

A Bayesian Approach to Zero-Inflation Modeling

---

A Thesis

Presented to

The Division of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

Reed College

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Arts

---

Josh Yamamoto

May 2023



Approved for the Division  
(Mathematics & Statistics)

---

Leonard Wainstein



# Acknowledgements

I'd like to thank my advisors Lenny Wainstein and Kelly McConville for their significant support, insight, and kindness throughout this thesis process. I'm also extremely grateful for the guidance and mentorship of Jonathan Wells, Kristin Bott, Simon Couch, and Grayson White who were each uniquely integral to my time studying Statistics at Reed.



# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Zero-Inflated Data	1
1.2 Clustered Data	3
1.3 Forestry Setting	3
1.3.1 Immediate Modeling Struggles	5
1.3.2 The New Model	6
1.3.3 Building the Model	7
1.4 Looking Ahead	8
<b>Chapter 2: Frequentists and Bayesians</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Bayesian “v.s.” Frequentist: Cryptic Definitions	11
2.2 Worked Example: A better way to learn	12
2.2.1 Frequentist Version	12
2.2.2 Bayesian Version	15
2.3 Takeaways	20
<b>Chapter 3: Methods</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Notation	21
3.2 Model Structure Motivation	21
3.3 Specific Models	22
3.4 Model Fitting: Two Ways	23
3.4.1 Frequentist	23
3.4.2 Bayesian	24
3.5 Evaluation of the Bayesian Model: Posterior Predictive Distribution	30
3.5.1 Theoretical version	31
3.5.2 MCMC version	33
3.5.3 Combining the Model Predictions	34
3.5.4 Posterior Predictive Distribution Finalized	35

3.5.5	Prediction Intervals . . . . .	35
<b>Chapter 4:</b>	<b>Simultaneous v.s Separate . . . . .</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1	Simultaneous Model Build . . . . .	37
4.2	Practical Backing . . . . .	39
<b>Chapter 5:</b>	<b>Simulation Study . . . . .</b>	<b>41</b>
5.1	Aims . . . . .	41
5.2	Data and Dials . . . . .	42
5.2.1	Estimands . . . . .	42
5.2.2	Data Generating Process . . . . .	42
5.2.3	Dials . . . . .	44
5.3	Methods . . . . .	47
5.4	Performance metrics . . . . .	48
<b>Chapter 6:</b>	<b>Results . . . . .</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1	Expectations . . . . .	51
6.2	Model Failures . . . . .	52
6.2.1	Model Regularization through Informative Priors . . . . .	55
6.3	Root Mean Squared Error . . . . .	56
6.4	Empirical Variance . . . . .	57
6.5	Empirical Bias . . . . .	57
6.6	Coverage . . . . .	58
6.7	General Remarks . . . . .	59
6.7.1	Results Discussion . . . . .	60
6.7.2	Procedural Discussion . . . . .	61
<b>Chapter 7:</b>	<b>Package Vignette . . . . .</b>	<b>63</b>
7.1	R Package: zinf . . . . .	63
7.2	Forestry Data . . . . .	65
7.3	Application . . . . .	65
7.3.1	Individual Frequentist models . . . . .	66
7.3.2	Individual bayesian models . . . . .	67
7.3.3	Using zinf . . . . .	70
7.4	Next Steps . . . . .	73
<b>Chapter 8:</b>	<b>Conclusion . . . . .</b>	<b>75</b>
8.1	Future Work . . . . .	76



References . . . . .	79
----------------------	----



# List of Figures

1.1	Zero-Inflated data . . . . .	2
1.2	Zero-Inflated Forestry data. . . . .	4
1.3	The shortcomings of a simple linear regression model in this context.	5
1.4	Example of two new data points that we might be interested in testing our model on. . . . .	7
2.1	A visualization of Frequentist confidence intervals. . . . .	14
2.2	The Prior, Likelihood, and Posterior for this example all plotted together.	19
3.1	Various parameter values for the prior distributions. . . . .	25
3.2	The Gamma(a, b) Distribution . . . . .	29
5.1	The distribution of the response variable in the population that we generated for our simulation. . . . .	43
5.2	Scatterplot of the main covariate against the response variable in Group 1 of our generated population data. . . . .	43
6.1	Model Failure rates across all simulation settings. . . . .	53
6.2	Results Excerpt Example . . . . .	54
6.3	Percent of Results we would get to use if we only included simulation iterations where none of the models failed. . . . .	54
6.4	Model Failure Rate comparison between the Bayesian Normal model with flat priors and with informative priors. . . . .	55
6.5	Root Mean Squared Error . . . . .	56
6.6	Empirical Variance . . . . .	57
6.7	Empirical Bias . . . . .	58
6.8	Struggles for the Frequentist model in $J = 5$ . . . . .	61
7.1	Two Software Versions . . . . .	64

7.2	Relationship between Tree Canopy Cover and Dry Above Ground	
	Biomass from Live Trees . . . . .	68
7.3	Posterior Predictive Distributions for the two groups in our test dataset	73

# Abstract

This thesis considers modeling situations where the data exhibits two distinctive features: the response variable is “zero-inflated”, and the data is “clustered”. I take zero-inflated to mean that values of the response are either zero or belong to a strictly positive continuous distribution, and I take clustered to mean that there is a meaningful grouping in the data structure that makes points within clusters similar. The thesis focuses primarily on building the models in a Bayesian frame and is just as interested in understanding the procedural aspects of doing so as it is in dissecting the results. In this way this work departs from the majority of statistical modeling literature as it seeks to highlight the ways in which a model can be valuable beyond the results that it produces. An extensive simulation was run with the aim of understanding how the performance of these models changes as we vary the sample size, the number of total clusters, and the quality of the priors used. While we find that the Bayesian model performs very similarly to its Frequentist counterpart in terms of traditional performance metrics, we also lay out and describe the ways in which the additional conceptual work associated with building Bayesian models has the capacity to promote greater intentionality and understanding in a model building workflow. Finally, we introduce the developmental version of an R software package that aims to reduce the computational burden of executing methods like prediction and summary for these zero-inflation models.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

In this thesis, I will be concerned with modeling a response variable using various explanatory variables from data that exhibit two distinctive features: (i) the response variable is “zero-inflated”, and (ii) the data is “clustered”.

### 1.1 Zero-Inflated Data

As the name suggests, data are canonically classified as being zero-inflated when they contain a significant proportion of zeroes. While it’s hardly ever very productive to spell out a definition for a phrase that is its own definition, I do so here to emphasize the fact that to call data zero-inflated is to only say something very broad about how that data is distributed. There is no commonly accepted cutoff for at what proportion of zeros our data deserves the label zero-inflation, and there is no restriction on the distribution of the non-zero data. While the work done in this thesis concerns zero-inflated data with no constraint on the level of “zerness”, I do require that the non-zero data is positive and continuously distributed. For example, a response variable that is zero-inflated in this way might look like this:




Figure 1.1: Zero-Inflated data

In reality, this form of zero-inflated data is one that we see quite often in the real world. We should note that an abundance of zeros in a measured variable might come about for a variety of different reasons. Sometimes it could be a characteristic of the data itself. For example, if we collected data on the total weight of fish caught at a lake by individuals on a given day, we would likely see a lot of individuals who caught zero fish leading to a significant portion of zeros in our data. But, other times it could be a characteristic of the data collection process itself. For example a measurement error or a sampling error could cause data to be zero-inflated as well.

Importantly, as I am working in a modeling setting, when I say that data is zero-inflated I mean that the *response variable* is zero-inflated. Although I will simply refer to my data as being zero-inflated and my models as being suited for zero-inflated data for the duration of this thesis, this is simply a matter of convenience and not a statement that the methods work for any situation in which data can be considered zero-inflated. Put simply, I explore, present, and evaluate a model that is suited for a response variable which has a significant portion of zeroes, with the non-zero portion of that variable belonging to a positive continuous distribution.



## 1.2 Clustered Data

Furthermore, we will be operating in a setting where the data is not only zero-inflated, but also exhibits a clustered structure. Again, the notion of data being clustered is a very non precise one. For this thesis we will not put a very strong restriction on what this looks like. Our data will be considered clustered in the sense that there is meaningful grouping in the data structure that makes data points within the same cluster more alike on average than points between clusters.

For example, going back to the fishing in a lake example, if we looked at data on the weight of each individual fish caught, we would imagine that fish of the same species would generally be more similar in weight than fish from different species.

## 1.3 Forestry Setting

One specific setting where we see both of these features is the United States' forests. In particular, I will focus on forestry data collected by the Forestry Inventory & Analysis Program (FIA) of the U.S. Government. The FIA monitors the nation's forests by collecting data on, and providing estimates for, a wide array of forest attributes. Not only is this work vitally important, but it's essential that it be done accurately and efficiently: "The FIA is responsible for reporting on dozens, if not hundreds, of forest attributes relating to merchantable timber and other wood products, fuels and potential fire hazard, condition of wildlife habitats, risk associated with fire, insects or disease, biomass, carbon storage, forest health, and other general characteristics of forest ecosystems."(McConville, Moisen, & Frescino, 2020).

