

Interactions

EES 4891-06/5891-01

Bayesian Statistical Methods



Jonathan Magnolia Gilligan

Class #10: Monday February 16, 2026

Regularization

Regularizing Priors

- Alternate approach: *regularizing priors*
 - Widely used in Machine Learning
 - Models that are worse at fitting *training data* can be better at predicting *test data*.
 - Regularizing priors tend to force unnecessary parameters to small (near-zero) values.
- Regularizing normal prior for β params:



- Synthetic data generated from 3-parameter distribution.
 - N samples in training set, N in testing set.
 - blue = in-sample, black = out-of-sample
- With more training data ($N = 100$), regularizing priors keep out-of-sample deviance small, even with many parameters.
- You can use fancier regularizing priors than just normal distributions.

Predicting Predictive Accuracy

Cross-Validation


- How can we get a sense of how well our model will work with out-of-sample predictions?
- We started by splitting our data in half: *training* and *test* data.
- Sometimes it's not efficient to split our data in half.
- Can we do better?
- k -fold cross-validation:
 - Split data into k equal parts (example: $k = 5$)
 - For each part i (called a “fold”), fit the model to the other $k - 1$ parts and then predict part i .
 - Repeat this for all k parts.
 - Use all k folds to assess model performance
- Leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV):
 - An extreme form of K -fold cross-validation, where $k = N$, the size of the data.
 - For each data point, fit the model to all the others and then predict that one point.
- Problem: If you have N observations, then you have to fit your model N times. If N is large, this can be very slow.
- Pareto-Smoothed Importance Sampling (PSIS) is a fancy technique that lets us estimate LOOCV while we fit the model one time, without actually having to do real cross-validation.

Information Criteria

- As an alternative to cross-validation, use information theory to estimate the out-of-sample KL divergence.
- Examine the differences between in-sample and out-of-sample divergence in the figure
 - The difference is roughly twice the number of parameters.
 - In general, for relatively flat priors, the overfitting penalty is about twice the number of parameters.
 - Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)

$$AIC = D_{\text{train}} + 2p = -2\text{lppd} + 2p,$$


where lppd is the log-pointwise-predictive density (basically a sample of the posterior).



- Conditions for validity:
 - Priors are flat, or dominated by likelihood (data).
 - Posterior distribution is approximately Gaussian for each parameter.
 - The data sample size N is much greater than the number of parameters k .

Other Information Criteria

- AIC is only valid under these conditions:
 - Priors are flat, or dominated by likelihood (data).
 - Posterior distribution is approximately Gaussian for each parameter.
 - The data sample size N is much greater than the number of parameters k .
- Flat priors are usually not a good choice.
- DIC (Deviance Information Criteria) works with informative priors, but the other two criteria still apply.
- Watanabe-Akaike Information Criteria (WAIC, also called Widely Applicable Information Criterion) is more broadly applicable.
 - We won't go into details of calculating WAIC. The rethinking package will do it for us, and so will most other Bayesian analysis packages.
- General principle:
 - For all the information criteria we're examining, the smaller (more negative) they are, the better the model performs.



- Comparison of different measures

How to Compare Models


Comparison vs. Selection

- Many people use CV, PSIS, Deviance, or Information Criteria to select models
 - Use whatever model has the smallest score
- This is not wise. It only looks at what model is smallest, but doesn't consider how great the differences are between models.
 - This is like only looking at the mode (maximum) of the posterior and ignoring the rest of it.
 - The width the posterior matters too. It tells us about how uncertain the estimate is.
- When we compare models, look at how great the differences are between them.
- Remember that these criteria tell us about predictive power, but we have seen that predictive power doesn't tell us about causality.
 - Backdoor paths can have useful information, even though it's not causal.
 - But backdoor predictions only work if we don't interfere with the system.
 - In other words, if the future is just like the past.
 - In the plant-growth model, knowing about the fungus was a better predictor of plant growth than knowing about the anti-fungus treatment
 - but knowing about the fungus doesn't help us predict the effect of treating a field.

