Chapter 1

Model Diagnostics

Contents

In statistical modelling, the process of model validation is a critical step, but also a step that is too often overlooked. A very simple procedure is to remark upon commonly encountered metrics, such as the R^2 value. However, using a small handful of simple measures and methods is insufficient to properly assess the quality of a fitted model. To do so properly, a full and comprehensive analysis that tests of all of the assumptions, as far as possible, must be carried out.

Residual analysis is a widely used model validation technique. A residual is simply the difference between an observed value and the corresponding fitted value, as predicted by the model. The rationale is that, if the model is properly fitted to the model, then the residuals would approximate the random errors that one should expect. that is to say, if the residuals behave randomly, with no discernible trend, the model has fitted the data well. If some sort of non-random trend is evident in the model, then the model can be considered to be poorly fitted. Statistical software environments, such as the R Programming language, provides a suite of tests and graphical procedure sfor appraising a fitted linear model, with several of these procedures analysing the model residuals.

Other considerations in model fitting must also be addressed. The question of whether or not a point should be considered an outlier. An Outlier is an observation whose true value is unusual given its value on the predictor variables. The question of leverage must also be addressed. Leverage describes an observation with an extreme value on a predictor variable is a point with high leverage. Leverage is a measure of how far an independent variable deviates from its mean. High leverage points can have a great amount of effect on the estimate of regression coefficients.

Influence can be thought of as the product of leverage and outlierness. An observation is said to be influential if removing the observation substantially changes the estimate of the regression coefficients.

The R programming language has a variety of methods used to study each of the aspects for a linear model.

Cook's distance

In the study of Linear Model Diagnostics, Cook proposed a measure that combines the information of leverage and residual of the observation, now known simply as the Cook's Distance. **?** have adapted this measure for the analysis of LME models.

Assumption of Normality

As with fitted models, the assumption of normality of residuals and homogeneity of variance is applicable to LMEs also.

Homoscedascity is the technical term to describe the variance of the residuals being constant across the range of predicted values. Heteroscedascity is the converse scenario : the variance differs along the range of values.

while Linear Models and GLMS can be studied with a wide range of diagnsotc technqiues, the choice of methodology is much more restricted for the case of LMEs.

? extend several regression diagnostic techniques commonly used in linear regression, such as leverage, infinitesimal influence, case deletion diagnostics, Cook's distance, and local influence to the linear mixed-effects model. In each case, the proposed new measure has a direct interpretation in terms of the effects on a parameter of interest, and collapses to the familiar linear regression measure when there are no random effects. The new measures are explicitly defined functions and do not necessitate re-estimation of the model, especially for cluster deletion diagnostics. The basis for both the cluster deletion diagnostics and Cook's distance is a generalization of Miller's simple update formula for case deletion for linear models. Pregibon's infinitesimal case deletion diagnostics is adapted to the linear mixed-effects model. A simple compact matrix formula is derived to assess the local influence of the fixed-effects regression coefficients.

1.1 Measures of Influence

The impact of an observation on a regression fitting can be determined by the difference between the estimated regression coefficient of a model with all observations and the estimated coefficient when the particular observation is deleted. The measure DFBETA is the studentized value of this difference.

Influence arises at two stages of the LME model. Firstly when V is estimated by $\hat{V}$, and subsequent estimations of the fixed and random regression coefficients β and u, given $\hat{V}$.

1.1.1 DFFITS

DFFITS is a statistical measured designed to a show how influential an observation is in a statistical model. It is closely related to the studentized residual.

$$DFFITS = \frac{\widehat{y_i} - \widehat{y_{i(k)}}}{s_{(k)}\sqrt{h_{ii}}}$$

1.1.2 PRESS

The prediction residual sum of squares (PRESS) is an value associated with this calculation. When fitting linear models, PRESS can be used as a criterion for model selection, with smaller values indicating better model fits.

$$PRESS = \sum(y - y^{(k)})^2 \tag{1.1}$$

- $e_{-Q} = y_Q - x_Q\hat{\beta}^{-Q}$

- $PRESS_{(U)} = y_i - x\hat{\beta}_{(U)}$

1.1.3 DFBETA

$$\begin{aligned} DFBETA_a &= \hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{(a)} & (1.2) \\ &= B(Y - Y_{\bar{a}} & (1.3) \end{aligned}$$

1.2 Covariance Parameters

The unknown variance elements are referred to as the covariance parameters and collected in the vector θ.

