is

$$x_{1.23\dots p} = \mu_1 - \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{R_{1j} \sqrt{\sigma_{11}}}{R_{11} \sqrt{\sigma_{jj}}} (x_j - \mu_j)$$

Result (3):

$$\beta_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} = \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{1 \cdot 34 \dots p}}{\sigma_{2 \cdot 34 \dots p}}$$

$$= \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{1 \cdot 234 \dots p}}{\sigma_{2 \cdot 134 \dots p}}$$

Result (4):

$$\beta_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} \cdot \beta_{21 \cdot 34 \dots p} = \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2$$

Relationship between multiple correlation coeff & partial correlation coeffs of different orders:

$$(1 - \rho_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}^2) = (1 - \rho_{12}^2)(1 - \rho_{13 \cdot 2}^2) \dots (1 - \rho_{1p \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2)$$

$$= (1 - \rho_{1p}^2)(1 - \rho_{1p-1 \cdot p}^2) \dots (1 - \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p}^2)$$

proof:  $V(e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}) = \text{COV}(e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p}, e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p})$

$$= \text{COV}(X_1, e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p})$$

$$= \text{COV}(X_1 - X_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}, e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p})$$

$$= \text{COV}(e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}, X_1 - \mu_1) - \beta_{12 \cdot 34 \dots p} (X_2 - \mu_2) - \dots - \beta_{1p \cdot 34 \dots p-1} (X_p - \mu_p)$$

$$= \text{COV}(e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}, X_1) - \beta_{1p \cdot 34 \dots p-1} \text{COV}(e_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}, X_p)$$

$$= \sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2 - \rho_{1p \cdot 23 \dots p-1} \frac{\sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}}{\sigma_{p \cdot 23 \dots p-1}} \rho_{1p \cdot 2 \dots p-1} \sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1} \sigma_{p \cdot 2 \dots p-1}$$

$$= \sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2 - \rho_{1p \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2 \sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2$$

$$= (1 - \rho_{1p \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2) \sigma_{1 \cdot 23 \dots p-1}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow (1-\rho_{1,2,3,\dots,p}^2) \sigma_{11} \\ = (1-\rho_{1,2,3,\dots,p-1}^2) \sigma_{11} (1-\rho_{1p,2,3,\dots,p-1}^2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow (1-\rho_{1,2,3,\dots,p}^2) = (1-\rho_{1p,2,3,\dots,p-1}^2) (1-\rho_{1,2,3,\dots,p-1}^2)$$

Using this repeatedly, we get the result:

$$(1-\rho_{1,2,3,\dots,p}^2) = (1-\rho_{12}^2)(1-\rho_{13,2}^2) \dots (1-\rho_{1p,2,3,4,\dots,p-1}^2)$$

### Problems:

① Let  $\underline{x}$  be a random vector with mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ . s.t.

$$[CV] \quad P[(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu}) > \lambda] < \frac{p}{\lambda} \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0$$

Sol<sup>n</sup>: By Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & P[(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu}) > \lambda] \\ & < \frac{E[(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})]}{\lambda} \\ & = \frac{E[\text{tr}\{(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})\}]}{\lambda} \\ & = \frac{E[\text{tr}\{\Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})'\}]}{\lambda} \\ & = \frac{\text{tr}[\Sigma^{-1} E\{(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})'\}]}{\lambda} \\ & = \frac{\text{tr}[\Sigma^{-1} \Sigma]}{\lambda} = \frac{p}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

Alternative:  $\Sigma^{p \times p}$  is pd  $\Rightarrow \exists$  n.s.  $B \ni \Sigma = BB^T$ .

Define  $\underline{y} = B^{-1}(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})$

$$\begin{aligned} E(\underline{y}) &= 0, \text{Disp}(\underline{y}) = B^{-1} \Sigma (B^{-1})^T \\ &= B^{-1} B B^T (B^{-1})^T \\ &= I_p \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &P[(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) > \lambda] \\ &= P[\underline{y}' \underline{y} > \lambda] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &< \frac{E(\underline{y}' \underline{y})}{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{E\left(\sum_{i=1}^p y_i^2\right)}{\lambda} = \frac{p}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

② Let  $(y, x_1, \dots, x_p)'$  be any (p+1) component random vector. Show, making suitable assumption that

$$\text{i) } \rho_{y, 123 \dots p}^2 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_y^2} E\left(y - \mu_y - \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i x_i\right)^2$$

$$\text{ii) } \rho_{y, 12 \dots p}^2 \geq \rho_{y, 23 \dots p}^2$$

In each of the above cases comment on the case of equality.



Hint:  $\diamond$  Consider an arbitrary linear  $f^u$  (15)  
 $l_0 + l_1 x_1 + \dots + l_p x_p$  as a predictor of  $Y$ .

Now, consider the problem of minimization of the MSE

$$E\left(Y - l_0 - \sum_{i=1}^p l_i x_i\right)^2$$

We know that the linear  $f^u$

$$\beta_0 + \beta'_1 \underline{x} = x_{y \cdot 12 \dots p}$$

obtained by minimizing the MSE, is the multiple linear regression of  $Y$  on  $\underline{x}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(Y - l_0 - \sum_{i=1}^p l_i x_i\right)^2 &\geq E\left(Y - \beta_0 - \beta'_1 \underline{x}\right)^2 \\ &= \sigma_{y \cdot 123 \dots p}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Now, } \rho_{y \cdot 123 \dots p}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma_{y \cdot 12 \dots p}^2}{\sigma_y^2} \quad (\text{prove it})$$

$$\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_y^2} E\left(Y - l_0 - \sum_{i=1}^p l_i x_i\right)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ii)} \quad (1 - \rho_{y \cdot 12 \dots p}^2) &= (1 - \rho_{y \cdot 23 \dots p}^2) (1 - \rho_{y \cdot 23 \dots p}^2) \\ &\leq (1 - \rho_{y \cdot 23 \dots p}^2) \quad \text{since } 0 \leq 1 - \rho_{y \cdot 23 \dots p}^2 \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof.

iff case:  $\diamond$  iff  $\rho_{y \cdot 23 \dots p}^2 = 0$

$\Rightarrow$  There is no use of  $x_1$  in the prediction of  $Y$ .

③ If  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \dots + a_px_p = k$  (constant), then  
find  $\rho_{1.23\dots p}$  &  $\rho_{1.23\dots p}$ .

Soln:  $E(x_1 | x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_p = x_p)$   
 $= \frac{1}{a_1} [k - a_2x_2 - \dots - a_px_p]$

So, the regression is linear.

Thus, the multiple <sup>linear</sup> regression of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, \dots, x_p$  will also be

$$x_{1.23\dots p} = \frac{1}{a_1} [k - a_2x_2 - \dots - a_px_p] \quad \dots (1)$$

So,  $e_{1.23\dots p} = x_1 - x_{1.23\dots p} = 0$

$\Rightarrow V(e_{1.23\dots p}) = 0 \Rightarrow \rho_{1.23\dots p} = 1$

Since it is a case of linear regression, so partial correl<sup>n</sup> bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  eliminating the effect  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$  is equivalent to correl<sup>n</sup> bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  keeping  $x_3, x_4, \dots, x_p$  fixed, i.e. correl<sup>n</sup> bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  with

$$a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = \text{constant}$$

So, this partial correl<sup>n</sup> will be +1 or -1 according as  $a_1$  &  $a_2$  are of opposite sign or same sign.

Alternatively:

$$\beta_{12.34\dots p} = -\frac{a_2}{a_1} \quad [\text{From (1)}]$$

Similarly  $\beta_{21.34\dots p} = -\frac{a_1}{a_2}$

$\Rightarrow \rho_{12.34\dots p} = 1$  or  $-1$  according as  $a_1$  &  $a_2$  are of opposite assign or same sign

$[\because \rho_{12.34\dots p}^2 = \beta_{12.34\dots p} \cdot \beta_{21.34\dots p}$  & sign of  $\rho_{12.34\dots p}$  is same as that of  $\beta_{12.34\dots p}$ ]

# Multivariate Normal Dist<sup>n</sup>: (17)

The pdf of a univariate normal is in the form  $f(x) = k e^{-\frac{1}{2} a (x-l)^2}$ .

$$= k e^{-\frac{1}{2} (x-l) a (x-l)} \quad \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

where  $l \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a > 0$  &  $k > 0$ .

Generalizing concept, the pdf of a multivariate normal is taken as

$$f(\underline{x}) = k e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}-\underline{l})' A (\underline{x}-\underline{l})}, \quad \text{if } \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

where  $\underline{l} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $A$  is a p.d. matrix &  $k > 0$ .