Example Using WAIC

- Plant growth experiment:

- DAG



H_0 = height before, H_1 = height after,
 T = anti-fungal treatment, F = fungus

- Three models:

1. mdl_0 : $\mu \sim \text{log-Normal}(0, 0.25)$

2. mdl_T : $\mu = \alpha + \beta_T T$

3. mdl_TF : $\mu = \alpha + \beta_T T + \beta_F F$

```
set.seed(11)
round(WAIC(mdl_TF), 2)
```

```
##      WAIC      lppd penalty std_err
## 1 361.45 -177.17      3.55   14.17
```

```
set.seed(77)
round(compare(mdl_0, mdl_T, mdl_TF, func = WAIC), 2)
```


```
##      WAIC      SE dWAIC      dSE pWAIC weight
## mdl_TF 361.81 14.26  0.00      NA   3.74      1
## mdl_T  402.65 11.20 40.84 10.44   2.58      0
## mdl_0  405.91 11.65 44.10 12.22   1.58      0
```

- Best predictions on top.
- “d” are differences from the best model.
- “SE” are standard errors.
- pWAIC is prediction penalty (estimate of *out-of-sample* vs. *in-sample*).
- weight gives the relative support for each model, given the data.
 - Useful for model-averaging.

Example Using WAIC

- Plant growth experiment:

- DAG



H_0 = height before, H_1 = height after,
 T = anti-fungal treatment, F = fungus


- Three models:

1. mdl_0 : $\mu \sim \text{log-Normal}(0, 0.25)$

2. mdl_T : $\mu = \alpha + \beta_T T$

3. mdl_TF : $\mu = \alpha + \beta_T T + \beta_F F$

```
plot(compare(mdl_0, mdl_T, mdl_TF, func = WAIC), cex=2, lwd=2)
```



- Plot:

- Line is range of estimated out-of-sample deviance
- Gray point is best estimate of out-of-sample deviance
- Black point is in-sample deviance
- Light lines over models are differences from best model

- TF model is clearly the best for predictions
 - We can't tell which of the others is better
- TF model has post-treatment confounder
 - WAIC can't tell us about causation

Interactions

- Multiple regression models may or may not include interactions:
 - Non-interacting models are *separable*: The effect of each variable is independent of all the other variables.

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta_x x + \beta_z z$$

- Doubling x has the same effect on μ regardless what z is.
- Interacting models are *non-separable*: The effect of one variable depends on another.

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta_x x + \beta_z z + \beta_{xz} xz$$

- The effect of doubling x depends on z .
 - Example: Compared to non-smokers who aren't exposed to asbestos,
 - Smokers have 10.3 times greater risk of lung cancer.
 - Non-smokers exposed to asbestos have 7.4 times greater risk.
 - Smokers exposed to asbestos have 36.8 times greater risk.
 - If there was no interaction, the increase would be 17.7 times (10.3 + 7.4).

Interactions and DAGs

- A DAG can't tell you about an interaction.

$$X \longrightarrow Y \longleftarrow Z$$

- This figure could represent a model with or without interactions:

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta_x x + \beta_z z$$

or

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta_x x + \beta_z z + \beta_{xz} xz$$

- The DAG says that x and z influence y , but it doesn't say **how** they influence y .