1.2.1 Case Deletion Diagnostics

Since the pioneering work of Cook in 1977, deletion measures have been applied to many statistical models for identifying influential observations.

Case-deletion diagnostics provide a useful tool for identifying influential observations and outliers.

The computation of case deletion diagnostics in the classical model is made simple by the fact that estimates of β and σ^2, which exclude the ith observation, can be computed without re-fitting the model. Such update formulas are available in the mixed model only if you assume that the covariance parameters are not affected by the removal of the observation in question. This is rarely a reasonable assumption.

1.3 Terminology for Case Deletion diagnostics

Preisser (1996) describes two type of diagnostics. When the set consists of only one observation, the type is called 'observation-diagnostics'. For multiple observations, Preisser describes the diagnostics as 'cluster-deletion' diagnostics.

1.3.1 Cook's Distance

Cooks Distance (D_i) is an overall measure of the combined impact of the ith case of all estimated regression coefficients. It uses the same structure for measuring the combined impact of the differences in the estimated regression coefficients when the kth case is deleted. $D_{(k)}$ can be calculated without fitting a new regression coefficient each time an observation is deleted.

Cook (1977) greatly expanded the study of residuals and influence measures. Cook's key observation was the effects of deleting each observation in turn could be computed without undue additional computational expense. Consequently deletion diagnostics have become an integral part of assessing linear models.

Cook's Distance is a well known diagnostic technique used in classical linear models, extended to LME models. For LME models, two formulations exist; a Cook's distance that examines the change in fixed fixed parameter estimates, and another that examines the change in random effects parameter estimates. The outcome of either Cook's distance is a scaled change in either β or θ.

1.3.2 Cooks's Distance

Cook's D statistics (i.e. colloquially Cook's Distance) is a measure of the influence of observations in subset U on a vector of parameter estimates (Cook, 1977).

$$\delta_{(U)} = \hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{(U)}$$

If V is known, Cook's D can be calibrated according to a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the rank of $\boldsymbol{X}$ (?).

1.3.3 Cook's Distance

In classical linear regression, a commonly used meausre of influence is Cook's distance. It is used as a measure of influence on the regression coefficients.

For linear mixed effects models, Cook's distance can be extended to model influence diagnostics by definining.

$$C_{\beta i} = \frac{(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{[i]})^T (\boldsymbol{X}' \boldsymbol{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{X})(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{[i]})}{p}$$

It is also desirable to measure the influence of the case deletions on the covariance matrix of $\hat{\beta}$.

1.4 Cook's Distance

1.4.1 Cook's Distance

Cooks Distance (D_i) is an overall measure of the combined impact of the ith case of all estimated regression coefficients. It uses the same structure for measuring the combined impact of the differences in the estimated regression coefficients when the kth case is deleted. $D_{(k)}$ can be calculated without fitting a new regression coefficient each time an observation is deleted.

Cook (1977) greatly expanded the study of residuals and influence measures. Cook's key observation was the effects of deleting each observation in turn could be computed without undue additional computational expense. Consequently deletion diagnostics have become an integral part of assessing linear models.

Cook's Distance is a well known diagnostic technique used in classical linear models, extended to LME models. For LME models, two formulations exist; a Cook's distance that examines the change in fixed fixed parameter estimates, and another that examines the change in random effects parameter estimates. The outcome of either Cook's distance is a scaled change in either β or θ.

1.4.2 Cooks's Distance

Cook's D statistics (i.e. colloquially Cook's Distance) is a measure of the influence of observations in subset U on a vector of parameter estimates (Cook, 1977).

$$\delta_{(U)} = \hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{(U)}$$

If V is known, Cook's D can be calibrated according to a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the rank of $\boldsymbol{X}$ (?).

