

T as a piece-wise constant function from the predictors to Y

Simulations and Comparisons

Simulated Data

Tree-based methods shine in situations with correlated predictors, although these situations can pose problems for inference. In a situation with correlated predictors X_1 and X_2 , and the model we are considering is $Y \sim X_1 + X_2$, it is difficult to say how much of the modeled effect on Y is due to X_1 or X_2 . To illustrate this idea, compare a few existing methods, and explore methods of inference on tree based models three datasets will be simulated with different correlation structures. We will be focused more on the correlation structure between the predictors than on their relationships with the response and this will be reflected in the simulations.

To aid in comparisons between the methods, one of the simulated datasets considered in this paper will be generated from the same method as used in (Strobl et al, 2008??). Under this method, the 13 x 1000 data set, D_1 , has 12 predictors, V_1, \dots, V_{12} , where $V_j \sim N(0, 1)$. The first four are, however, block correlated to each other with $\rho = .9$. They are related to Y by the linear equation:

$$Y = 5 \cdot V_1 + 5 \cdot V_2 + 2 \cdot V_3 + 0 \cdot V_4 + -5 \cdot V_5 + -5 \cdot V_6 + 0 \cdot V_7 + 0 \cdot \dots + E, E \sim N(0, \frac{1}{2})$$

Note that the coefficients for V_7, \dots, V_{12} are all zero.

Table 1: Correlation of V_1, \dots, V_7 and Y

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	y	beta
V1	1.000	0.915	0.908	0.907	-0.034	0.006	0.012	0.829	5
V2	0.915	1.000	0.914	0.914	-0.020	-0.001	-0.001	0.830	5
V3	0.908	0.914	1.000	0.903	-0.017	-0.007	0.007	0.808	2
V4	0.907	0.914	0.903	1.000	-0.002	-0.015	0.023	0.789	0
V5	-0.034	-0.020	-0.017	-0.002	1.000	0.044	0.005	-0.388	-5
V6	0.006	-0.001	-0.007	-0.015	0.044	1.000	-0.005	-0.364	-5
V7	0.012	-0.001	0.007	0.023	0.005	-0.005	1.000	-0.141	-2

As can be seen from the last column in the table, “beta”, although V_4 was not included in the model $Y \sim V_1, \dots, V_{12}$, its’ strong correlation with more influential predictors V_1, \dots, V_3 insures that it still shows a strong linear correlation with Y . A linear model would likely *overstate* the effect of V_4 on Y .^{1 2}

As can be seen above in Figure 1 the densities of V_1, \dots, V_5 are all very similar due to the way they were generated.

Figure 2 is an illustration of the relationship between $Y \sim V_4$ with linear correlation of .789.

While D_1 represents a situation with linear correlation between the predictors, D_2 does not. Here, the

¹A brief note on uncertainty is needed here. It’s true that in this setting we can say that V_4 is actually unimportant to understanding Y , but in situations with real data this is profoundly more difficult to parse. Often like in the social science situations that Morgan and Sonquist encountered, the real relationship between correlated predictors is complicated and often there is some theoretical backing or other insight that is gained to include variables that may not be important to the model.

²Another point that could be said is that, no V_4 is not unimportant, V_1, V_2 , and V_3 are just stand ins for the real star, V_4 , as they are nearly the same ($\rho \sim 1$). Then the real relationship represented here is $Y \sim (5 + 5 + 2) \cdot V_4 + -5 \cdot V_5 + -5 \cdot V_6 + -2 \cdot V_7$. This model is not unsuccessful in capturing the structure of the data, and this is typically the practice used to model data with highly correlated predictors. If this seems philosophically satisfying to you, the rest of this thesis may seem a bit inconsequential. I apologize.




Figure 1: Density Graphs for V1 through V5




Figure 2: Plot of $Y \sim V4$, Correlation = .789

model is the same, $Y = X_1 + \dots + X_{12}$ where Y is generated according to the equation:

$$Y = 5 \cdot X_1 + 5 \cdot X_2 + 2 \cdot X_3 + 0 \cdot X_4 + -5 \cdot X_5 + -5 \cdot X_6 + 0 \cdot X_7 + 0 \cdot \dots + E, E \sim N(0, \frac{1}{2})$$

However, instead of block correlation with $\rho = .9$, four variables are related to each other by the equations below. Note that $X_1, X_5, \dots, X_{12} \sim N(0, 1)$

$$X_2 = X_1 + E, E \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$

$$X_3 = X_2 + E, E \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$

$$X_4 = X_3 + E, E \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$

Table 2: Correlation of X_1, \dots, X_7 and Y

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	y	beta
X1	1.000	0.693	0.605	0.552	-0.043	0.009	-0.006	0.760	5
X2	0.693	1.000	0.847	0.745	0.004	0.006	-0.018	0.845	5
X3	0.605	0.847	1.000	0.877	0.007	0.005	-0.024	0.785	2
X4	0.552	0.745	0.877	1.000	0.011	0.006	-0.032	0.696	0
X5	-0.043	0.004	0.007	0.011	1.000	-0.008	0.020	-0.318	-5
X6	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.006	-0.008	1.000	-0.046	-0.310	-5
X7	-0.006	-0.018	-0.024	-0.032	0.020	-0.046	1.000	-0.133	-2

As one can see, Table 2 mirrors Table 1. For this dataset, however, the correlation structure is more complicated. X_1 and X_2 are highly correlated with $\rho = .7$.

As seen in Figure 4, the pattern observed between X_1 and X_2 does not carry over to the other correlated predictors.

Figure 5 demonstrate how the correlation between a few of the predictors and Y may be effected by slope. Scale is much more a factor in this dataset, with some variables like X_3 having a larger range than the variables $X_1 \sim N(0, 1)$ or $X_5, \dots, X_{12} \sim MVN()$.