The FIA employs a quasi-systematic sampling design to determine which locations across the U.S. to physically collect forest attribute data at. These sampled locations are referred to as plot-level data and the FIA sends a crew out to physically measure a wealth of forest attributes at that location. As you might expect, not only is this method extremely time intensive, but it is also very expensive. The vastness of the nation's forests in tandem with the resources needed to collect plot-level data, make it impossible to collect census level data on forest metrics. Thus, the need for additional data sources as well as statistical models are vital to the work that the FIA does. The main secondary data source that the FIA employs as covariates in their statistical models is remote sensed data. The remote sensed data typically includes climate metrics (e.g. temperature and precipitation), geomorphological measures (e.g. elevation and eastness), as well as metrics like proportion of forest which

can be measured from a satellite.

While the main use of the additional remote sensed data sources are to increase the accuracy of the estimators that the FIA builds, they are also used to make rational decisions about the aforementioned plot-level data collection. Before sending a crew out to a given sampled location, the FIA will first look at the remote sensed data for that location. If that location happens to be in a place where there is clearly no forest, for example in the middle of a parking lot, the FIA will not send a crew out and instead will mark all forest attributes for that location as being zero. As you might imagine, this happens quite a bit, and so an interesting characteristic of many forest attribute variables collected by the FIA is that they are zero-inflated. Importantly, this is an example of where the data is zero-inflated because of the data collection process.

If we look at the distribution of the FIA collected forest attribute “Dry Above Ground Biomass From live Trees”, we can see that it is indeed quite zero-inflated.




Figure 1.2: Zero-Inflated Forestry data.

Additionally, the FIA groups the continental U.S. into smaller domains called Eco-Subsections. These Eco-Subsections are drawn with the goal of maintaining internal ecologically homogeneity as best as possible. Thus each plot-level data point belongs to a specific Eco-Subsection and it’s this grouping that gives us a clustered data structure.

Not only is the FIA data a good real life example where we see this zero-inflated

and clustered data structure, but it's also a setting in which it's quite important that the models used to estimate these forest attributes are sufficiently accurate and efficient.

### 1.3.1 Immediate Modeling Struggles

To motivate using a more complex method, I'll first show what happens when we try to just fit a simple linear regression to this type of data. If we regress our response variable on a useful covariate and plot both the data and the simple linear regression line together we get the following




Figure 1.3: The shortcomings of a simple linear regression model in this context.

While this model isn't awful, it's certainly misspecified. What I mean by this is that a simple straight line shown in Figure 1.3 does not appropriately capture the dynamics of the relationship between our covariate and our response. The zero-inflation in the response variable pulls the regression line down so that it doesn't properly capture the relationship between the explanatory variable and the *non-zero* response, but more importantly it doesn't capture the structure of zeros in the response at all. We can see that the only time this model will predict a near zero response is when the covariate value is very close to zero, but this is an extreme limitation of the model since we observe zero response values across almost the entire range of observed values for the covariate. What's more, a simple linear regression

model does not allow us to understand how the probability of our response variable being zero, changes with our covariate.

We would call this model statistically biased, as it is overly simple and thus doesn't properly capture the structure of the data. While perhaps it's unfair to motivate my method by pitting it against the simplest of statistical models, the reality is that linear regression is a very powerful and widely used tool. Moreover, in a setting such as this one where the data looks plausibly linear, the principle of parsimony might make a linear regression model a well reasoned choice. While there's certainly a need for a model that is better fit to the data, I won't go down the route of constructing an incredibly opaque and complex deep learning model to do so. Instead, the model I present is interpretable and intuitive while flexible enough to better capture the structure of the zero-inflated data.

### 1.3.2 The New Model

While I will exhaustively describe the details of, and the math behind, the exact model in Chapter 3, I'll go through a non-technical overview of how it will function here.

The defining characteristic of the model is that it is a two-part model. Instead of trying to fit the data with a singular model, we instead fit two different models and then combine them at the end. The two models are

1. A classification model fit to the entire data set that predicts how likely it is that a certain data point has a non-zero response value.
2. A regression model fit to the *non-zero* portion of the dataset that predicts the continuous response variable.

To get a final prediction for a data point we take the prediction from model (1) and multiply it by the prediction from model (2).

$$\text{Final Prediction} = \underbrace{\left( \text{Classification Model Output} \right)}_{\text{Model (1)}} \times \underbrace{\left( \text{Regression Model Output} \right)}_{\text{Model (2)}}$$

We can go back to Figure 1.3 to unpack why this is a reasonable strategy.




Figure 1.4: Example of two new data points that we might be interested in testing our model on.

Let's start with the left hand side of Figure 1.4 that has a data point with zero response value. We'd expect a very bad prediction from model (2) which was only fit to the non-zero data, but the intuition here is that if our classification model is sufficiently accurate then it shouldn't matter, as it will identify the point as being zero and thus the prediction will just be sent close to zero when multiplied by that classification model output.

On the other hand, the right hand side of Figure 1.4 where we have a data point with non-zero response value. We'd expect a good prediction from model (2) here and again if the classification model is sufficiently accurate then it should identify it as being a likely non-zero data point and the model (2) prediction should be relatively unchanged when multiplied by the classification model output.

Clearly the success of this strategy relies on the quality of the two individual models, but at least we can see how this method has the capacity to capture the zero-inflation data structure.

### 1.3.3 Building the Model

Now, as the title suggests I'll be building these models in a Bayesian frame. But what does that even mean and why would one want to do that? While most of the thesis will be devoted to answering the second question, I'll spend some time in the next section describing Bayesian methods, and walking through how they differ from

a Frequentist approach.

Importantly, since this thesis is simply an earnest exploration of a Bayesian method, it has no intention to participate in the deep and opaque philosophical dialogue regarding whether Bayesian or Frequentist methods are a more “correct” way to do statistics.

That being said, the word Bayesian is so overwhelmingly ideologically tied to this statistical dichotomy that it is, by nature, very difficult to talk about a Bayesian method without talking about Frequentism as well. Because classical statistical methods are all Frequentist ones, there is often a pressure to validate a Bayesian method by standing it next to its Frequentist counterpart. While this Bayesian thesis will indeed feature an alternative Frequentist method, it does so, not to argue for one side or the other, but rather to illustrate some of the key differences in, and logic behind, Bayesian and Frequentist analyses.

## 1.4 Looking Ahead

In order to introduce, study, and implement these models I will structure the research in the following way:

- Chapter 2 gives a thorough functional overview of how Bayesian and Frequentist methods differ in the simple setting of inference for a mean. The goal here is primarily to provide a gentle introduction to Bayesian data analysis, so as not to drop the reader into the deep end when the main model is introduced.
- Chapter 3 gives a detailed overview of all the methods employed in the thesis. It starts with a high-level description of the Cluster Zero-Inflation model, before moving on to detailed descriptions of how each model will be built. Next, prediction for Bayesian models is illustrated both theoretically and computationally.
- Chapter 4 walks through a proof that provides justification for building each part of the Bayesian two part model separately and then combining the results at the end.
- Chapter 5 sets up the simulation study that serves as the main process by which we evaluate the various models.
- Chapter 6 showcases the results of each model’s performance in the simulation study. Beyond comparing the performance metrics of each model, I also

describe the challenges associated with making comparisons between Bayesian and Frequentist models in a complex setting like this one.

- Chapter 7 gives an overview of the R Package written to accompany the methods explored in this thesis. A vignette is provided that applies the R Package to the Forestry data setting.
- Finally, Chapter 8 provides some concluding thoughts and describes possible extensions.





# Chapter 2

## Frequentists and Bayesians

### 2.1 Bayesian “v.s.” Frequentist: Cryptic Definitions

Perhaps the biggest roadblock for understanding how a Bayesian methodology differs from a Frequentist one stems from the fact that most of the statements you find on the internet are short cryptic quips that, while true, are largely unhelpful for someone just starting to dig in.

For example, a simple Google search for “Bayesian v.s. Frequentist” will tell you that this statistical philosophic divide is mainly a question of what we mean by probability. The top search result will likely say that for Frequentists, probabilities are fundamentally related to the frequencies of repeated events, while for Bayesians probabilities are related to one’s own certainty or uncertainty about events. Again, while this statement is correct and does lead to many of the main functional differences between the two methods, it’s nearly impossible to translate this statement into an understanding of how the methods differ in practice.

If you dig a bit deeper and refine your Google search, you’ll eventually come across a more technical definition such as this one from Gelman:

“Bayesian statistical conclusions about a parameter  $\theta$  are made in terms of probability statements. These probability statements are conditional on the observed value of  $[x]$ , and ... are written simply as  $p(\theta \mid x)$  ... It is at the fundamental level of conditioning on observed data that Bayesian inference departs from the approach to statistical inference described in many textbooks, which is based on a retrospective evaluation of the procedure used to estimate  $\theta$  over the distribution of possible  $[x]$  val-

ues conditional on the true unknown value of  $\theta$ " (Gelman, Carlin, Stern, & Rubin, 1995)

It's not important to understand what this is saying right now, but I include it here because in just a few sentences Gelman fully lays out the core difference between Bayesian and Frequentist methods. While it is not a good entry point for someone just beginning to learn, it will be helpful to return back to portions of this excerpt as we work through an extended example.