1.4.3 Cook's Distance

In classical linear regression, a commonly used meausre of influence is Cook's distance. It is used as a measure of influence on the regression coefficients.

For linear mixed effects models, Cook's distance can be extended to model influence diagnostics by definining.

$$C_{\beta i} = \frac{(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{[i]})^T (\boldsymbol{X'V^{-1}X})(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{[i]})}{p}$$

It is also desirable to measure the influence of the case deletions on the covariance matrix of $\hat{\beta}$.

1.5 Effects on fitted and predicted values

$$\hat{e}_{i(U)} = y_i - x\hat{\beta}_{(U)} \tag{1.4}$$

1.5.1 Methods and Measures

The key to making deletion diagnostics useable is the development of efficient computational formulas, allowing one to obtain the case deletion diagnostics by making use of basic building blocks, computed only once for the full model.

Zewotir and Galpin (2005) lists several established methods of analyzing influence in LME models. These methods include

- Cook's distance for LME models,

- likelihood distance,

- the variance (information) ration,

- the Cook-Weisberg statistic,

- the Andrews-Prebigon statistic.

1.6   Case Deletion Diagnostics for LME models

? notes the case deletion diagnostics techniques have not been applied to linear mixed effects models and seeks to develop methodologies in that respect.

? develops these techniques in the context of REML.

Christensen et al. (1992) develops case deletion diagnostics, in particular the equivalent of Cook's distance, for diagnosing influential observations when estimating the fixed effect parameters and variance components. Deletion diagnostics provide a means of assessing the influence of an observation (or groups of observations) on inference on the estimated parameters of LME models.

Data from single individuals, or a small group of subjects may influence non-linear mixed effects model selection. Diagnostics routinely applied in model building may identify such individuals, but these methods are not specifically designed for that purpose and are, therefore, not optimal. We describe two likelihood-based diagnostics for identifying individuals that can influence the choice between two competing models.

1.7 Influence analysis for LME Models

Likelihood based estimation methods, such as ML and REML, are sensitive to unusual observations. Influence diagnostics are formal techniques that assess the influence of observations on parameter estimates for β and θ. A common technique is to refit the model with an observation or group of observations omitted.

West et al. (2007) examines a group of methods that examine various aspects of influence diagnostics for LME models. For overall influence, the most common approaches are the 'likelihood distance' and the 'restricted likelihood distance'.

1.7.1 Cook's 1986 paper on Local Influence

Cook 1986 introduced methods for local influence assessment. These methods provide a powerful tool for examining perturbations in the assumption of a model, particularly the effects of local perturbations of parameters of observations.

The local-influence approach to influence assessment is quite different from the case deletion approach, comparisons are of interest.

1.7.2 Overall Influence

An overall influence statistic measures the change in the objective function being minimized. For example, in OLS regression, the residual sums of squares serves that purpose. In linear mixed models fit by maximum likelihood (ML) or restricted maximum likelihood (REML), an overall influence measure is the likelihood distance [Cook and Weisberg].

1.8   Cook's Distance for LMEs

Diagnostic methods for fixed effects are generally analogues of methods used in classical linear models. Diagnostic methods for variance components are based on 'one-step' methods. Cook (1986) gives a completely general method for assessing the influence of local departures from assumptions in statistical models.

For fixed effects parameter estimates in LME models, the Cook's distance can be extended to measure influence on these fixed effects.

$$\mathrm{CD}_i(\beta) = \frac{(c_{ii} - r_{ii}) \times t_i^2}{r_{ii} \times p}$$

For random effect estimates, the Cook's distance is

$$\mathrm{CD}_i(b) = g\prime_{(i)}(I_r + \mathrm{var}(\hat{b})D)^{-2}\mathrm{var}(\hat{b})g_{(i)}.$$

Large values for Cook's distance indicate observations for special attention.

