Re: independent variables − ln

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006−12/msg00139.html

- *From*: "Reef Fish" <large_nassua_grouper@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 4 Dec 2006 15:42:35 −0800

J W wrote:

> rastompk@xxxxxxxxx
> wrote:
>
> > Hi there,
> > If x1,...,xn
> > are random
> > independent
> > variables,
> > it is true
> > that
> > ln(x1),...,ln(xn)
> > are also
> > independent?
>
> I substituted "independent random variables" for "random independent
> variables" in the above, in which case I believe my response is correct.

As we'll see, your language is still ambiguous. You were correct in the sense you later stated, but incorrect in another sense which I'll explain and illustrate.

> I thought that QUESTION wss so infantile
> that was not worth
> even a one line comment, such as:
>
> What is the meaning of your "independent"
> in
> "random indepdent variables"?

> I would argue that *all* serious questions, no matter how trivial, are
> worthy of a reply. The question posed seemed plain enough to me,

Therein lies my QUESTION and COMMENT in my reply

RF> What is the meaning of your "independent" in
RF> "random indepdent variables"?

which is both serious and non−facetious, in view of recent discusions
of the meaning of "independent variables" in a regression (the lr
in the subject).

a