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#### Abstract

A nom alies persist in the foundations of ridge regression as set forth in H oerl and $K$ ennard (1970) and subsequently. C onventional ridge estim ators and their properties do not follow on constraining lengths of solution vectors using LaG range's m ethod, as claim ed. Estim ators so constrained have singular distributions; the proposed solutions are not necessarily m in im izing; and heretofore undiscovered bounds are exhibited for the ridge param eter. N one of the considerable literature on estim ation, prediction, cross\{validation, choice of ridge param eter, and related issues, collectively know n as ridge regression, is consistent $w$ ith constrained optim ization, nor $w$ ith corresponding inequality constraints. T he problem is traced to a m isapplication of $\mathrm{L} a \mathrm{G}$ range's principle, failure to recognize the singu larity of distributions, and $m$ isplaced links betw een constraints and the ridge param eter. O ther principles, based on condition num bers, are seen to validate both conventional ridge and surrogate ridge regression to be de ned. N um erical studies illustrate that ridge analysis often exhibits som e of the sam e pathologies it is intended to redress.


## 1. Introduction

G iven the full\{ rank m odely $=\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{w}$ th zero $\{\mathrm{m}$ ean, hom oscedastic, and uncorrelated errors, the ordinary least squares ( OLS ) estim ators $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ solve the k equations X \& $=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$
 cialchallenges, in that $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ often exhibits excessive length, in ated variances, instability, and other intrinsic di culties. $N$ oting these, $H$ oerl $(1962,1964)$ considered ad hoc solutions $b_{R}$ $=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}=\left(\mathrm{X} \mathrm{X}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)^{1} \mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y} ; \quad 0 \mathrm{~g}$ and noted their successful applications in chem ical engineering. A nalyses built around these have been labeled ridge regression in statistics, although Levenberg (1944) and R iley (1955) earlier posed such solutions in num ericalanalysis. N oting that OLS \does not have built into it a m ethod for portraying sensitivity of the solutions to the estim ation criterion," H oerl and K ennard (1970) sought mathem atical foundations beyond G auss's principle with its inherent lim itations. Speci cally, they asserted that $b_{R}$ are solutionsminim izing $Q()$ sub ject to the constraint $f^{0}=c^{2} g$ : 0 thers identify ridge regression instead with the constraints $f^{0} \quad c^{2} g$ of Balakrishnan (1963); how ever, H oerl and K ennard (1970), p. 64, speci cally relegate this to approaches other than ridge regression.

[^0]$R$ idge estim ators abound, based on estim ative, predictive, cross\{validative, and num erous other criteria, typically giving disparate choioes for : Even the early sim ulations ofD em pster, Schatzo , and W em uth (1977) identi ed 57 ridge and related shrinkage estim ators. An expository survey and num erical exam ples are provided in M yers (1990). In short, a considerable literature, spanning the past thirty \{ six years, rests on the foundations of H oerl and $K$ ennard (1970), ostensibly the $m$ athem atics of constrained optim ization, to rem edy defects of OLS in ill\{conditioned system $s$.

In fact, little of the collective literature known as ridge regression is consistent $w$ ith the constrained optim ization of H oerl and K ennard (1970), nor w ith corresponding inequality constraints. H ere the problem is traced to (i) a m isapplication of LaG range's principle, (ii) failure to identify singular distributions, and (iii) invalid links betw een the constraints and the ridge param eters. These errors are evident also in M arquardt (1970), M arquardt and Snee (1975), G olub, H eath and W ahba (1979), van N ostrand (1980), and elsew here throughout the literature. In consequence, $m$ uch that is know $n$ about ridge regression rests on a false prem ise. By analogy, H oerland K ennard (1970) considered generalized ridge regression as solving the modi ed equations ( X $\mathrm{X}+$ ) $=\mathrm{X}{ }^{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{Y}$; w ith nonnegative ridge param eters
$=D \operatorname{iag}(1 ;::: ; k): A$ s noted later, these solutions again are inconsistent w ith LaG range $m$ inim ization. In sum $m$ ary, not to denigrate its usefiulness in practice, the collective body of ridge regression rests on little $m$ ore than heuristics. To the contrary, aspects of ridge regression have proven useful enough, often enough, to deserve sound rationale for their im plem entation. In th is spirit we seek to supplant the $m$ issing foundations $w$ ith altematives based on conditioning of the linear system $X X=X{ }^{\circ} Y$. An outline follows.

Supporting developm ents com prise Section 2, to include notation and the basics of invariance and condition num bers. Section 3 reexam ines LaG range optim ization in linear inference. Section 4 develops supporting rationale for ridge regression as currently practioed, and an altemative approach using surrogate ridge m odels. A case study in Section 5 revisits an ill\{conditioned data set considered elsew here. Section 6 concludes w ith a brief sum $m$ ary.

## 2. Prelim inaries

2.1. $N$ otation. The symbols $R^{k}$ and $R_{+}^{k}$ designate Euclidean $k\{$ space and its positive orthant; $F_{n k}$ and $F_{n k}^{C}$ comprise the real and complex ( $n \quad k$ ) m atrices of rank $k \quad n$; and $S_{k}$ and $S_{k}^{+}$designate the real sym metric ( $k \quad k$ ) $m$ atrices and their positive de nite varieties. The transpose, inverse, trace, and detem inant of $A 2 F_{k k}$ are $A^{0} ; A^{1} ; \operatorname{tr}(\mathrm{A})$; and $j A j$ and $V$ is the conjugate transpose of $V 2 F_{n k}^{C}$ : G roups of note include $U(k)$ as the unitary ( $k \quad k$ ) matrices, and $O(k)$ as the real orthogonal group. Special arrays are the ( $\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{k}$ ) identity $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$; the unit vector $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}=[1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1]^{0} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{k}}$; and the diagonalm atrix $\mathrm{D}{ }_{\mathrm{a}}=$ $D$ iag $\left(a_{1} ;::: ; a_{k}\right): T$ hem apping $(X)=[1 ;::: ; k]^{0}$ takes $X 2 \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{nk}}^{\mathrm{C}}$ into its ordered singular values $f_{1}:: \quad k_{k}>0 g: T$ he singular decomposition is $X=U D V$; such that $D=$ $D \operatorname{iag}(\mathrm{D} ; 0)$ of order $(\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{k}) ; \mathrm{D}=\mathrm{D} \operatorname{iag}(1 ;::: ; \mathrm{k})$; U $2 \mathrm{U}(\mathrm{n})$; and $V 2 \mathrm{U}(\mathrm{k})$; where the

Colum ns of $U=\left[u_{1} ;::: ; u_{n}\right]$ and $V=\left[v_{1} ;::: ; V_{k}\right]$ comprise the leff $\{$ and right $\{$ singular vectors of $X$ : Equivalently write $X=U_{1} D V={ }_{i=1}^{k}{ }_{i} u_{i} V_{i} w$ ith $U_{1}=\left[u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right]$; and itsM oore $\left\{\right.$ P enrose inverse as $X^{Y}=V D^{Y} U \quad$; with $D^{y}=D \operatorname{iag}\left(D^{1}\right.$; 0) of order ( $k \quad n$ ): Speci cally, the realm odel $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X} \quad+\quad$ in canonical form becom es $Y=P \mathrm{D} \quad+\quad$; where $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{PD} \mathrm{Q}^{0}$ and $=\mathrm{Q}^{0}$ is an orthogonal reparam etrization. For $\mathrm{Y} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{n}}$ random, designate its $m$ ean vector, its dispersion and correlation $m$ atrioes as $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Y})=; \mathrm{V}(\mathrm{Y})=$; and $C(Y)=R$; and its law ofdistribution as $L(Y)$ :
22. Invariance and $C$ onditioning. A function ( ) on $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{n}}$ is called unitarily invariant if, for each $G 2 F_{n k}^{C}$ and any unitary $m$ atrices $U 2 U(n)$ and $V 2 U(k)$; it follows that
$(G)=(U G V): T h e n \quad(G)$ depends on $G$ only through its ordered singular values
$(G)=[1 ;::: ; k]^{0}:$ Let comprise the symmetric gauge functions on $R^{k}$ such that for each ( ) 2 ; (i) ( $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}} ;::: ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) is sym $m$ etric under the $2^{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{k}$ ! perm utations and re ections about the origin; (ii) (u) > 0 when $u \notin 0$; (iii) ( ) is hom ogeneous, i.e., (cu) = $\bar{c} j$ (u) forc 0 ; and (iv) ( $u+v$ ) (u) + (v): Let comprise the unitarily invariant $m$ atrix nom son $F_{n k}^{C}$; von $N$ eum ann (1937) dem onstrated that these are generated as $f k \quad k ; 2 g$
 with ( P ; Q) $2 \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n}) \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{k})$; see also Schatten (1970) and M arshall and $\mathrm{O} \mathbb{k}$ in (1979). In particular, the Frobenius norm on $F_{n k}$ is $\left.k X k_{F}=\operatorname{tr}(X X)\right]^{1=2}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}P \\ i=1 & 2 \\ i\end{array}\right)^{1=2}$ in term $s$ of the singular decom position $X=P D \quad Q^{0}$; w ith $k \quad k$ as the Euclidean norm on $k$ :