Our object is to find the constant  $\underline{l}$  &  $A$  in terms of the moments of the multivariate normal dist<sup>n</sup>. Let  $\underline{x}$  be a multivariate normal variate with the pdf

$$f(\underline{x}) = k e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}-\underline{l})' A (\underline{x}-\underline{l})}, \quad \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

$$\text{Now, } \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} f(\underline{x}) d\underline{x} = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow k \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}-\underline{l})' A (\underline{x}-\underline{l})} d\underline{x} = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow k \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{y}' \underline{y}} \frac{1}{|J|} d\underline{y} = 1$$

$\because A$  is p.d.  $\exists$  a p.s.  
 $P \exists P P^T = \Sigma$   
Let  $\underline{y} = P^T (\underline{x} - \underline{l})$   
Then  $|J(\frac{\underline{y}}{\underline{x}})|$   
 $= |P^T| = \sqrt{|P P^T|}$   
 $= \sqrt{|A|}$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{y}' \underline{y}} d\underline{y} = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum y_i} dy_1 \dots dy_p = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_i^2} dy_i \right\} = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} (\sqrt{2\pi})^p = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow k = \frac{\sqrt{|A|}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p}$$

Now, the pdf of  $\underline{y}$  is

$$f_{\underline{y}}(\underline{y}) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{y}' \underline{y}}, \quad \underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

Here,

$$E(y_i) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_i \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^p e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum y_i^2} dy_1 \dots dy_p$$

$$= \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_i \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^p e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_i^2} dy_i \right) \prod_{j \neq i} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_j^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy_j \right\}$$

$$= 0 \quad \forall i$$

$$\text{cov}(y_i, y_j) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_i y_j \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^p e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum y_i^2} dy_1 \dots dy_p$$

$$= \begin{cases} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_i^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_i^2} dy_i \right) \left( \prod_{j \neq i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_j^2} dy_j \right) & [ \because E(y_i) = 0 ] \\ & \text{if } i=j \\ \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_i^2} dy_i \right) \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_j^2} dy_j \right) \left( \prod_{k \neq i, j} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y_k^2} dy_k \right) & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i=j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

$$\therefore E(\underline{x}) = \underline{0} \quad \& \quad \text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \underline{I}_p$$

Now,  $E(\underline{x}) = \underline{0}$

$$\Rightarrow P'(E(\underline{x}) - \underline{\mu}) = \underline{0}$$

$$\Rightarrow \underline{\mu} = E(\underline{x}) = \underline{\mu}, \text{ say } [\because P' \text{ is n.s.}]$$

$$D(\underline{x}) = \underline{I}_p$$

$$\Rightarrow P' D(\underline{x}) P = \underline{I}_p$$

$$\Rightarrow D(\underline{x}) = (P')^{-1} P^{-1} = (P^* P')^{-1} = A^{-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow A = \Sigma^{-1} \text{ where } \Sigma = D(\underline{x}).$$

$$\text{Hence, } K = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p |\Sigma|}$$

Def<sup>n</sup>.

A random vector  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is said to have a multivariate normal dist<sup>n</sup> with mean vector  $E(\underline{x}) = \underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ , if the pdf of  $\underline{x}$  is

$$f_{\underline{x}}(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})}, \quad \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

We write  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ .

Remarks:

- ① The pdf  $f_{\underline{x}}(\underline{x})$  is maximum if the exponent is minimum, i.e.  $(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})$  is minimum.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) &> 0 \quad \text{if } \underline{x} \neq \underline{\mu} \\ &= 0 \quad \text{if } \underline{x} = \underline{\mu} \\ &\text{since } \Sigma^{-1} \text{ is p.d.}\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\underline{x} = \underline{\mu}$  is the mode of the dist<sup>n</sup>.

$$\text{Let } Q(\underline{x}) = (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})$$

$$\text{Then, } \frac{\partial Q(\underline{x})}{\partial (\underline{x})} = \underline{0} \quad \text{at } \underline{x} = \underline{\mu}$$

② Note that the exponent

$$\begin{aligned}Q(\underline{x}) &= (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \\ &= \underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{x} - \underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{\mu} - \underline{\mu}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{x} \\ &\quad + \underline{\mu}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{\mu} \\ &= \underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{x} - 2 \underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{\mu} + \underline{\mu}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{\mu}\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Let } Q^*(\underline{x})$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^p l_i x_i + c$$

be the exponent of a multivariate normal dist<sup>n</sup>'s pdf.

Note that

$$Q^*(\underline{x}) = \underline{x}' A \underline{x} + \underline{x}' \underline{l} + c$$

Comparing, we get,

$$A = \Sigma^{-1} \Rightarrow \Sigma = A^{-1}$$

Theorem 7:

If  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then for a n.s matrix  $P^{p \times p}$ ,

$$P' \underline{x} \sim N_p(P' \underline{\mu}, P' \Sigma P)$$

proof: The pdf of  $\underline{x}$  is

$$f(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})}, \quad \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Let  $\underline{y} = P' \underline{x}$ .

$$\text{Now, } |J\left(\frac{\underline{y}}{\underline{x}}\right)| = |P'| = \sqrt{|P'P|}$$

The pdf of  $\underline{y}$  is

$$g(\underline{y}) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ (P')^{-1} \underline{y} - \underline{\mu} \right\}' \Sigma^{-1} \left\{ (P')^{-1} \underline{y} - \underline{\mu} \right\}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|P'P|}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p \sqrt{|P' \Sigma P|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{y} - P' \underline{\mu})' P^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} (P')^{-1} (\underline{y} - P' \underline{\mu})}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p \sqrt{|P' \Sigma P|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{y} - P' \underline{\mu})' (P' \Sigma P)^{-1} (\underline{y} - P' \underline{\mu})}$$

$$\therefore \underline{y} \sim N_p(P' \underline{\mu}, P' \Sigma P).$$

## Moment generating function:

The mgt of a  $p$  dimensional R.V.  $\underline{x}$  is defined as

$$M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t}) = E(e^{\underline{t}'\underline{x}}),$$

provided it exists, where  $\underline{t}$  belongs to a region containing the origin as an interior point.

### Theorem 8:

If  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then the mgt of  $\underline{x}$  is

$M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t}) = e^{\underline{t}'\underline{\mu} + \frac{1}{2}\underline{t}'\Sigma\underline{t}}$ , where  $\underline{t}$  belongs to a region containing the origin as an interior point.

proof:  $M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t}) = E(e^{\underline{t}'\underline{x}})$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{\underline{t}'\underline{x}} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})'\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})} d\underline{x}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\{\underline{x}'\Sigma^{-1}\underline{x} - 2\underline{x}'\Sigma^{-1}\underline{\mu} + \underline{\mu}'\Sigma^{-1}\underline{\mu} - 2\underline{t}'\underline{x}\}} d\underline{x}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\{\underline{x}'\Sigma^{-1}\underline{x} - 2\underline{x}'\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{\mu} + \Sigma\underline{t}) + \underline{\mu}'\Sigma^{-1}\underline{\mu}\}} d\underline{x}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu}-\Sigma\underline{t})'\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu}-\Sigma\underline{t}) + \underline{t}'\underline{\mu} + \frac{1}{2}\underline{t}'\Sigma\underline{t}} d\underline{x}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[ \because \tilde{x}'\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{x} - 2\tilde{x}'\Sigma^{-1}(\mu + \Sigma t) + \mu'\Sigma^{-1}\mu \right. \\
& = \tilde{x}'\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{x} - 2\tilde{x}'\Sigma^{-1}(\mu + \Sigma t) + (\mu + \Sigma t)'\Sigma^{-1}(\mu + \Sigma t) \\
& \quad + \mu'\Sigma^{-1}\mu - (\mu + \Sigma t)'\Sigma^{-1}(\mu + \Sigma t) \\
& = (\tilde{x} - \mu - \Sigma t)'\Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{x} - \mu - \Sigma t) - \mu'\Sigma^{-1}\Sigma t \\
& \quad - t'\Sigma^{-1}\mu - t'\Sigma^{-1}\Sigma t \\
& = (\tilde{x} - \mu - \Sigma t)'\Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{x} - \mu - \Sigma t) - 2t'\mu - t'\Sigma t \left. \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= e^{t'\mu + \frac{1}{2}t'\Sigma t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} n_p(\tilde{x} | \mu + \Sigma t, \Sigma) d\tilde{x}$$

$$= e^{t'\mu + \frac{1}{2}t'\Sigma t}$$

[where  $n_p(x | \mu, \Sigma)$  is the pdf of  $N_p(\mu, \Sigma)$ ]

Example 1:

Prove theorem 7 using mgf technique.

Hint:  $M_{\tilde{y}}(t) = E(e^{t'\tilde{x}})$   
 $= E(e^{(Pt)'\tilde{x}})$

$$= E(e^{u'\tilde{x}}) \quad , \quad u = Pt$$

$$= e^{u'\mu + \frac{1}{2}u'\Sigma u}$$

$$= e^{t'(P'\mu) + \frac{1}{2}t'(P'\Sigma P)t}$$

which is the mgf of  $N_p(P'\mu, P'\Sigma P)$ .

### Theorem 9:

Let  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$  &  $B^{q \times p}$  ( $q \leq p$ ) be a matrix of rank  $q$ .

Then,  $\underline{y}^{q \times 1} = B\underline{x} \sim N_q(B\underline{\mu}, B\Sigma B^T)$

proof:  $M_{\underline{y}}(\underline{t})$

$$= E(e^{\underline{t}'\underline{y}})$$

$$= E(e^{\underline{t}'B\underline{x}})$$

$$= E(e^{(B'\underline{t})'\underline{x}})$$

$$= E(e^{\underline{u}'\underline{x}}) \quad \underline{u}^{p \times 1} = B'\underline{t}$$

$$= e^{\underline{u}'\underline{\mu} + \frac{1}{2}\underline{u}'\Sigma\underline{u}}$$

$$= e^{(B'\underline{t})'\underline{\mu} + \frac{1}{2}(B'\underline{t})'\Sigma(B'\underline{t})}$$

$$= e^{\underline{t}'(B\underline{\mu}) + \frac{1}{2}\underline{t}'(B\Sigma B^T)\underline{t}}, \text{ which is the mgf of } N_q(B\underline{\mu}, B\Sigma B^T)$$

Hence by uniqueness of mgf,

$$\underline{y} \sim N_q(B\underline{\mu}, B\Sigma B^T).$$

### Theorem 10:

If  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then we can write

$\underline{x} = \underline{\mu} + P\underline{y}$ , where  $PP^T = \Sigma$  &  $\underline{y} \sim N_p(0, I_p)$ .

proof: The pdf of  $\underline{x}$  is

$$f_{\underline{x}}(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})'\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{x}-\underline{\mu})}, \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

Since  $\Sigma$  is p.d., there exists a n.s.  $P$  such that  $PP^T = \Sigma$ .

