

# CORRELATION AND LINEAR LEAST SQUARES PREDICTION

MICHAEL J. SHARPE  
MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UCSD

## 1. NOTATION

Throughout this section, we assume that all random variables have a finite second moment. That is, we assume  $EX^2 < \infty$  for every random variable  $X$  that will appear here. If we use the inequality

$$(1.1) \quad |x| \leq 1 + x^2, \quad x \in \mathbf{R},$$

which follows from the trivial estimates  $|x| \leq x^2$  for  $|x| > 1$  and  $|x| \leq 1$  for  $|x| \leq 1$ , we find, taking expectation,

$$E|X| \leq 1 + EX^2,$$

so that  $X$  also has a finite first moment. The last inequality is crude, and will be improved below. The second simple estimate we need is that

$$(1.2) \quad |EX| \leq E|X|,$$

which follows by writing  $X = X^+ - X^-$ , the positive and negative parts of  $X$ , so that  $|X| = X^+ + X^-$  and  $|EX| = |EX^+ - EX^-| \leq EX^+ + EX^- = E|X|$ . (Note: for any real  $x$ ,  $x^+$  is defined to be  $x$  if  $x \geq 0$ , and equal to 0 otherwise; similarly,  $x^-$  is defined to be  $-x$  if  $x < 0$  and 0 otherwise.)

We shall use the notation  $\mu_X$  sometimes in place of  $EX$ , and  $\sigma_X^2$  for the variance of  $X$ , namely  $\sigma_X^2 = E(X - \mu_X)^2$ .

**Proposition 1.3.** *If  $X$  and  $Y$  each have finite second moment, then so does  $aX + bY$  for any scalars  $a, b$ .*

*Proof.* Just observe that the simple inequality  $(u + v)^2 \leq 2u^2 + 2v^2$  (which comes about from expanding the first square and using  $2uv \leq u^2 + v^2$ ) yields  $E(aX + bY)^2 \leq 2a^2EX^2 + 2b^2EY^2 < \infty$ .  $\square$

### 1.1. Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

**Theorem 1.4.** (Cauchy-Schwarz) *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  have finite second moment. Then  $E|XY| < \infty$ , and*

$$(1.5) \quad |E(XY)| \leq \sqrt{E(X^2)E(Y^2)},$$

*and equality holds if and only if one of  $X, Y$  is a scalar multiple of the other.*

*Proof.* For every real  $t$ ,  $X + tY$  has a finite second moment by Proposition ??, and so the function  $g(t) := E(X + tY)^2$  is finite valued. Expanding the square gives

$$g(t) = EX^2 + 2tE(XY) + t^2EY^2.$$

That is,  $g(t)$  is quadratic in  $t$ , and clearly  $g(t) \geq 0$  for all  $t$ . If  $EY^2 = 0$ , then  $Y$  vanishes almost surely, so  $E(XY) = 0$ , and (??) is clearly satisfied, with  $Y$  a scalar multiple (0) of  $X$ . otherwise, if  $EY^2 > 0$ , we use the fact that the discriminant of the quadratic must be  $\leq 0$ , which is to say  $4(E(XY))^2 - 4EX^2EY^2 \leq 0$ . This clearly proves (??). If equality holds in (??), then the discriminant of  $g(t)$  vanishes, hence  $g(t)$  has a single real root, say at  $t_0$ . The fact that  $g(t_0) = 0$  implies that the positive random variable  $(X + t_0Y)^2$  has expectation 0, and so must vanish almost surely. Thus we find  $X = -t_0Y$  almost surely.  $\square$

**1.2. Covariance and correlation.** Given  $X, Y$  with finite variances  $\sigma_X^2, \sigma_Y^2$  and means  $\mu_X, \mu_Y$ , define the covariance  $\text{Cov}(X, Y)$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  by

$$(1.6) \quad \{\text{eq:cov}\} \quad \text{Cov}(X, Y) := E((X - \mu_X)(Y - \mu_Y)) = E(XY) - \mu_X\mu_Y.$$

In view of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(1.7) \quad |\text{Cov}(X, Y)| \leq \sigma_X\sigma_Y$$

with equality if and only if one of  $X - \mu_X, Y - \mu_Y$  is a scalar multiple of the other, which is to say that either  $Y = aX + b$  for some scalars  $a, b$ , or vise-versa. To put this another way, let's assume that  $\sigma_X > 0$  and  $\sigma_Y > 0$ , and then define the correlation coefficient  $\rho_{X,Y}$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  by

$$\rho_{X,Y} := \frac{\text{Cov}(X, Y)}{\sigma_X\sigma_Y}.$$

Then one finds from (??) that

$$(1.8) \quad |\rho_{X,Y}| \leq 1, \quad \text{and } \rho_{X,Y} = \pm 1 \text{ if and only if } Y = aX + b \text{ for some scalars } a, b.$$

(With a little additional work, one sees that  $\rho_{X,Y} = 1$  implies  $a > 0$ , while  $\rho_{X,Y} = -1$  implies  $a < 0$ .)