T wo types of conditioning are germ ane to the present study:
Type A C onditioning: Stability of the solution $z$ of the linear system $A z=b$; when the coe cients A $2 \mathrm{~F} k$ are subjected to sm allperturbations, is gauged by the condition num ber $C_{g}(A)=g(A) g\left(A^{1}\right)$; where $g()$ ordinarily is a norm. $T$ he system iswellconditioned at $A=$ $I_{k} w$ th $C_{g}\left(I_{k}\right)=1.0$, larger values re ecting greater ill-conditioning. Speci cally, $w$ ith $g(A)$ $=k A k$; then fc ( ); 2 g comprise the unitarily invariant Type A condition num bers, so that fc $(A)=k A k A^{1} k ; 2$ g; as treated in $M$ arshalland $O \mathbb{k}$ in (1979), H om and Johnson (1985), and elsew here. In particular, take $C_{1}(A)=1=k$ where f $\quad$ it: $\quad k g$ are the ordered eigenvalues of A:

Type B C onditioning: The concept of elasticities is invoked in Belsley, $K$ uh and $W$ elsch (1980) to link sensitivities of solutions, and of variances of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}=(\mathrm{Z} \mathrm{Z})^{1} \mathrm{Z}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; w ith disturbances in the data $m$ atrix $Z 2 F_{n k}$; as gauged by its condition number $C_{1}(Z)={ }_{1}=k$; $w$ th $(Z)=\left[1 ;::: ;_{k}\right]^{0}: H$ ere $Z$ is the result of scaling the colum ns of $X$ to have (approxin ately) equal lengths. M ore generally, the unitarily invariant condition num bers on $F_{n k}$ are $c(X)=(X)\left(X^{y}\right)$; w th $X^{y}$ as the $M$ oore $\{$ P enrose inverse. The system is well conditioned at $X=P I_{k} Q^{0}$; where $c\left(P I_{k} Q^{0}\right)=c\left(I_{k}\right)=1.0$, larger values re ecting greater ill-conditioning. In sum mary, Belsley et al. (1980) proceed to scale the colum ns of X ! Z to have approxim ately equal lengths, and to focus on $\mathrm{kZ} \mathrm{k}{ }_{1}=1$; so that $\mathrm{C}_{1}(Z)={ }_{1}={ }_{\mathrm{k}}$ :

## 3. The Principal Issues

3.1. LaG range's $M$ ethod. G iven di erentiable functions $f\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)$ and $g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)$ such that the gradient $\mathrm{r} g\left(\mathrm{u}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{k}}\right) \in$ on $\mathrm{G}_{0}=\mathrm{fu} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{k}}: \mathrm{g}(\mathrm{u})=0 \mathrm{~g}$; the problem is to $m$ inim ize $f\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)$ subject to the constraint $g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)=0 . W$ rite $L\left(u_{1} ;:: ; u_{k} ;\right)=$ $f\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)+\left[g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right) \quad 0\right]$ : It is necessary that gradient vectors in $R^{k}$ be parallel, i.e,

$$
\begin{equation*}
r f\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)=r g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right) ; \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

whereas

$$
\begin{equation*}
@ L\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k} ;\right)=@=\left[g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right) \quad 0\right] \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

recovers the constraint. LaG range's principle requires solving the $k+1$ equations, (3.1) and (32), in the $k+1$ unknowns fu $;:::: ; u_{k} ; ~ g: T o m$ inim ize $f\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right)$ sub ject to $g\left(u_{1} ;::: ; u_{k}\right) \quad 0$; de ne the Lagrangian $L(u ;)=f(u) \quad g(u):$ Stuezlell has given conditions for $u$ to be a solution, nam ely, (i) $g(u)$ ) (ii) $r_{u} L(u \quad$; ) $=0$; (iii) $g(u)=0$; and (iv) 0 :

For constrained least squares the ob jective function is now

$$
L\left(1 ;::: j_{k} ;\right)=Q()+\left(0 \quad c^{2}\right)
$$

w ith $Q()=(Y \quad X \quad)^{0}(Y \quad X \quad)$ as before. Corresponding to (3.1) and (3.2) are

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(X X+I_{k}\right)=X^{0} Y  \tag{3.3}\\
0=c^{2} \tag{3.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

to be solved for the $k+1$ unknowns ( $1 ;::: ; k ;)$ : Designate these as $f_{c}{ }_{c} ;{ }^{b} g$ such that $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}^{0} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{c}^{2}$; as apparently intended by H oerl and K ennard (1970). If instead $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{)}$ is to be $m$ inim ized subject to $f{ }^{0} \quad c^{2} g$; then the constrained solution $b_{0}$ satis es $b_{0}=b_{L}$ whenever $b_{L}^{0} b_{L}<c^{2}$; and otherw ise $\left(X \&+I_{k}\right)_{0}=X^{0} Y$ for some $>0$ such that $\mathrm{b}_{0}^{0} \mathrm{~b}_{0}=\mathrm{c}^{2}$; as shown in Balakrishnan (1963). See also the conditions (i) $\{$ (iv) of Stuezle (2005) as cited.
32. $R$ idge $R$ egression: A Survey. W e recall essentials of conventional ridge regression as set forth principally in $H$ oerland $K$ ennard (1970), M arquardt (1970), and M arquardt and Snee (1975). For continuity we retain their notation, with their fk;p;b;b corresponding to our $f ;{ }_{k} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{g}$ and, on occasion, $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{r}$ : A ccordingly, write the residual sum ofsquaresas $=\left(\begin{array}{llll}Y & X b\end{array}\right)^{0}\left(\begin{array}{lll}Y & X & b\end{array}\right)=m$ in $+(b)$; where $m$ in $=\left(\begin{array}{lll}Y & X & )^{0}\left(\begin{array}{lll}Y & X & b\end{array}\right), ~\end{array}\right.$ and $\quad(b)=(\mathrm{b} \quad \mathrm{b})^{0} \mathrm{X}$ \& ( $\left.\mathrm{b} \quad \mathrm{b}\right)$ :Various assertions have been set forth, as enum erated here for later reference.

A 1. H oerland $K$ ennard (1970), p. 57: $\backslash^{b}=\left[I_{p}+k(X X)^{1}\right]^{1 b}(2.3)^{*} . "$
A 2. Hoerl and Kennard (1970), pp. 58\{59: \The ridge trace can be shown to be follow ing a path through the sum $s$ of squares surface so that for a xed a single value for

[^1]b is chosen and that is the one w ith m in m al length." P recisely: $\backslash \mathrm{M}$ in im ize $\mathrm{b}^{0} \mathrm{~b}$ sub ject to
 is chosen to satisfy the restraint (32)*."

A 3. H oerl and $K$ ennard (1970), p. 59: \O f course, in practioe it is easier to choose a $\mathrm{k} \quad 0$ and then to com pute 0 : In term s of $b$ the residual sum of squares becom es (k) $=\left(\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{b}}\right)^{0}(\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{Xb})=\mathrm{m}$ in $+\mathrm{k}^{2 \mathrm{~b}}{ }^{0}(\mathrm{X} \text { X })^{1 \mathrm{~b}} \quad$ (3.6)*."

A 4. H oerl and K ennard (1970), p. 59: \A com pletely equivalent statem ent of the problem is this: If the squared length of the regression vectorb is xed at $R^{2}$; then $b$ is the value of $b$ that gives $a \min$ im um sum of squares. That is, $b$ is the value of $b$ that $m$ in im izes the function $F_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{llll}(Y & X\end{array}\right)^{0}(Y \quad X \quad b)+(1=k)\left(b \% \quad R^{2}\right)(3.7)^{\star} . "$

A 5. M arquardt and Snee (1975), p. 5: \If ${ }^{b}$ is the solution of $(X X+k I)^{b}=g$; then b $m$ in im izes the sum of squares of residuals on the sphere centered at the origin whose radius is the length of ${ }^{b}:$ " Here $g=X ~ X^{0} Y:$
3.3. P roperties of Solutions. W e next exam ine distributions of the constrained solutions $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}$; sub ject to $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}^{0} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{c}^{2}$; to continue the un nished w ork of oerland K ennard (1970), and of $b_{0}$ under inequality constraints. To these ends identify the sphere $S_{c}=f u 2 R^{k}: u u^{0}=c^{2} g$ and the open ball $B_{c}=f u 2 R^{k}: u^{0} u<c^{2} g$; both of radius $c$; and the complem ent $B_{c}^{c}=f u 2 R^{k}: u u^{c} C^{2} g: A$ ccordingly, let ( ) be the probability m easure on $k$ induced through $Y$ ! $b_{L}$; let $S_{c}()$ be the $m$ easure on $S \quad R^{k}$ induced through solutions $b_{c}$ of (3.3) and (3.4); and let $B_{c}()$ be the nonsingular measure on $B R^{k}$ induced through $L\left(b_{L} j b_{L}^{0} b_{L}<c^{2}\right)$ : Stochastic properties of $b_{c}$ and $b_{0}$ are given next.