Let  $\underline{y} = P^{-1}(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})$ .

Note that  $|J(\frac{\underline{y}}{\underline{x}})| = ||P^{-1}|| = \sqrt{|(P^{-1})^T| |P^{-1}|}$

$$= \sqrt{|(PP^T)^{-1}|}$$

$$= \sqrt{|\Sigma^{-1}|}$$

$$\therefore \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Sigma|}}$$

The pdf of  $\underline{z}$  is

$$g_{\underline{z}}(\underline{z}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{z}' P' (PP')^{-1} P \underline{z}} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{z}' \underline{z}}$$

$\therefore \underline{z} \sim N_p(\underline{0}, I_p)$ , where  $\underline{x} = \underline{\mu} + P\underline{z}$   
&  $\Sigma = PP^T$ .

Corollary:

If  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then

$$(\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \sim \chi_p^2$$

proof: If  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$  then we have

$$\underline{x} - \underline{\mu} = P\underline{z} \quad \text{where } PP' = \Sigma$$

$$\& \underline{z} \sim N_p(\underline{0}, I_p).$$

$\therefore$  pdf of  $\underline{z}$  is

$$g_{\underline{z}}(\underline{z}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{z}' \underline{z}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p z_i^2}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y_i \text{ iid } N(0,1), i=1(1)p.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \\ &= \underline{y}' \underline{y} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p y_i^2 \\ &\sim \chi^2_p \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ .

Consider the following partition

$$\underline{x}^{p \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{x}^{(1) p_1 \times 1} \\ \underline{x}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{\mu}^{p \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{\mu}^{(1)} \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\& \text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \Sigma^{p \times p} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{p_1 \times p_1} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} (= \Sigma_{12}') & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Cov}(\underline{x}^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(1)}) & \text{Cov}(\underline{x}^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(2)}) \\ \text{Cov}(\underline{x}^{(2)}, \underline{x}^{(1)}) & \text{Cov}(\underline{x}^{(2)}, \underline{x}^{(2)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

Now, consider the following theorems—

Theorem

Theorem 11:

If  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then the necessary & sufficient condition for  $\underline{x}^{(1)}$  &  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  to be indept is that  $\Sigma_{12} = 0$ .

proof: Let  $\Sigma_{12} = \text{cov}(\underline{x}^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(2)}) = 0$

Then the pdf of  $\underline{x}^{(1)}$  is

$$n_p(\underline{x}^{(1)} | \underline{\mu}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)})}, \quad \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

$$\text{Now, } \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & 0 \\ 0^T & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{Hence } |\Sigma| = |\Sigma_{11}| |\Sigma_{22}|$$

$$\& \Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Now, the exponent becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)} \\ \underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}' \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)} \\ \underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)})' \Sigma_{11}^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)}) + (\underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)})' \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$n(\underline{x} | \underline{\mu}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma_{11}|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)})' \Sigma_{11}^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(1)} - \underline{\mu}^{(1)})} \times \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p-p_1}{2}} \sqrt{|\Sigma_{22}|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)})' \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)})}$$

Hence  $\underline{x}^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(2)}$  are indept.

Note that  $\underline{x}^{(1)} \sim N_{p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(1)}, \Sigma_{11})$

&  $\underline{x}^{(2)} \sim N_{p-p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22})$

Let  $\underline{x}^{(1)}$  &  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  are indept

[ $\Leftrightarrow x_i$  &  $x_j$  are indept,  $i=1(1)p_1, j=\overline{p_1+1}(1)p$ ]??

$$\text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) = E[(x_i - \mu_i)(x_j - \mu_j)] \quad , \begin{matrix} i=1(1)p_1 \\ j=\overline{p_1+1}(1)p \end{matrix}$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_i - \mu_i)(x_j - \mu_j) f(x_1, \dots, x_p) dx_1 \dots dx_p$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_i - \mu_i)(x_j - \mu_j) f_1(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}) f_2(x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p) dx_1 \dots dx_p$$

$$= \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_i - \mu_i) f_1(x_1, \dots, x_{p_1}) dx_1 \dots dx_{p_1} \right\}$$

$$\times \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_j - \mu_j) f_2(x_{p_1+1}, \dots, x_p) dx_{p_1+1} \dots dx_p \right\}$$

$$= \{E(x_i) - \mu_i\} \{E(x_j) - \mu_j\}$$

$$= 0$$

$$\therefore \sigma_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall i=1(1)p_1, j=\overline{p_1+1}(1)p.$$

$$\Rightarrow \Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{21}^T = \mathbf{0}$$

Theorem 12:

If  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then any subvector is also a multivariate normal with mean vector & dispersion matrix obtained by taking the corresponding components

of  $\mu$  &  $\Sigma$ . In particular,

$$\tilde{X}^{(2)} \sim N_{p-p_1}(\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}).$$

proof: [From the previous theorem, we have following facts:

If  $\tilde{X} \sim N_p(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\Sigma})$ , then

$$\tilde{X}^{(1)} \sim N_{p_1}(\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}, \Sigma_{11})$$

$$\& \tilde{X}^{(2)} \sim N_{p-p_1}(\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}) \quad \text{if } \Sigma_{12} = 0]$$

Consider the transformation

$$\tilde{Y}^{(1)} = \tilde{X}^{(1)} + M\tilde{X}^{(2)}$$

$$\tilde{Y}^{(2)} = \tilde{X}^{(2)}$$

where  $M$  is such that

$$\text{COV}(\tilde{X}^{(1)}, \tilde{X}^{(2)}) = 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow E[(\tilde{X}^{(1)} - E(\tilde{X}^{(1)}))(\tilde{X}^{(2)} - E(\tilde{X}^{(2)}))'] = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow E[(\tilde{X}^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) + M(\tilde{X}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})](\tilde{X}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})' = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow E[\tilde{X}^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}](\tilde{X}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})'$$

$$+ M E[\tilde{X}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)}](\tilde{X}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})' = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{COV}(\tilde{X}^{(1)}, \tilde{X}^{(2)}) + M \text{COV}(\tilde{X}^{(2)}, \tilde{X}^{(2)}) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \Sigma_{12} + M \Sigma_{22} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow M = -\Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1}$$

Hence the transformation becomes

$$\tilde{Y}^{(1)} = \tilde{X}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \tilde{X}^{(2)}$$

$$\tilde{Y}^{(2)} = \tilde{X}^{(2)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \underline{y} = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{y}^{(1)} \\ \underline{y}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{p_1} & -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \underline{x}^{(1)} \\ \underline{x}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \underline{y} = P\underline{x}, \text{ say, where } P = \begin{pmatrix} I_p & -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \text{i.s.} \\ \text{n.s.} \end{matrix}$$

Hence by ~~the~~ theorem 7,

$$\underline{y} \stackrel{p \times 1}{\sim} P\underline{x} \sim N_p(P\underline{\mu}, P\Sigma P')$$

Note that

$$P\underline{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{p_1} & -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \underline{\mu}^{(1)} \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{\mu}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\underline{\mu}^{(2)} \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \& P\Sigma P' &= \begin{pmatrix} I_p & -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_p & -\Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{pmatrix}' \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Hence, } \begin{pmatrix} \underline{y}^{(1)} \\ \underline{y}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \sim N_p \left( \begin{pmatrix} \underline{\mu}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\underline{\mu}^{(2)} \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

$$\text{Hence, } \text{cov}(\underline{y}^{(1)}, \underline{y}^{(2)}) = 0$$

Hence, we have

$$\underline{y}^{(2)} = \underline{x}^{(2)} \sim N_{p-p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}).$$



## Conditional dist<sup>n</sup>:

### Theorem 13:

If  $\underline{x} \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , then the conditional dist<sup>n</sup> of  $\underline{x}^{(1)}$  given  $\underline{x}^{(2)} = \underline{x}^{(2)}$  is

$$N_{p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(1)} + \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\underline{x}^{(2)} - \underline{\mu}^{(2)}), \Sigma_{11.2})$$

$$\text{Where } \Sigma_{11.2} = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \Sigma_{21}$$

proof: Consider the following transformation-

$$y^{(1)} = \underline{x}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \underline{x}^{(2)}$$

$$y^{(2)} = \underline{x}^{(2)}$$

$$\text{Then } \begin{pmatrix} y^{(1)} \\ y^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \sim N_p \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \underline{\mu}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \\ \underline{\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11.2} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right]$$

Hence the pdf of  $\begin{pmatrix} y^{(1)} \\ y^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$  is

$$n(\underline{x}^{(1)}, \underline{x}^{(2)})$$

$$= n(y^{(1)} | \underline{\mu}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{11.2}) n(y^{(2)} | \underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}) \quad \text{--- } \textcircled{*}$$

$$[\because y^{(1)} \sim N_{p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{11.2})$$

$$\& y^{(2)} \sim N_{p-p_1}(\underline{\mu}^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}) \text{ indeptly,}$$

$$\text{as } \text{cov}(y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}) = 0]$$

The pdf of  $\begin{pmatrix} \underline{x}^{(1)} \\ \underline{x}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$  will be obtained from

$\textcircled{*}$  by replacing  $y^{(1)}$  by  $\underline{x}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \underline{x}^{(2)}$  &

$y^{(2)}$  by  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  since the Jacobian of the

transformation is unity.  $[|J(\frac{y}{x})| = \begin{vmatrix} I_{p_1} & -\Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-p_1} \end{vmatrix} = 1]$ .

