Visualizing Linear Models: An R Bag of Tricks Session 3: Examples & Extensions

Michael Friendly
SCS Short Course
Oct-Nov, 2022
https://friendly.github.io/VisMLM-course/

Today's topics

- Manipulating & visualizing models
- MANOVA examples
  - Distinguishing among psychiatric groups
  - Robust MLMs: down-weighting outliers
- Multivariate regression
  - PA tests & ability
  - Canonical correlation
  - MANCOVA & homogeneity of regression
- Homogeneity of (co)variance
  - Visualizing Box's M test

Manipulating & visualizing models

- R modeling functions [lm(), glm(), …] return model objects, but these are "messy"
  - extracting coefficients takes several steps: data.frame(coef(mymod))
  - some info (R^2, F, p.value) is computed in print() method, not stored
  - can't easily combine models
- Some have associated plotting functions
  - plot(model): diagnostic plots
  - car package: many model plot methods
  - effects package: plot effects for model terms
- But what if you want to:
  - make a table of model summary statistics
  - fit a collection of models, compare, summarize or visualize them?

---

broom: manipulating models

- The broom package turns model objects into tidy data frames
  - **glance**(models) extracts model-level summary statistics (R^2, df, AIC, BIC)
  - **tidy**(models) extracts coefficients, SE, p-values
  - **augment**(models) extracts observation-level info (residuals, …)


Image from: https://opr.princeton.edu/workshops/Downloads/2016Jan_BroomRobinson.pdf

Example: Penguin data

Say we want to model the length of penguin bills
- Potential predictors: body_mass, species, sex, island, …

```
ggplot(data=peng, aes(x=body_mass, y=bill_length, color=species, fill=species)) +
  geom_point() +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm", size=1.5) +
  stat_ellipse(size=1.5)
```

How to extract & plot model statistics?

How to fit multiple models for subsets (by: sex, island)?

Predict bill_length from body_mass, species, sex, island

```
peng.mod0 <- lm(bill_length ~ body_mass + species + sex + island, data=peng)
summary(peng.mod0)
```

```
Call:
lm(formula = bill_length ~ body_mass + sex + species + island, data = peng)

Residuals:
    Min     1Q  Median      3Q     Max
 -6.938 -1.473   0.002   1.257  10.490
```
observation level

```
Coefficients:
                 Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)     31.237676   1.378201   22.67  < 2e-16 ***
body_mass        0.001744   0.000394    4.43  1.3e-05 ***
sexm             2.532799   0.361396    7.01  1.4e-11 ***
speciesChinstrap 10.281510  0.410391   25.05  < 2e-16 ***
speciesGentoo    6.149100   0.672481    9.14  < 2e-16 ***
islandDream     -0.463555   0.457443   -1.01     0.31
islandTorgersen  0.092246   0.474401    0.19     0.85
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```
component level (coefficients)

```
Residual standard error: 2.26 on 326 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.832,   Adjusted R-squared:  0.829
F-statistic:  269 on 6 and 326 DF,  p-value: <2e-16
```
model level

---

glance() gives the model level summary statistics

```
> glance(peng.mod0)
  r.squared adj.r.squared sigma statistic   p.value   df  logLik   AIC   BIC deviance df.residual
1     0.832         0.829  2.26      269. 4.60e-123    6  -741. 1497. 1528.    1667.         326
```

tidy() gives the model component (term) statistics

```
> tidy(peng.mod0)
  term             estimate std.error statistic  p.value
1 (Intercept)       31.2      1.38       22.7    5.90e-69
2 body_mass          0.00174  0.000394    4.43   1.29e- 5
3 sexm               2.53     0.361       7.01   1.39e-11
4 speciesChinstrap  10.3      0.410      25.1    5.61e-78
5 speciesGentoo      6.15     0.672       9.14   6.65e-18
6 islandDream       -0.464    0.457      -1.01   3.12e- 1
7 islandTorgersen    0.0922   0.474       0.194  8.46e- 1
```

augment() gives the observation level statistics

```
> augment(peng.mod0) %>% sample_n(5)
  bill_length body_mass sex   species   island  .fitted .resid   .hat .sigma  .cooksd .std.resid
        <dbl>     <int> <fct> <fct>     <fct>     <dbl>  <dbl>  <dbl> <dbl>    <dbl>      <dbl>
1        35.7      3150 f     Adelie    Biscoe     36.7  -1.03 0.0273  2.26 0.000858     -0.463
2        39.7      3550 m     Adelie    Biscoe     40.0  -0.263 0.0331 2.26 0.0000684    -0.118
3        41.1      4050 m     Adelie    Biscoe     40.8   0.265 0.0257 2.26 0.0000532     0.119
4        49.3      4050 m     Chinstrap Dream      50.7  -1.35 0.0177  2.26 0.000939     -0.604
5        48.4      5850 m     Gentoo    Biscoe     50.1  -1.72 0.0169  2.26 0.00145      -0.769
```


Fitting multiple models

With `dplyr::nest_by()`, you can fit one model for each subset of the data
Feed this to `broom::glance()` to get model-level statistics

