

Many Variables (Part 1)

EES 4891-06/5891-01

Bayesian Statistical Methods

Jonathan Magnolia Gilligan

Class #6: Monday February 2, 2026

Outline of Regression Modeling

Outline of Regression Modeling

1. Develop a formula relating outcome variable (y) to predictor variables (x_1, x_2, \dots)

$$y \sim \text{Normal}(\mu, \sigma)$$

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta x$$

- You can use theory and/or exploratory analysis of your actual data.

2. Develop priors for parameters

$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(178, 20)$$

$$\beta \sim \text{Normal}(0, 10)$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$

- Use theory
- Check using *prior predictions*:
 - Does applying priors to formulas make reasonable predictions

3. Fit model:

- Combine *formulas, priors, and observed data* to produce *posterior* probability distributions of parameters
- *Prior* represents what you knew about the parameters before getting the new data.
- *Posterior* reflects your improved knowledge about parameters after incorporating new observations.

4. Check model:

- Compare *posterior predictions* to your observed data.
- Covariance among posteriors for different parameters may indicate a problem with your formulas.


Checking Models

Checking fit

- Sample a and b from the posterior
- Plot a line with the median slope and intercept
- Plot the original data

```
post <- extract.samples(lin_md1)
map <- summarize(post, a = median(a), b = median(b))
map_line <- tibble(weight = range(d2$weight),
                   height = map$a +
                             map$b * (weight - wbar))

ggplot(d2, aes(x = weight, y = height)) +
  geom_line(data = map_line, size = 1, color =
            "black") +
  geom_point(size = 2, color = "darkblue", alpha =
            0.2) +
  labs(x = "weight (kg)", y = "height (cm)")
```



What is the Posterior?

- The posterior is *full of lines*
 - Predict distribution of *average* heights


```
lines <- tidy_draws(lin_mdl, n = 20) |>  
  mutate(a = a - b * wbar)
```

- The posterior is *full of people*
 - Predict distribution of *individual* heights

```
people <- predicted_draws(lin_mdl, new_data,  
                          value = "height") |>  
  summarize(lower = quantile(height, 0.055),  
            upper = quantile(height, 0.945),  
            height = median(height))
```

- Plot the result

```
ggplot(d2, aes(x = weight, y = height)) +  
  geom_point(size = 2, color = "darkblue", alpha = 0.3)  
  +  
  geom_abline(data = lines, aes(slope = b, intercept =  
    a),  
             linewidth = 0.3) +  
  geom_ribbon(data = people, aes(ymin = lower, ymax =  
    upper),  
            fill = "darkgreen", alpha = 0.2) +  
  labs(x = "Weight (kg)", y = "Height (cm)")
```




Checking predictions

```
post <- predicted_draws(lin_mdl, new_data, value = "height")
post_sum <- summarize(post, lower = quantile(height, 0.055),
                      upper = quantile(height, 0.945),
                      height = mean(height))

p2 <- ggplot(d2, aes(x = weight, y = height)) +
  geom_ribbon(data = post_sum, aes(ymin = lower, ymax = upper),
            fill = "darkgreen", alpha = 0.2) +
  geom_line(data = post_sum, size = 2, color = "darkgreen") +
  geom_point(size = 2, color = "darkblue", alpha = 0.3) +
  labs(x = "weight (kg)", y = "height (cm)")
```

p2


- The graph shows the observed data and the 89% compatibility interval for predictions of where we will see data points.
 - 89% of the data should lie within this interval.
 - `linpred_draws` samples from posterior for $\mu = \alpha + \beta x$
 - `predicted_draws` samples from posterior for $y \sim \text{Normal}(\mu, \sigma)$



Fit Subsets of Data

```
f <- function(N) {  
  dN <- slice_head(d2, n = N)  
  mN <- quap(flist_lin, data = dN)  
  post <- tidy_draws(mN, n = 20) |>  
    mutate(a = a - b * wbar)  
  
  ggplot(dN, aes(x = weight, y = height)) +  
    geom_abline(data = post, mapping = aes(slope = b, intercept =  
      a),  
              color = "black", linewidth = 0.5, alpha = 0.3) +  
    geom_point(size = 3, color = "darkblue", alpha = 1 / log(N)) +  
    ylim(135, 180) +  
    labs(x = "weight (kg)", y = "height (cm)",  
         title = str_c("N = ", N))  
}  
  
library(patchwork)  
  
p1 <- f(10)  
p2 <- f(50)  
p3 <- f(150)  
p4 <- f(nrow(d2))  
  
p1 + p2 + p3 + p4 + plot_layout(ncol = 2)
```