Hence the pdf of  $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}^{(1)} \\ \tilde{x}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & n(\tilde{x}^{(1)}, \tilde{x}^{(2)}) \\ &= n(\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \tilde{x}^{(2)} \mid \mu^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \mu^{(2)}, \Sigma_{11 \cdot 2}) \\ & \times n(\tilde{x}^{(2)} \mid \mu^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the conditional pdf of  $\tilde{x}^{(1)}$  given  $\tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is

$$f_{\tilde{x}^{(1)} \mid \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)}}(\tilde{x}^{(1)})$$

$$= \frac{n(\tilde{x}^{(1)}, \tilde{x}^{(2)})}{n(\tilde{x}^{(2)} \mid \mu^{(2)}, \Sigma_{22})}$$

$$= n(\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \tilde{x}^{(2)} \mid \mu^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \mu^{(2)}, \Sigma_{11 \cdot 2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma_{11 \cdot 2}|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left[ (\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}))' \Sigma_{11 \cdot 2}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)})) \right]}$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{x}^{(1)} \mid \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)} \sim N_{p_1}(\mu^{(1)} + \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}), \Sigma_{11 \cdot 2})$$

Remarks:

(i) Note that

$$E(\tilde{x}^{(1)} \mid \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)}) = \mu^{(1)} + \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}), \text{ a linear fn of } \tilde{x}^{(2)}.$$

Hence the regression of  $\tilde{x}^{(1)}$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is linear.

Also, the dispersion matrix of  $\tilde{x}^{(1)}$  given

$$\tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)} \text{ is } \Sigma_{11 \cdot 2} = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} \text{ which is}$$

Indep<sup>t</sup> of  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$ .

Hence the conditional dist<sup>n</sup> of  $\underline{x}^{(1)}$  given  $\underline{x}^{(2)}$  is homoscedastic.

Problems:

④ ~~③~~ Suppose  $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \sim N_3(\underline{0}, \Sigma)$ .

1993  
3④

Where  $\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \rho^2 \\ \rho & 1 & \rho \\ \rho^2 & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

S.T for any  $c > 0$ ,

$$P[(x_2^2 + c)\rho^2 - 2(x_1x_2 + x_2x_3)\rho + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - c \leq 0]$$

$$= \int_0^c \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-y/2} y^{1/2} dy$$

Sol<sup>n</sup>: Since  $\underline{x} \sim N_3(0, \Sigma)$ ,

$$(\underline{x} - \underline{0})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{0}) \sim \chi_3^2$$

Hence  $P[\underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{x} \leq c] = \int_0^c f_{\chi_3^2}(y) dy$

Now,  $\underline{x}' \Sigma^{-1} \underline{x} \leq c$

$$= \int_0^c \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-y/2} y^{1/2} dy$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (x_2^2 + c)\rho^2 - 2(x_1x_2 + x_2x_3)\rho + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - c \leq 0.$$

⑤ Suppose  $(x_1, \dots, x_p)^T \sim N_p(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , where

2005  
3④

$$\underline{\mu} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T, \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \dots & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & \dots & 3 & 3 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \dots & p-1 & p \end{pmatrix}$$

Then, s.t.  $Q = (x_2 - x_1)^2 + (x_3 - x_2)^2 + \dots + (x_p - x_{p-1})^2$   
has a chi-square dist<sup>n</sup>.

Sol<sup>n</sup>: Let  $y_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ ,  $i = 2(1)p$ .

$$\therefore \underset{\sim}{y}^{p \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} y_2 \\ y_3 \\ \vdots \\ y_p \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{p \times p} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ \vdots \\ x_p \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= B \underset{\sim}{x}^{p \times 1}, \text{ say.}$$

Note that  $\rho(B^{p \times p}) = p-1$ . [  $\rho(A)$ : rank of  $A$  ]

Hence,

$$\underset{\sim}{y} = B \underset{\sim}{x} \sim N_{p-1}(B\underset{\sim}{\mu}, B\Sigma B^T) \quad [ \text{Theorem 9} ]$$

It can be shown that

$$B\underset{\sim}{\mu} = \underset{\sim}{0}$$

$$B\Sigma B^T = I_{p-1}$$

Hence,  $\underset{\sim}{y} \sim N_{p-1}(\underset{\sim}{0}, I_{p-1})$

$\Rightarrow y_2, y_3, \dots, y_p$  are iid  $N_1(0,1)$

$$\Rightarrow Q = \sum_{i=2}^p y_i^2 \sim \chi^2_{p-1}$$

Theorem 14:

$$\underline{\underline{x}}^{px1} \sim N_p(\underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{\Sigma}}) \text{ iff } \underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{x}} \sim N_1(\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{l}}) \forall \underline{\underline{l}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

Proof: if: Let  $\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{x}} \sim N_1(\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{l}})$

Then the mgf of  $\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{x}}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & E(e^{t(\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{x}})}) \\ &= e^{t(\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}) + \frac{1}{2} t^2 (\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{l}})} \quad \forall t \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $t=1$ ,

$$E(e^{\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{x}}}) = e^{\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} (\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{l}})} \quad \forall \underline{\underline{l}}$$

$\Leftrightarrow$  The mgf of  $\underline{\underline{x}}$

$$= e^{\underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\underline{l}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{l}}}$$

$$= \text{mgf of } N_p(\underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{\Sigma}}).$$

By uniqueness property of mgf,

$$\underline{\underline{x}} \sim N_p(\underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{\Sigma}})$$

Only if: Let  $\underline{\underline{x}}^{px1} \sim N_p(\underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{\Sigma}})$ .

Consider a vector  $k\underline{\underline{t}}$  where  $k$  is a constant.

The mgf of  $\underline{\underline{x}}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & E(e^{(k\underline{\underline{t}})' \underline{\underline{x}}}) \\ &= e^{(k\underline{\underline{t}})' \underline{\underline{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} (k\underline{\underline{t}})' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} (k\underline{\underline{t}})} \quad \forall \underline{\underline{t}} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \end{aligned}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow E(e^{k(\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{x}})}) = e^{k(\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}) + \frac{1}{2} k^2 (\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{t}})}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Leftrightarrow \text{mgf of } \underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{x}} &= e^{k(\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}) + \frac{1}{2} k^2 (\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{t}})} \quad \forall \underline{\underline{t}} \in \mathbb{R}^p \\ &= \text{mgf of } N_1(\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{t}}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{x}} \sim N_1(\underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\mu}}, \underline{\underline{t}}' \underline{\underline{\Sigma}} \underline{\underline{t}}) \quad \forall \underline{\underline{t}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

## Multiple & Partial Correl<sup>m</sup> Coeffs:

The regression of  $\tilde{x}^{(1)}$  on  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  is

$$E(\tilde{x}^{(1)} | \tilde{x}^{(2)}) \\ = \mu^{(1)} + \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)})$$

Define the residual variables by

$$\tilde{x}_{1.2} = \cancel{\mu^{(1)}} \tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)})$$

Note that  $E(\tilde{x}_{1.2}) = 0$  &

$$E[(\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}) \tilde{x}'_{1.2}] \\ = E[(\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}) \{ (\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}) \}^T] \\ = \Sigma_{21} - \Sigma_{22} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} = 0$$

ie the residual variables are uncorrelated with the fixed set variables.

Again, the covariance matrix of  $\tilde{x}_{1.2}$  is

$$E(\tilde{x}_{1.2} \tilde{x}'_{1.2}) \\ = E[\{ (\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}) \} \tilde{x}'_{1.2}] \\ = E[(\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \tilde{x}'_{1.2}] \quad \text{since the residuals are uncorrelated with } \tilde{x}^{(2)}. \\ = E[(\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \{ (\tilde{x}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)}) \}^T] \\ = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} = \Sigma_{11.2} \\ = \text{covariance matrix of the conditional dist<sup>n</sup> of } \tilde{x}^{(1)} \text{ given } \tilde{x}^{(2)}.$$

Hence the elements of the covariance matrix of the conditional dist<sup>n</sup>

of  $\tilde{x}^{(1)}$  given  $\tilde{x}^{(2)}$  are the partial variances & covariances.

Let the  $(ij)^{\text{th}}$  element of

$$\Sigma_{11.2} = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}$$

be denoted by  $\nabla_{ij}^{\circ} \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p$ .