1.8.1   Change in the precision of estimates

The effect on the precision of estimates is separate from the effect on the point estimates. Data points that have a small Cook's distance, for example, can still greatly affect hypothesis tests and confidence intervals, if their influence on the precision of the estimates is large.

1.9 Iterative and non-iterative influence analysis

Schabenberger (2004) highlights some of the issue regarding implementing mixed model diagnostics.

A measure of total influence requires updates of all model parameters.

however, this doesnt increase the procedures execution time by the same degree.

1.9.1 Iterative Influence Analysis

For linear models, the implementation of influence analysis is straightforward. However, for LME models, the process is more complex. Update formulas for the fixed effects are available only when the covariance parameters are assumed to be known. A measure of total influence requires updates of all model parameters. This can only be achieved in general is by omitting observations, then refitting the model.

Schabenberger (2004) describes the choice between iterative influence analysis and non-iterative influence analysis.

1.10 Matrix Notation for Case Deletion

1.10.1 Case deletion notation

For notational simplicity, $\boldsymbol{A}(i)$ denotes an $n \times m$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ with the i-th row removed, a_i denotes the i-th row of $\boldsymbol{A}$, and a_{ij} denotes the $(i, j)-$th element of $\boldsymbol{A}$.

1.10.2 Partitioning Matrices

Without loss of generality, matrices can be partitioned as if the $i-$th omitted observation is the first row; i.e. $i = 1$.

Chapter 2

Zewotir's Paper

2.1 Efficient Updating Theorem

Zewotir and Galpin (2005) describes the basic theorem of efficient updating.

-

$$m_i = \frac{1}{c_{ii}}$$

2.2 Zewotir Measures of Influence in LME Models

Zewotir and Galpin (2005) describes a number of approaches to model diagnostics, investigating each of the following;

- Variance components

- Fixed effects parameters

- Prediction of the response variable and of random effects

- likelihood function

2.2.1 Cook's Distance for LMEs

- For variance components γ: $CD(\gamma)_i$,

- For fixed effect parameters β: $CD(\beta)_i$,

- For random effect parameters $\boldsymbol{u}$: $CD(u)_i$,

- For linear functions of $\hat{beta}$: $CD(\psi)_i$

Random Effects

A large value for $CD(u)_i$ indicates that the $i-$th observation is influential in predicting random effects.

linear functions

$CD(\psi)_i$ does not have to be calculated unless $CD(\beta)_i$ is large.

2.2.2 Information Ratio

2.3   Computation and Notation

with $\boldsymbol{V}$ unknown, a standard practice for estimating $\boldsymbol{X\beta}$ is the estime the variance components σ_j^2, compute an estimate for $\boldsymbol{V}$ and then compute the projector matrix A,
$$\boldsymbol{X\hat{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{AY}.$$

Zewotir and Galpin (2005) remarks that $\boldsymbol{D}$ is a block diagonal with the $i-$th block being $u\boldsymbol{I}$

2.4 Measures 2

2.4.1 Cook's Distance

- For variance components γ

Diagnostic tool for variance components

$$C_{\theta i} = ((\hat{\theta})_{[i]} - \hat{(\theta)})^T \text{cov}(\hat{(\theta)})^{-1}((\hat{\theta})_{[i]} - \hat{(\theta)})$$

2.4.2 Variance Ratio

- For fixed effect parameters β.

2.4.3 Cook-Weisberg statistic

- For fixed effect parameters β.

2.4.4 Andrews-Pregibon statistic

- For fixed effect parameters β.

The Andrews-Pregibon statistic AP_i is a measure of influence based on the volume of the confidence ellipsoid. The larger this statistic is for observation i, the stronger the influence that observation will have on the model fit.

2.5 Haslett's Analysis

For fixed effect linear models with correlated error structure Haslett (1999) showed that the effects on the fixed effects estimate of deleting each observation in turn could be cheaply computed from the fixed effects model predicted residuals.