```
models <- peng |>
  nest_by(species, sex) |>
  mutate(model = list(lm(bill_length ~ body_mass, data = data)))
models |>
  summarise(broom::glance(model), .groups = "keep") |>
  select(species, sex, r.squared, sigma, statistic, p.value, nobs)
```

```
# A tibble: 6 x 7
# Groups:   species, sex [6]
  species   sex   r.squared sigma statistic p.value  nobs
  <fct>     <fct>     <dbl> <dbl>     <dbl>   <dbl> <int>
1 Adelie    f        0.0289  2.01      2.12  0.150     73
2 Adelie    m        0.0486  2.24      3.62  0.0610    73
3 Chinstrap f        0.0760  3.03      2.63  0.115     34
4 Chinstrap m        0.0568  1.54      1.93  0.175     34
5 Gentoo    f        0.0739  1.99      4.47  0.0389    58
6 Gentoo    m        0.153   2.52     10.7   0.00182   61
```

Plotting via broom::augment

```
models |>
  summarise(broom::augment(model), .groups = "keep") |>
  mutate(
    sex = stringr::str_to_upper(sex),
    SpeciesSex = forcats::fct_cross(species, sex)) |>    # Combine species and sex
  ggplot(aes(x=body_mass, y=.std.res, color=SpeciesSex, fill=SpeciesSex)) +
  geom_point(alpha=0.4) +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm", size = 2, alpha=0.3)
```

Ex: Neuro- & Social-Cognitive measures in psychiatric groups

- A study by Leah Hartman @York examined whether patients classified as 'schizophrenic' or 'schizoaffective' (on DSM-IV) could be distinguished from a normal, control sample on standardized tests in the following domains:
  - Neuro-Cognitive: processing speed, attention, verbal learning, visual learning, problem solving
  - Social-cognitive: managing emotions, theory of mind, externalizing bias, personalizing bias

- Research questions → MANOVA contrasts
  - Analyze neuro-cog (NC) and social-cog (SC) separately
  - Do the two psychiatric groups differ from the controls?
  - Do the psychiatric groups differ from each other?

See: Friendly & Sigal (2017), Graphical Methods for Multivariate Linear Models in Psychological Research: An R Tutorial
The Quantitative Methods for Psychology, *13*, 20-45, http://dx.doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.13.1.p020

Schizophrenia symptoms: Hallucinations, disorganized thinking, delusions, …
Schizoaffective disorder combines symptoms of schizophrenia with mood disorder (bipolar or depression)

Neuro-cognitive measures

Data

```
> data(NeuroCog, package="heplots")
> car::some(NeuroCog)
              Dx Speed Attention Memory Verbal Visual ProbSolv SocialCog Age    Sex
14  Schizophrenia   19         9     19     33     24       39        28  44 Female
88  Schizoaffective  27        44     24     33     26       31        36  53 Female
105 Schizoaffective  23        41     42     48     46       29        50  52 Female
114 Schizoaffective  41        53     47     39     30       50        63  32 Female
130        Control   44        25     21     37     32       43        29  43 Female
165        Control   35        35     43     53     57       37        40  30   Male
194        Control   47        40     53     53     40       45        49  55 Female
```

diagnostic group   -------------- neuro-cognitive measures -----------   ---------- ignored ------

Questions:

- Do the diagnostic groups differ collectively on the neuro-cognitive measures?
- How do group differences relate to research hypotheses?
- How many dimensions (aspects) are reflected in the differences among means?

# NeuroCog: EDA

Always plot the data first!
With boxplots, often useful to show more: jittered points show the data

What can
we see
here?

How did I make this plot?

1. Reshape the data wide → long
2. ggplot() + geom_jitter() + geom_boxplot() + facet_wrap(~response)

```
NC_long <- NeuroCog |>
    select(-SocialCog, -Age, -Sex) |>
    tidyr::gather(key = response, value = "value", Speed:ProbSolv)
```

```
# show a few observations
library(dplyr)
NC_long |>
    group_by(Dx) |>
    sample_n(4) |>
    ungroup()
```

```
      Dx                response  value
 1 Schizophrenia    Verbal      37
 2 Schizophrenia    Speed       49
 3 Schizophrenia    ProbSolv    61
 4 Schizophrenia    Visual      23
 5 Schizoaffective  Attention   11
 6 Schizoaffective  Speed       39
 7 Schizoaffective  Visual      41
 8 Schizoaffective  Memory      54
 9 Control          Speed       57
10 Control          Memory      45
11 Control          Speed       41
12 Control          ProbSolv    61
```

How did I make this plot?

1. Reshape the data wide → long
2. ggplot() + geom_jitter() + geom_boxplot() + facet_wrap(~response)