Then the partial correl<sup>n</sup> coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_i^{\circ}$  &  $x_j^{\circ}$  with all the members of the 2<sup>nd</sup> set held constant is

$$\rho_{ij}^{\circ} \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p = \frac{\nabla_{ij}^{\circ} \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p}{\sqrt{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ} \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p} \sqrt{\nabla_{jj}^{\circ} \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p}} \quad , \quad \begin{matrix} \bar{r}_{ij}^{\circ} = 1(0) p, \\ i \neq j. \end{matrix}$$

Note that  $E(x^{(1)} | \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)})$

$$= \tilde{\mu}^{(1)} + \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}(\tilde{x}^{(2)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})$$

Consider the component  $x_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ,

$$E(x_i | \tilde{x}^{(2)} = \tilde{x}^{(2)}) = \alpha + \beta' \tilde{x}^{(2)}$$

where

$$\beta' = \nabla_{(i)}' \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \quad \text{where } \nabla_{(i)}' \text{ is the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ row of } \Sigma_{12}$$

$$\& \alpha = \mu_i - \beta' \tilde{\mu}^{(2)}$$

The multiple correl<sup>n</sup> coeff

$$\rho_{i \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p}^2 = \sqrt{\frac{\beta' \Sigma_{22} \beta}{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\nabla_{(i)}' \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \nabla_{(i)}}{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ}}}$$

$$\Rightarrow 1 - \rho_{i \cdot \bar{p}_{i+1} \dots p}^2 = \frac{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ} - \nabla_{(i)}' \Sigma_{22}^{-1} \nabla_{(i)}}{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ}}$$

$$= \frac{|\Sigma^*|}{\nabla_{ii}^{\circ} |\Sigma_{22}|}$$

$$\text{where } \Sigma^* = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{ii}^{\circ} & \nabla_{(i)}' \\ \nabla_{(i)} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

## Problems

(6) Let  $\tilde{x} \sim N_p(\underline{0}, \sigma^2 I_p)$  and  $P_1^{m \times p}$  is a matrix such that  $P_1 P_1^T = I_m$ , then show that  $\tilde{y} = P_1 \tilde{x} \sim N_m(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$  is indeptly dist'd with  $\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (\tilde{x}' \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}' \tilde{y}) \sim \chi^2_{p-m}$ .

Sol<sup>n</sup>: Note that

$P_1 P_1^T = I_m$ , here  $P_1^{m \times p}$  is a semi-orthogonal matrix.

Hence we can find  $P_2^{(p-m) \times p}$  such that  $P P^T = I_p$  where  $P^{p \times p} = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 \\ P_2 \end{pmatrix}$

Let  $\tilde{z} = P \tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 \\ P_2 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 \tilde{x} \\ P_2 \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y} \\ \tilde{w} \end{pmatrix}$  where  $\tilde{w} = P_2 \tilde{x}$ .

Since  $P$  is n.s,

$$\tilde{z} = P \tilde{x} \sim N_p(\underline{0}, \sigma^2 I_p)$$

$$\text{i.e. } \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y} \\ \tilde{w} \end{pmatrix} \sim N_p(\underline{0}, \sigma^2 I_p)$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{y} \sim N_m(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$$

$$\& \tilde{w} \sim N_{p-m}(0, \sigma^2 I_{p-m}) \text{ indeptly.}$$

$$\text{Now, } \tilde{z}' \tilde{z} = \tilde{x}' P' P \tilde{x} = \tilde{x}' \tilde{x}$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{x}' \tilde{x} = \tilde{z}' \tilde{z} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y}' \\ \tilde{w}' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y} \\ \tilde{w} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y}' & \tilde{w}' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{y} \\ \tilde{w} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \tilde{y}' \tilde{y} + \tilde{w}' \tilde{w}$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{w}' \tilde{w} = \tilde{x}' \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}' \tilde{y}$$



Since  $\underline{w} \sim N_{p-m}(0, \sigma^2 I_{p-m})$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\underline{w}'\underline{w}}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{p-m}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (\underline{x}'\underline{x} - \underline{y}'\underline{y}) = \frac{\underline{w}'\underline{w}}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{p-m}$$

which is indepthly dist<sup>d</sup> with

$$\underline{y} \sim N_m(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$$

⑦ Let  $\underline{y}_\alpha \sim N_p(a_\alpha, \mu, \Sigma)$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$  indepthly.

S.T.  $\theta = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \underline{y}_\alpha \underline{y}_\alpha' - \underline{z}'\underline{z}'$  &  $\underline{z}\underline{z}'$  are

indepthly dist<sup>d</sup> where  $\underline{z} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left( \frac{a_\alpha}{\sqrt{\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha^2}} \right) \underline{y}_\alpha$

Sol<sup>n</sup>: Let  $\underline{z}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} \underline{y}_\beta$   $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$ .

Where  $b_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{a_\beta}{\sqrt{\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha^2}}$  &  $B = (b_{\alpha\beta})$  is orthogonal

$$\text{Now, } \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \underline{z}_\alpha \underline{z}_\alpha'$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left( \sum_{\beta=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} \underline{y}_\beta \right) \left( \sum_{\delta=1}^n b_{\alpha\delta} \underline{y}_\delta' \right)$$

$$= \sum_{\beta=1}^n \sum_{\delta=1}^n \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\alpha\delta}) \underline{y}_\beta \underline{y}_\delta'$$

$$= \sum_{\beta=1}^n \sum_{\delta=1}^n \delta_{\beta\delta} \underline{y}_\beta \underline{y}_\delta' \quad \text{since } B^T B = I_n$$

[ The  $(\beta, \delta)^{\text{th}}$  element of  $B^T B$  is

$$C_{\beta\delta} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n b'_{\beta\alpha} b_{\alpha\delta} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\alpha\delta}$$

$$\therefore B^T B = I_n \Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\alpha\delta} = \delta_{\beta\delta}$$

$$= \sum_{\beta} Y_{\beta} Y'_{\beta} \quad \text{since } \delta_{\beta\beta} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta = \beta \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta \neq \beta \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{z}_n &= \sum_{\beta=1}^n \left( \frac{a_{\beta}}{\sqrt{\sum_1^n a_{\alpha}^2}} \right) Y_{\beta} \\ &= \underline{z} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\underline{z}_{\alpha}$ 's are the linear combination of  $Y_{\alpha}$ 's, the set  $\{\underline{z}_{\alpha}\}$  have a joint normal dist.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}(\underline{z}_{\alpha}, \underline{z}_{\beta}) \\ &= \text{cov}\left(\sum_{\beta=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} Y_{\beta}, \sum_{\epsilon=1}^n b_{\beta\epsilon} Y_{\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\epsilon} b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\beta\epsilon} \text{cov}(Y_{\beta}, Y_{\epsilon}) \\ &= \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\epsilon} b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\beta\epsilon} (\delta_{\beta\epsilon} \Sigma) \\ &= \left( \sum_{\beta=1}^n b_{\alpha\beta} b_{\beta\beta} \right) \Sigma \quad \text{since } \delta_{\beta\epsilon} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta = \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Sigma \end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha \neq \beta$ ,  $\text{cov}(\underline{z}_{\alpha}, \underline{z}_{\beta}) = 0$ , i.e.  $\underline{z}_{\alpha}$ 's are indept.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \underline{Y}_{\alpha} \underline{Y}_{\alpha}' - \underline{z} \underline{z}' \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \underline{z}_{\alpha} \underline{z}_{\alpha}' - \underline{z}_n \underline{z}_n' \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \underline{z}_{\alpha} \underline{z}_{\alpha}' \quad \Delta \quad \underline{z}_n \underline{z}_n' \end{aligned}$$

$\underline{z}_n \underline{z}_n'$  are indepthly distd.

# Multinomial dis<sup>m</sup>:

Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$  be jointly dist'd with pmf

$$f(\underline{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{m!}{x_1! x_2! \dots x_k!} p_1^{x_1} p_2^{x_2} \dots p_k^{x_k} & \text{for nonnegative} \\ & \text{integral values} \\ & \text{of } x_1, \dots, x_k \text{ such} \\ & \text{that } \sum_{i=1}^k x_i = m \end{cases}$$

where the parameters  $p_i$  are such that

$$p_i > 0 \quad \forall i=1(1)k \\ \& \sum_{i=1}^k p_i = 1$$

Then  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is said to follow a multinomial dis<sup>m</sup>.

The mgf of  $\underline{x}$  is

$$M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t}) = E\left(e^{\sum_{i=1}^k t_i x_i}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k} e^{\sum_{i=1}^k t_i x_i} \frac{m!}{\prod_{i=1}^k x_i!} \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{x_i}$$

$$= \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k} \frac{m!}{\prod_{i=1}^k x_i!} \prod_{i=1}^k (p_i e^{t_i})^{x_i}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k p_i e^{t_i}\right)^m$$

Note that,

$$\frac{\partial M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t})}{\partial t_i} = m (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_i e^{t_i} + \dots + p_k e^{t_k})^{m-1} p_i e^{t_i}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 M_{\underline{x}}(\underline{t})}{\partial t_i^2} = m(m-1) (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_k e^{t_k})^{m-2} \{p_i e^{t_i}\}^2$$

$$+ m p_i (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_k e^{t_k})^{m-1} e^{t_i}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 M_{\underline{X}}(\underline{t})}{\partial t_i \partial t_j} = m p_i e^{t_i} (m-1) (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_k e^{t_k})^{m-2} p_j e^{t_j} \quad [i \neq j]$$

Evaluating the derivatives at  $\underline{t} = \underline{0}$ , we get

$$E(X_i) = m p_i$$

$$E(X_i^2) = m(m-1) p_i^2 + m p_i$$

$$\Rightarrow V(X_i) = m p_i (1 - p_i)$$

$$E(X_i X_j) = m(m-1) p_i p_j$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{cov}(X_i, X_j) = -m p_i p_j, \quad i \neq j$$

$$\therefore \rho_{X_i, X_j} = - \sqrt{\frac{p_i p_j}{(1-p_i)(1-p_j)}}, \quad i \neq j$$