## 2.2 Worked Example: A better way to learn

At a very high level, the fact that one should always return to when comparing a Bayesian and Frequentist methodology is that in an analysis for a parameter  $\theta$ ,

- Frequentists treat the parameter as fixed and aim to quantify how the data might vary around the fixed (but unknown) parameter value.
- Bayesians treat the parameter as random and try to quantify how the parameter might vary based on the observed data.

With this in mind, we now turn to a simple inference example.

Suppose we are interested in estimating the average weight of squirrels in a given park, let's call this  $\theta$ . Moreover, suppose that we want to somehow quantify our uncertainty for that estimate. Suppose that the distribution of the weight for the entire squirrel population in that park is  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$  (we treat the standard deviation as being fixed and known so as to simplify our example) and that we've properly collected a random sample  $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$  from the population.

### 2.2.1 Frequentist Version

We choose the sample mean  $\bar{X}$  as our point estimate and because of the Central Limit Theorem we can say that it is distributed  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1/n)$ . And indeed, as laid out above, by using asymptotic theory to place a distribution on the data while centering it on the fixed unknown value of the parameter, we are treating the data as random and the unknown parameter as fixed. Some shifting and scaling tells us that,

$$\frac{\bar{X} - \theta}{1/\sqrt{n}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

Furthermore, properties of the Normal distribution tell us that,

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(-1.96 < \frac{\bar{X} - \theta}{1/\sqrt{n}} < 1.96\right) &= 0.95 \\
\implies P\left(\bar{X} - 1.96 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} < \theta < \bar{X} + 1.96 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) &= 0.95
\end{aligned}$$

So a Frequentist would end up with what is called a 95% confidence interval for  $\theta$  of:

$$\left(\bar{X} - 1.96 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \bar{X} + 1.96 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (2.1)$$

Let's pause to ask ourselves what is random in Equation (2.1). For starters,  $\bar{X}$  is certainly random since it came from a random sample from the population, but an immediate implication of this is that the interval itself is actually random too. The very first step in our process was to use asymptotic theory (the Central Limit Theorem) to place a distribution on our observed data  $\bar{X}$ . This randomness in the data thus carries through to our confidence interval and we end up with an uncertainty statement about the **procedure** being performed and not the parameter itself. Different samples will result in different  $\bar{X}$ s which will result in different confidence intervals.

It's perhaps easiest to understand how to interpret Equation (2.1) through a quick simulation and visualization. If we generated a 100 new samples from the population with the true parameter  $\theta$  being 5, and computed a confidence interval for each, we could then plot all 100 intervals and count how many of them contain the true parameter.



Figure 2.1: A visualization of Frequentist confidence intervals.

First of all, 2.1 really drills home the point that Frequentists treat the parameter as fixed and try to quantify how the data might vary around it. Here we see that in 6 of our iterations of this sampling procedure, the confidence interval did not contain the true parameter, giving us coverage of 94%. The reason we did not observe 95% coverage, is again due to the fact that the intervals are random and Equation (2.1) is an asymptotic statement about the process of resampling data and computing a new confidence interval. Thus, the correct interpretation of Equation (2.1) is that if we repeated the sampling procedure many times, we'd expect the true mean,  $\theta$ , to be captured by such an interval 95% of the time.

With this new understanding, we can unpack why it's incorrect to interpret Equation (2.1) as saying that “the interval contains the true parameter with probability 0.95”. As we just saw, our confidence interval is really a statement about a result we'd see if we repeated the whole procedure many times, and it is absolutely not a statement about any singular instance of the procedure. For a given confidence interval, the true parameter either lies within the interval or it doesn't, with 100% certainty.

## Revisiting the Cryptic Definitions

Before moving on to exploring how a Bayesian would tackle this inference problem, think back to the beginning of the section where we described how an internet search

might tell you that Frequentists conceptualize probability in terms of frequency of related events. While this statement is largely unhelpful on its own, it actually becomes quite helpful when taken together with the example that we’ve just walked through. Through a Frequentist lense, the probability statement in Equation (2.1) must be conceptualized in terms of frequency of related events, which in this case is hypothetical resampling of the data.

What’s more, while it’s still overly complicated in its language, Gelman’s statement that Frequentist inference is “based on a retrospective evaluation of the procedure used to estimate  $\theta$  over the distribution of possible  $[x]$  values conditional on the true unknown value of  $\theta$ ” (Gelman et al., 1995), can at least partially be understood. Each of these pieces are things ideas that we’ve developed through our example:

- “The retrospective evaluation of the procedure used to estimate  $\theta$ ”: In the example this was the resampling of our data
- “over the distribution of possible  $[x]$  values”: In our example this involved using the Central Limit Theorem to place a distribution on our data
- “conditional on the true unknown value of  $\theta$ ”: Treating  $\theta$  as fixed but unknown.

While these definitions are still found to be lacking when trying to absorb them on their own, in the context of our example, we can start to understand and appreciate the things that they are saying.

## 2.2.2 Bayesian Version

Instead of first describing the nuts and bolts of how we estimate both the parameter of interest and the uncertainty in that estimate as we did in the previous section, we start at the end with the final expression for both of these things in order to draw out some of the more important similarities and differences between the two methods.

### General Form

A good place to start whenever performing a Bayesian analysis is to remember that “the guiding principle for bayesian statistics is that the state of knowledge about anything unknown is described by a probability distribution.” (Gelman et al., 1995). In the context of inference where we’re interested in an unknown parameter  $\theta$ , a Bayesian describes all of their knowledge about  $\theta$  using a probability distribution. In particular, Bayesians use a specific distribution to do so- *the posterior distribution*. The posterior distribution is the center of interest for all Bayesian analyses and it is

simply the distribution of the parameter of interest, conditional on the observed data:  $p(\theta \mid x)$ .

Let's step back for a moment and think about what the immediate implications of this framework are. By describing our knowledge about  $\theta$  using a distribution we are already doing something very different from in the Frequentist version. In particular, we're making conclusions about the distribution of  $\theta$ , a.k.a how it varies, conditional on our observed data. For a Bayesian, this distribution holds all of the available information about  $\theta$  and thus is the focus of their attention. So in the context of our example, when a Bayesian wants to perform inference for the mean weight of squirrels in a park, they will do so by constructing a posterior distribution that describes how the *true* mean weight might vary conditional on the set of observed data.

Once we have an expression for our posterior, we quantify our uncertainty by creating what are called credible intervals. We do so by finding an interval  $C$  such that,

$$\int_C p(\theta \mid x) d\theta = 0.95$$

Again, notice how drastically this differs from the Frequentist calculation of an uncertainty estimate. No longer do we rely on asymptotic theory about the randomness of the data sampling process, but instead, since we treat the parameter as random, our uncertainty pertains to the fact that we have uncertainty about what that true parameter is. While estimation of the parameter and uncertainty in that estimate is a two step process in the Frequentist framework (first calculate  $\bar{X}$ , then use theory to calculate the confidence interval), both things are baked right into the posterior distribution in the Bayesian framework. This is by far one of the most appealing aspects of using a Bayesian method: because we make conclusions in terms of probability statements, we get uncertainty estimates “at no extra cost” in all of our analyses. While increasingly complex Frequentist methods might require increasingly complex procedures for estimating uncertainty, a Bayesian model can be expanded in complexity with no extra work required to acquire uncertainty estimates.

Furthermore, once we compute  $C$ , then we can correctly say that.

$$P(\theta \in C \mid x) = 0.95 \tag{2.2}$$

And here we really do mean that the probability that our interval  $C$  captures  $\theta$  is 0.95. Bayesians conceptualize probability in terms of certainty, or uncertainty, about events, meaning that their probability statements can be about the unknown

parameter itself.

## Back to the Cryptic Definitions!

Again, it's the fact that Bayesians conceptualize probability as being related to one's own certainty or uncertainty, that allows us to interpret (2.2) in the way that we do. Furthermore, if we revisit Gelman's quote as well that "Bayesian statistical conclusions about a parameter  $\theta$  are made in terms of probability statements. These probability statements are conditional on the observed value of  $[x]$ , and ... are written simply as  $p(\theta | x)$ " (Gelman et al., 1995), we can directly tie it into what we showed above.

Now that we've explained the gist of Bayesian analysis at a high level, we'll dive into the nuts and bolts of how the posterior is actually computed.