```
ggplot(NC_long, aes(x=Dx, y=value, fill=Dx)) +
    geom_jitter() +
    geom_boxplot() +
    facet_wrap(~response, scales = "free_y") +
    theme_bw()
```

Neuro-cognitive measures: Analyses

- Could do a series of univariate ANOVAs
  - car::Anova(NC.mlm1 <- lm (Speed ~ DX, data=NeuroCog))
  - car::Anova(NC.mlm2 <- lm (Attention ~ DX, data=NeuroCog))
  - car::Anova(NC.mlm3 <- lm (Memory ~ DX, data=NeuroCog))
  - …
- Better: MANOVA test for all 6 responses together
  - Anova(NC.mlm = lm(cbind(Speed, Attention, Memory, …) ~ Dx, data=NeuroCog)
- Research hypotheses: test contrasts
  - Dx1: Control – (Schiz + SchizAff)/2 = 0 → linearHypotheses(NC.mlm, "Dx1")
  - Dx2: Schiz – SchAff = 0 → linearHypotheses(NC.mlm, "Dx2")
- Dimensions:
  - Canonical analysis → NC.can <- candisc(NC.mlm); plot(NC.can)
  - Canonical HE plot → heplot(NC.can)
- Tech note: anova() in base R vs. car::Anova
  - anova() uses only Type 1 (sequential) tests, rarely useful; doesn't handle MLM well ✗
  - car::Anova() provides Type 2, 3 (partial) tests; give sensible results for MLMs ✓
  - car::linearHypotheses() gives univariate and multivariate tests of contrasts ✓

Tidy univariate analyses: *F*-tests

Using broom::tidy() we can fit a separate univariate ANOVA model for each response
I've used some tidyverse magic to make a nicely formatted table of F values

```
NC_long |>
  mutate(response = factor(response, levels=unique(response))) |>   # keep variable order
  group_by(response) |>
  do(tidy(anova(lm(value ~ Dx, .)))) |>                             # run anova on each submodel
  filter(term != "Residuals") |>
  select(-term) |>
  rename(F = statistic, df1 = df,                                   # use more specific names
         SS = sumsq, MS =meansq) |>
  mutate(df2 = 239) |>                                              # kludge: extract dfe from object?
  relocate(df2, .after = df1) |>
  mutate(signif = noquote(gtools::stars.pval(p.value))) |>          # add significance stars
  mutate(p.value = noquote(scales::pvalue(p.value)))               # format p.values nicely
```

```
  response    df1    df2    SS    MS      F p.value   signif
  <fct>     <int> <dbl> <dbl> <dbl> <dbl> <noquote> <noquote>
1 Speed         2   239 8360. 4180.  37.1 <0.001    ***
2 Attention     2   239 5579. 2790.  17.4 <0.001    ***
3 Memory        2   239 3764. 1882.  13.9 <0.001    ***
4 Verbal        2   239 4672. 2336.  27.3 <0.001    ***
5 Visual        2   239 3692. 1846.  16.6 <0.001    ***
6 ProbSolv      2   239 4165. 2083.  25.1 <0.001    ***
```

All variables
are signif.

Tidy univariate analyses: *t*-tests

Can do the same to extract the *t*-tests for coefficients or contrasts in the univariate models for each response

```
NC_long |>
  mutate(response = factor(response, levels=unique(response))) |>
  group_by(response) |>
  do(tidy(lm(value ~ Dx, .))) |>
  filter(term != "(Intercept)") |>
  mutate(signif = noquote(gtools::stars.pval(p.value))) |>
  mutate(p.value = noquote(scales::pvalue(p.value)))
```

```
   response  term  estimate std.error statistic p.value   signif
   <fct>     <chr>    <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl> <noquote> <noquote>
1  Speed     Dx1      7.99      0.940      8.51 <0.001    ***
2  Speed     Dx2     -0.0252    1.10      -0.0229 0.982
3  Attention Dx1      6.44      1.12       5.75 <0.001    ***
4  Attention Dx2     -0.558     1.31      -0.426 0.671
5  Memory    Dx1      5.31      1.03       5.16 <0.001    ***
6  Memory    Dx2     -0.375     1.20      -0.311 0.756
7  Verbal    Dx1      5.91      0.818      7.22 <0.001    ***
8  Verbal    Dx2     -0.442     0.957     -0.461 0.645
9  Visual    Dx1      5.31      0.933      5.69 <0.001    ***
10 Visual    Dx2     -0.0371    1.09      -0.0340 0.973
11 ProbSolv  Dx1      5.70      0.807      7.07 <0.001    ***
12 ProbSolv  Dx2      0.719     0.944      0.762 0.447
```

Neuro-cognitive measures: MANOVA

Multivariate tests are more straight-forward & comprehensive

```
# fit the MANOVA model
NC.mlm <- lm(cbind(Speed, Attention, Memory, Verbal, Visual, ProbSolv) ~ Dx,
             data=NeuroCog)
Anova(NC.mlm)


Type II MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic
   Df test stat approx F num Df den Df    Pr(>F)
Dx  2    0.2992   6.8902     12    470 1.562e-11 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```
✓

So, the groups differ. But how?
What about the research hypotheses?

```
> contrasts(NeuroCog$Dx)
                 [,1] [,2]
Schizophrenia   -0.5    1
Schizoaffective -0.5   -1
Control          1.0    0
```

Dx1: Control – (Schiz + SchizAff)/2 = 0

Neuro-cognitive measures: Contrasts

A simple result: Control ≠ (Schizophrenia ≈ Schizoaffective)

```
> print(car::linearHypothesis(NC.mlm, "Dx1"), SSP=FALSE)

Multivariate Tests:
                 Df test stat approx F num Df den Df   Pr(>F)
Pillai            1     0.289    15.9      6    234 2.8e-15 ***
Wilks             1     0.711    15.9      6    234 2.8e-15 ***
Hotelling-Lawley  1     0.407    15.9      6    234 2.8e-15 ***
Roy               1     0.407    15.9      6    234 2.8e-15 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

> print(car::linearHypothesis(NC.mlm, "Dx2"), SSP=FALSE)

Multivariate Tests:
                 Df test stat approx F num Df den Df Pr(>F)
Pillai            1     0.006   0.249      6    234 0.96
Wilks             1     0.994   0.249      6    234 0.96
Hotelling-Lawley  1     0.006   0.249      6    234 0.96
Roy               1     0.006   0.249      6    234 0.96
```
✓

✗

Visualize me: in data space

heplot (NC.mlm, var=1:2, ...)

pairs(NC.mlm, ...)