The dispersion matrix of  $\underline{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$  is

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} m p_1 (1-p_1) & -m p_1 p_2 & \dots & -m p_1 p_k \\ -m p_2 p_1 & m p_2 (1-p_2) & \dots & -m p_2 p_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -m p_k p_1 & -m p_k p_2 & \dots & m p_k (1-p_k) \end{pmatrix}$$

Now

$$|\Sigma| = m^k \begin{vmatrix} p_1(1-p_1) & -p_1 p_2 & \dots & -p_1 p_k \\ -p_2 p_1 & p_2(1-p_2) & \dots & -p_2 p_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -p_k p_1 & -p_k p_2 & \dots & p_k(1-p_k) \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= m^k \begin{vmatrix} 0 & -p_1 p_2 & \dots & -p_1 p_k \\ 0 & p_2(1-p_2) & \dots & -p_2 p_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -p_k p_2 & \dots & p_k(1-p_k) \end{vmatrix} \quad \left[ \text{By } e_i' \rightarrow \sum_1^k c_i \right]$$

$$= 0 \quad \left[ \because \sum_1^k p_i = 1 \right]$$

Hence, in the above form of the dist<sup>n</sup> is singular since  $|\Sigma^{k \times k}| = 0$ . In fact  $\text{rank}(\Sigma^{k \times k}) = k-1$ . To avoid the difficulties associated with singularity, we consider the jt dist<sup>n</sup> of  $k-1$  r.v.s, say,  $x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}$  with pmf

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} \frac{m!}{x_1! \dots x_{k-1}! (m - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i)!} p_1^{x_1} \dots p_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}} (1 - \sum_1^{k-1} p_i)^{m - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} & \text{for nonnegative integral values } x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \text{ such that } \sum_1^{k-1} x_i \leq m \\ 0 & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1})$  is said to follow a multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $m, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}$ , such that  $p_i > 0 \forall i$  &  $\sum_1^{k-1} p_i < 1$

The mgf of the above multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> is

$$\begin{aligned} & M_{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}}(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}) \\ &= E\left(e^{\sum_1^{k-1} t_i x_i}\right) \\ &= \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}} e^{\sum_1^{k-1} t_i x_i} \frac{m!}{\prod_1^{k-1} x_i! (m - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i)!} \prod_1^{k-1} p_i^{x_i} (1 - \sum_1^{k-1} p_i)^{m - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i \leq m}} \frac{m!}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i! (m - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i)!} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (p_i e^{t_i})^{x_i} (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i)^{m - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i}$$

$$= (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_{k-1} e^{t_{k-1}} + 1 - p_1 - \dots - p_{k-1})^m$$

The marginal mgf of  $X_i$  is

$$M_{X_i}(t_i) = M_{X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}}(0, \dots, 0, t_i, 0, \dots, 0)$$

$$= (p_i e^{t_i} + 1 - p_i)^m$$

$$= \text{mgf of Bin}(m, p_i)$$

By uniqueness property of mgf,  
 $X_i \sim \text{Bin}(m, p_i)$ ,  $i = 1(1)k-1$

The mgf of the marginal dist<sup>n</sup> of any subset of  $q$  r.v.s, say,  $X_1, \dots, X_q$ ,  $q < k-1$ ,

is

$$M_{X_1, \dots, X_q}(t_1, \dots, t_q, 0, \dots, 0)$$

$$= (p_1 e^{t_1} + \dots + p_q e^{t_q} + 1 - p_1 - \dots - p_q)^m$$

which is the mgf of multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $m, p_1, \dots, p_q$ .

Hence any subset of a multinomial r.v.'s is also a multinomial random vector.

## Conditional dist<sup>n</sup>:

The conditional dist<sup>n</sup> of  $x_1, \dots, x_q$  given a set of values of  $x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1}$ , say,  $x_{q+1} = x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}$ , is given by the conditional pmf

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f_{x_1, \dots, x_q | x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1}}(x_1, \dots, x_q | x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1}) \\
 &= \frac{f_{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}}(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})}{f_{x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1}}(x_{q+1}, \dots, x_{k-1})} \\
 &= \frac{\frac{n!}{x_1! \dots x_q! x_{q+1}! \dots x_{k-1}! (n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i)!} p_1^{x_1} \dots p_q^{x_q} \dots p_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}} (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i}}{\frac{n!}{x_{q+1}! \dots x_{k-1}! (n - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} x_i)!} p_{q+1}^{x_{q+1}} \dots p_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}} (1 - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} p_i)^{n - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} x_i}} \\
 &= \frac{(n - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} x_i)!}{x_1! \dots x_q! (n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i)!} \left(\frac{p_1}{\delta}\right)^{x_1} \dots \left(\frac{p_q}{\delta}\right)^{x_q} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{p_i}{\delta}\right)\right)^{(n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i)}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta = 1 - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} p_i$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left[1 - \sum_{i=1}^q p_i\right] &= \left(1 - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} p_i - \sum_{i=1}^q p_i\right) \\
 &= \left(\delta - \sum_{i=1}^q p_i\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

which is the pmf of a multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $n - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} x_i, \frac{p_1}{\delta}, \dots, \frac{p_q}{\delta}$  where  $\delta = 1 - \sum_{i=q+1}^{k-1} p_i$ .

Hence the conditional dist<sup>n</sup> of  $x_1$  given  $x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}$  is binomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $n - \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} x_i$  &  $\frac{p_1}{1 - \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} p_i}$

Hence,

$$E(x_1 | x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}) \\ = (m - \frac{k-1}{2} x_i) \left( \frac{p_1}{1 - \frac{k-1}{2} p_i} \right)$$

which is linear in  $x_i$ 's.

[The regression eqn of any r.v. on the others is linear in multinomial set up]

$$\text{And } V(x_1 | x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}) \\ = (m - \frac{k-1}{2} x_i) \left( \frac{p_1}{1 - \frac{k-1}{2} p_i} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{p_1}{1 - \frac{k-1}{2} p_i} \right)$$

Problems:

⑧ Suppose  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  follows a multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $m$  &  $p_1, \dots, p_k$ , such that  $\sum_1^k x_i = m$  &  $\sum_1^k p_i = 1$ . S.T. the square of the multiple correl<sup>n</sup> coeff of  $x_1$  on  $x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}$  is

$$\rho_{1.23 \dots k-1}^2 = \frac{p_1(p_2 + p_3 + \dots + p_{k-1})}{(1-p_1)(1-p_2 - p_3 - \dots - p_{k-1})}$$

Also find  $\rho_{1.23 \dots k}$

Hint: Find  $\Sigma$ .

$$\rho_{1.23 \dots k-1}^2 = 1 - \frac{|\Sigma|}{V_{11}|\Sigma_2|}$$

⑨ Suppose  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  follows a multinomial dist<sup>n</sup> with parameters  $m$  &  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  such that  $\sum_1^k x_i = m$  &  $\sum_1^k p_i = 1$ . S.T. the partial correl<sup>n</sup> coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  when the variables  $x_3, \dots, x_q$  are held fixed



$$\rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots q} = - \sqrt{\frac{p_1 p_2}{(1-p_2-\dots-p_q)(1-p_1-p_3-\dots-p_q)}}$$

$$\rho_{12} = \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots q}$$

Sol<sup>n</sup>: Here the dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is singular.

Then the dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1})$ , where  $\sum_1^{k+1} x_i \leq m$  &  $\sum_1^{k+1} p_i < 1$ , is nonsingular.

The marginal dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, \dots, x_q)$  is a multinomial with parameters  $m, p_1, \dots, p_q$ ,  $q \leq k-1$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} E(x_1 | x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_q = x_q) \\ = (m - x_2 - x_3 - \dots - x_q) \cdot \frac{p_1}{1 - \sum_{i=2}^q p_i} \end{aligned}$$

Again, since the regression is linear,

$$\begin{aligned} E(x_1 | x_2 = x_2, \dots, x_q = x_q) \\ = \alpha + \beta' x_{(2)} \\ = \alpha + \sum_{j=2}^q \beta_{j \cdot 2 \dots j-1 j+1 \dots q} x_j \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \beta_{12 \cdot 34 \dots q} = - \frac{p_1}{1 - p_2 - p_3 - \dots - p_q}$$

Similarly,

$$\beta_{21 \cdot 34 \dots q} = - \frac{p_2}{1 - p_1 - p_3 - \dots - p_q}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore \rho_{12 \cdot 34 \dots q} &= - \sqrt{\beta_{12 \cdot 34 \dots q} \cdot \beta_{21 \cdot 34 \dots q}} \\ &= - \sqrt{\frac{p_1 p_2}{(1 - p_2 - \dots - p_q)(1 - p_1 - p_3 - \dots - p_q)}} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\beta_{12.34\dots q}$ ,  $\beta_{21.34\dots q}$  &  $\rho_{12.34\dots q}$  have the same sign.

Alt: Use  $\rho_{12.34\dots q} = -\frac{\Sigma_{12}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{11}\Sigma_{22}}}$

Where  $\Sigma_{ij}$  is the cofactor of  $(ij)^{th}$  element of dispersion matrix of  $(x_1, \dots, x_q)$

### Ellipsoid of concentration:

Let  $\underline{x}^{(p \times 1)}$  be a random vector with mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ . Our problem is to compare the variability of  $\underline{x}^{(p \times 1)}$  with another random vector  $\underline{y}^{(p \times 1)}$  with the mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$ !