## Building an Estimate

So how do we actually calculate and estimate  $p(\theta | x)$ ? As the name of the framework suggests, we leverage Bayes Theorem as a way to try to quantify the posterior distribution. Bayes Theorem tells us that we can break it down into three separate pieces.

$$p(\theta | x) = \frac{p(x | \theta)p(\theta)}{p(x)}$$

So the problem of quantifying  $p(\theta | x)$  is really a problem of quantifying these three other pieces. Traditionally  $p(x | \theta)$  is referred to as the likelihood function, which is treated as being a function of  $\theta$ , and we can think of it capturing how likely it would be for us to observe the sample data  $x$  given a certain realization of  $\theta$ . Next,  $p(\theta)$  describes our belief about  $\theta$  *before* we have performed any analysis, and thus it is aptly named the prior.  $p(x)$  is just a function of the observed data and thus is referred to as, and treated like, a normalizing constant. Because of this we usually just ignore it and write,

$$p(\theta | x) \propto p(x | \theta)p(\theta)$$

In plain English, we can imagine a Bayesian approach progressing in the following way. First we supply a prior belief about the unknown parameter. Then, once we observe the data we can generate an expression for the likelihood and can update our belief by multiplying our prior by that likelihood to get our posterior  $p(\theta | x)$ .

Importantly, while the likelihood function,  $p(x \mid \theta)$ , is a function of  $\theta$ , it comes directly from the data and reflects our assumed model of that data. But perhaps the largest, and most contentious, consequence of describing  $\theta$  by a probability distribution conditioned on  $x$  is that Bayes Theorem forces us to supply a prior distribution  $p(\theta)$  ourselves. The reality is that Bayes theorem places almost no restrictions on what  $p(\theta)$  could be and this means that in certain cases, drastically different priors can lead to very different posterior distributions. There is a whole body of literature that talks about this “subjective” aspect of a Bayesian analysis, but as we will show later in this thesis, these priors do have the capacity to regularize an analysis. If we have some prior information about  $\theta$  it makes sense to try to utilize it, and the prior distribution gives us a way to do so.

To clear up what all of this looks like in practice, we’ll now walk through our squirrel weights example in this Bayesian setting. As we walk through this process, just remember that at the end of the day, all we’re really doing is choosing a prior, computing the likelihood, and multiplying the prior by the likelihood.

Recall that each individual  $X$  is distributed  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$  so this gives us our likelihood function. Next, we might start by guessing that squirrels might weigh around 1.5 pounds on average, but we aren’t squirrel experts so we attach a relatively large variance of 10 to that guess. So the prior that we supply could be  $p(\theta) = \mathcal{N}(1.5, 10)$ . While there is a huge literature on how you should choose your priors, for now, all you need to know is that at the very least a prior should extend over the entire range of possible values that your unknown parameter could take on. While we could use a distribution that is strictly positive to emphasize the fact that  $\theta$  is certainly positive, we’ll stick with a normally distributed prior for the sake of simplicity (in fact what makes this a simple choice is that it achieves something called conjugacy which in this case just means that it guarantees that our posterior will also be a normal distribution).

Next we use Bayes Theorem to combine our prior with the likelihood:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta \mid x) &\propto p(\theta \mid x)p(\theta) \\ &= \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n p(\theta \mid x_i) \right] p(\theta) \\ &= \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x_i - \theta)^2\right) \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot 10^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^2}(\theta - 1.5)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

A rather large amount of math will simplify this down to



$$p(\theta \mid x) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_f^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_f^2}(\theta - \theta_f)^2\right)$$

Which we can recognize as being a normal distribution with mean  $\theta_f$  and variance  $\sigma_f^2$ . In particular  $\theta_f$  and  $\sigma_f^2$  are

$$\theta_f = \frac{\frac{1}{10^2} \cdot 1.5 + n \cdot \bar{x}}{\frac{1}{10^2} + n}$$

$$\sigma_f^2 = \frac{10^2}{1 + 10^2 \cdot n}$$

where each have notably been influenced by both the prior and the likelihood. It can be helpful to visualize what has happened here with a plot.




Figure 2.2: The Prior, Likelihood, and Posterior for this example all plotted together.

Above we see the three main components of a Bayesian analysis plotted all together. It's helpful to visualize what's happening here because it really drills home the idea that the posterior is, in a sense, a tradeoff between the prior and the likelihood function. More technically, the posterior is the normalized product of the likelihood and the prior. The result is that the prior information has pulled the posterior to the left and has introduced more variance than from the likelihood function alone.

Clearly, even in this simple example it takes quite a bit of work to derive the exact expression for the posterior. In fact, in practice the posterior is often times something

that is incredibly complicated and so we don't even bother trying to simplify the product of the likelihood and the prior down into a distribution that we can recognize. Instead we make use of the massive computational advances that have been made that allow us to algorithmically approximate the posterior. Mainly, a process called Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is used due to its very powerful ability to produce samples from the posterior distribution.

## 2.3 Takeaways

In summary, in a Frequentist analysis the question being asked is “What sort of  $\theta$  would we expect to get under hypothetical resampling?”, while in a Bayesian analysis the question is “What is our knowledge of  $\theta$  based on the data and our prior information?”

While this thesis will focus on statistical predictive models rather than inference, the fundamental functional differences remain the same. To build a model in a Bayesian frame is to represent one's knowledge about the model parameters using probability distributions. What's more, predictions are no longer point estimates but rather distributions themselves. As stated earlier, *the state of knowledge about anything unknown is described by a probability distribution.*

This all seems fine and interesting, but at the end of the day the question remains—why bother doing statistical analysis in this way? This thesis should be read as a log of the time I spent trying to answer that question and not as some strongly opinionated piece about the quality of Bayesianism relative to Frequentism.

# Chapter 3

## Methods

We now move into a thorough description of all of the methods employed in this thesis. In subsections 3.1-3.3 the necessary notation and model structure are introduced. While the rest of the subsections intermittently mention the Frequentist model, they are primarily focused on the Bayesian models. In particular, 3.4 describes how the Bayesian models are fit and 3.5 describes what prediction with a Bayesian model looks like.

### 3.1 Notation

Let  $U$  denote a finite population with  $N$  elements.  $U$  is broken into  $J$  groups  $U_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ , where each group  $U_j$  is defined as having  $n_j$  sample observations. Let  $p = 1, \dots, P$  index the covariates. Each sample observation,  $i$  in group  $j$  has auxiliary information  $x_{ij}^p$  for covariate  $p$ , response value  $y_{ij}$ , and indicator for being non-zero  $z_{ij}$ .

$$z_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_{ij} \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } y_{ij} = 0 \end{cases}$$

### 3.2 Model Structure Motivation

We now introduce the modeling technique that will be the main focus of the thesis. Wonderfully, there is some real mathematical backing for why we might build this model in the way that we do and I think that looking at the steps draws out a lot of helpful intuition.

Let  $Y$  represent the response variable and  $X$  represent the covariates. We typically

write  $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid X]$  to denote the expected value of our response variable conditional on it's covariates. Since the separation of the response into values that are zero and those that are not is a finite partition, we can leverage the law of iterated expectation to expand our model structure:

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y \mid X = x] &= \underbrace{E[Y \mid X = x, Y = 0]}_{= 0} P(Y = 0 \mid X = x) + \\ &\quad E[Y \mid X = x, Y > 0] P(Y > 0 \mid X = x) \\ &= E[Y \mid X = x, Y > 0] P(Y > 0 \mid X = x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Out of this equation comes a nice intuition for what our new modeling process will look like. What we end up with is something that is somewhat meta in that it doesn't tell us what the exact model will be, but rather it tells us what the structure of our model should look like. What we do know is that we should have one model that predicts our non-zero response using our covariates  $E[Y \mid X = x, Y > 0]$ , and another that predicts whether our response is non-zero or not, again using the covariates  $P(Y > 0 \mid X = x)$ . Think back to the Introduction where we introduced the model as being:

$$\text{Final Prediction} = \left( \text{Classification Model Output} \right) \times \left( \text{Regression Model Output} \right)$$

all we've done above is provided a formal theoretical backing for this structure and strategy.

Importantly, while Equation (3.1) describes the broader two-part model strategy that will be employed by both the Frequentist and Bayesian versions of the model, the formulation can't technically be extended into the context of prediction for the Bayesian model. Equation (3.1) does describe how prediction functions in the Frequentist case, but as we will get to later in the Bayesian setting everything is described by a probability distribution and so we aren't working with expected values anymore. That being said, this is just a small technicality that shouldn't take away from the really nice larger intuition that Equation (3.1) holds for both models.

### 3.3 Specific Models

Although we could model these two parts however we wanted to, we will use a logistic regression model for the classification model and a generalized linear regression model

(that is non-logistic) for the regression model. Moreover, because the data we will be working with has a clustered structure we include group-level random effects in both models. The precise models that we will be evaluating will be as follows.

