

Re: transformation of regressors to remove collinearity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2008-03/msg00088.html>

- *From:* sangdonlee@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Tue, 11 Mar 2008 07:42:43 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 11, 10:08 am, papu <prac...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Actually because of model governance rules we are required to use a certain minimum number of variables. The VIFs need to be less than 3 and correlation coefficient should be less than 0.7. I have some predictors that have correlation coefficient 0.75 or so..they are not highly correlated but not desirable either..

If I were you, I would do the following (to make the long story short)

1. The first way (possibly the best in my opinion) is to combine/delete the correlated variables based on previous results or theory. For example, the track width and wheelbase of a vehicle can be combined into planview. (planview=trackwidth*wheelbase). This approach may result in a model with very few predictors.

Hence I thought why not separate the correlated and uncorrelated parts between the predictors using geometric decomposition or projections and use those transformation as predictors. This way the collinearity is zero. But the question remains how to decompose these predictors and will the predictive power of the transformed predictors remain the same as a group.– Hide quoted text –

2. Apply PCA (principal component analysis) and then PCR (principal component regression) or PLS (partial least square). All of them are geometric projections/decomposition of the predictors. They are "mere" mathematical transformation of predictors and they provide correlational structure among predictors (hopely).

By the way, if your data are from observational studies (not from "controlled" experiments where the predictors are orthogonal, samples

Re: transformation of regressors to remove collinearity

are balanced, confounding variables are controlled), the interpretation should be very careful (almost futile in my experience). As you already know, prediction and interpretation are completely separate issues.

Hope this helps.

Sangdon Lee, Ph.D.,
GM Tech. Center