Wow! All neuro-cog measures highly correlated in group means!
Only 1 dim. of **H** variation


Visualize me: in canonical space

- As with biplot, we can visualize MLM hypothesis variation for *all* responses by projecting **H** and **E** into low-rank space.
- Canonical projection: $\boldsymbol{Y}_{n \times p} \mapsto \boldsymbol{Z}_{n \times s} = \boldsymbol{Y}\boldsymbol{E}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{V}$, where **V** = eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{HE}^{-1}$.
- This is the view that maximally discriminates among groups, ie max. **H** wrt **E** !

Very simple interpretation

Can1: normal vs. others
All vars highly + correlated;

Can2: only 1.5%, NS; but perhaps suggestive (ProbSolv vs. Attention)

Visualize me: canonical HE plots

- Canonical HE plot is just the HE plot of canonical scores, $(\boldsymbol{z}_1, \boldsymbol{z}_2)$ in 2D,
- or, $\boldsymbol{z}_1, \boldsymbol{z}_2, \boldsymbol{z}_3$, in 3D.
- As in biplot, we add vectors to show relations of the $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ response variables to the canonical variates.
- variable vectors here are structure coefficients = correlations of variables with canonical scores.

The multivariate "juicer"

Shows just group means, H ellipse & E ellipse

Variable vectors offer interpretation of Can dimensions.

Social cognitive measures

- These measures deal with the person's perception and cognitive processing of emotions of others
  - Scales: managing emotions, theory of mind, externalizing bias, personalizing bias
- Questions:
  - Do these differentiate normal from patient groups?
  - Can they distinguish between schizophrenic & schizoaffective
 - If so, this could be a major finding.

SocialCog: EDA

Again, it is helpful to plot the data!
Same steps: (a) Reshape to long; (b) ggplot() + ... + facet_wrap(~response)

What can we see here?

How do groups differ?
Unusual features?

Social cognitive measures

Data

```
> car::some(SocialCog)
        Dx MgeEmotions ToM ExtBias  PersBias
24    Schizophrenia       32  18      -2     1.00
58    Schizophrenia       32  17       4     0.92
69    Schizophrenia       52  23       2     0.80
85    Schizoaffective     28  12      -5     1.00
99    Schizoaffective     40  22       1     0.36
111   Schizoaffective     51  23       6     0.91
124   Control             51  24      -5     1.00
155   Control             57  28       1     0.30
168   Control             47  32       0     0.77
216   Control             64  31       3     0.69
```

diagnostic group   ------- social-cognitive measures ------

Analyses

Standard MANOVA test:

```
Anova(SC.mlm = lm(cbind(...) ~ DX, data=SocialCog)
```

Test contrasts:

```
linearHypotheses(SC.mlm, "Dx1")
linearHypotheses(SC.mlm, "Dx2")
```

```
> contrasts(   SocialCog$Dx)
                    [,1] [,2]
Schizophrenia      -0.5    1
Schizoaffective    -0.5   -1
Control             1.0    0
```

Social cognitive measures

```
> data( SocialCog, package="heplots")
> SC.mlm <-   lm(cbind(MgeEmotions,ToM, ExtBias, PersBias) ~ Dx,
              data=SocialCog)
> Anova(SC.mlm)

Type II MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic
   Df test stat approx F num Df den Df  Pr(>F)
Dx  2    0.212     3.97      8    268 0.00018 ***    ✔
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Test contrasts: Dx1 = Normal vs. Patient; Dx2 = Schizo vs. Schizoaffective

```
> print(linearHypothesis(SC.mlm, "Dx1"), SSP=FALSE)
Multivariate Tests:
           Df test stat approx F num Df den Df   Pr(>F)
Pillai      1    0.1355    5.212      4    133 0.000624 ***    ✔

> print(linearHypothesis(SC.mlm, "Dx2"), SSP=FALSE)
Multivariate Tests:
           Df test stat approx F num Df den Df Pr(>F)
Pillai      1    0.0697    2.493      4    133 0.0461 *    ✔
```

Visualize me: data space

