## Lab 5: Regularization and Dimension Reduction

We will use the Hitters data set in the ISLR package to predict Salary for baseball players.

```
library(ISLR)
library(tidyverse)
library(knitr)
str(Hitters)
```

| \#\# | 'data.frame | 322 obs. of 20 variables: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#\# | \$ AtBat | int 293315479496321594185298323401 |
| \#\# | \$ Hits | int 66811301418716937738192 |
| \#\# | \$ HmRun | : int 178182010410617 |
| \#\# | \$ Runs | : int 30246665397423242649 |
| \#\# | \$ RBI | int 2938727842518843266 |
| \#\# | \$ Walks | : int 143976373035217865 |
| \#\# | \$ Years | : int 11431121123213 |
| \#\# | \$ CAtBat | int 29334491624562839644082145093415206 |
| \#\# | \$ CHits | int 668354571575101113342108861332 |
| \#\# | \$ CHmRun | int 1696322512191006253 |
| \#\# | \$ CRuns | int 3032122482848501304132784 |
| \#\# | \$ CRBI | int 294142668384633693734890 |
| \#\# | \$ CWalks | int 143752633543319424128866 |
| \#\# | \$ League | : Factor w/ 2 levels "A", "N": 121221212 |
| \#\# | \$ Division | Factor w/ 2 levels "E","W": 1221112120 |
| \#\# | \$ PutOuts | : int 446632880200805282761211430 |
| \#\# | \$ Assists | int 3343821140421127283290 |
| \#\# | \$ Errors | int $201014 \begin{array}{lllllll} \\ \text { in }\end{array}$ |
| \#\# | \$ Salary | : num NA 47548050091.575070100751100 |
| \#\# | \$ NewLeagu | Factor w/ 2 levels "A","N": 121221112 |

### 0.1 Data Processing

1. Remove records with missing values from the data (Hint: complete.cases() is useful)

Use model.matrix to create an $X$ matrix for all predictors that contains dummy variables for categorical predictors (for predicting Salary). You can specify this as a formula in the model.matrix call, e.g.

```
x <- model.matrix(y ~ ., data)[, -1] # remove the y column
```

3. Create a $Y$ vector of Salary information.

### 0.2 Ridge Regression

The glmnet() function in the glmnet package can perform both ridge regression and the lasso. This is done with the specification of a parameter alpha. If alpha $=0$ then a ridge regression model is fit and if alpha $=1$ then the lasso is fit.

By default, glmnet performs ridge regression for an automatically selected range of values, but we can instead pass a vector of values.

1. Create a vector of $\lambda$ values from $\lambda=.01$ to $\lambda=10^{1} 0$ of length 100 .
2. Fit a ridge regression model for each $\lambda$ in your grid.

Note, by default glmnet will standardize the $X$ variables.
3. Make a line plot of coefficient corresponding to each $\lambda$. You should have an individual line for each variable with coefficient value on the $y$-axis and $\lambda$ on the $x$ axis. What happens to your coefficients as $\lambda$ increases?
4. Use cv.glmnet to perform 10 -fold cross validation and get an estimate of the test MSE for each $\lambda$ in your grid. Which $\lambda$ would you choose and why?

### 0.3 Lasso

1. Fit the lasso model for each $\lambda$ in your grid.
2. Make a line plot of coefficient corresponding to each $\lambda$. You should have an individual line for each variable with coefficient value on the $y$-axis and $\lambda$ on the $x$ axis. (Hint: coef may be a useful function). What happens to your coefficients as $\lambda$ increases?
3. Use cv.glmnet to perform 10 -fold cross validation and get an estimate of the test MSE for each $\lambda$ in your grid. Which $\lambda$ would you choose and why?

### 0.4 Principal Components Regression

The pcr() function in the pls package can perform principal components regression.

1. Fit the PCR model using the pcr command. A couple tips: a) setting scale = TRUE will standardize your data prior to fitting the model, and b) setting validation $=$ TRUE will perform 10 -fold cross validation for each value of $M$.
2. Create a plot of the CV MSE (note root MSE is reported) vs. $M$.
3. When does the smallest cross-validation error occur? Which $M$ would you choose for your final model?
4. The summary function also provides the percentage of variance explained in the predictors and the response using $M$ principal components. How many principal components would we need to explain at least $80 \%$ of the variability in the predictors?
5. How much variability in $Y$ is explained for your chosen value of $M$ ?