Worked Example: Africa

Geography and Economy in Africa

- Is there a relationship between topographic roughness and per-capita GDP?


```
data(rugged)
d <- rugged
```

■ Columns include:

- `rgdppc_2000`: GDP per-capita in 2000
- `rugged`: Terrain ruggedness.
- `cont_africa`: Indicator variable if continent is Africa

■ Transform data

```
dd <- d |> filter(complete.cases(rgdppc_2000)) |>
  mutate(
    log_gdp = log(rgdppc_2000),
    log_gdp_std = log_gdp / mean(log_gdp),
    rugged_std = rugged / max(rugged)
  )
```



```
dd |> mutate(Africa = ifelse(cont_africa, "African nations",
                             "Non-African nations")) |>
  ggplot(aes(x = rugged_std, y = log_gdp_std)) +
  geom_point(size = 2, alpha = 0.5, color = "darkblue") +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm", color = "darkblue") +
  labs(x = "Ruggedness (std)", y = "Log GDP (std)") +
  facet_wrap(~Africa)
```


Model



```
mdl_simple <- quap(
  alist(
    log_gdp_std ~ dnorm(mu , sigma),
    mu <- a + b * (rugged_std - 0.215),
    a ~ dnorm(1, 1),
    b ~ dnorm(0, 1),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = dd)
```

- The **0.215** is the average roughness for all countries.
- Now check the priors

```
prior <- extract.prior(mdl_simple, n = 50)
new_data <- tibble(rugged_std = seq(0, 1, 0.01))
prior_samples <- linpred_draws(
  mdl_simple, new_data, post = prior, value = "mu")
```

- Plot the priors

```
ggplot(prior_samples, aes(x = rugged_std, y = mu, group = .draw)) +
  geom_line(color = "gray50") +
  geom_hline(yintercept = quantile(dd$log_gdp_std, c(0.055, 0.945)),
    linetype = "dashed", size = 1) +
  labs(x = "Ruggedness (std)", y = "log GDP", )
```



Examine the model

```
mdl_simple <- quap(
  alist(
    log_gdp_std ~ dnorm(mu , sigma),
    mu <- a + b * (rugged_std - 0.215),
    a ~ dnorm(1, 0.1),
    b ~ dnorm(0, 0.3),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = dd)
```

```
precis_show(precis(mdl_simple, digits = 2))
```

```
##      mean    sd  5.5% 94.5%
## a      1.00 0.01   0.98  1.02
## b      0.00 0.05 -0.09  0.09
## sigma 0.14 0.01   0.12  0.15
```

- Create an interaction:
 - Intercept depends on the continent
 - Create an indicator variable:

```
# Make an indicator variable
dd <- dd |> mutate(cid = ifelse( dd$cont_africa==1 , 1 , 2 ))
```

```
mdl_inter <- quap(
  alist(
    log_gdp_std ~ dnorm(mu, sigma) ,
    mu <- a[cid] + b * (rugged_std - 0.215) ,
    a[cid] ~ dnorm(1, 0.1) ,
    b ~ dnorm(0, 0.3) ,
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data=dd)
```

```
compare(mdl_simple, mdl_inter) |> round(2)
```

```
##           WAIC      SE dWAIC    dSE pWAIC weight
## mdl_inter  -252.27 15.28   0.00    NA   4.24      1
## mdl_simple -188.70 13.31  63.57 15.16   2.71      0
```

```
precis_show(precis(mdl_inter, depth = 2, digits = 2))
```


```
##      mean    sd  5.5% 94.5%
## a[1]   0.88 0.02   0.85  0.91
## a[2]   1.05 0.01   1.03  1.07
## b     -0.05 0.05 -0.12  0.03
## sigma  0.11 0.01   0.10  0.12
```