```
heplot (SC.mlm,
hypotheses=list("Dx1", "Dx2"),...)
```

```
pairs(SC.mlm,
hypotheses=list("Dx1", "Dx2"),...)
```


The groups are ordered Schizo < ScAffective < Control on these measures

One of these vars is not like the others!

Visualize me: canonical space

Contrasts:
Dx1 : Control vs. patients. Controls > patients on MgeEmotions, ExtBias, ToM
Dx2 : Schizo vs. schizoaffective.

Can1: group order

Can2: Schizoaffective vs. others

Dx1 suggests ≈ spacing
Schizo < ScAff < Control

Model checking & remedies

- The MLM assumes residuals are multivariate normal
  - → Squared Mahalanobis distances
    $$D^2_M (\mathbf{y}_i) = (\mathbf{y}_i - \overline{\mathbf{y}})^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_i - \overline{\mathbf{y}}) \quad \sim \quad \chi^2_p \text{ with p d.f.}$$
  - → a quantile – quantile plot of ordered $D^2_M (\mathbf{y}_i)$ vs. quantiles of χ^2_p should plot as straight line
  - Outliers are readily apparent
  - plots: heplots::cqplot()
- Influence plots
  - mvinfluence::influence() calculates multivariate analogs of influence measures

Social cog: cqplot

heplots::cqplot() creates a chi-square QQ plot from a MLM

```
cqplot(SC.mlm, id.n=2)
```


One observation appears as an extreme outlier.

This was a case w/ ExtBias = -33, but valid range = (-10, +10)

Refitting w/o case 15:
Overall & DX1 tests still OK ☺
Dx2 test: *p*=0.074, now NS ☹

Social cog: Influence

mvinfluence::influencePlot() creates a multivariate analog of an influence plot

```
>library(mvinfluence)
>influencePlot(SC.mlm, …)

     H      Q      CookD   L      R
15 0.0233 0.3985 0.4202 0.0238 0.4080
80 0.0333 0.0233 0.0352 0.0345 0.0241
```

Case 15 stands out as hugely influential (a data error)

The 3 columns of circles correspond to the 3 groups

Robust MLMs

- Robust methods for univariate LMs are now well-developed and implemented
  - → proper SEs, CIs and hypothesis tests
- Analogous methods for multivariate LMs are a current hot research topic
- The heplots package now provides `robmlm()` for the fully general MLM (MANOVA, MMReg)
  - Uses simple M-estimator via IRLS
  - Weights: calculated from Mahalanobis D^2, a robust covariance estimator and weight function, $\psi(D^2)$

$$D^2 = (\mathbf{Y} - \overline{\mathbf{Y}})^T \mathbf{S}^{-1}_{robust} (\mathbf{Y} - \overline{\mathbf{Y}}) \sim \chi^2_p$$

  - Downside: SEs, p-values only approximate

Robust MLMs

```
SC.rlm <- robmlm(cbind( MgeEmotions, ToM, ExtBias, PersBias) ~ Dx,
               data=SocialCog)
```


Observation weights

Approx test of Dx2 in robust model

```
> print(linearHypothesis(SC.rlm, "Dx2"), SSP=FALSE)

Multivariate Tests:
         Df test stat approx F num Df den Df Pr(>F)
Pillai    1     0.069     2.44      4    132   0.05 *
Wilks     1     0.931     2.44      4    132   0.05 *
 …
```

Robust MLMs: Pottery data

- Chemical composition of ancient pottery found at four sites in Great Britain
  - Sites: AshleyRails, Caldicot, IsleThorns, Llanedyrn
  - Measures: Al Fe Mg Ca Na
- Analyses:
  - standard MANOVA lm(cbind(Al, Fe, Mg, …) ~ Site, data=Pottery)
  - robust MANOVA robmlm(cbind(Al, Fe, Mg, …) ~ Site, data=Pottery)
- Data:

```
> car::some(Pottery)
          Site   Al   Fe   Mg   Ca   Na
2     Llanedyrn 13.8 7.08 3.43 0.12 0.17
14    Llanedyrn 12.5 6.44 3.94 0.22 0.23
17   IsleThorns 18.3 1.28 0.67 0.03 0.03
18   IsleThorns 15.8 2.39 0.63 0.01 0.04
21   IsleThorns 20.8 1.51 0.72 0.07 0.10
22  AshleyRails 17.7 1.12 0.56 0.06 0.06
23  AshleyRails 18.3 1.14 0.67 0.06 0.05
```


Robust MLMs: Pottery data

```
> pottery.mod <     - lm( cbind ( Al,Fe,Mg,Ca,Na   )~Site, data=Pottery)
> pottery.rmod     <-  robmlm ( cbind  ( Al,Fe,Mg,Ca,Na   )~Site, data=Pottery)
```

Observation weights

residual E ellipse shrinks a lot
overlaid HE plots

MMRA example: PA tasks & ability

- Rohwer data from Timm (1975)
- How well do paired associate (PA) tasks predict performance on measures of aptitude & achievement in kindergarten children?
  - Samples: 69 children in two groups (schools): 'Lo' | 'Hi' SES
  - Outcomes (Y):
    - Scholastic aptitude test (SAT)
    - Peabody picture vocabulary test (PPVT)
    - Raven progressive matrices (Raven)
  - Predictors (X): Scores (0—40) on PA tasks where the stimuli were:
    - named (n), still (s), named-still (ns), named-action (na), sentence-still (ss)

```
> data("Rohwer", package="heplots")
> car::some(Rohwer, n=5)
   group SES SAT PPVT Raven n  s ns na ss
8      1  Lo   8   68     8 0  0 10 19 14
9      1  Lo  49   74    11 0  0  7 16 13
17     1  Lo  19   66    13 7 12 21 35 27
52     2  Hi  38   66    14 0  0  3 16 11
66     2  Hi   8   55    16 4  7 19 20 13
```

```
> Rohwer2 <- subset(Rohwer, subset=SES=="HI")
```

Having a group factor makes the analysis more complicated (MANCOVA)

Start with analysis of the Hi SES group

Why not univariate models?