Theorem 1. Let $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{k}}$ be the constrained solution satisfying (3.3) and (3.4), and let $\mathrm{b}_{0} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{m}$ inim ize $Q\left(1 ;::: ;{ }_{k}\right)$ subject to $\mathrm{f}^{0} \quad \mathrm{c}^{2} g ; \mathrm{w}$ ith $\mathrm{o}(\mathrm{l})$ as its probability $m$ easure on $R^{k}$ :
(i) The joint distribution $L\left(b_{c}\right)=F_{c}(b)$ corresponding to $S_{c}(\quad)$ is singular on $k$ of rank k 1:
(ii) The $m$ easure $o()$ for $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ adm its the $m$ ixture representation

$$
\begin{equation*}
0(A)=B_{c}(A)+\quad S_{c}(A) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $m$ ixing probabilities $=1 \quad 2(0 ; 1)$; such that
(iii) $B_{c}(A)=\left[\left(B_{C}\right)\right]^{1}{ }_{A}^{R} I_{B_{c}}(t) d$ ( $t$ ); where $I_{B_{c}}(t)$ is the indicator function; and
(iv) $=\left(B_{c}\right)$ :

Proof: C onclusion (i) is im m ediate, since $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{C}} 2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{k}}$ constructively lies on the sphere $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{C}}=$ $c^{2}:$ W e proceed by conditioning on the exclusive outcom es $b_{L} 2 B_{c}$ and $b_{L} 2 B_{c}^{c}: C$ learly $b_{0}$ takes the value $b_{L} w$ ith probability $=P\left(b_{L}^{0} b_{L}<C^{2}\right)=\left(B_{C}\right)$; where the conditionalm easure corresponding to $L\left(b_{L} j_{L} b_{L}^{0} b_{L}<C^{2}\right)$ is $B_{C}(A)=\left[\left(B_{C}\right)\right]^{1}{ }_{A}^{R} I_{B_{C}}(t) d$ (t); as asserted, to give conclusion (iii). Sim ilarly, $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ takes the value $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{w}$ ith probability $=1$ as in (iv), its conditionalm easure as in (i), to com plete our proof.

O bserve that the singular distribution $L\left({ }_{C}\right)$ of conclusion (i) $m$ ay be added to the list of distributions arising in the analysis of directional data, to include the von $M$ ises $\{F$ isher
distributions, for exam ple. For further reference see B atschelet (1981), F isher (1993), F isher, Lew is and Embleton (1993), Evans, H astings and P eacock (2000), and M ardia and Jupp (2000). C onclusion (ii) for $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ com plem ents the work of B alakrishnan (1963) in the context of linear estim ation. M oreover, under $G$ aussian errors, $=\left(B_{c}\right)$ derives from a weighted sum ofk independent noncentralchi\{squared random variables, each having a single degree of freedom ; see K otz, Johnson and B oyd (1967).
3.4. A $C$ ritique. $W$ e next reexam ine the critical assertions of Section 32.

A ssertion A 1: False. A s noted, the solution $b_{c}$ necessarily lies on the sphere $b_{c}{ }_{c} b_{c}=c^{2}$ and thus has a joint singular distribution in $R^{k}$ of rank $k \quad 1: T o$ the contrary, A ssertion A 1 im plies that b() has a nonsingular distribution for each 0 , yet b clearly refers to the constrained solution throughout Section 3 of H oerl and K ennard (1970). The assertion is false, applying to solutions of (3.3) only, as there is no one\{to \{one linear transform ation taking $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ onto the sphere $\mathrm{b}^{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{c}^{2}$ : In consequence, expression (3.6)* of H oerland K ennard (1970) is in error, as are its im plications, since the term $k^{2 b}{ }^{0}\left(X^{\&}\right)^{1} b$ derives from the inapplicable A ssertion A 1.

A ssertion A 2, and its dual A 4, appear to be essentially intact. The exception is that $\backslash 1=\mathrm{k} "$ in expression (3.7)* of H oerl and K ennard (1970) instead should be $\backslash \mathrm{k}$ :"

A ssertion A 5: False. This assertion arises as the dual to A 3, excluding (3.6)* of H oerl and $K$ ennard (1970). The basic idea is to solve (3.3) as ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathrm{l}$ ) for xed $>0$; and then to discover the im plied constraint $f^{0}=c^{2} g$ at (3.4) on evaluating $b 0 b=c^{2}: H$ owever, the solution ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathrm{l})$ need not m in m ize the residual sum of squares $S S()=[\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{b}()]^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ $\left.X^{b}()\right]$; as claim ed. This fallacy stem $s$ from the tacit but unfounded assum ption that and $c^{2}$ correspond one\{to \{one. To the contrary, it is dem onstrated in Section 5 that m ultiple solutionsm ay have the sam e length but di erent s , for exam ple, k b $\left(\mathrm{I}_{1}\right) \mathrm{k}=\mathrm{k}$ b ( 2 ) k w th $1<2$ : But then the solution $b(2)$ cannot be $m$ inim izing, $\operatorname{asS} S(2)>S S(1)$ from the $m$ onotonicity ofSS ( ): In this regard Figure 3 ofM arquardt and Snee (1975) is particularly $m$ isleading. A ssertions A 2, \for a xed a single value forb is chosen and that is the one $w$ th $m$ inim al length," and A 5, that $\backslash \mathrm{b} m$ inim izes the sum of squares of residuals on the sphere centered at the origin whose radius is the length of ${ }^{b} ;$ " often are $m$ isrepresented as equivalent assertions regarding solutions $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ of (3.3) alone. See van N ostrand (1980), for exam ple.

To continue, for xed c de ne the equivalence class

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (c) }=\mathrm{f} \quad: \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{b}} \text { ( ) } \mathrm{k}=\mathrm{cg} ; \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and let $c=m \inf$ (c)g: Then A ssertion A 5 m ay be corrected as follow s .
A ssertion $A 5^{*}$. If ${ }^{b}()$ is a solution of $(X \&+I)^{b}=X^{0} Y$ having length $k{ }^{\mathrm{b}}() k=c$; then $b\left({ }_{c}\right) m$ inim izes the sum of squares of residuals on the sphere centered at the origin whose radius is the length $c$ of ${ }^{b}$; where $c=m$ inf (c) $g$ :

A ssertion A $5^{*}$ has profound consequences in practice. O fthe $m$ any schem es devised for choosing the ridge param eter ; the user then $m$ ust exam ine the corresponding equivalence
class for each such : If it is a singleton set, then the solution thus attained is $m$ in in izing. O therw ise the algorithm A 5* m ust be im plem ented to attain the minim izing solution. Further details are provided in Section 5.3.

It is clear that $b_{c}$ is the LaG range solution $m$ inim izing $Q()$ subject to $f^{0}=c^{2} g:$ To the contrary, H oerl and K ennard (1970), M arquardt (1970), M arquardt and Snee (1975), G olub et al. (1979), and others concemed w ith constrained optim ization, instead take $b_{R}$ as the ridge estim ator, solving (3.3) alone for som e >0:Togetherw ith A ssertion A 5, th is is tantam ount to asserting that the $k$ linear equations (3.3) som ehow em body the constraint (3.4) as well, which they clearly cannot. Yet $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; not $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{C}}$; com prise the ridge estim ators on which essentially all of ridge regression now rests. A ssertion A 1 clearly holds for solutions $b_{R}$ satisfying (3.3) only.

C onfusion persists in the $m$ eaning of ridge regression. B unke (1975), Hocking (1976), and $T$ ibshirani (1996), for exam ple, assert that ridge regression em bodies the inequality constraint $f{ }^{0} \quad c^{2} g$; despite the disclaim er of $H$ oerl and $K$ ennard (1970). Yet now here do these authors acknow ledge the constrained solution $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ of Balakrishnan (1963), nor its properties as in Theorem 1, opting instead for the ridge solutions $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g of H oerl $(1962,1964)$. On the other hand, the inequality \{constrained solution $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ does have the nonsingularm ixture distribution of $T$ heorem 1. H ow ever, we are aw are of no work in ridge regression that explicitly accounts for the structure of either $\mathrm{b}_{c}$ or of $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ as in $T$ heorem 1 .

In short, ridge regression in its present form rests essentially on $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ through an accident of history. Indeed, expressions for variances and biases; solutions for purporting to $m$ in $\mathbf{m}$ ize expected $m$ ean squares; prediction, validation, and cross\{validation; and other aspects of ridge regression; all are predicated on A ssertion A 1. If instead either $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}$ or $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ were taken as starting points, as required under the aegis of constrained optim ization, then the ensuing \ridge regressions" would di er dram atically from the conventionalone based on $f_{R} b_{R}$; $0 g$; together w ith the criticalbut false A ssertion A 1, w ith $c^{2}$ now corresponding to :These di erences necessarily would include issues such as (i) the stability of the solutions $b_{c}$ or $b_{0}$ instead of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; in comparison $w$ ith $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$; (ii) the in ation of variances, taking into account actual variances to be derived from $T$ heorem 1 as reference; (iii) prediction using $\boxplus_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{C}}$ or $\oiint_{0}=X b_{0}$; instead of $\oiint_{\mathrm{R}}=X \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; (iv) the use, m eaning, and properties of cross\{ validative and predictive criteria based on $\uplus_{C}$ or $\oplus_{0}$; instead of $\Psi_{R}$; (v) ridge traces as $m$ odi ed to take into account $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ and singularity of the joint distribution of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}$; and (vi) the trade $\left\{0\right.$ betw een bias and variance of the constrained estim ators $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{c}}$ and $\mathrm{b}_{0}$; as determ ined using actual m om ents to be derived from T heorem 1. O ther di erences m ay be noted. All such properties would have to be established anew, com plicated considerably by the nonstandard distributions encountered in $T$ heorem 1.

