Reparameterized SGLMM (Spatial Generalized Linear Mixed Model): A Review

Frances Lin

June 2022

1. Introduction

The SGLMM (spatial generalized linear mixed model) is a hierarchical model that introduces spatial dependence through a GMRF (Gaussian Markov random field) (Besag et al., 1991). The SGLMM was initially proposed for prediction for count data, reframing as problem of image restoration. It has later been applied to estimation and prediction for other types of data (e.g. binary) and found applications in many fields (e.g. ecology, geology, epidemiology, image analysis, and forestry).

The SGLMM has been the dominant model for areal data because of its flexible hierarchical specification, the availability of the software `WinBUGS` for data analysis (Lunn et al., 2000) and various theoretical and computational advantages over the competitive model named automodel. However, SGLMMs suffer from two major shortcomings: i) variance inflation due to spatial confounding and ii) computational challenges posed by high dimensional latent variables (or random effects).

On the other hand, while another model named RHS model seeks to alleviate confounding by introducing synthetic predictors that are orthogonal to the fixed-effects predictors (Reich et al., 2006), failing to account for the underlying graph, the RHS model can result in random-effects structure with negative spatial dependence (i.e. repulsion) that is not typically applied in practice.

A sparse, reparameterized model is proposed, and it is able to alleviate confounding, and, at the same time, include patterns of positive spatial dependence (i.e. attraction) while excluding patterns of repulsion. Other methods have been proposed (Higdon, 2002; Cressie & Johannesson, 2008; Banerjee et al., 2008; Furrer et al., 2006; Rue & Tjelmeland, 2002), but these methods focus on dimension reduction for spatial point-referenced models. The proposed model is thus considered one of the first dimension reduction techniques for spatial areal models.

2. Traditional SGLMM (Spatial Generalized Linear Mixed Model)

Undirected graphs

Let

$$G = (V, E)$$

be an undirected, labelled graph, where $V = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ is a set of vertices (nodes) and $E = \{i, j\}$ is a set of edges, where $i, j \in V$, $i \neq j$. Each vertex v represents an area of interest and each edge e represents the proximity of areas i and j. The graph G is represented using an adjacency matrix A, which is a nxn matrix with $diag(A) = 0$ and entries $A_{ij} = 1\{(i, j) \in E, i \neq j\}$, where $1(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. That is, if the entry a_{ij} is $= 1$, then vertex v_i and v_j are adjacent, and the entry is $= 0$, otherwise.

The traditional SGLMM

Further let $Z = (Z_1, ... Z_n)^T$ be the random field of interest, where Z_i is the random variable associated with vertex i. Then, the first stage of the model is given by

$$g(E(Z_i|\beta, W_i)) = X_i\beta + Wi, \qquad (1)$$

where g is a link function, X_i is the ith row of the design matrix X, β is a p-vector of regression parameters and W_i is a spatial random effect associated with vertex i. Different types of data require different canonical choices of the link function g. For example, for binary spatial data, it is the logit function, for count data, it is the natural logarithm function, and for normal data, it is the identity function (Nelder & Wedderburn, 1972).

GMRF prior for the random effects

The field of random effects $W = (W_1, ..., W_n)^T$, through which spatial dependence is incorporated, is assumed to follow an improper GMRF prior or the so-called intrinsic conditionally autoregressive (Besag & Kooperberg, 1995)

$$p(W|\tau) \propto \tau^{rank(Q)/2} exp(-\frac{\tau}{2}W^TQW), \qquad (2)$$

where τ is a smoothing (or precision) parameter and $Q(= Q(\tau)) = diag(A1) - A$ is a precision matrix. The precision matrix Q is the matrix inverse of the covariance matrix Σ (i.e., $Q = \Sigma^{-1}$), the precision parameter is the inverse of the variance parameter ($\tau = 1/\sigma^2$), and A is an adjacency matrix. The precision matrix Q incorporates both dependence and prior uncertainty. That is, W_i and W_j, $i \neq j$, are independent given their neighbors iff $Q_{ij} = Q_{ji} = 0$ iff $(i, j) \notin E$. Uncertainty about W_i is inversely proportional to the degree of vertex i ($Q_{ii} = A_i1$, where A_i is the ith row of A). For spatial data over a continuous domain, i.e. point-referenced data or geostatistical data, a SGLMM can be formulated by replacing the GMRF with a GP (Gaussian process) (Diggle et al., 1998; De Oliveira, 2000; Christensen & Waagepetersen, 2002). In addition, since prior (2) is improper (Q is singular), the SGLMM is restricted to a Bayesian or restricted maximum likelihood (REML) analysis. This paper considers Bayesian analysis.