2.5.1 Influence Diagnostics: Basic Idea and Statistics

The general idea of quantifying the influence of one or more observations relies on computing parameter estimates based on all data points, removing the cases in question from the data, refitting the model, and computing statistics based on the change between full-data and reduced-data estimation.

2.5.2 Influence Analysis for LME Models

The linear mixed effects model is a useful methodology for fitting a wide range of models. However, linear mixed effects models are known to be sensitive to outliers. Christensen et al. (1992) advises that identification of outliers is necessary before conclusions may be drawn from the fitted model.

Standard statistical packages concentrate on calculating and testing parameter estimates without considering the diagnostics of the model.The assessment of the effects of perturbations in data, on the outcome of the analysis, is known as statistical influence analysis. Influence analysis examines the robustness of the model. Influence analysis methodologies have been used extensively in classical linear models, and provided the basis for methodologies for use with LME models. Computationally inexpensive diagnostics tools have been developed to examine the issue of influence (Zewotir and Galpin, 2005). Studentized residuals, error contrast matrices and the inverse of the response variance covariance matrix are regular components of these tools.

2.5.3 Influence Statistics for LME models

Influence statistics can be coarsely grouped by the aspect of estimation that is their primary target:

- overall measures compare changes in objective functions: (restricted) likelihood distance (Cook and Weisberg 1982, Ch. 5.2)

- influence on parameter estimates: Cook's (Cook 1977, 1979), MDFFITS (Belsley, Kuh, and Welsch 1980, p. 32)

- influence on precision of estimates: CovRatio and CovTrace

- influence on fitted and predicted values: PRESS residual, PRESS statistic (Allen 1974), DFFITS (Belsley, Kuh, and Welsch 1980, p. 15)

- outlier properties: internally and externally studentized residuals, leverage

2.5.4 What is Influence

Broadly defined, influence is understood as the ability of a single or multiple data points, through their presence or absence in the data, to alter important aspects of the analysis, yield qualitatively different inferences, or violate assumptions of the statistical model. The goal of influence analysis is not primarily to mark data points for deletion so that a better model fit can be achieved for the reduced data, although this might be a result of influence analysis (Schabenberger, 2004).

2.5.5 Quantifying Influence

The basic procedure for quantifying influence is simple as follows:

- Fit the model to the data and obtain estimates of all parameters.

- Remove one or more data points from the analysis and compute updated estimates of model parameters.

- Based on full- and reduced-data estimates, contrast quantities of interest to determine how the absence of the observations changes the analysis.

Cook (1986) introduces powerful tools for local-influence assessment and examining perturbations in the assumptions of a model. In particular the effect of local perturbations of parameters or observations are examined.

2.6 Extension of techniques to LME Models

Model diagnostic techniques, well established for classical models, have since been adapted for use with linear mixed effects models.Diagnostic techniques for LME models are inevitably more difficult to implement, due to the increased complexity.

Beckman, Nachtsheim and Cook (1987) **?** applied the local influence method of Cook (1986) to the analysis of the linear mixed model.

While the concept of influence analysis is straightforward, implementation in mixed models is more complex. Update formulae for fixed effects models are available only when the covariance parameters are assumed to be known.

If the global measure suggests that the points in U are influential, the nature of that influence should be determined. In particular, the points in U can affect the following

- the estimates of fixed effects,

- the estimates of the precision of the fixed effects,

- the estimates of the covariance parameters,

- the estimates of the precision of the covariance parameters,

- fitted and predicted values.

Chapter 3

Application to Method Comparison Studies

3.1 Application to MCS

Let $\hat{\beta}$ denote the least square estimate of β based upon the full set of observations, and let $\hat{\beta}^{(k)}$ denoted the estimate with the kth case excluded.