Case I: Let  $X$  be a r.v. with mean  $\mu$  & variance  $\sigma^2$ . Let  $U$  be a r.v. uniformly dist'd in the interval  $(\mu - k\sigma, \mu + k\sigma)$  such that  $U$  has the same mean & variance as that of  $X$ .

Note that  $E(U) = \mu = E(X)$

&  $V(U) = \frac{k^2\sigma^2}{3}$

But  $V(U) = V(X)$

$\Rightarrow \frac{k^2\sigma^2}{3} = \sigma^2$

$\Rightarrow k = \sqrt{3}$

Clearly, the interval  $(\mu - \sqrt{3}\sigma, \mu + \sqrt{3}\sigma)$  can be interpreted as the geometrical

representation of concentration of  $X$ .

Let  $L = \{u: \mu - \sqrt{3}\sigma < u < \mu + \sqrt{3}\sigma\}$ , the interval  $L$  is called the line of concentration of  $X$  with mean  $\mu$  & variance  $\sigma^2$ .

Another r.v.  $Y$  with mean  $\mu'$  & variance  $\sigma'^2$  has the line of concentration.

$$L' = \{u: \mu' - \sqrt{3}\sigma' < u < \mu' + \sqrt{3}\sigma'\}$$

If  $\sigma \geq \sigma'$ , then accordingly,  $L \supset L'$  or  $L \subset L'$  and we say that  $Y$  has greater or smaller concentration than that of  $X$ .

### Case II: Ellipsoid: $p \geq 2$

The above idea may be generalized to the case of a random vector of order  $p \times 1$ ,  $p \geq 2$ . Let the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_p$  have a j.t. dist<sup>n</sup> with mean vector  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$  which is pd.

Let  $\underline{u}$  be a r.v. dist<sup>d</sup> uniformly over a closed region, say, the region  $S^{\mathbb{R}} = \{\underline{u}: (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu})' A (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu}) < 1\}$ , where  $A$  is pd, such that  $\underline{u}$  has the same mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$  as that of  $\underline{X}^{p \times 1}$ .

The pdf of  $\underline{u}$  is

$$f(\underline{u}) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } \underline{u} \in S \\ 0 & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}; \text{ where } k \text{ is a constant such that}$$

$$\int_S f(\underline{u}) d\underline{u} = 1$$

Since  $A$  is pd,  $\exists$  a n.s.  $P \Rightarrow PP' = A$

Consider the transformation,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{y} &= P'(\underline{u} - \underline{\mu}) & |\text{Jacobian}| \\ & & = \frac{1}{|P'|} \\ & & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|PP'|}} \\ & & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A|}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now, } 1 &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(\underline{u}) d\underline{u} \\ &= \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} \int_{\underline{v}'\underline{v} < 1} d\underline{v} \\ &= \frac{k}{\sqrt{|A|}} \cdot \frac{\pi^{p/2}}{\Gamma(p/2+1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow k = \sqrt{|A|} \frac{\Gamma(p/2+1)}{\pi^{p/2}}$$

Hence the pdf of  $\underline{y}$  is

$$g(\underline{y}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(p/2+1)}{\pi^{p/2}}, & \text{if } \underline{y}'\underline{y} < 1 \\ 0, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$E(y_i) = 0 \quad \forall i$$

$$\begin{aligned} \& E(y_i^2) &= \int_{\underline{v}'\underline{v} < 1} v_i^2 g(\underline{v}) d\underline{v} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(p/2+1)}{\pi^{p/2}} \frac{\pi^{p/2}}{2\Gamma(p/2+2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{p+2} \quad \forall i. \end{aligned}$$

$$\& \text{cov}(v_i, v_j) = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j$$

$$\text{Thus, } \text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{p+2} I_p \quad \& \quad E(\underline{x}) = \underline{\mu}$$

$$\therefore E(\underline{u}) = \underline{\mu}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \& \text{Disp}(\underline{u}) &= (P')^{-1} \frac{1}{p+2} I_p (P')^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p+2} (PP')^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p+2} A^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

By construction,

$$\text{Disp}(\underline{x}) = \text{Disp}(\underline{u})$$

$$\Rightarrow A = \frac{\Sigma^{-1}}{p+2}$$

Hence the region  $S$  is

$$\left\{ \underline{u} : (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu}) < p+2 \right\}$$

that is  $\underline{u}$  is uniformly dist<sup>d</sup> over the region  $S = \left\{ \underline{u} : (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu})' \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{u} - \underline{\mu}) < p+2 \right\}$

having same mean  $\underline{\mu}$  & dispersion matrix  $\Sigma$  as of  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1}$ . Hence the region  $S$  will serve as a geometrical representation of the mode of concentration of the dist<sup>n</sup> of  $\underline{x}$  about the mean  $\underline{\mu}$ .

If the ellipsoid of concentration of a random vector  $\underline{y}^{p \times 1}$  with the same mean  $\underline{\mu}$  as  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1}$ , is enclosed entirely within the ellipsoid of concentration of  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1}$ , then  $\underline{y}^{p \times 1}$  has greater concentration (or smaller dispersion) than that of  $\underline{x}^{p \times 1}$ .

Note that

$y^{p \times 1}$  has greater concentration than  $x^{p \times 1}$  if  $S \supset S'$  where

$$S = \{ y : (y - \mu)' \Sigma^{-1} (y - \mu) < k+2 \}$$

$$S' = \{ y : (y - \mu)' \Sigma^{*-1} (y - \mu) < k+2 \},$$

$$\Sigma^* = \text{diag}(\Sigma).$$

ie if  $(y - \mu)' \Sigma^{*-1} (y - \mu) - (y - \mu)' \Sigma^{-1} (y - \mu) \geq 0 \forall y$

and strictly more than 0 for at least one  $y$ .

ie if  $(y - \mu)' (\Sigma^{*-1} - \Sigma^{-1}) (y - \mu) \geq 0 \forall y$   
&  $\exists y \ni$  it is  $> 0$ .

ie if  $(\Sigma^{*-1} - \Sigma^{-1})$  is nnd.  $\Leftrightarrow (\Sigma - \Sigma^*)$  is nnd

Alternatively, we can compare the areas of  $S$  &  $S'$ . The smaller the area, the greater the concentration.

### Problem:

(10) Suppose the jnt pdf of  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)'$  is

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \begin{cases} \text{constant} & \text{if } x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2 < r^2 \\ 0 & \text{o.w} \end{cases}$$

Find the correlation coeff bet<sup>n</sup>  $x_1$  &  $x_2$ . Are  $x_1$  &  $x_2$  indept? Justify.

Hint: Let  $x_1 = R \cos \theta_1$

$$x_2 = R \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2$$

$$x_3 = R \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_3$$

⋮

$$x_n = R \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \dots \sin \theta_{n-1}$$

$$0 \leq \theta_i < \pi,$$

$$i = 1(1)n-2$$

$$0 \leq \theta_{n-1} < 2\pi$$

$$0 < R < \delta.$$

$$|J| = R^{n-1} (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2} (\sin \theta_2)^{n-3} \dots \sin \theta_{n-2}$$

Now,

$$E(x_1) = \int_{\sum x_i^2 < r^2} x_1 f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \dots dx_n$$

$$= K \int_{\theta_1=0}^{\pi} \dots \int_{\theta_{n-2}=0}^{\pi} \int_{\theta_{n-1}=0}^{2\pi} \int_0^{\delta} (R \cos \theta_1) R^{n-1} (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2} \dots \sin \theta_{n-2} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_{n-1} dR$$

$$= K \left\{ \int_0^{\pi} \cos \theta_1 (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2} d\theta_1 \right\} \left\{ \int_0^{\pi} (\sin \theta_2)^{n-3} d\theta_2 \right\} \dots \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_{n-1} \right\} \left\{ \int_0^{\delta} R^n dR \right\}$$

= 0

$$\left[ \text{Let } g(\theta_1) = \cos \theta_1 (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2} \right.$$

$$g(\pi - \theta_1) = -\cos \theta_1 (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2}$$

$$\therefore \int_0^{\pi} \cos \theta_1 (\sin \theta_1)^{n-2} d\theta_1 = 0 \left. \right]$$

Here  $E(x_i) = 0$ , since the pdf or dist<sup>n</sup> is symmetric w.r.t the r.v.s  $x_i$ 's.

Now,

$$\text{cov}(x_1, x_2) = E(x_1 x_2)$$

$$= \int_{\sum x_i^2 < r^2} x_1 x_2 f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \dots dx_n$$

$$= k \left\{ \int_0^\pi \cos \theta_1 (\sin \theta_1)^{n-1} d\theta_1 \right\} \left\{ \int_0^\pi \cos \theta_2 (\sin \theta_2)^{n-3} d\theta_2 \right\} \dots \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_{n-1} \right\} \left\{ \int_0^r R^{n+1} dR \right\} = 0$$

Hence,  $\rho(x_1, x_2) = 0$ .

But variables are related & they are not indept.