3. Spatial confounding

The automodel

The automodel, SGLMM's closest competitor, is a Markov random-field model that incorporates dependence directly and is defined as

$$g(E(Z_i|\beta, \eta, Z_{-i})) = X_i\beta + \eta \sum_{(i,j)\in E} Z_j^*, \qquad (3)$$

where g is a (canonical) link function, η is the dependence parameter ($\eta > 0$ implies attraction; $\eta < 0$ implies repulsion), and Z_{-i} is the field excluding the ith observation. For the centred automodel, $Z_j^* = Z_j - \mu_j$, where μ_j is the independence expectation of Z_j (i.e., $\mu_j = E(Z_j|\beta, \eta = 0) = g^{-1}(X_j\beta)$). For the uncentred automodel, $Z_j^* = Z_j$.

The sum term $\sum_{(i,j)\in E} Z_j^*$ is called the autocovariate, and it is considered as a synthetic predictor since it uses the observations or observations along with the regression component $X\beta$ of the model. The autocovariate of the centred automodel makes the dependence parameter easily interpretable (η captures the relativity of an observation to its neighbours, conditional on the hypothesized regression component). On the other hand, the autocovariate of the uncentred automodel not only poses conceptual challenge but also shows spatial confounding. That is, the uncentred autocovariate is difficult to interpret, and β and η also tend to be strongly correlated.

The RHS model

The traditional SGLMM can also shown to be confounded. More specifically, introduction of the random effects can inflate the variance of the posterior distribution of β. This is because the traditional model contains predictors that are collinear with X, and this collinearity causes the variance inflation (Reich et al., 2006).

Consider P be a projection onto $C(X)$

$$P = X(X^TX)^{-1}X^T$$

and let $P^{\perp}$ be the projection onto $C(X)$'s complement such that $P^{\perp} = I - P$, then equation (1) can be rewritten as

$$g(E(Z_i|\beta, W_i)) = X_i\beta + K_i\gamma + L_i\delta,$$

where K and L are orthogonal bases for $C(X)$ and $C(X)^{\perp}$ respectively and γ and δ are random coefficients. K and X now share the same column space, and this is the source of the spatial confounding.

Since K has no practical meaning, setting $\gamma = 0$, the first stage of the RHS model is given by

$$g(E(Z_i|\beta, \delta)) = X_i\beta + L_i\delta,$$

and, compared to equation (2), the prior for the random effects δ becomes

$$p(\delta|\tau) \propto \tau^{(n-p)/2} exp(-\frac{\tau}{2}\delta^T Q_R \delta),$$

3

where $Q_R = L^T Q L$.

The traditional SGLMM and RHZ model both share very similar approach to that of the automodel. The traditional SGLMM model makes use of synthetic predictors K and L, and the RHZ model makes use of L. Furthermore, the traditional SGLMM is analogous to the uncentred automodel since both models include predictors — K and the uncentred autocovariate $\sum Z_j^*$, respectively — that lead to spatial confounding. The RHZ model is analogous to the centred automodel since both models are designed to fit only residual structure of the data.

4. Sparse reparameterization of the areal SGLMM

The RHZ model does not allow parsimonious fitting of the residual clustering. Because the geometry corresponding to the projection $P^\perp$ fails to account for the underlying graph G, the RHZ model permits structure of negative spatial dependence (i.e. repulsion) in the random effects. However, neighboring observation tends to be similar, rather than dissimilar, so patterns of attraction are more useful in practice. The proposed reparameterized model considers an alternative projection that captures the geometry of the models, thus allowing only patterns of positive spatial dependence (i.e. attraction). Utilizing the geometry of the models also leads to dimension reduction of the random effects naturally.

The reparameterized model

The random effects for the sparse, reparameterized areal SGLMM

i) allow patterns of positive spatial dependence (i.e. attraction) while excluding patterns of repulsion and

ii) have dimension much smaller than n.