- Sample 20 pairs of (α, β) from posterior and plot lines



Beyond Linear Models

Beyond Linear Models


- Sometimes linear models aren't good enough.
 - If we include children, height is no longer a linear function of weight.
- Polynomial models (quadratic, cubic, etc.) may be better.
- High powers of variables can get large, so **standardize** your data

$$x_s = \frac{x - \bar{x}}{\sigma_x},$$

where \bar{x} is the mean of x and σ_x is the standard deviation.

```
d_std <- mutate(d, ws = (weight - mean(weight)) / sd(weight))

ggplot(d_std, aes(x = ws, y = height)) +
  geom_point(size = 2, color = "darkblue", alpha = 0.5) +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm", color = "darkgreen", fill = "darkgreen",
             alpha = 0.3) +
  labs(x = "weight (std)", y = "height (cm)")
```



Polynomial Regression

- Model:

$$h \sim \text{Normal}(\mu, \sigma)$$

$$\mu = \alpha + \beta_1 w_s + \beta_2 w_s^2$$

$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(178, 20)$$

$$\beta_1 \sim \text{Log-Normal}(0, 1)$$

$$\beta_2 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 1)$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 50)$$

- w_s = standardized weight
- For computational efficiency, make a new variable $ws2 = ws^2$.

```
d_std <- mutate(d, ws = standardize(weight), ws2 = ws^2)


flist_lin_s <- alist(
  height ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
  mu <- a + b * ws,
  a ~ dnorm(178, 20),
  b ~ dlnorm(0,1),
  sigma ~ dunif(0,50)
)
lin_mdl_s <- quap(flist_lin_s, data = d_std)

flist_quad_s <- alist(
  height ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
  mu <- a + b1 * ws + b2 * ws2,
  a ~ dnorm(178, 20),
  b1 ~ dlnorm(0,1),
  b2 ~ dnorm(0,1),
  sigma ~ dunif(0,50)
)
quad_mdl_s <- quap(flist_quad_s, data = d_std)

precis(quad_mdl_s)
```

##		mean	sd	5.5%	94.5%
##	a	146.057412	0.3689756	145.467718	146.647106
##	b1	21.733063	0.2888891	21.271362	22.194763
##	b2	-7.803267	0.2741839	-8.241466	-7.365068
##	sigma	5.774476	0.1764652	5.492450	6.056501

Different polynomials



Nonparametric Models

Splines

- Originally from mechanical drafting splines
- Arbitrary smooth curve
- Complexity:
 - Physical splines: “ducks” or “whales”
 - Mathematical splines: “knots”
- Splines are a special case of a class of models called *generalized additive models* (GAMs).



(Photos: Rain Noe, When Splines Were Physical Objects)

Splines in Statistical Regression


- Cherry blossom data
 - Over 1000 years of historical records of cherry tree blossoming dates
 - Y. Aono & S. Saito, *Int. J. Biometeorology* **54**, 211 (2010).
 - No changes for most of history, but pronounced trend in 20th century (global warming).
- Spline regression:
 - *Basis splines*: for the i th point, x_i

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\text{knots}}} w_j B_{i,j}$$


n_{knots} = # knots, w_j = weight for knot j ,
 $B_{i,j}$ = i th row of j th basis function (matrix with one row for each x value, and n_{knots} columns).

```
data(cherry_blossoms)
d <- cherry_blossoms
precis_show(precis(d, digits = 2))
```

```
## 'data.frame': 1215 obs. of 5 variables:
##      mean      sd  5.5%  94.5%      histogram
## year    1408.00 350.88 867.77 1948.23
## doy      104.54   6.41  94.43 115.00
## temp       6.14   0.66   5.15   7.29
## temp_upper  7.19   0.99   5.90   8.90
## temp_lower  5.10   0.85   3.79   6.37
```




```
ggplot(d, aes(x = year, y = doy)) +
  geom_point(color = "darkblue", size = 1, alpha = 0.3) +
  scale_x_continuous(breaks = seq(600, 2200, by = 200)) +
  labs(x = "Year", y = "Day of year",
       title="Timing of cherry blossoms in Kyoto")
```



