## Practical 2

## Jumping Rivers

## **Cross validation**

• Fit a linear regression model to the cars2010 data set with FE as the response, using EngDispl, NumCyl and NumGears as predictors. Load the data like so

data("FuelEconomy", package = "jrPred")

- What is the training error rate (RMSE) for this model? Hint: The training error can be found by taking the square root of the average square residuals. The sqrt and resid functions may be useful.
- We can re-train the model using the validation set approach to estimate a test RMSE. That is, splitting up the data into a training and testing set.

## TrainRMSE TrainRsquared TrainMAE method
## 1 4.702351 0.6017011 3.543246 lm

Doing it this way we can see that the RMSE is larger. Validation set estimates tend to over estimate the test RMSE as models perform worse with less data. Furthermore, if we ran this code again, we'd get a completely different test RMSE estimate. For validation set estimates, the test RMSE is highly variable depending on which observations are chosen for each group.

- We can use k-fold cross validation to solve these two issues. Re-run this model but using 10-fold cross-validation instead.
- How do these estimates compare with the validation set approach?
- The object returned by train also contains timing information that can be accessed via the times component of the list. Which of the methods is fastest? Hint: The \$ notation can be used pick a single list component.
- Using k-fold cross validation to estimate test error investigate how the number of folds effects the resultant estimates and computation time.
- Experiment with adding terms to the model, transformations of the predictors and interactions say and use cross validation to estimate test error for each. What is the best model you can find?