Consider the operator $(I - 11^T/n)A(I - 11^T/n)$ that appears in the numerator (top) of Moran's I-statistic (a commonly used for nonparametric method for spatial dependence)

$$I(A) = \frac{n}{1^T A 1} \frac{Z^T (I - 11^T/n) A (I - 11^T/n) Z}{Z^T (I - 11^T/n) Z},$$

where I is a $n x n$ identity matrix and 1 is a n-vector of 1s. Next replace $I - 11^T/n$ with $P^\perp$, then the resulting operator called the Moran operator for X with respect to G, $P^\perp A P^\perp$, appears in the numerator of the generalized Moran's I-statistic

$$I_x(A) = \frac{n}{1^T A 1} \frac{Z^T P^\perp A P^\perp Z}{Z^T P^\perp Z}.$$

It has been shown that (Boots & Tiefelsdorf, 2000) (a)...... and (b) the eigenvectors include all possible mutually distinct patterns of clustering residual to X while accounting for G. The positive and negative eigenvalues correspond to varying degrees of positive and negative spatial dependence, respectively, and the associated eigenvectors are the patterns of spatial clustering of data.

Assume M to be a matrix that contains the first $q \ll n$ eigenvectors of the Moran operator. Further assume $\lambda_q > 0$ since neighboring observations tend to be similar, rather than dissimilar, in practice. At least half

of the eigenvectors can be discarded as a result, making it possible to achieve a much greater dimension reduction.

Replacing L with M in the RHS model, the first stage of the reparameterized model is given by

$$g(E(Z_i|\beta, \delta_S)) = X_i\beta + M_i\delta_S,$$

and the prior for the random effects δ_S becomes

$$p(\delta_S|\tau) \propto \tau^{q/2} exp(-\frac{\tau}{2}\delta_S^T Q_S \delta_S),$$

where $Q_S = M^T QM$.

The sparse, reparameterized SGLMM model is more closely analogous to the centred automodel than it is to the RHZ model. Both the sparse SGLMM model and centred automodel account for X and the underlying graph. On the other hand, the RHZ model accounts for X but does not account for the underlying graph. The uncentred automodel does not fit residual structure to X but does account for the underlying graph by including (uncentred) autocovariate that sums the neighbors.

An alternative measure of spatial dependence is Geary's C, which uses the graph Laplacian Q in place of A (Geary, 1954). Geary's C is the spatial analogue of Durbin–Watson statistic for measuring autocorrelation in the residuals from a time series regression model (Durbin & Watson, 1950). The eigensystem of $P^\perp QP^\perp$ would then be an alternative to that of $P^\perp AP^\perp$.

Table 1 compares and contrasts the five models.

Table 1: Comparision of various SGLMMs

Model	Confounded	Account_G
Traditional SGLMM	Yes	No
Uncentred automodel	Yes	Yes
Centred automodel	No	Yes
RHZ SGLMM	No	No
Sparse SGLMM	No	Yes

5. Dimension reduction for spatial models

Fitting a GP (Gaussian process) model can be computationally expensive since it requires the repeated evaluation of expressions involving inversion of the covariance matrix $H(= H(\phi))$. One approach is to consider Cholesky decomposition of H. However, time complexity of the overall fitting algorithm is in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ since Cholesky decomposition of a typically dense H is in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. This computational expense makes the analyses of large-scale point-referenced data sets time consuming or indefeasible. Efforts to reduce the computational burden have resulted in approaches such as discrete process convolution (Higdon, 2002), fixed rank kriging (Cressie & Johannesson, 2008), Gaussian predictive process models (Banerjee et al., 2008), covariance tapering (Furrer et al., 2006) and approximation by a GMRF (Rue & Tjelmeland, 2002).

Fitting an areal mixed model can also be computationally demanding.

. . . . . .

Computational challenge of fitting the RHZ or sparse model lies respectively in the evaluation of the quadratic form $\delta^T Q_R \delta$ or $\delta_S^T Q_S \delta_S$. Time complexity of the operation for the RHZ model is in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, which is significant enough to discourage or prevent application of the model to large data sets. Evaluation of the quadratic form $\delta_S^T Q_S \delta_S$ for the sparse model can be $\mathcal{O}(1)$, which makes the model more suitable for large-scale areal data sets.

6. Simulated application

All three spatial models (e.g. Bernoulli, Poisson and Gaussian) are applied in a Bayesian setting. MCMC algorithms such as. . . . . . are used.

6.1 Binary data

6.2 Count data

6.3 Normal data

7. Discussion

Reference

Bolin, D. (2015). *Lecture 5: Intrinsic GMRFs Gaussian Markov random fields.* Personal Collection of D. Bolin, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg Sweden.

Haran, M. (2011). Gaussian random field models for spatial data. Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo, 449-478.

Hughes, J., & Haran, M. (2013). Dimension reduction and alleviation of confounding for spatial generalized linear mixed models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology), 75(1), 139-159.