3.2 Grubbs' Data

For the Grubbs data the $\hat{\beta}$ estimated are $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ respectively. Leaving the fourth case out, i.e. $k = 4$ the corresponding estimates are $\hat{\beta}_0^{-4}$ and $\hat{\beta}_1^{-4}$

$$Y^{-Q} = \hat{\beta}^{-Q} X^{-Q} \tag{3.1}$$

When considering the regression of case-wise differences and averages, we write $D^{-Q} = \hat{\beta}^{-Q} A^{-Q}$

	F	C	D	A
1	793.80	794.60	-0.80	794.20
2	793.10	793.90	-0.80	793.50
3	792.40	793.20	-0.80	792.80
4	794.00	794.00	0.00	794.00
5	791.40	792.20	-0.80	791.80
6	792.40	793.10	-0.70	792.75
7	791.70	792.40	-0.70	792.05
8	792.30	792.80	-0.50	792.55
9	789.60	790.20	-0.60	789.90
10	794.40	795.00	-0.60	794.70
11	790.90	791.60	-0.70	791.25
12	793.50	793.80	-0.30	793.65

$$Y^{(k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(k)} X^{(k)} \tag{3.2}$$

Consider two sets of measurements , in this case F and C , with the vectors of case-wise averages A and case-wise differences D respectively. A regression model of differences on averages can be fitted with the view to exploring some characteristics of the data.

When considering the regression of case-wise differences and averages, we write

$$D^{-Q} = \hat{\beta}^{-Q} A^{-Q} \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\hat{\beta}$ denote the least square estimate of β based upon the full set of observations, and let $\hat{\beta}^{(k)}$ denoted the estimate with the kth case excluded.

For the Grubbs data the $\hat{\beta}$ estimated are $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ respectively. Leaving the fourth case out, i.e. $k = 4$ the corresponding estimates are $\hat{\beta}_0^{-4}$ and $\hat{\beta}_1^{-4}$

$$Y^{(k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(k)} X^{(k)} \tag{3.4}$$

Consider two sets of measurements , in this case F and C , with the vectors of case-wise averages A and case-wise differences D respectively. A regression model of differences on averages can be fitted with the view to exploring some characteristics of the data.

```
Call: lm(formula = D ~ A)


Coefficients: (Intercept)              A
  -37.51896       0.04656
```

When considering the regression of case-wise differences and averages, we write

$$D^{-Q} = \hat{\beta}^{-Q} A^{-Q} \tag{3.5}$$

3.2.1 Influence measures using R

R provides the following influence measures of each observation.

	dfb.1_	dfb.A	dffit	cov.r	cook.d	hat
1	0.42	-0.42	-0.56	1.13	0.15	0.18
2	0.17	-0.17	-0.34	1.14	0.06	0.11
3	0.01	-0.01	-0.24	1.17	0.03	0.08
4	-1.08	1.08	1.57	0.24	0.56	0.16
5	-0.14	0.14	-0.24	1.30	0.03	0.13
6	-0.00	0.00	-0.11	1.31	0.01	0.08
7	-0.04	0.04	-0.08	1.37	0.00	0.11
8	0.02	-0.02	0.15	1.28	0.01	0.09
9	0.69	-0.68	0.75	2.08	0.29	0.48
10	0.18	-0.18	-0.22	1.63	0.03	0.27
11	-0.03	0.03	-0.04	1.53	0.00	0.19
12	-0.25	0.25	0.44	1.05	0.09	0.12

Bibliography

Christensen, R., L. M. Pearson, and W. Johnson (1992). Case-deletion diagnostics for mixed models. *Technometrics 34*(1), 38–45.

Cook, R. (1977). Detection of influential observations in linear regression. *Technometrics 19*, 15–18.

Cook, R. (1986). Assessment of local influence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological) 48*(2), 133–169.

Preisser, J. S. (1996). Deletion diagnostics for generalised estimating equations. *Biometrika 83*(3), 551–5562.

Schabenberger, O. (2004). Mixed model influence diagnostics. 18929.

West, B., K. Welch, and A. Galecki (2007). *Linear Mixed Models: a Practical Guide Using Statistical Software*. Chapman and Hall CRC.

Zewotir, T. and J. Galpin (2005). Influence diagnostics for linear mixed models. *Journal of Data Science 3*, 153–177.