```
rohwer.mod1 <- lm(SAT   ~ n + s + ns + na + ss, data = Rohwer2)
rohwer.mod2 <- lm(PPVT  ~ n + s + ns + na + ss, data = Rohwer2)
rohwer.mod3 <- lm(Raven ~ n + s + ns + na + ss, data = Rohwer2)

library(stargazer)
stargazer(rohwer.mod1, rohwer.mod2, rohwer.mod3, type="text", …)
```

```
Univariate regression models for Rohwer data
=================================================
                        Dependent variable:
                    -----------------------------
                     SAT        PPVT      Raven
-------------------------------------------------
n                   3.26*       0.07       0.06
s                   3.00        0.37       0.49**
ns                 -5.86***    -0.37      -0.16
na                  5.67***     1.52*      0.12
ss                 -0.62        0.41      -0.12
-------------------------------------------------
R2                  0.56        0.35       0.31
F Statistic (df = 5; 26)  6.54***   2.85*   2.32
=================================================
Note:              *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001
```

Results are disappointing

- Only model for SAT highly signif.
- Only a few coefs. signif. $\neq 0$

MANOVA tests

```
> rohwer.mlm <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ n + s + ns + na + ss, data=Rohwer2)
> Anova(rohwer.mlm)

Type II MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic
   Df test stat approx F num Df den Df Pr(>F)
n  1    0.202     2.02      3     24 0.1376
s  1    0.310     3.59      3     24 0.0284 *
ns 1    0.358     4.46      3     24 0.0126 *
na 1    0.465     6.96      3     24 0.0016 **
ss 1    0.089     0.78      3     24 0.5173
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Much better!

Multivariate tests:
- pool evidence for all Ys
- take correlations of Ys into account

Can also test overall hypothesis, H_0: **B = 0** (all coefs = 0)

```
> print(linearHypothesis(rohwer.mlm,
+                 c("n", "s", "ns", "na", "ss")), SSP=FALSE)

Multivariate Tests:
                 Df test stat approx F num Df den Df   Pr(>F)
Pillai            5   1.0386    2.753     15  78.00 0.001912 **
Wilks             5   0.2431    2.974     15  66.65 0.001154 **
Hotelling-Lawley  5   2.0615    3.115     15  68.00 0.000697 ***
Roy               5   1.4654    7.620      5  26.00 0.000160 ***
```

Strongly reject H_0 by all criteria

Visualize me!

```
cols <-  c("red", "blue", "black", "darkgreen", "darkcyan", "magenta", "gray20")
hyp <- list("Regr" = c("n", "s", "ns", "na", "ss"))   # Test of B = 0
heplot(rohwer.mlm,
       hypotheses = hyp,
       fill=TRUE, fill.alpha=0.1, col=cols,lwd=c(1,3))
```


Each predictor gives a 1 df test -> H_i ellipse is a line
**E** here is a 3D ellipsoid (rank(**E**) = min(p,q))

Interpretation:

- Any **H** ellipse that protrudes outside **E** ellipse is significant by Roy's test
- Length of each H_i line ≈ strength of association
- Orientation of each H_i line shows relation of X_i to the two Y_j responses shown.

pairs.mlm() plot

View all pairwise HE plots

```
pairs(rohwer.mlm, hypotheses=hyp,
      col=cols, fill=TRUE, fill.alpha=0.1, …)
```


Can now understand more subtle aspects

SAT is best predicted overall, but relation with PA tests varies
The na & ns tasks are strongest for SAT

Raven is weakly predicted

Coefficient plots for MLMs

In multivariate models, confidence intervals for coefficients become ellipsoids
Two coefficients are jointly significant if their conf. ellipse $\mathbb{E}(b_1, b_2)$ excludes (0,0)
These plots are provided by `heplots::coefplot(mlm)`

```
coefplot(rohwer.mlm, var=c(1,2))
```
```
coefplot(rohwer.mlm, var=c(1,3))
```


Bivariate 68% coefficient plot for SAT and PPVT

Bivariate 68% coefficient plot for SAT and Raven

Influence plots

As always, we should check for influential observations and multivariate outliers

```
mvinfluence::influencePlot(Rohwer.mlm, id.n=4, …)
```

One point (5) deserves further attention

Canonical correlations

For quantitative (X, Y) data, canonical correlation analysis is an alternative to MMRA
It finds the weighted sums of the Y variables most highly correlated with the Xs

```
> X <- Rohwer2[, 6:10] # X variables for High SES students
> Y <- Rohwer2[, 3:5]  # Y variables for High SES students
> (cc <- cancor(X, Y, set.names=c("PA", "Ability")))

Canonical correlation analysis of:
        5   PA  variables:  n, s, ns, na, ss
   with    3   Ability  variables:  SAT, PPVT, Raven

     CanR CanRSQ  Eigen percent    cum                              scree
1 0.7710 0.5944 1.4654  71.080  71.08 *******************************
2 0.5465 0.2987 0.4259  20.659  91.74 *********
3 0.3815 0.1455 0.1703   8.261 100.00 ***

Test of H0: The canonical correlations in the
current row and all that follow are zero

     CanR LR test stat approx F numDF  denDF  Pr(> F)
1 0.77096      0.24307   2.9738    15 66.655 0.001154 **
2 0.54652      0.59926   1.8237     8 50.000 0.094538 .
3 0.38147      0.85448   1.4759     3 26.000 0.244178
```