To integrate  $\int_{S_k} y_1^{u_1-1} y_2^{u_2-1} \dots y_k^{u_k-1} (1-y_1-\dots-y_k)^{u_{k+1}-1} dy_1 \dots dy_k$

use transform<sup>n</sup>:

$$y_1 = x_1 - x_1 x_2 = x_1 (1 - x_2)$$

$$y_2 = x_1 x_2 (1 - x_3)$$

⋮

$$y_{n-1} = x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-1} (1 - x_n)$$

$$y_n = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$$

$$x_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$$

$$x_1 x_2 = \sum_{i=2}^n y_i$$

$$x_1 x_2 x_3 = \sum_{i=3}^n y_i$$

$$x_1 x_2 \dots x_n = y_n$$

$$|J| = x_1^{k+1} x_2^{k-2} \dots x_{k-2}^2 x_{k+1}$$



## Dirichlet dist<sup>n</sup> :

A random vector  $\underline{x}^k \sim x^1 = (x_1, \dots, x_k)'$  is said to have a Dirichlet dist<sup>n</sup> if its pdf is

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + v_2 + \dots + v_{k+1}) \cdot x_1^{v_1-1} \dots x_k^{v_k-1} (1-x_1-\dots-x_k)^{v_{k+1}-1}}{\Gamma(v_1) \Gamma(v_2) \dots \Gamma(v_{k+1})} \\ \quad \text{if } \underline{x} \in S_k = \left\{ \underline{x} : 0 < x_i < 1, \right. \\ \quad \left. i=1, \dots, k \text{ \& } \sum_{i=1}^k x_i < 1 \right\} \\ 0, \text{ outside } S_k. \end{cases}$$

[Check this is a pdf, see Malik-Arora]

where  $v_i > 0, \forall i=1, \dots, k+1$  are the parameters.

Then, we write

$$(x_1, \dots, x_k) \sim D(v_1, \dots, v_k; v_{k+1})$$

## Moments :

$$E(x_1^{\gamma_1} x_2^{\gamma_2} \dots x_k^{\gamma_k}) =$$

$$= \int_{S_k} x_1^{\gamma_1} x_2^{\gamma_2} \dots x_k^{\gamma_k} f(x_1, \dots, x_k) dx_1 \dots dx_k$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k+1})} \int_{S_k} x_1^{v_1 + \gamma_1 - 1} \dots x_k^{v_k + \gamma_k - 1} (1-x_1-\dots-x_k)^{v_{k+1}-1} dx_1 \dots dx_k$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k+1})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \gamma_1) \dots \Gamma(v_k + \gamma_k) \Gamma(v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_k)}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k+1})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \gamma_1) \dots \Gamma(v_k + \gamma_k)}{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_k)}$$

$$E(X_i) = \frac{v_i^0}{v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1}}, \quad i = 1(1)k$$

$$\therefore E(X_i) = \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1}) \Gamma(v_i + 1)}{\Gamma(v_i) \Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 1)}$$

$$\& V(X_i)$$

$$= E(X_i^2) - E^2(X_i)$$

$$= \frac{(v_i + 1) v_i^0}{(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 1)(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})} - \left( \frac{v_i^0}{v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1}} \right)^2$$

$$\therefore E(X_i^2) = \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1}) \Gamma(v_i + 2)}{\Gamma(v_i) \Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 2)}$$

$$= \frac{v_i (v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} - v_i)}{(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})^2 (v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 1)}$$

$$\text{COV}(X_i, X_j) = E(X_i X_j) - E(X_i) E(X_j)$$

$$= \frac{v_i v_j}{(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})^2 (v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 1)} - \frac{v_i v_j}{(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})^2}$$

$$= - \frac{v_i v_j}{(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})^2 (v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + 1)}$$

### Marginal dis<sup>n</sup>:

Theorem 15: If  $x$  is a bounded r.v, then its cdf  $F(\cdot)$ , ie its dis<sup>n</sup> is uniquely determined by the sequence  $\{\mu_r'\}$  of moments.

proof: Since  $X$  is bounded, there exists two finite numbers  $a$  &  $b$  such that

$$P(a < X < b) = 1$$

Let  $M = \max\{|a|, |b|\}$ , then  $P(|X| < M) = 1$ .

$$\text{Now, } |\mu_r'| = \left| \int_a^b x^r dF(x) \right|$$

$$\leq \int_a^b |x|^r dF(x)$$

$$\leq M^r \int_a^b dF(x)$$

$$= M^r, \quad r = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Note that

$$\left| \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_r' t^r}{r!} \right| \leq \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} |\mu_r'| \frac{|t|^r}{r!} \leq \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{M^r |t|^r}{r!} = e^{M|t|},$$

which is finite for all  $t$ .

Hence the mgf of  $X$  exists & the cdf  $F(\cdot)$  is uniquely determined by the sequence  $\{\mu_r'\}$  of moments.

The multivariate version of the theorem is also true.

Note that,

$$\mu_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{k_1}}'$$

$$= E(X_1^{r_1} \dots X_{k_1}^{r_{k_1}})$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k_1})} \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + r_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k_1} + r_{k_1})}{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1} + r_1 + \dots + r_{k_1})}$$

$\because k_1 < k$

Thus, we see that the general moment  $\mu'_{x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}}$  of the marginal dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1})$ ,  $k_1 < k$ , of  $k$ -variate Dirichlet dist<sup>n</sup>  $D(v_1, \dots, v_k; v_{k+1})$ , has the value which is the general moment of  $D(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k_1}; v_{k+1} + \dots + v_{k+1})$ , a  $k_1$ -variate Dirichlet dist<sup>n</sup>.

Since  $x_i$ 's are bounded, i.e.

$$P(0 < x_i < 1) = 1,$$

the dist<sup>n</sup> of  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1})$ ,  $k_1 < k$ , is uniquely determined by its moments.

Hence,

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}) \sim D(v_1, \dots, v_{k_1}; v_{k+1} + \dots + v_{k+1})$$

Conditional dist<sup>n</sup> & the regression of  $x_k$  on  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ :

$$f(x_k | x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \frac{f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)}{f_1(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})}$$

$$= \frac{\frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \Gamma(v_2) \dots \Gamma(v_{k+1})} x_1^{v_1-1} \dots x_k^{v_k-1} (1-x_1-\dots-x_k)^{v_{k+1}-1}}{\frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_{k-1}) \Gamma(v_k + v_{k+1})} x_1^{v_1-1} \dots x_{k-1}^{v_{k-1}-1} (1-x_1-\dots-x_{k-1})^{v_k + v_{k+1} - 1}}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_k + v_{k+1})}{\Gamma(v_k) \Gamma(v_{k+1})} \left( \frac{x_k}{1 - x_1 - \dots - x_{k-1}} \right)^{v_k - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{x_k}{1 - x_1 - \dots - x_{k-1}} \right)^{v_{k+1} - 1} \left( \frac{1}{1 - x_1 - \dots - x_{k-1}} \right)$$

$$, \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} 0 < x_k < (1 - x_1 - \dots - x_{k-1}) \end{array} \right\}$$

The conditional dist<sup>n</sup>

$$\frac{x_k}{1 - x_1 - \dots - x_{k-1}} \mid (x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \text{ is } B(v_k, v_{k+1}) \text{ dist}^n$$

[Transform<sup>n</sup>:

$$y = \frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i}]$$

$$[x \rightarrow (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}, y)]$$

Note that

$$E(x_k \mid x_1 = x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}) \\ = \int_0^{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} x_k f(x_k \mid x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) dx_k$$

$$= \int_0^{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} x_k \frac{1}{B(v_k, v_{k+1})} \left( \frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} \right)^{v_k - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} \right)^{v_{k+1} - 1} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i} dx_k$$

$$= \int_0^1 \frac{y^{v_k} (1-y)^{v_{k+1}-1} (1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i)}{B(v_k, v_{k+1})} dy$$

$$[y = \frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i}]$$

$$= \frac{B(v_{k+1}, v_k) (1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i)}{B(v_k, v_{k+1})}$$

$$= \frac{v_k}{v_k + v_{k+1}} (1 - \sum_1^{k-1} x_i)$$

Hence the regression  $E(x_k \mid x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$  is linear.

[Ait. Since  $\frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i} \sim B(v_k, v_{k+1})$

$$\Rightarrow E\left(\frac{x_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i} \mid x_1 = x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}\right) = \frac{v_k}{v_k + v_{k+1}}$$

$$\Rightarrow E(x_k \mid x_1 = x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}) = \frac{v_k}{v_k + v_{k+1}} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i\right)$$

Result:

If  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is a random vector having  $D(v_1, \dots, v_k; v_{k+1})$  dist<sup>n</sup>, then  $(x_1 + \dots + x_k)$  has the Beta dist<sup>n</sup>  $B(v_1 + \dots + v_k; v_{k+1})$ .

proof:  $E\left[\left\{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i\right\}^r\right]$

$$= \int_{S_k} \left\{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i\right\}^r d(x)$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_k)}{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_k)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(v_1) \dots \Gamma(v_k) \Gamma(v_{k+1} + r)}{\Gamma(v_1 + \dots + v_k + v_{k+1} + r)}$$

$$= \frac{B(v_{k+1} + r, v_1 + \dots + v_k)}{B(v_{k+1}, v_1 + \dots + v_k)},$$

which is the  $r$ th order moment of  $B(v_{k+1}, v_1 + \dots + v_k)$

Hence  $\left\{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i\right\} \sim B(v_{k+1}, v_1 + \dots + v_k)$

[since  $\left\{1 - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i\right\}$  is a bounded r.v., the dist<sup>n</sup> is uniquely determined by its moments]

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \sim B(v_1 + \dots + v_k, v_{k+1}).$$

\* ————— \*