Linear Basis Spline

- Linear basis functions $B_j(x)$
 - 5 knots
 - Piecewise linear
 - At most 2 functions are nonzero for any x .
- Model fits weights w_j for each basis function



Cubic Basis Spline


- 15 knots
 - Equal # of years with data between knots.
- Cubic functions
- Only 3 have nonzero values for any x.

```
library(splines)
d2 <- filter(d, ! is.na(doy)) # omit missing values
n_knots <- 15
knot_list <- quantile(d2$year,
                      probs=seq(0,1, length.out = n_knots))

# Create basis function matrix
B <- bs(d2$year, knots = knot_list[-c(1,n_knots)],
       degree = 3, intercept = TRUE)

mdl <- quap(
  alist(
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + B %*% w,
    a ~ dnorm(100, 10),
    w ~ dnorm(0, 10),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ),
  data = list(D = d2$doy, B = B),
  start = list(w = rep(0, ncol(B)))
)
```

- `%*%` means matrix multiplication




Multiple Regression

Multiple Regression

- Single Regression:
 - Dependent variable depends on one independent (predictor) variable
- Multiple Regression:
 - Dependent variable depends on multiple independent variables.
- Why use Multiple Regression?
 - Statistical controls for confounding effects
 - On average, men are taller than women
 - Studies of how income correlates with height should control for sex.
- Why use Multiple Regression? (cont.)
 - Multiple causes and complex causation
 - Earth's temperature depends on
 - Greenhouse gas concentrations
 - Albedo (reflection of sunlight)
 - Brightness of the sun
 - Interactions (Chapter 8)
 - Smoking increases risk of lung cancer
 - Exposure to radon increases risk of lung cancer
 - The effect of radon is much greater among smokers

Does Waffle House Drive Divorce Rates?



- The Waffle-House Index

US NEWS

Major sign of how bad winter storm will be: Waffle House locations close across the South

By Anna Young
Published Jan. 25, 2026, 2:28 a.m. ET

53 Comments

A Tennessee Waffle House has closed because of the winter storm. Here's what to know about the Waffle House Index

When a Waffle House location closes, it's become an unofficial way of scaling just how dangerous weather conditions are.

LIVE

FIRST ALERT WEATHER

WINTER STORM HITS MIDDLE TENNESSEE

8:04 21°

WSMV4


WINTER STORM WARNING HENRY COUNTY UNTIL 6:00 PM ON SUNDAY

A Waffle House closed in Murfreesboro amid the weekend winter storm.


WAFFLE HOUSE

WAFFLE HOUSE DECLARES "CODE RED" SHUTS DOWN MULTIPLE LOCATIONS ACROSS FOUR STATES


M



Spurious Association



- Causation vs. correlation



Standardize Data

- Standardizing makes it easier to compare effects of different variables

```
library(rethinking)
data(WaffleDivorce)
d <- WaffleDivorce |> mutate(
  D = standardize(Divorce),
  M = standardize(Marriage),
  A = standardize(MedianAgeMarriage)
)
```

- Model

$$D_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_A A_i$$



$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.2)$$

$$\beta_A \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.5)$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$


```
mdl_A <- quap(
  alist(
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + bA * A,
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),
    bA ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = d)
```

```
mdl_M <- quap(
  alist(
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + bM * M,
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),
    bM ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = d)
```




Causal Relationships

- **Think before you regress**
 - The pattern we see here is typical when one variable influences the dependent variable and also the other independent variable.
 - Two possible causal relationships




- Which is it?



Testable Implications

- What are the possible *testable implications* of these DAGs?



- **Conditional independencies:**

1. Which variables should be associated in the data?
2. Which variables become dis-associated when we *condition* on another set of variables
 - **Conditioning:** Y is independent of X , conditioned on Z ($Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X | Z$) if X doesn't give us any additional information about Y when we already know Z .
 - Left DAG: There shouldn't be any independence among D , A , and M .
 - Right DAG: $D \perp\!\!\!\perp M | A$.