By analogy, $H$ oerl and $K$ ennard (1970) further considered generalized ridge regression invoking the $k$ equations $(X X+)=X^{0} Y$; with $=D$ iag ( $1 ;::: ; k$ ) as nonnegative ridge param eters. N ote that this, too, cannot have resulted from LaG range $m$ inim ization: $G$ iven that $f_{1}^{2}=c_{1}^{2} ;::: ;{ }_{k}^{2}=c_{k}^{2} g$; the only function of the data now would be to determ ine
signs of the roots $\mathrm{f}_{1}=\mathrm{c}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{g}: 0 \mathrm{n}$ the other hand, if inequality constraints $\mathrm{f}_{1}^{2} \quad C_{1}^{2} ;::: ;{ }_{k}^{2} \quad C_{k}^{2} g$ are invoked instead, then correct solutions are provided by $M$ yoken and U chida (1977) akin to those ofBalakrishnan (1963) where $\mathrm{f}_{1}=\quad \overline{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{g}$ :

## 4. Foundations $V$ ia $C$ onditioning

W e seek substitutes for the failed principle of constrained optim ization as a basis for conventional ridge regression. In what follow $s$ we consider $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g as solutions to (3.3) alone as in H oerl $(1962,1964)$, w thout reference to constrained optim ization and discredited assertions thereto as noted. Type A conditioning of the linear system X \& $=\mathrm{X}{ }^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{Y}$ prom pts the modi cation ( X \& $+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) $=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; from the perspective of both num erical analysis (Levenberg (1944) and Riley (1955)) and of statistics (H oerl (1962, 1964)). A survey is provided subsequently. M oreover, the T ype B conditioning of $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X}+$ is also germ ane, since the conditioning of $X$ \& depends on that of $X$; and for further reasons to be cited. A new approach to ill conditioned system s , using surrogate ridge m odels, rests essentially on $T$ ype $B$ conditioning. D etails follow .
4.1. B ackground. Tlliconditioned $m$ odels typically arise from nonorthogonality ofcolum $n s$ of X : Let $\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{X}$ \& and $\mathrm{V}=(\mathrm{X} \&)^{1}:$ Since $\mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)={ }^{2} \mathrm{~V}$; the variance in ation factors
 of the actual variance to the \ideal" variance attained when collum ns ofX are orthogonal, so that $\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{D}$ iag $\left(\mathrm{w}_{11} ;::: ; \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{kk}}\right): 0$ ften $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{Z}+$ is taken w ith $\mathrm{Z} Z$ in Coorrelation form" having unit diagonal elem ents; then $\operatorname{fVIF}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}_{j}}\right)=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{j} j} ; 1 \quad \mathrm{j} \quad \mathrm{kg}$ are diagonal elem ents of $V=(Z Z)^{1}$ from the scale\{invariance of $V \mathbb{F} s$. $W$ ith $\mathrm{fV}_{1} \quad V_{2} \quad::: V_{k} g$ as the ordered diagonal elem ents of V ; M arquardt and Snee (1975) identify $\mathrm{V}_{1}$ to be \the best single $m$ easure of the conditioning of the data," thus a critical diagnostic tool. See also M arquardt (1970), Beaton, Rubin and Barone (1976), and D avies and Hutton (1975). A basic connection betw een V FF s and condition num bers is due to Berk (1977):

Lem $m$ a 1. $G$ iven $Z Z$ in correlation form, with $\mathrm{fv}_{1} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{2} \quad::: \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{g}$ as the ordered diagonal elem ents of $V=(Z Z)^{1}: T$ hen the condition number $C_{1}(Z Z)$ satis es

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{1} \quad c_{1}(Z Z) \quad k\left(V_{1}+\quad \text { t }\right) \mathrm{v} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since fc $(A)=C\left(A^{1}\right) ; 2$ gfrom Section 22, the $T$ ypeA condition num ber forz $Z=$ $Z^{{ }^{0} Y}$ is identical to $\left.c \mid\left(b_{L}\right)\right]$; so that Lem $m$ a 1 is really about dispersion param eters in the equivalent form

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\mathrm{v}_{1} & \mathrm{c}_{1}\left[\begin{array} { l } 
{ ( b _ { \mathrm { L } } ) ] }
\end{array} \mathrm { k } \left(\mathrm{~V}_{1}+\quad \text { k) } \mathrm{v}\right.\right. \tag{4}
\end{array}
$$

42. R idge $R$ egression. That $X$ \& ! ( $X$ \& $+I_{k}$ ) im proves conditioning has been cited by $M$ arshall and $O \mathbb{k}$ in (1979) as a justi cation for ridge regression. In brief, their $T$ heorem C 3, p. 273, asserts that for any ( $A$; B ) $2 S_{k}^{+}$such thatc ( $B$ ) C (A); with fc ( ); 2 g as in Section 22, then $c(A+B) \quad C(A): R$ iley (1955) showed that $B=I_{k}$ satis es the hypothesis of the theorem for any A $2 S_{k}^{+}$; where depends on num erical considerations.

This holds for any Type A conditioning of $A z=b!\left(A+I_{k}\right) z=b$ as in Section 22, and thus in particular for X \& $=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}!\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{X}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; as noted by M arshall and O $\mathbb{k}$ in (1979), p. 273, to give Type A conditioning as a basis for ridge regression. M oreover, using condition numbers $c_{1}()$; the im provem ent is seen directly on comparing $c(X \&)$
 properties of $b_{L}$ and $b_{R}$ are sum $m$ arized in Table 1, along $w$ ith the surrogate estim ator, $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{s}}$; to be de ned subsequently.

Table 1. Properties of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{b}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ;_{\mathrm{P}^{S}}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{g}$ under G auss $\{\mathrm{M}$ arkov assum ptions, where $X=P D \operatorname{iag}\left(\frac{P}{{ }_{1}^{2}+} ;::: ;{ }^{P} \frac{{ }_{k}^{2}+}{}\right) Q^{0}$ and $A=\left(X Q+I_{k}\right)$ :

| E stim ator | De nition | E (b) | V (b) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\text {L }}$ | $(\mathrm{X} \mathrm{X})^{1} \mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ |  | ${ }^{2}\left(\mathrm{X} \mathrm{X}^{\text {X }}\right)^{1}$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $A^{1} \mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{1} \mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{X}$ | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A}^{1} \mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{XAA}{ }^{1}$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | A ${ }^{1} \mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ | A ${ }^{1} \mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{X}$ | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A}$ |

4.3. Surrogate M odels. N onetheless, the correspondence $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{z}=\mathrm{b} \quad!\quad \mathrm{X}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ is incom plete in the context of linear inference, since both $A=X \&$ and $b=X{ }^{0} Y$ are sub ject to disturbances in X : T his has not been taken into account. In particular, ridge solutions satisfying ( X $\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) $=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; despite im proved conditioning on the left, still are sub ject to the ill\{conditioning of $X$ on the right. To correct this oversight, we invoke Type B conditioning from Section 2.2 on observing that $X \&!\left(X X+I_{k}\right)$ is tantam ount to $m$ odifying $X$ itself as a $m$ eans to enhanced conditioning. In particular, begin $w$ th the
 that ( $\mathrm{X}{ }^{\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) $=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{X}$; and note that ridge regression entails $\mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ : Instead, we take $Y=X \quad+\quad$ as an approxim ation, or surrogate, for the $i l l\{$ conditioned $m$ odel $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X}+$ itself, as in the follow ing.

D e n ition 1. G iven an ill\{conditioned m odel $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X} \quad+$; its ridge surrogate is a modi ed m odel $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X} \quad+\quad$ :The surrogate estim ator $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$; solving $\mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{X} \quad=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; is OLS for the surrogate m odel.

To continue, the order of approxim ation of $X$ for $X ~ m$ ay be gauged by the Frobenius distance

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{kX} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{F}}=\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{k}}} \quad \mathrm{i} \frac{\mathrm{i}}{{ }_{i}^{2}+} \quad 2^{\#_{1=2}} ; \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

from the unitary invariance of $k$ $k$ : M oreover, the conditioning of $\mathrm{X}{ }^{0} \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{X}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$ now $m$ ay be gauged through Type B conditioning as in Section 22 . For later reference, basic properties of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{S}}$; 0 g are sum m arized in Table 1 . It rem ains to com pare properties of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}: \mathrm{D}$ irect com parisons are som ew hat obscure; how ever, these becom e m ore transparent on invoking canonical form $s$ to be considered next.
4.4. C anon ical Form s . The singular decom position $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{PD} \mathrm{Q}^{0}$; with $\mathrm{P} P=I_{\mathrm{k}}$; together with the orthogonal reparam etrization $=Q^{0}$; gives $Y=X+!Y=$ PD $Q^{0}+!U=P^{0} Y=D \quad+P^{0}$; such that $E\left(P^{0}\right)=0$ and $V\left(P^{0}\right)={ }^{2} P{ }^{0} I_{n} P$ $={ }^{2} I_{k}$ under $G$ auss $\{\mathrm{M}$ arkov assum ptions regarding the errors of $Y=X+: A$ ccord ingly, $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{U})=\mathrm{D}$ and $V(\mathrm{U})={ }^{2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ : In canonicalform it follow sthat $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}=\left(\mathrm{D}^{2}\right)^{1} \mathrm{D} \quad \mathrm{U}=$ $D^{1} U ; E\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)=$; and $V\left(P_{\mathrm{L}}\right)={ }^{2} \mathrm{D}{ }^{2}$ underOLS, as given in Table 2. Sim ilar expressions for the canonical ridge estim ators $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g ; and the canonical surrogate ridge estim ators
 for all three estim ators, Table 1 follows directly from Table 2, and conversely. M oreover, issues regarding the conditioning of $f \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}$; as linear data transform ations, and conditioning of the corresponding dispersion $m$ atrioes $\mathrm{fV}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}\right) ; \mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right) ; \mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right) \mathrm{g}$; are considered subsequently. These can be established directly in term $s$ of those of $f_{L} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}$; since Q is orthogonal and condition num bers here are unitarily invariant.