Two dimensions acct for 91.7% of (X,Y) association

Only Can1 is significant

Visualize CCA in HE plot

```
cols <-  c("red", "blue", "black", "darkgreen", "darkcyan",
          "magenta", "gray20")
heplot(cc, hypotheses=list("na+ns"=c("na", "ns")),
      fill = TRUE, fill.alpha=0.1, col=cols,
      label.pos = c(3, rep(1,5), .1),
      cex=1.4, var.cex=1.25, var.lwd=3, var.col="black")
```


Residuals are uncorrelated in canonical space

H ellipses for X terms same as in ordinary HE plots – outside **E** ellipse *iff* signif. by Roy's test

Variable vectors for Ys: correlations with canonical variables Ycan1, Ycan2
- SAT & PPVT: mainly Ycan1
- Raven: more aligned with Ycan2

MANCOVA & homogeneity of regression

- With a group variable (SES) can test differences in means (intercepts)
  - rohwer.mod <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ SES + n + s + ns + na + ss, data=Rohwer)
  - This assumes that slopes (B) are the same for both groups (homogeneity of regression)
- Can test for equal slopes by adding interactions of SES with Xs
  - rohwer.mod1 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ SES * (n + s + ns + na + ss))
- Or, fit separate models for each group

```
rohwer.ses1 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ n + s + ns + na + ss,
                  data = Rohwer, subset = SES == "Hi")
rohwer.ses2 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ n + s + ns + na + ss,
                  data = Rohwer, subset = SES == "Lo")
```

MANCOVA

Fit the MANCOVA model & test hypotheses

```
> rohwer.mod <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ SES + n + s + ns + na + ss,
+                  data=Rohwer)
> Anova(rohwer.mod)

Type II MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic
    Df test stat approx F num Df den Df  Pr(>F)
SES  1    0.379    12.18     3    60  2.5e-06 ***
n    1    0.040     0.84     3    60   0.4773
s    1    0.093     2.04     3    60   0.1173
ns   1    0.193     4.78     3    60   0.0047 **
na   1    0.231     6.02     3    60   0.0012 **
ss   1    0.050     1.05     3    60   0.3770
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

SES: diff in means

Visualize effects

```
pairs(rohwer.mod,
      hypotheses=list("Regr" = c("n", "s", "ns", "na", "ss")),
      fill=TRUE, fill.alpha=0.1)
```


The SES effect is positive for all Y variables
Hi SES group > Lo SES group

Fit model with interactions

Fit heterogeneous regression model with SES interactions

```
> rohwer.mod1 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ SES * (n + s + ns + na + ss),
+                   data=Rohwer)
> Anova(rohwer.mod1)

Type II MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic
       Df test stat approx F num Df den Df  Pr(>F)
SES     1    0.391    11.78      3     55 4.5e-06 ***
n       1    0.079     1.57      3     55 0.20638
s       1    0.125     2.62      3     55 0.05952 .
ns      1    0.254     6.25      3     55 0.00100 ***
na      1    0.307     8.11      3     55 0.00015 ***
ss      1    0.060     1.17      3     55 0.32813
SES:n   1    0.072     1.43      3     55 0.24417
SES:s   1    0.099     2.02      3     55 0.12117
SES:ns  1    0.118     2.44      3     55 0.07383 .
SES:na  1    0.148     3.18      3     55 0.03081 *
SES:ss  1    0.057     1.12      3     55 0.35094
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

OK, as expected

Hmm ???

Test interactions

Can test all interactions simultaneously with linearHypothesis()
Do I need any interaction terms?

I use a 'grep' trick here to find the names of coefficients like 'SES:' containing a ':'

```
> coefs <- rownames(coef(rohwer.mod1))    # store coefficient names in a vector
> print(linearHypothesis(rohwer.mod1,     # only test for interaction effects
+                  coefs[grep(":", coefs)]), SSP=FALSE)

Multivariate Tests:
                 Df test stat approx F num Df den Df  Pr(>F)
Pillai            5    0.4179    1.845     15  171.0 0.03209 *
Wilks             5    0.6236    1.894     15  152.2 0.02769 *
Hotelling-Lawley  5    0.5387    1.927     15  161.0 0.02396 *
Roy               5    0.3846    4.385      5   57.0 0.00191 **
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Evidence shows that some slopes differ for Hi/Lo SES

Fit separate models

Fitting a model for each group allows all slopes to differ
Also allows within-group covariances to differ