- Left DAG:

```
library(dagitty)
DMA_dag1 <- dagitty("dag{ D <- A -> M -> D }")
impliedConditionalIndependencies(DMA_dag1)
```

- No conditional independencies

- Right DAG:

```
DMA_dag2 <- dagitty("dag{ D <- A -> M }")
impliedConditionalIndependencies(DMA_dag2)
```

```
## D _||_ M | A
```


Multiple Regression Models

Multiple Regression Notation

$$D_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_M M_i + \beta_A A_i$$

$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.2)$$

$$\beta_M \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.5)$$

$$\beta_A \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.5)$$


$$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$$

```
mdl_multi <- quap(  
  alist(  
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),  
    mu <- a + bM * M + bA * A,  
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),  
    bM ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    bA ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    sigma ~ dexp(1)  
  ), data = d  
)  
  
precis_show(precis(mdl_multi, digits=2))
```

##	mean	sd	5.5%	94.5%
## a	0.00	0.10	-0.16	0.16
## bM	-0.07	0.15	-0.31	0.18
## bA	-0.61	0.15	-0.85	-0.37
## sigma	0.79	0.08	0.66	0.91

Comparing Models

```
coefstab_plot(coefstab mdl_A, mdl_M, mdl_multi), pars = c("bA", "bM"))
```




- In the multiple model, b_M is consistent with zero:
 - If we know the median age A ,
 - we get no additional information from knowing the marriage rate M .
 - $D \perp\!\!\!\perp M|A$

```
mdl_A <- quap(  
  alist(  
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),  
    mu <- a + bA * A,  
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),  
    bA ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    sigma ~ dexp(1)  
  ), data = d)  
  
mdl_M <- quap(  
  alist(  
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),  
    mu <- a + bM * M,  
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),  
    bM ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    sigma ~ dexp(1)  
  ), data = d)  
  
mdl_multi <- quap(  
  alist(  
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),  
    mu <- a + bM * M + bA * A,  
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),  
    bM ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    bA ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),  
    sigma ~ dexp(1)  
  ), data = d  
)
```

Conclusion


```
coefstab_plot(coefstab mdl_A, mdl_M, mdl_multi), pars = c("bA", "bM"))
```




- In the multiple model, b_M is consistent with zero:
 - If we know the median age A ,
 - we get no additional information from knowing the marriage rate M .
 - $D \perp\!\!\!\perp M|A$

- Therefore, DAG 2 is more consistent with the data

1. DAG 1 (No conditional independencies)



2. DAG 2 ($D \perp\!\!\!\perp M|A$)



Diagnostic Posterior Plots

Diagnostic Posterior Plots

- We can also learn from plotting the posterior in different ways.
 1. **Predictor residual plots:**
 - *Data versus residual predictor values.*
 - These are only useful for understanding the model itself.
 2. **Posterior prediction plots:**
 - *Predictions versus raw data.*
 - Useful for checking how well the model fits the data.
 - Don't tell us about causal relationships.
 3. **Counterfactual plots:**
 - *Implied predictions for imaginary experiments.*
 - Useful for exploring causal implications.

Predictor Residual Plots

- Predict M from A


```
mdl_MA <- quap(
  alist(
    M ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + b * A,
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),
    b ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = d
)

new_data <- select(d, D, A, M, Loc)
notable_states_MA <- c("WY", "ND", "ME",
                       "HI", "DC")

post_MA <- linpred_draws(
  mdl_MA, new_data,
  value = "mu", ndraws = 100 ) |>
ungroup() |>
summarize(estimate = mean(mu),
          .by = c("Loc", "D", "A", "M"))
```



```
library(ggrepel)

ggplot(post_MA, aes(x = A, y = M)) +
  geom_point(size = 3, color = "darkblue", alpha = 0.3) +
  geom_line(aes(y = estimate), size = 1, color = "black") +
  geom_segment(aes(xend = A, yend = estimate), size = 0.25,
              color = "gray40") +
  geom_text_repel(data = . %>% filter(Loc %in% notable_states_MA),
                  aes(label = Loc), size = 5,
                  nudge_x = 0.01, nudge_y = 0.05) +
  labs(x = "Age at marriage (std)", y = "Marriage rate (std)",
       title = "Predict marriage rate from age at marriage") +
  theme_bw(base_size = 15) + theme(panel.grid = element_blank())
```




Which Model?

- We compared two models:




- We ruled out (1).

- But what about this alternative?