We fit a generalized linear model with random intercepts to the **non-zero** portion of the data (the  $*$  helps differentiate this model from our final model). The linear predictor is specified as follows

$$\mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_j \quad \text{where} \quad u_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

We choose a link function  $g^{-1}$  and a probability distribution for the response, which gives us the final model:

$$E[y_{ij}^* | x] = g^{-1}(\mu_{ij})$$

To spoil the surprise, the two GLMs that we will look at will be one with identity link and Normal distribution (i.e normal linear regression), and one with the log link and a Gamma distribution. That being said, we keep the notation broad at this point so as to emphasize the fact that this portion of the model aims to capture the structure of the non-zero response, and even though we try to model it using various distributions, this is still the main goal.

Here,  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T = (x_{ij}^1, \dots, x_{ij}^P)$  is a  $P \times 1$  vector of covariates,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a  $1 \times P$  vector of fixed effects, and  $u_j$  is the random effect associated with group  $j$ . Finally,  $\sigma_u^2$  is the between group variance parameter.

Next we fit a logistic regression random intercepts model to the full data set

$$P(z_{ij} = 1) = p_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + v_j)}} \quad \text{where} \quad v_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_v^2)$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  is a  $1 \times P$  vector of fixed effects and  $v_j$  is the random effect associated with group  $j$ . Again,  $\sigma_v^2$  is the between group variance parameter.

We will now quickly go over how these models are fit in a Frequentist frame before going in depth into how they are fit in a Bayesian frame.

## 3.4 Model Fitting: Two Ways

### 3.4.1 Frequentist

As it is not the focus of this thesis, we will not go in depth into how these models are fit in a Frequentist setting. Still, it's important to at least provide a brief summary

of how it is most often done.

In most cases (and in particular in most statistical software), Frequentist regression models are fit using something called Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE). Very broadly, MLE functions by first assuming that the observed data was sampled from some distribution. Out of that assumption we get a likelihood function  $p(\text{data} \mid \text{parameters})$ . And finally, as the name suggests, we choose parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data given that parameter. In words, we choose the parameters under which the data we observed was the most likely outcome, assuming our model.

We won't say much more about this process and this strategy other than to tie it back to some of the ideas laid out in Section 2. By making an assumption about the model that best describes the process that generated the data, we are placing a distribution assumption on the data. The goal is to figure out which fixed parameters define a process that would have been most likely to produce an instance of the data like the one we observed.

### 3.4.2 Bayesian

Before diving into the specifics of the Bayesian model fitting, recall that a Bayesian analysis proceeds by conditioning on the observed data and treating the unknown parameters as random. Importantly we still are interested in estimating the posterior  $p(\theta \mid \text{data})$ , but now we have many parameters of interest (i.e slope, intercept, and variance parameters) and so the expressions get a bit more complicated. As we get into all of the specifics that we lay out below, always remember that at the core of this process, we are treating our parameters as random and trying to quantify how they might vary given our observed data.

We'll start by describing the logistic regression model, before moving on to the two different versions of the generalized linear regression component.

#### Logistic Regression Component

Again we start by specifying the broad distribution of our response in this model

$$z_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\mu_{ij}}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + v_j \quad \text{and} \quad v_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_v^2)$$

Up until this point we have done nothing differently than in the usual Frequentist

formulation of a model, but now instead of treating our model parameters as fixed, we treat them as random variables and attach priors to them.

Since the fixed effects coefficients  $\gamma$  could plausibly be any real number, we'll utilize a normal distribution for their priors. On the other hand the variance parameter is necessarily strictly positive and so we use a Half-Cauchy prior for it.

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_p &\sim \mathcal{N}(m_p, s_p^2) & \forall p \in 1, \dots, P \\ \sigma_v^2 &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(0, r_1^2)\end{aligned}$$

The prior parameters  $m_p$ ,  $s_p$ , and  $r_1$  are real-valued numbers that center and scale the priors, thus they are chosen with the specifics of the data set in mind. A Half-Cauchy distribution is just a Cauchy distribution bounded to non-negative values, and is broadly utilized as a prior for variance parameters due to the fact that “even in the tail, they have a gentle slope (unlike, for example, a half-normal distribution) and can let the data dominate if the likelihood is strong in that region.” (Gelman, 2006). While dependence between priors *can* be modeled in a bayesian frame, we will assume that all of our priors are independent of each other. An example of what the prior distributions look like across a few of their parameter values is shown below.




Figure 3.1: Various parameter values for the prior distributions.

Again, in estimating the actual *model parameters* in a Bayesian analysis the goal is to recover the joint posterior distribution of those parameters. As before, let  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_P)$  and  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_J)$ . The joint posterior distribution can be written

as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) &\propto \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2) \right] \cdot p(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_P, v_1, \dots, v_J, \sigma_v^2) \\ &= \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2) \right] \cdot p(\gamma_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(\gamma_P) p(v_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(v_J) p(\sigma_v^2) \end{aligned}$$

If we're able to compute a simple form expression for the posterior, then we can attain posteriors for each of our individual model parameters by marginalizing—i.e. integrating out all of the other parameters. For example, we might be interested in the posterior of only  $\sigma_v^2$ . In that case, the marginal posterior could be computed as follows:

$$p(\sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\gamma_1} \dots \int_{\gamma_P} \int_{v_1} \dots \int_{v_J} p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) d\beta_1 \dots d\beta_P dv_1 \dots dv_J$$

The result would be a probability density function that encapsulates all of our information about  $\sigma_v^2$ .

As it turns out, the models are often complex enough that the RHS will not result in a recognizable probability density function. Thus we employ a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm to simulate draws from the approximate posterior. To do so we use the probabilistic programming language **Stan**. The specific version of MCMC algorithm that Stan runs is called “Hamiltonian Monte Carlo”. While this thesis will not describe MCMC in depth, the short and sweet description is that an MCMC algorithm’s strategy for drawing samples from an unknown probability distribution is to wander around the space in such a way that the amount of time spent in each location is proportional to the height of that target distribution. The real nuts and bolts of the algorithm lie in how decisions are made about how and where to move around in the space so that the result is obtained. The especially powerful thing about MCMC algorithms is that under enough iterations, they construct a Markov Chain (random walk) that *has the desired posterior distribution as it’s stationary distribution*. Thus we have to be a little bit careful with our language when interpreting the MCMC output. It’s not that we are attaining samples from the actual posterior distribution (after all it is unknown), but rather stops along the random walk that is exploring the unknown posterior. That being said, if the MCMC algorithm converges properly then we will have samples from the approximate posterior distribution that should have characteristics similar to the actual posterior.

In it’s default configuration Stan will output 2,000 sets of parameter draws which



represent samples from the approximate joint posterior distribution.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1^{(1)} & \dots & \gamma_P^{(1)} & v_1^{(1)} & \dots & v_J^{(1)} & (\sigma_v^2)^{(1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \gamma_1^{(2000)} & \dots & \gamma_P^{(2000)} & v_1^{(2000)} & \dots & v_J^{(2000)} & (\sigma_v^2)^{(2000)} \end{bmatrix}$$

One really nice aspect of this is that the while the combination of all of the columns in the output represent samples from the approximate *joint* posterior distribution, each column individually represent samples from the approximate *marginal* posterior distributions for that given individual parameter.

### (Generalized) Linear Regression Component: Normal

The simplest way to model the non-zero response is through simple linear regression i.e generalized linear regression using the identity link and assuming a Normal distribution on the response. Again it may seem silly to introduce a simple linear regression model in this way, but we do so to stress that this form of the model still places just as many distributional assumptions as a more common GLM does.

$$y_{ij}^* \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_j \quad \text{and} \quad u_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_P)$ . In this setting, the errors are assumed to be distributed  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$ . The other model parameters are given the same class of priors as before.

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_p &\sim \mathcal{N}(m_p, s_p^2) \quad \forall p \in 1, \dots, P \\ \sigma_\varepsilon^2 &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(0, r_1^2) \\ \sigma_u^2 &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(0, r_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

Importantly while  $s_p, r_1$ , and  $r_2$  are given the same names as in the previous model, they should be chosen with the specific scale of the response in mind.

We can write out our expression for the posterior as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) &\propto \left[ \prod_{i: y_i > 0} p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \right] \cdot p(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_P, u_1, \dots, u_J, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \\
&= \left[ \prod_{i: y_i > 0} p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \right] \cdot p(\beta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(\beta_P) p(u_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(u_J) p(\sigma_u^2) p(\sigma_\varepsilon^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we employ MCMC using Stan to simulate draws from it. The Stan output will be 2000 draws from the approximate joint posterior distribution

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\beta_1^{(1)} & \dots & \beta_P^{(1)} & u_1^{(1)} & \dots & u_J^{(1)} & (\sigma_u^2)^{(1)} & (\sigma_\varepsilon^2)^{(1)} \\
\vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\beta_1^{(2000)} & \dots & \beta_P^{(2000)} & u_1^{(2000)} & \dots & u_J^{(2000)} & (\sigma_u^2)^{(2000)} & (\sigma_\varepsilon^2)^{(2000)}
\end{bmatrix}$$

### (Generalized) Linear Regression Component: Gamma

An alternative model that we considered in this thesis was a Gamma Generalized Linear Model. The motivation for this was to have a model that is more flexible to the distribution of the non-zero response. Figure 3.2 displays several versions of a Gamma distribution with various parameters. In particular, note that the Gamma distribution is able to capture the fact that the non-zero response might be skewed, which a Normal distribution cannot do.