Table 2. Properties of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}$ under standard G auss $\{\mathrm{M}$ arkov assumptions, where $U=P^{0} Y$ and $D\left(!_{i}\right)=D \operatorname{iag}\left(!_{1} ;::: ;!_{k}\right)$ :

| Estim ator | De nition | E (b) | v P) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | D ${ }^{1} \mathrm{U}$ |  | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{D}$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | D ( $\left.i_{i}=\left({ }_{i}^{2}+\right)\right) U$ | D ( $\left.{ }_{i}^{2}=\left(\begin{array}{l}2 \\ i\end{array}+\right)\right)$ | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{D}\left({ }_{i}^{2}=\left({ }_{i}^{2}+\right)^{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$ |  | D ( $i_{i}=\binom{$ P }{$i_{i}+}$ | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{D}\left(1=\left({ }_{i}^{2}+\right)\right)$ |

Speci cally, in canonical form we have $D \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{U}$; so that the Type B condition num ber $C_{1}(X)=C_{1}(D \quad)={ }_{1}={ }_{k}$ properly gauges the sensitivity of the solution $b_{L}$ to disturbances in X : Sim ilarly, with $\mathrm{D}=\mathrm{D} \operatorname{iag}\left(\left(\begin{array}{c}2 \\ 1\end{array}+\right)={ }_{1}^{2} ;::: ;\binom{2}{k}={ }_{k}^{2}\right)$; observe from $D \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{U}$ that its condition num ber gauges sensitivity of the solution $b_{R}$; and thus of $b_{R}=Q b_{R}$ to perturbations in $X$; from the orthogonality of $Q: T$ his underscores the central role of $T$ ype B conditioning from Section 22, as set forth in Belsley et al. (1970).
4.5. C entral Issues. Several issues, to be exam ined em pirically in Section 5, appear to be open questions not addressed in the volum inous literature on ridge regression. Intrinsic di culties w ith O LS include (i) nonorthogonality of the colum ns ofX ; as re ected in c (X ) and c (X X ); (ii) instability of solutions linked to the conditioning of the data transform ation $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{Y})=(\mathrm{X} \text { X })^{1} X^{0} \mathrm{Y}$; considered as a function of Y ; and (iii) pathologies in dispersion param eters as re ected in VIFs and the ill\{conditioning of V ( $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ ): M oreover, at som e level the conditioning of $E\left(b_{R}\right)=T()$ becom es an issue in transform ing the param eter space, as in assessing the trade-o betw een variance and bias. A s ridge regression seeks rem edies, it is pertinent to ask how well the ridge solutions progress tow ards those ends. Regarding item (i), the apparent \correlations" in $W=X \&$; nam ely $f w_{i j}={ }^{p} \overline{W_{i i} W_{j j}} g$; are taken into $f w_{i j}=\overline{\left(w_{i i}+\right)\left(w_{j j}+\quad\right)} g$ as elem ents of $\left(X X+I_{k}\right): T$ hese in tum decrease in $m$ agnitude
w ith increasing : N onetheless, ridge solutions them selves are sub ject to nonorthogonality, together w ith attendant di culties regarding stability, V IF s, and conditioning of their dispersion $m$ atrioes. Im proving stability of the solutions thus hinges on the conditioning of $b_{R}(Y)$ when considered as a data transform ation. M oreover, the capacity to am eliorate dispersion problem sof $O$ LS hinges on im proving $V I F s$ and condition num bers for $V\left(b_{R}\right)$ : O $n$ the other hand, it is widely know $n$ that $b_{R}$ shrinks stochastically tow ards the origin, as do its $m$ ean and dispersion $m$ atrix, $w$ ith increasing. These issues in tum prom pt several questions to be considered subsequently.

Q 1: D oes it follow that stability of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{Y})$ necessarily im proves w ith increasing ?
Q 2: G iven that $V\left(b_{R}\right)={ }^{2}\left(X X+I_{k}\right)^{1} X X\left(X X+I_{k}\right)^{1}$; does it follow that condition numbers $c_{1} N\left(b_{R}\right)$ ] decrease $w$ ith increasing ?
Q 3: W ith regard to variance in ation, does it follow that VIF $s$ for elem ents of $b_{R}$ decrease w ith increasing ?
Q 4: V iew ing $E\left(b_{R}\right)=T()$ as a transform ation on the space of param eters, does it follow that its conditioning im proves w ith increasing ?

For com pleteness, observe that the foregoing issues pertain not only to the ridge estim ators $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; $\quad 0 \mathrm{~g}$ them selves, but also to other biased solutions to include $\mathrm{fb}_{\mathrm{S}}$; 0 g .
$W$ e next undertake a com parative study of properties of ridge and surrogate ridge solutions, to be continued in the case studies of Section 5 .
4.6. Som e C om parisons. Regarding the conventional $f_{R} b_{R} \quad 0 g$ and surrogate ridge $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{S}}$; 0 g estim ators, both shrink stochastically tow ards the origin w th increasing ; as do their $m$ eans and variances, and sim ilarly for $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g and $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{S}}$; 0 g : Speci cally, for a given ; it is seen from $T$ able 2 that $\mathrm{b}_{S}$ achieves lesser shrinkage, both in expectation and varianœ, than $b_{R}$ :

C ondition num bers for various arrays are given in Table 3 for the canonical estim ators $\mathrm{f}^{\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}: T$ hese arrays include (i) coe cients de ning $\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{U}) \mathrm{w}$ th reference to stability of the solutions; (ii) coe cients de ning the param eter transform ations E ( b ) $=\mathrm{T}$ ( ) ; and (iii) the dispersion $m$ atrix $V(b)$ : Entries in $T a b l e 3$ follow directly from $T a b l e 2$ and the de nition of $C_{1}()$; on recalling that elem ents ofD $=D$ iag ( $1 ;::: ;{ }_{k}$ ) are ordered as $f_{1}$
:: : $\quad \mathrm{k}>0 \mathrm{~g}:$ O bserve, $m$ oreover, that the row s of $T$ able 3 m ay be identi ed equivalently as $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}$; and the colum ns as $\left.\left.\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{C}_{1}} \mathrm{~b}(\mathrm{Y})\right] ; \mathrm{C}_{1}[\mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{r})] ; \mathrm{c}_{1} \mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{~b})\right] g ;$ respectively. T his follow S since $=Q \quad ; \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{b}} ;$ and $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{P})=\mathrm{Q} V(\mathrm{~B}) \mathrm{Q}^{0} ; \mathrm{Q}$ is orthogonal, and the condition num bers are unitarily invariant.
$N$ ote further that $c_{1}\left[D_{L}(Y)\right]=c_{1}(X)$ and $\left.c_{1} N\left(b_{L}\right)\right]=c_{1}(X X)$; whereas $c_{1}\left[b_{S}(Y)\right]$ $=c_{1}(X)$ and $c_{1}\left[V\left(b_{S}\right)\right]=c_{1}\left(X^{0} X\right)$; as both are $O L S$ in their respective $m$ odels. $M$ oreover, both condition num bers, $\left.c_{1} b_{S}(Y)\right]=\left(P_{1}^{p} \overline{1}_{2}^{p} \frac{}{k_{k}^{2}+}\right)$; and its square $c_{1}\left[\left(b_{S}\right)\right]$; decrease $m$ onotonically $w$ ith increasing ; thus assuring im proved conditioning for the surrogate estim ators. C ondition num bers associated $w$ ith $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; and thus w ith $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; are more convoluted and will be exam ined further in Section 5.

Table 3. C ondition num bers fordata transform ations ${ }^{\text {b }}$ (U); forparam eter transform ations $E(b)=T()$; and for $V(p)$; for each of $f \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{g}$ :

| Estim ator | $\mathrm{C}_{1}{ }^{\text {b }}$ (U) ] | q [T ( ) ] | q $N(b)]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | 1 | 1.00 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ |  |  | $\frac{m \operatorname{maxf}_{i}^{2}=\left({ }_{i}^{2}+\right)^{2} g}{m \min f_{i}^{2}=(i}$ |
| $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $p \frac{\frac{{ }_{1}^{2}+}{2+}}{2+}$ |  | $\frac{2_{1}^{2}+}{\frac{1}{k}_{k}^{2}+}$ |

## 5. C ase Studies

5.1. T he D ata. W e reexam ine the $H$ ospital M anpow er $D$ ata as reported in $M$ yers (1990). Records at $n=17$ U.S. $N$ aval Hospitals include: $Y: M$ onthly $m$ an $\left\{\right.$ hours; $X_{1}: A$ verage daily patient load; $\mathrm{X}_{2}: \mathrm{M}$ onthly X \{ray exposures; $\mathrm{X}_{3}: \mathrm{M}$ onthly occupied bed days; $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ : Eligible population in the area 1000; and $X_{5}$ : A verage length of patients' stay in days. $T$ he basic $m$ odel is

