

Logarithmic transformation of response

Often, support \mathcal{S} of Y is $\mathcal{S} = (0, \infty)$.

Logarithm is then one of transformations to consider when trying to obtain a correct (wrong but useful) model.

Suppose that the following model is correct:

$$\log(Y) = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2).$$

Then

$$Y = \exp(\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \eta, \quad \eta = \exp(\varepsilon) \sim \mathcal{LN}(0, \sigma^2),$$

i.e., errors and a regression function are combined **multiplicatively**.

Properties of the log-normal distribution:

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta) = M = \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) > 1 \text{ for } \sigma^2 > 0,$$

$$\text{var}(\eta) = V = \{\exp(\sigma^2) - 1\} \exp(\sigma^2).$$

Logarithmic transformation of response

When does the log-transformation of Y help?

$\text{var}(Y; x)$ increases with $\mathbb{E}(Y; x)$

Captured by a normal linear model for $\log(Y)$ as then

$$\mathbb{E}(Y; x) = M \exp(\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

$$\text{var}(Y; x) = V \exp(2 \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) = V \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}(Y; x)}{M} \right)^2,$$

which is increasing function of $\mathbb{E}(Y; x)$ for Y with a support $\mathcal{S} = (0, \infty)$.

It is then said that the logarithmic transformation **stabilizes** the variance.

$\mathcal{D}(Y; x)$ skewed

Often sufficiently captured (leads to a model which is wrong but useful) by a normal linear model for $\log(Y)$ as then

$$\mathcal{D}(Y; x) = \mathcal{LN}(\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2),$$

and a log-normal distribution is one of the “benchmark” skewed distributions.

Interpretation of regression coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Let } \mathbf{x}_1 &= (x_{1,0}, \dots, x_{1,j}, \dots, x_{1,k-1})^\top, \\ \mathbf{x}_2 &= (x_{2,0}, \dots, x_{1,j} + 1, \dots, x_{2,k-1})^\top, \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} &= (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_j, \dots, \beta_{k-1})^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(Y; \mathbf{x}_2)}{\mathbb{E}(Y; \mathbf{x}_1)} = \frac{M \exp(\mathbf{x}_2^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})}{M \exp(\mathbf{x}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})} = \exp(\beta_j).$$

When (β_j^L, β_j^U) is the confidence interval for β_j with a coverage of $1 - \alpha$ then

$$\left(\exp(\beta_j^L), \exp(\beta_j^U) \right)$$

is the confidence interval for $\frac{\mathbb{E}(Y; \mathbf{x}_2)}{\mathbb{E}(Y; \mathbf{x}_1)}$ with a coverage of $1 - \alpha$.

Interpretation of regression coefficients

When ANOVA linear model with log-transformed response is fitted, estimated differences between the group means of log-response are equal to estimated **ratios** between the group means of the original response.

When a model with logarithmically transformed response is fitted, estimated regression coefficients, estimates of estimable parameters etc. and their confidence intervals are often reported back-transformed (exponentiated) due to above interpretation.