```
rohwer.ses1 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ n + s + ns + na + ss,
              data = Rohwer, subset = SES == "Hi")
rohwer.ses2 <- lm(cbind(SAT, PPVT, Raven) ~ n + s + ns + na + ss,
              data = Rohwer, subset = SES == "Lo")
```


For SAT & PPVT:
• means higher for Hi SES
• within-group covariance larger for Hi SES
• slopes of predictors smaller for Hi SES → SAT more important for this group.

Homogeneity of (co)variances

• ANOVA assumes equality of residual variances

$$\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \dots = \sigma_g^2$$

Levine's test: ANOVA of $z_{ij} = |\, y_{ij} - \overline{y}_i\,|$

• MANOVA: assumes equality of covariance matrices

$$\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \dots = \Sigma_g$$

Box's M test:

$$M = (N - g)\ln|\mathbf{S}_p| - \sum_{i=1}^{g}(n_i - 1)\ln|\mathbf{S}_i|$$

$-2 \ln(M) \sim \chi^2_{df}$

See: http://www.datavis.ca/papers/EqCov-TAS.pdf

Visualizing covariance matrices

Visualize covariance ellipses in data space
Center to see pure differences in size & shape

```
covEllipses(iris[,1:2], iris$Species, ...)
covEllipses(iris[,1:2], iris$Species, center=TRUE, ...)
```

View all pairs

```
covEllipses(iris[,1:4], iris$Species,
    center=TRUE, variables=1:4, ...)
```

In all cases, setosa stands out as different from the others
- sometimes correlation differs
- sometimes smaller variance(s)

Visualize in PCA space

PCA projects the data into an orthogonal space accounting for maximum variance
Covariance ellipses show the differences among groups in this space

Surprisingly, the small dimensions contribute largely to Box's *M* test.

PC1 & PC2   PC3 & PC4


```
iris.pca <- prcomp(iris[,1:4])
covEllipses(iris.pca$x, iris$Species, ...)
covEllipses(iris.pca$x, iris$Species, center=TRUE, ...)
```

```
covEllipses(iris.pca$x, iris$Species, center=TRUE,
    variables=3:4, ...)
```

Visualizing Box's *M* test

Box's test is based on a comparison of the log $|S_i|$ relative to log $|S_p|$: **plot them!**

```
iris.boxm <- boxM(iris[, 1:4], iris[, "Species"])
plot(iris.boxm, gplabel="Species")
```


CIs based on an asymptotic CLT ≈ distribution of ln|**S**| (Cai, Liang, and Zhou 2016) (Thx: Augustine Wong)

Unsolved: Bootstrap CI

Diabetes data: 2D mystery

Reaven & Miller (1968) found a peculiar "horse shoe" result in analysis of data on the relationship of blood glucose levels and production of insulin in patients with varying degrees of hyperglycemia


In a 2D plot this was a medical mystery.

What could be the explanation?

Diabetes data: 3D clarity

Using the first 3D computer graphics system (PRIM-9) they rotated the data in 3-space until a hypothesis was suggested.

Artist's view of the data suggests there were actually three groups in the data.

Two categories of Type 2 diabetes:
- Overt (advanced)
- Chemical (latent)

But, these were NOT stages in a progression!

Diabetes data: scatterplots

A grouped scatterplot reveals the truer story

scatterplot(instest ~ glutest | group, data=Diabetes, ellipse=TRUE, …)

Diabetes data: Ellipses

covEllipses(Diabetes[,2:5], Diabetes$group, fill=TRUE, pooled=FALSE,
        col=c("blue", "red", "darkgreen"), variables=1:3)

The pairwise data ellipses show visual summaries of the data

The differences in correlation and variances are dramatic here

Box's *M* test

```
diab.boxm <- boxM(Diabetes[,2:5], Diabetes$group)
diab.boxm
##
##  Box's M-test for Homogeneity of Covariance Matrices
##
## data:  Diabetes[, 2:5]
## Chi-Sq (approx.) = 383, df = 20, p-value <2e-16

plot(diab.boxm)
```

All pairs differ!

MANOVA & HE plots

```
diab.mlm <- lm(cbind(glufast, glutest, instest, sspg) ~ group, data=Diabetes)
# HE pairs plot
pairs(diab.mlm, fill=TRUE, fill.alpha=0.1, var.cex=3, cex=1.25)
```

The groups are well-separated in all views

Mostly positive correlation among group means

But: one of these plots is not like the others!

Run the juicer

```
diab.can <- candisc(diab.mlm)
plot(diab.can, ellipse=TRUE, var.lwd=2, …)
```


Filter the juice

```
heplot(diab.can, fill=c(TRUE, FALSE), fill.alpha=0.1, var.lwd=2, size="effect")
```

Summary

- MANOVA tests of MLMs are easily visualized in HE plots
  - Contrasts among groups can be easily shown
  - Canonical plots show data in 2D/3D space of max. group differences
  - Robust methods can help guard against outliers
- MMRA models
  - Visualize effects of quant. predictors as lines in data space
  - Test & visualize any linear hypothesis
  - Canonical correlations: visualize in 2D/3D of max. (X, Y) correlations
- Homogeneity of covariances
  - Visualize within-group $\mathbf{S}_i$ and pooled $\mathbf{S}_p$ by data ellipses
  - Visualize Box's M test by simple dot plot of $|\mathbf{S}_p|$ and $|\mathbf{S}_i|$