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{i}=0+{ }_{1} X_{1}+{ }_{2} X_{2}+{ }_{3} X_{3}+{ }_{4} X_{4}+{ }_{5} X_{5}+{ }_{i} ; 1 \text { i } n: \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Follow ing H oerland $K$ ennard (1970), M arquardt (1970), M arquardt and Snee (1975), M yers (1990), and others, we center and scale the model, so that $Y=Z+w$ ith $Z \mathrm{Z}$ in correlation form, the central focus being the rates of change $\left.=\left[{ }_{1} ; ~{ }_{2} ; ~ 3 ; ~{ }_{4} ; ~\right]_{5}\right]^{0}: T$ he data are given in Table 3.8,pp. 132 \{133, ofM yers (1990), and com putations w ere donem ostly using PROC $\mathbb{I}$ L of the SAS P rogramm ing System. The data are exceedingly ill\{conditioned: E lem ents ofD are $D=D \operatorname{iag}(2: 048687 ; 0: 816997 ; 0: 307625 ; 0: 201771 ; 0: 007347) ; C_{1}(Z$ Z $)$ $=77,754.86$; the $m$ axim alVIF in OLS estim ation is $V_{1}=\operatorname{VF}\left(b_{1}\right)=9,595.685$; and other V IF s appear subsequently in Table 8 at $=0$ :
52. C hoices for . W idely diverse criteria have evolved in the choice for ; w ith profound consequences regarding ridge estim ators, ridge predictors, and their properties. F ive criteria in com $m$ on usage are reported in Table 4, together $w$ ith de nitions and their values as determ ined for the $H$ ospital $M$ anpower D ata. These include DF $=\operatorname{tr}(\mathrm{H})$ with $H=$ [Z (Z Z $\left.+I_{k}\right)^{1} Z^{0}$ ]; the cross\{validation PRESS statistic of Alen (1974); a rotation $\{$ invariant version called $G$ eneralized C ross Validation (GCV) by G olub et al. (1979); C as a deviœe for varianœe\{bias trade\{o as in M allows (1973); and HKB as recommended by H oerl, K ennard and B aldw in (1975) based on sim ulation studies. A s listed in Table 4, $S S_{R e s ;}$ is the residual sum of squares using ridge regression; $b^{2}$ is the OLS residualm ean square; and $\mathrm{fe}_{(i ;)}^{2}, g$ are the PRESS residuals for ridge regression. Further details are given in M yers (1990), pp. $392\{411$, including num ericalvahes forDF ; C ; and PRESS as reported in Table 4. Further choices include 2 f0:01;0:03;0:05;0:07;0:09g and others to be noted subsequently.

Table 4. Choices for in the $H$ ospital $M$ anpower $D$ ata corresponding to conventional criteria DF ; GCV ; C ; PRESS ; and HKB :

| Name | De nition | Value for |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DF | $\operatorname{tr}\left(\begin{array}{ll} H & ) \end{array}{ }^{P} \underset{i=1}{k} \frac{2}{i}\right.$ | 0.0004 |
| GCV | $\left.\left.\frac{\mathrm{SS}}{\mathrm{Res} ;} \mathrm{m}^{(1+\operatorname{tr}(\mathrm{H}}\right) \mathrm{)}\right]^{2}$ | 0.004787 |
| C | $\left[\frac{S_{\text {Res }}}{\sim 2} \mathrm{n}+2+2 \operatorname{tr}(\mathrm{H})\right]$ | 0.0050 |
| PRESS | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{e}_{(\mathrm{i} ;)}^{2}$ | 02300 |
| H K B |  | 0.616964 |

5.3. M in im izing Solutions. O ften a de nitive value for the constraint $f{ }^{0}=c^{2} g$ is not apparent in a particular study. This m otivates the dual A ssertions A 3 and A 5 of Section 32: (i) choose ; (ii) solve (3.3) for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; (iii) evaluate the im plied constraint at (3.4) as $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}^{0} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{c}^{2}$; and (iv) assert as in A 5 that the solution so attained $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ inim izes the sum of squares of residuals on the sphere centered at the origin whose radius is the length" of $b_{R}$ : W e have claim ed that A ssertion A 5 is false. Evidence is provided in Table 5, where lengths

Table 5. Lengths of $b_{R}$; and square roots of residual sum $s$ of squares $R()=\left[\left(\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{Y} & \mathrm{Z} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\end{array}\right)^{0}\left(\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{R}} \quad\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right.$; for designated values of :

|  | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ | 394.67 | 137.82 | 33.14 | 31.50 | 70.02 | 99.19 | 122.10 | 140.73 |
| R() | 2129.53 | 2474.87 | 2735.75 | 2914.38 | 3057.54 | 3184.84 | 3305.00 | 3422.13 |
|  | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.48 | 0.56 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.68 |
| $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ | 15625 | 169.40 | 180.69 | 199.00 | 213.09 | 218.93 | 224.11 | 228.70 |
| R() | 3538.22 | 3654.22 | 3770.58 | 4004.70 | 424027 | 4358.28 | 4476.26 | 4594.06 |
|  | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}}^{\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}} \mathrm{k}$ | 232.79 | 236.42 | 239.65 | 242.53 | 245.08 | 247.34 | 249.33 | 251.09 |
| R() | 4711.56 | 4828.65 | 4945.23 | 5061.20 | 5176.49 | 5291.03 | 5404.77 | 5517.64 |

$k_{R} b_{R}$; and square roots $R()=\left[\left(Y \quad Z b_{R}\right)^{0}\left(Y \quad Z b_{R} \quad\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$; are reported as ranges system atically over $[0 ; 1]$ : R ecall that this range is stipulated by $H$ oerl and $K$ ennard (1970) and others when $Z \mathrm{Z}$ is in \correlation form." H ere $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\left[\mathrm{b}_{1} ; \mathrm{b}_{2} ; \mathrm{b}_{3} ; \mathrm{b}_{4} ; \mathrm{b}_{5}\right]^{0}$ consists of rates of change; sim ilar trends are exhibited when is expanded to include the intercept. It is seen that $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ initially decreases to a m inim um, then increases beyond $=1.0$, but eventually decreases to zero since $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ is a shrinkage estim ator.

G reaterdetailis seen on recalling from Section 4.4 that $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; that Q is orthogonal; and thus, letting $g_{R}()=k_{R} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}^{2}$; that $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{I})=\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{I}$ : The canonical form of Section
4.4 assures that $g_{R}()=P_{i=1}^{k} U_{i}^{2} \underset{i}{2}=\binom{2}{i}^{2}: T$ his is di erentiable; its derivative is
and its path traces evolution of the derivative as varies. In particular, at $=0$ we have $\left[g_{R}()=@\right]=0=2^{P}{ }_{i=1}^{k} U_{i}^{2}={ }_{i}^{4}$ : This is precipitous for the $H$ ospital $M$ anpow er $D$ ata in view of the fact that ${ }_{k}={ }_{5}=0.007347$.

A detailed local view is provided in Table 6, to inchude not only $k b_{R} k$ and $R()$; but also the ridge estim ates $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}=\left[\mathrm{b}_{1} ; \mathrm{b}_{2} ; \mathrm{b}_{3} ; \mathrm{b}_{4} ; \mathrm{b}_{5}\right]^{0}$ in row s corresponding to various choioes for : Values of $b_{R}$ for $2 f 0: 08 ; 0: 11 ; 0: 12 \mathrm{~g}$ are as in Table 8.9 of M yers (1990), who

Table 6. R idge estim ators $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; lengths of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; and square roots R()$=$ $\left[\left(\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{Y} & \mathrm{Z} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\end{array}\right)^{0}\left(\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ of residual sum S of squares, for designated values of :

|  | $\mathrm{b}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~b}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~b}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~b}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~b}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ | R() |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.08 | 10.6354 | 0.065428 | 0.359139 | 6.3206 | -30.7471 | 33.1448 | 2735.75 |
| 0.08095 | 10.6118 | 0.065432 | 0.358279 | 6.3674 | -28.9649 | 31.5000 | 2740.68 |
| 0.08797 | 10.4475 | 0.065444 | 0.352298 | 6.6903 | -16.4728 | 20.6250 | 2775.83 |
| 0.0981 | 102378 | 0.065414 | 0.344681 | 7.0942 | -0.3156 | 12.4645 | 2823.03 |
| 0.09829 | 10.2342 | 0.065413 | 0.344548 | 7.1012 | -0.0308 | 12.4615 | 2823.89 |
| 0.0983 | 10.2340 | 0.065413 | 0.344541 | 7.1015 | -0.0159 | 12.4615 | 2823.93 |
| 0.11 | 10.0248 | 0.065325 | 0.336955 | 7.4935 | 16.3900 | 20.6251 | 2874.22 |
| 0.12 | 9.8679 | 0.065217 | 0.331280 | 7.7785 | 28.8834 | 31.5000 | 2914.38 |

reports ridge estim ates for $2[0 ; 0.24]$ by increm ents of 0.01 . It is seen that $k_{R} b_{R} k$ takes its m inim um value, 12.46150, at m in $=0.09829$. To continue, designate $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ as $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}()$ : It is seen that $b_{R}(0: 12)$ and $b_{R}(0: 08095)$ have the sam e length, nam ely, $k b_{R}(0: 12) k=$ $31.500=k b_{R}(0: 08095) k$; so that $(31: 500)=f 0: 08095 ; 0: 12 \mathrm{~g}$ in the notation of (3.6). Suppose a user chooses $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}(0: 12)$ as the ridge estim ate for the $H$ ospital $M$ anpower D ata. Then $b_{R}(0: 12)$ is not the $m$ in im izing solution of length 31.500 ; this is seen from $R(0: 12)=$ $2914: 38>2740: 68=R(0: 08095):$ Sim ilarly, it is clear that $(20: 625)=f 0: 08797 ; 0: 11 \mathrm{~g}$ as in (3.6), and that $b_{R}(0: 11)$ of Table 6 is not $m$ inim izing, to be supplanted instead by $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}(0: 08797)$ from Table 6. A continuum offurther exam ples can be constructed by re ecting asym $m$ etrically about $m$ in $=0.09829$, the sm aller of each pair corresponding to the $m$ inim izing solution. These clearly constitute counterexam ples to A ssertion A 5 .
$N$ ot only are de nitive values for the constraint $f^{0}=c^{2} g$ not evident beforehand, but profound and heretofore undiscovered lim its pertain to adm issible values for in order that solutions of given length $c$ be $m$ inim izing. To $x$ ideas, suppose in equation (3.4) that $\operatorname{fg}_{R}(0: 00)>c^{2} \quad c^{2} \quad g_{R}(0: 09829)=12: 46150^{2}=155: 2877 \mathrm{~g}: T$ Then the only feasible values for are those in the interval [min $\left.\underset{R}{{ }_{R}^{1}}\left(c^{2}\right) ; 0: 09829\right]$ : For exam ple, if $33: 14481^{2}=$