Note that covariance and correlation coefficient are insensitive to change of location: that is,

$$\text{Cov}(X + \alpha, Y + \beta) = \text{Cov}(X, Y); \quad \rho_{X+\alpha, Y+\beta} = \rho_{X,Y}.$$

Their sensitivity to scale is also simple:

$$(1.9) \quad \text{Cov}(aX, bY) = ab \text{Cov}(X, Y); \quad \rho_{aX, bY} = \rho_{X,Y}.$$

{prop:indep}

**Proposition 1.10.** *If  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, then  $\text{Cov}(X, Y) = \rho_{X,Y} = 0$ . (The converse is definitely untrue, without further strong hypotheses.)*

*Proof.* Because  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, so are  $X - \mu_X$  and  $Y - \mu_Y$ . using the fact that the expectation of a product of independent random variables is the product of the expectation, we find

$$\text{Cov}(X, Y) = E((X - \mu_X)(Y - \mu_Y)) = E(X - \mu_X)E(Y - \mu_Y) = 0.$$

□

Covariance enters into computations of variances of sums, in the following way. (We omit the easily checked calculation.)

$$(1.11) \quad \text{Var}(X + Y) = \text{Var}(X) + 2\text{Cov}(X, Y) + \text{Var}(Y).$$

This is of course the same as writing  $\sigma_{X+Y}^2 = \sigma_X^2 + 2\rho_{X,Y}\sigma_X\sigma_Y + \sigma_Y^2$ .

**1.3. Linear Least Squares Prediction.** Once again, we assume  $X$  and  $Y$  have finite variances. The issue here is how to best predict  $Y$  using a linear function of  $X$ . That is, we wish to choose scalars  $u, v$  so that  $uX + v$  is as good as possible a predictor of  $Y$ . As criterion for “best”, we measure error of prediction by  $E(Y - (uX + v))^2$ . We shall let  $Y^* := Y - \mu_Y$  and  $X^* := X - \mu_X$ . Then it suffices to solve the least squares predictor problem  $E(Y^* - (sX^* + t))^2$ . Expanding out the square and taking expectations yields

$$E(Y^* - (sX^* + t))^2 = E(Y^*)^2 + s^2E(X^*)^2 + t^2 - 2sE(X^*Y^*) - 2tE(Y^*) - 2stE(X^*).$$

Since  $EX^* = EY^* = 0$  and  $E(X^*)^2 = \sigma_X^2$ , the right side reduces immediately to

$$\sigma_Y^2 + s^2\sigma_X^2 - 2s\text{Cov}(X, Y) + t^2.$$

For every  $s$ , the minimum as a function of  $t$  occurs when  $t = 0$ . The remaining term is a quadratic in  $s$ , complete the square, it becomes

$$\sigma_X^2(s^2 - 2\rho_{X,Y}\frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} + \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{\sigma_X^2}) = \sigma_X^2(s - \rho_{X,Y}\frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X})^2 + \sigma_Y^2(1 - \rho_{X,Y}^2),$$

which is clearly smallest when  $s = \rho_{X,Y} \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X}$ . From this we deduce that the best (least squares sense) linear predictor of  $Y^*$  given  $X^*$  is given by  $\rho_{X,Y} \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} X^*$ , and consequently, the best (least squares sense) linear predictor of  $Y$  given  $X$  is

$$(1.12) \quad \{\text{eq:predictor}\} \quad \hat{Y} := \mu_Y + \rho_{X,Y} \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} (X - \mu_X).$$

It may easily be checked that  $\text{Cov}(Y - \hat{Y}, \hat{Y}) = 0$ , and hence that  $\sigma_Y^2 = \sigma_{\hat{Y}}^2 + \sigma_{Y-\hat{Y}}^2$ , where of course  $\sigma_{\hat{Y}}^2 = \rho_{X,Y}^2 \sigma_Y^2$ .