Figure 3.2: The Gamma(a, b) Distribution

Because the response variable we are working with is strictly positive and often-times right skewed, it's logical to try to model the response as coming from a Gamma distribution. The model is formulated as follows

$$y_{ij}^* \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{\mu_{ij}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_j \quad \text{and} \quad u_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

We are operating under the shape and rate parametrization of a Gamma distribution, and this specific parametrization was chosen so the mean of our response would be the output of the linear component:

$$E[y_{ij}^*] = \alpha \left( \frac{\alpha}{\mu_{ij}} \right)^{-1} = \mu_{ij}$$

We then define priors for the other parameters as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_p &\sim \mathcal{N}(m_p, s_p^2) \quad \forall p \in P \\ \alpha &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(t_1, r_1^2) \\ \sigma_u^2 &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(0, r_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_p, s_p, t_1, r_1, r_2$  are real valued numbers. While the Cauchy prior put on the shape parameter  $\alpha$  is still bounded below by zero, we now allow it's mode to be

set based on the given data.

Letting  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_P)$  and  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_J)$  we can write out the joint posterior distribution as

$$p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \alpha \mid \mathbf{y}) = \left[ \prod_{i: y_i > 0} p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \alpha) \right] \cdot p(\beta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(\beta_P) p(u_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p(u_J) p(\sigma_u^2) p(\alpha)$$

Hopefully at this point the repetitiveness of this process and of these formulations has helped to drill home the Bayesian method of model fitting. We've seen it in three different flavors: Logistic regression, Normal regression, and Gamma regression, but all that's really changed at each step has been the link function and the priors and parameters used.

### 3.5 Evaluation of the Bayesian Model: Posterior Predictive Distribution

In the Frequentist frame the model parameters are treated as fixed but unknown and so once we obtain estimates for them, we simply use those point estimates to make predictions.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_{ij}^* &= \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \hat{u}_j \\ \hat{p}_{ij} &= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} + \hat{v}_j)}} \\ \hat{Y}_j &= \frac{1}{U_j} \sum_{i \in U_j} \hat{y}_{ij}^* \cdot \hat{p}_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

But in the Bayesian frame our model parameters are no longer fixed values, but are described by a posterior distribution. Instead of producing predictions that are single values, we construct what are called posterior predictive distributions. In fact it makes sense why we would end up with predictive distributions rather than single values when you consider that there are two main sources of variability that should be taken into account in our predictions:

1. Sampling variability in the data: we never expect our model to be perfectly deterministic, rather the real outcomes should be expected to vary around the model.
2. Posterior variability of the model parameters: we shouldn't go through all the

trouble of constructing posterior distributions for our parameters to just throw out that information when it comes time to make predictions, rather we incorporate the variability in our posterior distributions into our predictions.

Within the Bayesian frame, these two sources of variability are combined to produce what is called a posterior predictive distribution (Johnson, Ott, & Dogucu, 2022).

To get a feel for how this works, I'll start by just focusing on constructing a posterior predictive distribution for a new point,  $y_{ij, \text{new}}$ , using each model separately.

### 3.5.1 Theoretical version

To really stress the logic of what we're doing, imagine that we haven't collected any data yet and that we only had one parameter  $A$  in our model. In any model we assume that the data for a fixed parameter  $A$  has distribution  $p(y | A)$ . Moreover, before having observed any data, all of our uncertainty about the value of  $A$  is contained by the prior  $p(A)$ . We can imagine  $p(y | A)$  capturing the variability in (1) and  $p(A)$  capturing the variability in (2) as listed above.

To produce an estimate for the distribution of a new data point  $y_{ij, \text{new}}$  we simply integrate the product of the previous two terms over  $A$ .

$$p(y_{ij, \text{new}}) = \int_A p(y_{ij, \text{new}} | A)p(A)dA$$

This is sometimes called the prior predictive distribution for  $y_{ij, \text{new}}$  as it represents our knowledge about  $y_{ij, \text{new}}$  before observing any data.

But we can do much better at describing the variability of the model parameters than this. After observing the sample data  $\mathbf{y}$  we update our knowledge. Again we have the same  $p(y_{ij, \text{new}} | A)$  which captures the sampling variability in the data, but now the variability of the model parameter is described by our posterior distribution  $p(A | \mathbf{y})$ . Again the goal is to get a distribution for  $y_{ij, \text{new}}$  and this time which we can express as follows. This new distribution that takes into account the observed data is called the posterior predictive distribution.

$$\begin{aligned} p(y_{ij, \text{new}} | \mathbf{y}) &= \int_A p(y_{ij, \text{new}} | A, \mathbf{y})p(A | \mathbf{y})dA \\ &= \int_A p(y_{ij, \text{new}} | A)p(A | \mathbf{y})dA \quad y_{ij, \text{new}} \text{ independent of } \mathbf{y} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the quality of this posterior predictive distribution depends strongly on the quality of our posterior distribution. In other words, this distribution will

only accurately capture the structure of new data points, if the underlying posterior distribution correctly captures the structure of the parameters of interest.

As we move on to the expression for each full model, just remember that while the integral looks very complicated, all that we're doing is incorporating both sources of variability and averaging across the possible values of the model parameters. The posterior predictive distribution for a point  $y_{ij, new}^*$  using the Normal regression model can be written as:

$$p(y_{ij, new}^* | \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\beta_1} \cdots \int_{\beta_P} \int_{u_1} \cdots \int_{u_J} \int_{\sigma_u^2} \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^2} \left[ p(y_{ij, new}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 | \mathbf{y}) \right] d\beta_1 \dots d\beta_P du_1 \dots du_J d\sigma_u^2 d\sigma_\varepsilon^2$$

Similarly, for the Gamma model it can be written as

$$p(y_{ij, new}^* | \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\beta_1} \cdots \int_{\beta_P} \int_{u_1} \cdots \int_{u_J} \int_{\sigma_u^2} \int_{\alpha} \left[ p(y_{ij, new}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \alpha) p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \alpha | \mathbf{y}) \right] d\beta_1 \dots d\beta_P du_1 \dots du_J d\sigma_u^2 d\alpha$$

And for the logistic regression model it can be expressed as

$$p(z_{ij, new} | \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\gamma_1} \cdots \int_{\gamma_P} \int_{v_1} \cdots \int_{v_J} \int_{\sigma_v^2} \left[ p(z_{ij, new} | \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 | \mathbf{y}) \right] d\gamma_1 \dots d\gamma_P dv_1 \dots dv_J d\sigma_v^2$$

The distributions  $p(y_{ij, new}^* | \mathbf{y})$  and  $p(z_{ij, new} | \mathbf{y})$  not only capture where our prediction might lie, but also how we would expect it to vary. Often in predictive modeling we're interested in quantifying the uncertainty in our model estimates, and in the Bayesian framework these are baked right into the predictions themselves.

While the theory behind constructing these posterior predictive is pretty intuitive, it's clear that even in the case of a fairly simple model, the actual computations are rather unwieldy. Again, we are saved by the fact that in practice the posterior is too complex to algebraically solve for, so we're already functioning in a setting where we use MCMC to simulate draws from the approximate posterior.

### 3.5.2 MCMC version

First I will describe how the posterior predictive distribution is derived from the MCMC draws, and then I will explain how it approximates the exact calculation above.

To generate a posterior predictive distribution for a new data point  $y_{ij, \text{ new}}$  using the normal regression model we simulate a prediction from the model for each parameter set of the MCMC output. Recall that the superscripts  $(i)$  index the MCMC iteration.

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(1)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{x}_{ij, \text{ new}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} + u_j^{(1)}, (\sigma_\varepsilon^2)^{(1)}\right) \\ \vdots \\ y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(2000)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{x}_{ij, \text{ new}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2000)} + u_j^{(2000)}, (\sigma_\varepsilon^2)^{(2000)}\right) \end{bmatrix}$$

The result is a set  $\left\{y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(1)}, y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(2)}, \dots, y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(2000)}\right\}$  which approximates the posterior predictive distribution.

For the Gamma model we do the same thing but using the appropriate distribution

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(1)} \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\alpha^{(1)}, \frac{\alpha^{(1)}}{\mathbf{x}_{ij, \text{ new}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} + u_j^{(1)}}\right) \\ \vdots \\ y_{ij, \text{ new}}^{*(2000)} \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\alpha^{(2000)}, \frac{\alpha^{(2000)}}{\mathbf{x}_{ij, \text{ new}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2000)} + u_j^{(2000)}}\right) \end{bmatrix}$$

And we do the same thing for the classification model

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_{ij, \text{ new}}^{(1)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(1)} + v_j^{(1)}\right)}}\right) \\ \vdots \\ z_{ij, \text{ new}}^{(2000)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(2000)} + v_j^{(2000)}\right)}}\right) \end{bmatrix}$$

While it may not be immediately clear, these processes are really just mimicking what the massive integrals above were computing exactly. By simulating realizations of the distribution behind each model, we are again capturing the sampling variability in the data, and by doing so across all of our MCMC parameter draws, the uncertainty about the model parameters ( $p(A \mid \mathbf{y})$  from the 3.5.1) is being incorporated as well.