How does the model do?

```
rugged_seq <- seq(0.1, 1.1, length.out = 30)
mu_afr <- data.frame(rugged_std = rugged_seq, cid = 1)
mu_not_afr <- data.frame(rugged_std = rugged_seq, cid = 2)
new_data <- bind_rows(mu_afr, mu_not_afr)
```

```
post <- linpred_draws(mdl_inter, new_data) |>
  mutate(cid = ordered(cid, levels = c(1,2),
    labels = c("Africa", "Not Africa")))
post_sum <- post |> group_by(.row, rugged_std, cid) |>
  summarize(mu = mean(.value),
    pi = list(PI(.value) |>
      set_names(c("lower", "upper")))) |>
  ungroup() |> unnest_wider(pi)
```

```
dd |> mutate(cid = ordered(cid, levels = c(1,2),
  labels = c("Africa", "Not Africa"))) |>
ggplot(aes(x = rugged_std, y = log_gdp_std,
  color = cid, shape = cid, linetype = cid)) +
  geom_point(size = 2, alpha = 0.5) +
  geom_smooth(aes(y = mu, ymin = lower, ymax = upper),
    data = post_sum, size = 1) +
  scale_color_manual(values = c("Africa" = "darkblue",
    "Not Africa" = "black"),
    name = NULL) +
  scale_linetype_manual(values = c("Africa" = "solid",
    "Not Africa" = "dashed"),
    name = NULL) +
  scale_shape_manual(values = c("Africa" = 19,
    "Not Africa" = 1),
    name = NULL) +
  labs(x = "Ruggedness (std)", y = "log GDP (std)") +
  theme(legend.key.width = unit(3, "lines"))
```



Better Interactions

```
mdl_int_2 <- quap(  
  alist(  
    log_gdp_std ~ dnorm(mu, sigma) ,  
    mu <- a[cid] + b[cid] * (rugged_std - 0.215) ,  
    a[cid] ~ dnorm(1, 0.1) ,  
    b[cid] ~ dnorm(0, 0.3) ,  
    sigma ~ dexp(1)  
  ), data=dd)
```


```
precis_show(precis(mdl_int_2, depth = 2, digits = 2))
```

```
##          mean    sd  5.5% 94.5%  
## a[1]      0.89 0.02   0.86  0.91  
## a[2]      1.05 0.01   1.03  1.07  
## b[1]      0.13 0.07   0.01  0.25  
## b[2]     -0.14 0.05  -0.23 -0.06  
## sigma    0.11 0.01   0.10  0.12
```

```
compare(mdl_simple, mdl_inter, mdl_int_2) |> round(2)
```

```
##           WAIC      SE dWAIC    dSE pWAIC weight  
## mdl_int_2  -258.68 15.21  0.00    NA   5.38  0.97  
## mdl_inter  -251.99 15.25  6.69   6.69  4.36  0.03  
## mdl_simple -189.00 13.29 69.68 15.47  2.58  0.00
```

How does the model do?



Continuous Interactions

A Winter Flower

- Tulips grown in greenhouses
 - Soil
 - Light
 - Water

```
data(tulips)
d <- tulips
head(tulips)
```

```
##   bed water shade blooms
## 1   a     1     1    0.00
## 2   a     1     2    0.00
## 3   a     1     3  111.04
## 4   a     2     1  183.47
## 5   a     2     2   59.16
## 6   a     2     3   76.75
```

```
levels(tulips$bed)
```

```
## [1] "a" "b" "c"
```

```
d <- d |> mutate(
  blooms_std = blooms / max(blooms),
  water_cent = water - mean(water),
  shade_cent = shade - mean(shade)
)
```

- Predict `blooms` from `water`, and `shade`.
- Two models:

- **Non-interacting:**

```
mdl_tulip_non <- quap(
  alist(
    blooms_std ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + bw * water_cent + bs * shade_cent,
    a ~ dnorm(0.5, 0.25),
    bw ~ dnorm(0, 0.25),
    bs ~ dnorm(0, 0.25),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data=d)
```

- **Interacting:**

```
mdl_tulip_inter <- quap(
  alist(
    blooms_std ~ dnorm(mu, sigma) ,
    mu <- a + bw * water_cent + bs * shade_cent +
      bws * water_cent * shade_cent,
    a ~ dnorm(0.5, 0.25),
    bw ~ dnorm(0, 0.25),
    bs ~ dnorm(0, 0.25),
    bws ~ dnorm(0, 0.25),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data=d)
```

Interpreting the models