1098:5784 $c^{2} \quad 155: 2877$; then from Table 6 the feasible values are $2 \quad[0: 08 ; 0: 09829]:$ For $\mathrm{fg}_{\mathrm{R}}(0: 00) \quad \mathrm{C}^{2} \quad \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{R}}(0: 09829) \mathrm{g}$; the feasible values are $2[0: 00 ; 0: 09829]: T$ hese are the only feasible values for $2[0 ; 1]: O n$ the other hand, choosing $f 0<c^{2}<g_{R}(0: 09829)=$ $155: 2877 \mathrm{~g}$ requires in the interval $\left(\mathrm{m}\right.$ in $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{R}}{ }^{1}\left(\mathrm{c}^{2}\right) ; 1$ ); where $m$ in $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{R}}{ }^{1}(155: 2877)>158:$ For exam ple, if $c^{2}<100$; then the feasible values are $2(198 ; 1)$ : As these are far outside the recom $m$ ended interval $[0 ; 1]$; constraints $c^{2} 2(0 ; 155: 2877) \mathrm{m}$ ust be declared to be inadm issible. Values reported for $f 0<c^{2}<g_{R}(0: 09829)=155: 2877 \mathrm{~g}$ are supported by the $M$ aple softw are package. Values reported for PRESS and HKB in Table 4 are thus inadm issible in view of A ssertion A 5*.

In short, im bedded in the H ospital M anpower D ata are the hidden feasible constraints $f^{0}=c^{2} g$ w th $c^{2} \quad 155: 2877$ : These could not have been discemed beforehand short of the foregoing detailed analyses.

To sum $m$ arize, origins of the anom aly exhibited here $m$ ay be traced as follow $s$ : (i) $T$ he ridge trace of $\mathrm{b}_{5}()$ exhibits a dow $n$-up \{down character, beginning w ith $\mathrm{b}_{5}(0: 00)=$ -394.3280 , decreasing to zero betw een $=0.09$ and $=0.10$, and increasing thereafter to $\mathrm{b}_{5}(1: 00)=250.8307$ and beyond, and eventually decreasing to zero through shrinkage. (ii) $j \mathrm{j}_{5}(\mathrm{)}$ jdom inates other estim ates by orders of $m$ agnitude ranging from one to four exœpt near its $m$ in im um. (iii) $O$ ther estim ates exhibit relatively narrow ranges in com parison $w$ ith $\mathrm{b}_{5}()$ as varies over $[0 ; 1]$ : (iv) In consequence, $\mathrm{k} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ is largely determ ined by $\left[\mathrm{b}_{5}(\mathrm{t})\right]^{2}$ as varies. F inally note that (c) from (3.6) takes on tw $\circ$ values in the cases exam ined, from the down \{up \{down character of $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{k}$ as evolves. It is clear in other circum stances that
(c ) $m$ ay consist of three or $m$ ore elem ents. For exam ple, a single dom inant estim ate $m$ ay exhibit m ultiple sign changes, whereas estim ates for other coe cients $m$ ay have one or m ore sign changes as well. These and related $m$ atters are studied in Zhang and M CD onald (2005), and references cited therein, under special structure of $Z Z$ in correlation form. P roperties, to include sign changes, crossings, and rates\{of\{ change of individual ridge estim ates, as w ell as bounds on the num ber of sign changes, are determ ined by those authors on identifying zeros and derivatives of polynom ials in of degree k 1 ; under special structure as cited.
$T$ hese facts alone challenge the $m$ eaning of num erous sim ulation studies purporting to com pare altemative criteria for choosing ; when all such choices have ignored the m in m izing constraints on :Thus aggregates of minim izing/non \{minim izing values are com pared w th other such aggregates, to the e ect of total obfiuscation.

W etum next to properties of ridge and surrogate ridge solutions, to include condition num bers and other diagnostics. Com putations for the condition num bers proceed as in Table 3, based on equivalence betw een conditioning for ${ }^{b}$ and the canonical estim ators $b$; as noted in Section 4.6.
5.4. P roperties of $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ and $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$. In summary, the ridge solutions to ( $\mathrm{Z} \mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) $=\mathrm{Z}^{0} \mathrm{Y}$
 tions to $Z^{0} Z=Z^{0} Y$ account for ill\{conditioning on the right as well. It thus is germ ane to compare $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{S}}$; $\quad 0 \mathrm{gw}$ th $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; $\quad 0 \mathrm{~g}$ using the data at hand. W e next exam ine critical
issues from Section 4.5, applicable both to ridge and to surrogate ridge solutions. Table 7 lists condition num bers and other quantities a liated with $f \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g and $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{f}$; 0 g ; under values for as listed. Question 1 of Section 4.5 is negated for $b_{R}$ : Stability of

Table 7. Condition num bers for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{Y}) ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mathrm{Y}) ; \mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)$; and $\mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)$; the $m$ axim alV IF $s V_{M}\left(b_{R}\right)$ and $V_{M}\left(b_{S}\right)$; and the Frobenius distance $D_{Z}(Z)$
$=k Z \quad Z \quad k_{\text {F }}$; under various choiges for :

|  | $\mathrm{C}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{M}}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)$ | $\left.\mathrm{C}_{1} \mathrm{~V}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)\right]$ | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{M}}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ | $\left.\mathrm{C}_{1} \mathrm{~V}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)\right]$ | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{Z}}(\mathrm{Z})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.0004 | 33.1584 | 96.1565 | 141.5345 | 1099.4770 | 1146.399 | 9246.064 | 0.0140 |
| 0.004787 | 9.0957 | 29.4630 | 10.9688 | 82.7319 | 112.6300 | 868.0653 | 0.0638 |
| 0.005 | 9.0537 | 28.8348 | 10.8874 | 81.9695 | 108.0918 | 831.4473 | 0.0654 |
| 0.010 | 8.1707 | 20.4561 | 9.2481 | 66.7610 | 56.6915 | 418.4530 | 0.0974 |
| 0.030 | 11.6724 | 11.8596 | 21.2905 | 1362440 | 21.2197 | 140.6508 | 0.1847 |
| 0.050 | 15.1539 | 9.2114 | 34.0995 | 229.6392 | 13.6552 | 84.8507 | 0.2511 |
| 0.070 | 17.8166 | 7.8046 | 42.5990 | 317.4320 | 102639 | 60.9119 | 0.3083 |
| 0.090 | 20.4222 | 6.8997 | 51.7827 | 417.0673 | 8.3166 | 47.6061 | 0.3598 |
| 0.230 | 29.6720 | 4.3868 | 100.5675 | 880.4276 | 3.9338 | 19.2438 | 0.6429 |
| 0.616964 | 53.4183 | 2.7932 | 250.4309 | 2853.5130 | 2.0374 | 7.8022 | 1.1769 |
| 1.000 | 66.6915 | 2.2797 | 451.5788 | 4447.7550 | 1.5976 | 5.1968 | 1.5745 |

the solutions $b_{R}$; as gauged by $c_{1}\left[b_{R}(Y)\right]$ initially improves but then erodes. Further com putations show that $\left.C_{1} \bigotimes_{R}(Y)\right]$ takes its m in m al value, 7.4463, at $=0: 015$; and increases thereafter. In contrast, despite higher beginning values than $\left.c_{1}{ }_{[ }{ }_{R}(Y)\right]$; the condition num bers $c_{1}\left[b_{S}(Y)\right]$ for surrogate estim ators decrease $m$ onotonically $w$ ith increasing ; the trends $c_{1}\left[b_{R}(Y)\right]=11.7723=c_{1}\left[{ }_{S}(Y)\right]$ crossing at $=0.03045$.
Q uestions 2 and 3 of Section 4.5 are refuted for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}} \quad: \mathrm{C}$ om putations interpolating those of Table 7 show that $\left.C_{1} V\left(b_{R}\right)\right]$ tem porarily decreases over $2[0 ; 0: 015]$; where its $m$ in $m$ um is 55.4470 , but it increases thereafter. Sim ilarly, the $m$ axim alV IF $s$ for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ initially decrease and then increase. By com parison, both the condition num bers $\left.c_{1} V\left(b_{S}\right)\right]$; and them axim al $V$ IF $s$ for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$; decrease w ith increasing : A though in itially larger, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{M}}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ approxim ates $V_{M}\left(b_{R}\right)$ at $=0: 030$; and the ratio $V_{M}\left(b_{R}\right)=V_{M}\left(b_{S}\right)$ increases $m$ arkedly thereafter.