### 3.5.3 Combining the Model Predictions

Now that we have two sets which represent approximate the posterior predictive distribution for unit  $i$  in group  $j$  for each respective model, we have to think about how we combine them. After all, our final model prediction is the product of these two models, so we certainly need a posterior predictive distribution of  $y_{ij, new} = y_{ij, new}^* z_{ij, new}$ , but it's unclear how we should combine the predictive distributions from the individual models to get here. In the Frequentist version where our predictions are single point values, this poses no problem at all, but now that our predictions are themselves distributions, it's a little less clear how to proceed. One idea is to just match MCMC iteration  $k$  from each model together. For example, when using the GLM with normal distribution and identity link as well as the logistic regression model we might just proceed as follows:

$$\left\{ y_{ij, new}^{*(1)} \cdot z_{ij, new}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{ij, new}^{*(2000)} \cdot z_{ij, new}^{(2000)} \right\}$$

But what makes this matching more correct than shuffling the iterations and then matching them up?

One solution to this conundrum of combining the distributions is to simply build the models simultaneously. In practice this relies on a few tricks and definitely increases the complexity when actually writing code for it, but it can be done and it does allow us to avoid this problem. That being said, as the two models grow to be more complicated, this process of building them simultaneously grows much more difficult and so it isn't a very robust solution to the problem. But, it turns out that with a few minimal assumptions, we can show that the full posterior for the model built simultaneously is equal to the product of the posteriors for each model built separately. What this means in practice is that we can actually fit the models separately (as we have been doing) and then combine them at the end, and the result will be exactly the same as if we fit the models simultaneously.

We thought that the proof and description of this finding deserved it's own chapter, so it is located in Chapter 4. That being said, we'll use the result to finish up this



section on prediction.

### 3.5.4 Posterior Predictive Distribution Finalized

Now that we know that we can fit the models separately and then combine them at the end, we are finally ready to describe how final predictions are made.

Since we are interested in making predictions for the average response in group  $j$  we obtain a set that approximates the posterior predictive distribution for each unit  $i$  in group  $j$ . We do so by matching the samples from our approximate posterior predictive distributions by MCMC index  $(k)$  as follows:  $y_{ij, new}^{(k)} = y_{ij, new}^{*(k)} z_{ij, new}^{(k)}$ . Now, for example, if we fix  $j$  and let  $U_j = 5$  we would have 5 sets where each one represents a sample from the approximate posterior predictive distribution of  $y_{ij, new}$  for the 5 different points in  $U_j$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ y_{1j, new}^{(1)}, y_{1j, new}^{(2)}, \dots, y_{1j, new}^{(2000)} \right\} \\ & \left\{ y_{2j, new}^{(1)}, y_{2j, new}^{(2)}, \dots, y_{2j, new}^{(2000)} \right\} \\ & \vdots \\ & \left\{ y_{5j, new}^{(1)}, y_{5j, new}^{(2)}, \dots, y_{5j, new}^{(2000)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

To get the posterior predictive distribution for the mean in group  $j$   $Y_{j, new}$  we take averages across units in group  $j$  by indices of the MCMC draws. In other words we take the average of  $\left\{ y_{1j, new}^{(k)}, y_{2j, new}^{(k)}, \dots, y_{5j, new}^{(k)} \right\}$  for each MCMC draw  $k$ . In full we end up with the set:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{U_j} \sum_{i \in U_j} \hat{y}_{ij, new}^{(1)} \\ \frac{1}{U_j} \sum_{i \in U_j} \hat{y}_{ij, new}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{U_j} \sum_{i \in U_j} \hat{y}_{ij, new}^{(2000)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{Y}_{j, new}^{(1)} \\ \hat{Y}_{j, new}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{Y}_{j, new}^{(2000)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Which is an approximation of the posterior predictive distribution for the mean of the response in group  $j$ .

### 3.5.5 Prediction Intervals

In statistical modeling, another piece of information that we're often interested is a measure of our uncertainty in our predicted values. Often times these are referred to broadly as prediction intervals, and whereas the confidence intervals and credible

intervals that we described in Chapter 2 provide uncertainty bounds for parameter estimates, these prediction intervals provide uncertainty bounds for a future observation.

Immediately, we can see how straightforward it is to acquire these in the Bayesian setting. Because our predictions are not simply point estimates, but are distributions themselves, these prediction intervals are baked right into the prediction process.

Unfortunately it is far less straightforward in the Frequentist setting. While prediction intervals are straightforward to generate for singular regression models, things get a lot more complicated with a two part model like ours. The reality is that we spent a good amount of time trying to construct a bootstrap procedure to generate these prediction intervals and beyond being very computationally intensive, we also couldn't find one that actually worked correctly. While this was certainly frustrating, the struggle to try to develop a process for generating these prediction intervals for the Frequentist models really highlighted how nice it is that you get them for free in the Bayesian model.

### **A note of caution**

While it might be tempting to gleefully pronounce Bayesian models to be better than Frequentist ones simply for the ease of access to prediction intervals, an important caveat is that these prediction intervals are only assumed to be correct when the Bayesian model is correct. What I mean by that is that if our Bayesian model badly fits the data, then we still get uncertainty estimates for free, but a 95% prediction interval will likely not get 95% coverage, thus indicating that the intervals themselves are also incorrect.

# Chapter 4

## Simultaneous v.s Separate

### 4.1 Simultaneous Model Build

As we mentioned in 3.5.3, to get around our problem of how we combine the MCMC iterations for the models built separately, we could fit the models simultaneously. But, as we will show in this section, under a few assumptions we actually don't have to do this simultaneous build, and are justified in just building the two models separately and combining them at the end. The one major assumption that we will have here is that there is no dependence in the priors *between* models. While there are certainly cases where this doesn't hold, trying to incorporate these dependencies into the model incorporate a lot more complexity without much performance gain (Pfeffermann, Terry, & Moura, 2008).

This result holds regardless of the particular models that we use, but for the sake of simplicity and relevance we'll use a logistic regression model with random intercepts and a Normal linear regression model with random intercepts. In this setting our full posterior for both models would be:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{y} \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$$

We can expand this by writing out the likelihood more fully based on whether  $y$  is zero or not:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) \propto \left[ \prod_{i:y_i=0} (1-p_i) \prod_{i:y_i>0} (p_i) p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \right] \cdot p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$$

While it wasn't too difficult to write this out up to a proportionality constant, in practice it can be very difficult to figure out how to combine the two models in such a way that the MCMC algorithm still converges once you start using models that are more complicated than these ones.

But, there's important insight still to be found here. Let's group these terms based on the parameters that they use. In particular we'll group by which individual model the parameter belongs to:

$$= \left[ \left( \prod_{i:y_i=0} (1-p_i) \prod_{i:y_i>0} p_i \right) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2) \right] \left[ \left( \prod_{i:y_i>0} p(y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \right) p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \right]$$

Again, we are able to split the joint prior in this way because we are assuming that there is no dependence in the priors *between* models.

But now, if we look at this closely we can see that what we really have here is a full separation into the posteriors for the individual models for  $z$  and  $y^*$  as seen in our derivation in the section 3.4.2. This means that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) &\propto p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) \\ &= C \left[ p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since these are all proper probability distributions we know that they should all integrate to 1 when integrated across all of their parameters. If we integrate both sides over all of the parameters from both models, its clear that the LHS is 1, and once we recall that there is no parameter dependence *between* the models, it is clear that the RHS is as well. And so we are left with the conclusion that  $C = 1$  and thus we can say that,

$$p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_v^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) = p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{u}, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma_v^2 \mid \mathbf{y}) \quad (4.1)$$

So the full posterior for the model built simultaneously is equal to the product of the posteriors for each model built separately. The major upshot here is that *as*

long as we don't build in any correlations between the parameters in the two models, then we can build each model as complex as we might desire without having to worry about how we will eventually build the two models together. As we learned above, we can simply build them separately and combine the results at the end.. This is a really nice theoretical finding as it alleviates the need to figure out how to build the models simultaneously and encourages us to have freedom in how we build each one individually.

Practically speaking, if our MCMC algorithm properly converges, then we can interpret the MCMC output as a random sample from the approximate posterior distribution. Because of this it actually doesn't really matter how we match up the indices of the posterior predictive distributions from the models for  $y^*$  and  $z$ . That being said, for the sake of consistency, in all of our work we'll match the posterior predictive distributions by MCMC index.