The last dataset we'll consider is D_3 , a data set with even more non-linear relationships between the first four variables. Otherwise it is very similar to both D_1 and D_2 . The first four variables are generated as follows:

$$\omega_1 \sim N(1, 0)$$

$$\omega_2 = \log(\omega_1) + E, E \sim N(1, 0)$$

$$\omega_3 = \log(\omega_2) + E, E \sim N(1, 0)$$

$$\omega_4 = \log(\omega_4) + E, E \sim N(1, 0)$$

	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	y	beta
W1	1.000	-0.056	-0.040	0.041	0.002	-0.034	-0.028	0.322	5
W2	-0.056	1.000	-0.533	-0.279	-0.002	0.049	-0.003	0.668	5
W3	-0.040	-0.533	1.000	-0.002	-0.019	-0.031	-0.010	-0.096	2
W4	0.041	-0.279	-0.002	1.000	-0.007	-0.008	-0.079	-0.223	0
W5	0.002	-0.002	-0.019	-0.007	1.000	-0.012	-0.019	-0.382	-5
W6	-0.034	0.049	-0.031	-0.008	-0.012	1.000	0.004	-0.358	-5
W7	-0.028	-0.003	-0.010	-0.079	-0.019	0.004	1.000	-0.159	-2




Figure 3: Plot of $X_2 \sim X_1$, Correlation = .7




Figure 4: Correlation Structure of the First Four Variables in D2




Figure 5: Comparisons of the Density Graphs for X1 through X5

The linear correlation structure in D_3 is not as striking as in D_1 . The two strongest linear relationships are between ω_2 and ω_3 with $\rho = -.534$ and between Y and ω_2 with $\rho = .700$.




Figure 6: Correlation Structure of the First Four Variables in D_3

Figure 6 provides another way of visualizing some of the information given in Table 3. Here we can see the densities as well as the paired correlations of the first four variables in D_3 .

There is more variation between the densities of $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_5$ than we have seen in the other data sets. ω_2, ω_3 , and ω_4 have greater spread than their counterparts that are generated under the normal distribution.

As the relationship between Y and ω_2 was so striking, it is nice to see a scatter plot that represents it.

Models and Comparisons

CART: Regression Trees

As outlined in the 1984 textbook, *Classification and Regression Trees*, Brieman, Friedman, Olshen, and Stone described their method for creating, pruning, and testing regression trees. There are essentially three steps: one, decide on a variable to split over, two, partition that variable space in two distinct partitions, and three, set our initial predictions for each partition to be mean value of the response according to the observed responses corresponding to the values in the partitions. Recursively, this process is repeated for each new partition until some stopping condition is reached. This is a top down, greedy algorithm that functions by creating as large a tree as possible and then is pruned down to prevent over fitting.

Trees can be quite variable, so to get a better idea of the differences between the methods let's run a simulation.




Figure 7: Comparisons of the Density Graphs for W1 through W5

Algorithm 1 Simulation Scheme 2.1

- 1: **for** $i \leq 1000$ **do**
 - 2: Randomly sample $\frac{2}{3}$ of the observations in D_2 to a training set, $D_{2,train}^i$. The other observations, $x \in D_2, x \notin D_{2,train}^i$ form the testing set $D_{2,test}^i$
 - 3: Fit a tree, T^i , to the data under the model $Y \sim X_1, \dots, X_2$ using the observations in D_2^i
 - 4: Calculate the MSE_{test} of the model using the equation: $MSE_{test} = \frac{1}{n} \sum (y_j - \hat{y}_j)^2$
 - 5: **end for**
-




Figure 8: Plot of $Y \sim W2$, Correlation = .7




Figure 9: CART for the Model $Y \sim$, from D1,D2, and D3

Where n is the number of observations in $D_{2,test}^i$, $y_j \in D_{2,test}^i$, $\hat{y}_j \in T^i(D_{2,test}^i)$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. This produces two distributions of MSE_{test} , one for CART and one for CTree, conditional inference trees.




Figure 10: Comparison of the Simulated MSE_{test} Distributions of CART

The distribution of 1000 CART trees' MSE_{test} is roughly normal with a variance of `var(testmseC)`.

Bagged Forests

As one can see in the Figure 10, there is a fair amount of variability in a single tree, they are heavily dependent on fluctuations in the starting data set. As mention briefly in the introduction, bagged forests present one solution to this problem. To create a bagged forest, as outlined in *An Introduction to Statistical Learning* by James, Witten, Hastie and Tibshirani, 2013, many bootstrapped samples are taken from the initial dataset and trees are fitted to them. The final predictions are, then, averaged over all of the trees. This ensures that while each tree has high variance, when they are aggregated the variance will decrease.

Let's put that to the test here using our dataset $D3$ again. We'll build 100 forests of 100 trees each and compare the variability of the MSE distributions.

As one can see, the values of MSE_{test} for the bagged forest were entirely below the MSE_{test} for the trees and the variance was much smaller.

Random Forests

EXPAND AND BEGIN NOTATION OF R AS RANDOM FOREST




Figure 11: the Simulated MSEtest Distributions of Bagged Forests and CART

As the number of trees grown in each forest increases, the MSE_{test} decreases (cite). Still, this can become computationally intensive on larger data sets where we would like very accurate models. Random forests are often seen as a solution to this problem. In a bagged forest, every variable is considered when each split is made but in a random forest only $mtry, mtry \leq p$ are considered. This allows us to assume that the trees have a level of independence not found in bagged forests, and that a small random forest will often outperform the bagged forest.

For an illustration, let's build a random forest on $D3$ and compare the MSE .




Figure 12: Simulated MSE_{test} Distributions of CART, Random, and Bagged Forests