Recall that the surrogate $Y=Z \quad+\quad$ is intended as an approxim ation to $Y=Z \quad+\quad$ : The order of approxim ation, as gauged by the Frobenius distance (4.3), is tabulated as the nal colum n of Table 7. Relative changes, given by kZ Z $\quad k_{\text {F }}=k Z k_{\text {F }}$; are 0.1123 at $=0: 05$; ranging up to 0.5263 at $=0: 616964$; where the denom inator is $\mathrm{k} \mathrm{Z} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{F}}=$ 2236068.

Further details are given in Tables 8 and 9, from which several entries of Table 7 are drawn. Table 8 exam ines the evolution of VIFs, and conditioning of the correlation $m$ atrices, for $b_{R}$ as varies. Values for $c_{1}\left[C\left(b_{R}\right)\right]$ are included, as Lem malapplies in each case. It is found that $c_{1}\left[C\left(b_{R}\right)\right]$ achieves its $m$ in $m$ um, 61.4449, at $=0.0173$. In all

Table 8. Variance in ation factors for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$; and condition numbers for $C\left(b_{R}\right)$ and $T()=E\left(b_{R}\right)$; for designated values of :

|  | VIF1 | VIF 2 | VIF3 | VIF 4 | VIF5 | $\mathrm{C}_{1}\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)\right]$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}[\mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{)}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.000 | 9595.68 | 7.9406 | 8931.449 | 23.2887 | 42794 | 54756.83 | 1.0000 |
| 0.0004 | 141.5345 | 7.8481 | 133.0221 | 13.0512 | 3.3997 | 576.8409 | 8.4095 |
| 0.004787 | 7.1604 | 7.1682 | 7.8840 | 10.9688 | 3.0128 | 90.13222 | 89.5726 |
| 0.005 | 7.1047 | 7.1379 | 7.8349 | 10.8874 | 2.9972 | 89.50392 | 93.5175 |
| 0.010 | 8.0001 | 6.4919 | 8.8456 | 9.2481 | 2.6830 | 75.66936 | 185.8150 |
| 0.030 | 19.7743 | 4.7268 | 21.2905 | 5.6339 | 2.0003 | 109.4703 | 552.8219 |
| 0.050 | 32.0013 | 3.6885 | 34.0995 | 4.0168 | 1.6988 | 177.2545 | 916.3722 |
| 0.070 | 42.5990 | 3.0187 | 45.0695 | 3.1473 | 1.5363 | 227.9178 | 1276.515 |
| 0.090 | 51.7827 | 2.5598 | 54.4589 | 2.6269 | 1.4377 | 267.3171 | 1633.297 |
| 0.230 | 100.5675 | 1.3868 | 102.4723 | 1.6364 | 12446 | 441.9639 | 4040.511 |
| 0.616964 | 250.4309 | 1.0879 | 243.2535 | 1.8791 | 1.3541 | 1047.931 | 9965.795 |
| 1.000 | 451.5788 | 12184 | 430.5957 | 2.4738 | 1.5386 | 2174.418 | 14961.96 |

Table 9. Variance in ation factors for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$; and condition numbers for $C\left(b_{s}\right)$ and $V\left(b_{S}\right)$; for designated values of :

|  | $\mathrm{V} \mathbb{F} 1$ | VIF 2 | $\mathrm{~V} \mathbb{F} 3$ | $\mathrm{~V} \mathbb{F} 4$ | VIF 5 | $\mathrm{C}_{1}\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)\right]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.000 | 9595.68 | 7.9406 | 8931.449 | 23.2887 | 4.2794 | 54756.83 |
| 0.0004 | 1146.399 | 7.8846 | 1068211 | 14.2203 | 3.5089 | 5091.248 |
| 0.004787 | 112.6300 | 7.5308 | 106.0234 | 12.0987 | 3.2190 | 458.9380 |
| 0.005 | 108.0918 | 7.5147 | 101.7946 | 12.0488 | 3.2099 | 440.5738 |
| 0.010 | 56.6915 | 7.1607 | 53.8459 | 11.0379 | 3.0219 | 233.7461 |
| 0.030 | 21.2197 | 6.0737 | 20.5412 | 8.4506 | 2.5374 | 93.1862 |
| 0.050 | 13.6552 | 5.3181 | 13.3380 | 6.9511 | 2.2606 | 63.4167 |
| 0.070 | 10.2639 | 4.7584 | 10.0777 | 5.9605 | 2.0792 | 48.8365 |
| 0.090 | 8.3166 | 4.3258 | 8.1934 | 5.2538 | 1.9500 | 39.9124 |
| 0.230 | 3.9338 | 2.8218 | 3.9092 | 3.1133 | 1.5493 | 17.9102 |
| 0.616964 | 2.0374 | 1.7669 | 2.0330 | 1.8380 | 1.2710 | 7.5371 |
| 1.000 | 1.5976 | 1.4635 | 1.5957 | 1.4981 | 1.1781 | 5.0614 |

instances each V IF initially decreases, then increases, but values of at which the changes occur di er across the ve estim ators. If we view $E\left(b_{R}\right)=T()$ as a transform ation on the param eter space, $Q$ uestion 4 of Section 4.5 asks whether its conditioning im proves $w$ ith increasing : To the contrary, the last colum n of Table 8 shows that condition num bers increase explosively with increasing : From Table 3 it is clear that corresponding condition num bers for $E\left(b_{S}\right)=T()$ are square roots of those listed in $T$ able 8 for $b_{R}$ :

Sim ilar entries in Table 9 give the evolution of VIF $s$ and $C_{1}\left[C\left(b_{S}\right)\right]$ for $b_{S}$ :
A noted departure from $T a b l e 8$ is that the $m$ axim alVIF is $V_{M}\left(b_{S}\right)=V \mathbb{F}\left(b_{1}\right)$ for all cases, independently of : Further com putations show that the crossing $C_{1}\left[C\left(b_{R}\right)\right]=$ $99.56217=C_{1}\left[C\left(b_{S}\right)\right]$ occurs at $=0.02750$.

## 6. Conclusions

Little of the considerable literature on ridge regression is found to be consistent $w$ ith the optim ization of $H$ oerland $K$ ennard (1970) under equality constraints $f^{b} b^{0} b=c^{2} g$; and under the inequality constraints $f^{b} b^{0} b \quad c^{2} g$ of $B$ alakrishnan (1963), despite pervasive claim $s$ to the contrary.

The problem is traced to (i) a m isapplication of LaG range's principle; (ii) the false claim that the constrained solutions have nonsingular distributions, corresponding one\{to\{one w ith $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{L}}$; and (iii) the im plied but incorrect assertion that the ridge param eter corresponds one\{to\{onew ith $c^{2}$; and thus the false claim that the solution $b_{R}$ of $\left(X \&+I_{k}\right)=X^{0} Y$ $m$ in im izes the residual sum of squares am ong estim ators of length $b_{R}^{0} b_{R}=c^{2}$ : O ur Theorem 1 supplies the $m$ issing distributions appropriate to constrained $m$ in im ization. G eneralized ridge regression, seen as solving the equations $(X X+)=X{ }^{0} Y$ with nonnegative ridge param eters $=D$ iag ( $1 ;::: ; k$ ) ; is also shown to be inconsistent w ith LaG range $m$ in im ization.

LaG range optim ization having failed as a rational foundation for conventional ridge regression, altematives based on conditioning are developed in Section 4. Lim itations in Type A conditioning, on which a justi cation for $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ rests, prompt the introduction of surrogate ridge solutions, $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$; to account for ill\{conditioning of X on both sides of the OLS equations, $X \quad X \quad=X^{0} Y$ : Extensive num erical studies, as reported in Section 5, reexam ine the H ospital M anpow er D ata in a m anner com plem entary to the conventional analyses undertaken in M yers (1990). It is dem onstrated that none of the conditionings of $b_{R} \quad(Y)$; $E\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)=\mathrm{T}()$; and $V\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)$; nor the variance in ation factors, as critical properties of the ridge estim ators $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{R}}$; 0 g ; is enhanced m onotonically on increasing : In contrast, for the surrogate solutions $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{S}}$; all (except T ( )) of these are uniform ly enhanced as evolves. It is seen that $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{R}}$ is better w th in a narrow range for sm all; but its $V$ IF $s$ and condition num bers often becom e excessive w ith in the range of often recom $m$ ended in practice. In short, ridge regression often exhibits som e of the very pathologies it is intended to redress.

In sum $m$ ary, there is a vast and expanding com pendium on the so \{called theory, $m$ ethodology, and sim ulation studies surrounding ridge regression. If indeed constrained optim ization is to be pivotal, then the bulk of these studies $w$ ill have to be rew orked to take into account the nonstandard distributions of Section 3.3, as well as constraints for the ridge param eter to be m inim izing, as docum ented in Sections 3.4 and 5.3. It is rem arkable that this eld of applied engineering has thrived for so long, despite critical false assertions and a dearth of sustaining foundation principles.
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