Compare Residual Plots

DAG 2



vs. DAG 3




```

d2 <- post_MA |> mutate(resid = M - estimate)


mdl_MA_resid <- quap(
  alist(
    D ~ dnorm(mu, sigma),
    mu <- a + b_res * resid,
    a ~ dnorm(0, 0.2),
    b_res ~ dnorm(0, 0.5),
    sigma ~ dexp(1)
  ), data = d2
)

post_MA_2 <- linpred_draws(mdl_MA_resid, select(d2,
  resid),
  ndraws = 1000, value =
    "estimate") |>
ungroup() |>
summarize(mean = mean(estimate),
  lower = quantile(estimate, 0.055),
  upper = quantile(estimate, 0.945),
  .by = "resid")
  
```




Compare Residual Plots


DAG 2




vs. DAG 3



- Look for structure in the residuals.
 - Is the trend line consistent with being flat?
 - DAG 2: Marriage rate residuals? (Yes)
 - DAG 3: Age at marriage residuals? (No)
 - Correlation implies structure the model doesn't account for.
 - A influences D, even after accounting for M
 - DAG (3) is ruled out.



Posterior Predictive Plots



1. How well does the posterior distribution match the data?
 2. When the model fails, **how** does it fail?
- Notice that I use `linpred_draws` (equivalent to `link`), not `predicted_draws` (equivalent to `extract.samples`)

```
mu <- linpred_draws(mdl_multi, select(d, D, A, M, Loc),
                    ndraws = 1000, value = "mu")


d2 <- mu |> ungroup() |>
  summarize(estimate = mean(mu),
            lower = quantile(mu, 0.055),
            upper = quantile(mu, 0.975),
            .by = c("Loc", "D", "A", "M"))

notable_states <- c("ID", "UT", "RI", "ME")

ggplot(d2, aes(x = D, y = estimate,
               ymax = upper, ymin = lower)) +
  geom_pointrange(size = 1, color = "darkblue", alpha =
    0.3) +
  geom_text_repel(data = filter(d2, Loc %in%
                                notable_states),
                  aes(label = Loc), size = 5) +
  geom_abline(slope = 1, intercept = 0, color = "black",
              linetype = "dashed") +
  labs(x = "Observed divorce rate",
       y = "Predicted divorce")
```

Counterfactual Predictions


- No states have both a high median age of marriage and a high marriage rate.
- Utah: $A_{\text{std}} = -2.21$, $M_{\text{std}} = 2.5$, $D_{\text{std}} = 0.28$.
 - What would Utah's divorce rate be if its median age at marriage were high, and its marriage rate remained the same?
 - Use this causal model:




- Recipe:
 1. Pick a variable to manipulate: *intervention* variable.
 2. Define a range of values for the intervention variable.
 3. For each value of the intervention variable:
 - Sample parameters from the posterior.
 - For each sample of the posterior, use causal model to simulate the values of other variables, including the outcome.

Implementing Counterfactual Prediction

```
mdl_cfact <- quap( alist(  
  ## A -> D <- M  
  D ~ dnorm( mu, sigma),  
  mu <- a + bM * M + bA * A,  
  a ~ dnorm( 0, 0.2),  
  bM ~ dnorm( 0, 0.5),  
  bA ~ dnorm( 0, 0.5),  
  sigma ~ dexp( 1),  
  
  ## A -> M  
  M ~ dnorm( mu_M, sigma_M),  
  mu_M <- aM + bAM*A,  
  aM ~ dnorm( 0, 0.2),  
  bAM ~ dnorm( 0, 0.5),  
  sigma_M ~ dexp( 1)  
), data = d)  
  
new_data <- tibble(A = seq(from = -2, to = 2, length.out =  
  30))  
  
cfact <- sim(mdl_cfact, data = new_data, vars = c("M",  
  "D"))
```




- Model DAG:




Different Counterfactual

- Now, suppose you want to explore the effect of changing M instead of A?
 - If we're going to manipulate M, it no longer depends on A, so we need a different DAG:



```
new_data_2 <- tibble(M = seq(from = -2, to = 2, length.out = 30),  
                     A = 0)  
cfact_2 <- sim(mdl_cfact, data = new_data_2, vars =  
              c("D"))
```



- We've simulated two controlled experiments:
 1. Vary A and account for effects of A on M.
 2. Vary M and keep A constant.