## 4.2 Practical Backing

We'll now show that this holds in practice, with a simple example and we'll start by discussing how to actually build the models simultaneously. As mentioned previously, we have to get a bit crafty when building the models simultaneously and the way we do this is as follows. First we fit the logistic regression model as we normally would:

$$z_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\mu_{ij}}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + v_j$$

But then the two part process gets folded into the way that we set up the Normal linear regression model:

$$y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(z_{ij} \cdot m_{ij}, \left[z_{ij} \cdot \tau_1 + (1 - z_{ij})\tau_2\right]\right) \quad \text{where} \quad m_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_j$$

Here  $\tau_1$  represents the variance of  $y_{ij}$  when  $z_{ij} = 1$  and thus can be estimated, but  $\tau_2$  is the variance of  $y_{ij}$  when  $z_{ij} = 0$  and so there's no practical way for it to be estimated by the MCMC algorithm. The solution is to just set  $\tau_2$  as some small fixed number (i.e 0.001) and approximate the posterior for all the other parameters. This strategy functions on the idea that when  $z_{ij} = 1$  then we're fitting a Normal distribution centered at  $m_{ij}$  with model estimated variance  $\tau_1$ , and when  $z_{ij} = 0$  then we're fitting a Normal model centered at 0 with miniscule variance meaning that we'll


effectively get zero as we should.

To test our theoretical work above, we fit simpler versions of the two models with only one fixed effect and no random effects. The two models are

$$z_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\mu_{ij}}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \gamma_1 + \gamma_0$$

$$y_{ij}^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \beta_1 + \beta_0$$

And indeed, when we fit the models simultaneously and also fit them separately making use of MCMC to simulate samples from their approximate posteriors, we find that they are practically identical.



# Chapter 5

## Simulation Study

We now introduce the set up for the simulation study that will be the main avenue through which we evaluate our models.

### 5.1 Aims

The first aim for this simulation study is to understand when we might benefit from using a Bayesian model.

In order to try to answer this question of *when* we will be turning a few dials. Because we are functioning in a setting with grouped data we will vary the data along two axes

- Number of groups
- Number of observations per group

The second aim is to get a sense for the role that the prior plays in a Bayesian analysis. To do so we will vary the quality of the priors put on the model parameters. The two levels will be

- Uninformative
- Informative

The idea to vary the quality of the priors comes out of the idea that while the likelihood does dominate the prior in large sample size settings, the prior plays a much larger role in smaller sample settings and thus we might expect a lot more regularization and model convergence in the Bayesian models when more information is added through the priors.

## 5.2 Data and Dials

### 5.2.1 Estimands

The primary estimand for this simulation study will be  $Y_j$ : the mean of our response variable in group  $j$ . In order to stay consistent across all models and simulation runs, we only made predictions on group 1.

### 5.2.2 Data Generating Process

Our population data for the simulation was generated by the following process that takes as inputs the number of domains ( $J$ ) and the number of total observations ( $N$ ). The number of observations per group is thus ( $n = N/J$ ). The population was generated using  $N = 50 \cdot 500$  and  $J = 50$ , to give us 500 observations per group.

The DGP is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} z_{ij} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{ij}) \quad \text{where} \quad p_{ij} = \frac{\exp(1.5 + X_{ij} + v_j)}{1 + \exp(1.5 + X_{ij} + v_j)} \\ y_{ij}^* &\sim \text{Gamma}(3, 1/b_{ij}) \quad \text{where} \quad b_{ij} = 10 + X_{ij} + u_j \\ y_{ij} &= z_{ij} \cdot y_{ij}^* \end{aligned}$$

Where  $X_{ij} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $v_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $u_{ij} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

This data generating process checks all of our boxes as it produces zero-inflated data with a grouped structure and a moderate relationship between the response  $Y$  and a covariate  $X$ . For example in Figure 5.1 we examine the generated population data and see that the response variable is indeed zero inflated with a strictly positive and continuous non-zero portion.






Figure 5.1: The distribution of the response variable in the population that we generated for our simulation.

If we examine the correlation between  $X$  and  $Y$  we get 0.305 for the entire data set. And indeed when we examine the plot of  $Y$  against  $X$  we do see a relationship. Here we just plot points from a single group so as not to overclutter the plot.




Figure 5.2: Scatterplot of the main covariate against the response variable in Group 1 of our generated population data.

### 5.2.3 Dials

The exact levels of the dials for the number of groups and number of observations per group will be

- $n = \{15, 30, 50\}$
- $J = \{5, 10, 25, 50\}$

Note that these levels reflect the number of **sampled** groups and observations per group. We ran a simulation for each combination of those levels, for a total of 12 runs, to get a full sense of how the models perform across each of these measures of how “small” the data is. In order to generate data sets for these settings we first sampled  $J$  groups from the population, and then within those groups we sampled  $n$  observations. Importantly, because we were always predicting on group 1, we always forced that group into each simulation iteration. For each of the 12 individual settings we ran 400 total iterations of the simulation.

Next, within each  $(n, J)$  combination we built the Bayesian models with two types of priors: Non-Informative and Informative. Note that across our models we have a variety of parameters that require priors.


- For the Normal regression model we have the the fixed effects coefficients ( $\beta$ ), the variance parameter for the random intercepts ( $\sigma_u^2$ ), and the variance parameter for the observation level model error ( $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$ ).
- For the Gamma regression model we once again have the fixed effects coefficients ( $\beta$ ), and the variance parameter for the random intercepts ( $\sigma_u^2$ ), but this time we also have the shape parameter ( $\alpha$ ).
- For the Logistic regression model we have new fixed effects coefficients ( $\gamma$ ) and the variance parameter for the random intercepts ( $\sigma_v^2$ ).

Note that across all models the random effects are assumed to be  $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$  distributed and thus can be thought of as universally having a normal prior with a variance hyperparameter. While the distributions chosen for these priors were introduced in the methods section, we will now choose real valued numbers used to center and scale those priors.

The parameters that require priors can be placed into 3 main groups: fixed effects, variance, and shape. We simplified the process of assigning the levels of priors by not varying the priors within these groups within each bracket of quality.

### Non-Informative

In order to include no prior knowledge in your analysis, a flat prior can be used:  $p(\theta) \propto 1$ . Recall that the posterior can be factored into a normalized product of the likelihood and the prior. Thus, to use a flat, non-informative, prior is to “let the data speak for itself” and utilize only the likelihood function in estimating the posterior. That being said prior distributions should still not cover parameter values that are impossible, and thus the flat priors will have supports that are restricted to the range of possible values that the parameter could take on. For the fixed effects parameters a support of  $(-100, 100)$  was used and for the variance and shape parameters  $(0, 100)$  was used.



### Informative


Next, the goal with our informative priors was to add more information by choosing to center and scale the prior distributions with the observed data in mind. Naturally, since we know the exact process that generated the data it might be tempting to center the priors exactly on the correct parameter values, but to do so would certainly be both unfair and unrealistic. Instead exploratory data analysis was utilized to make the decisions.

An examination of a scatterplot of the response and covariates leads us to believe that the fixed effects coefficients for the models fitting the non-zero portion of the response are small *positive* numbers between the range of 0 to 10 and thus the prior  $\mathcal{N}(5, 3^2)$  was used.



On the other hand, we tweaked the scale of this prior for the logistic regression model since the response being modeled is on a different scale. At this point we don't have much of an idea of how the chance of being non-zero changes as the covariate changes, so we use a  $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$  prior for the fixed effects coefficients in the logistic regression model (this may seem like a tight distribution, but in the context of logistic regression slope coefficients it's really quite wide).

Next, following the advice of (Gelman, 2006) the scale parameter of 2.5 was used to parametrize the Cauchy prior put on all variance parameters. In full the Half-Cauchy(0, 2.5) prior was utilized.



Finally, since the non-zero portion of the response variable has a mean of 31.12, we can use the following “back of the napkin” calculation to get an idea for what the shape parameter should be centered on. Recall that a  $\text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$  distribution has mean  $\alpha/\beta$  and variance  $\alpha/\beta^2$ . Thus we can say that,

$$\bar{y} = 31.4 \approx \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad s^2 = 338.8 \approx \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}$$


But some algebra tells us then that

$$\frac{\bar{y}}{s^2} = 0.09 \approx \frac{\alpha/\beta}{\alpha/\beta^2} = \beta$$

but now plugging in our approximate value for  $\beta$  gives us

$$\frac{\alpha}{0.09} \approx 31.4 \implies \alpha \approx 2.8$$

And so we might guess that the shape parameter is around 3. Obviously this calculation will vary quite a bit depending on the sample that we generate, so we use the scale parameter of 5 to emphasize our uncertainty in that estimate. Thus the complete prior used was  $\text{Half-Cauchy}(3, 5)$ .



## 5.3 Methods

There will be 3 different models run throughout the simulation.

- Frequentist two-part:
  - Linear Random Effects Model (`lme4::lmer`)
  - Logistic Regression Random Effects Model (`lme4::glmer`)
- Bayesian two-part #1
  - Bayesian Linear Random Effects Model (`rstanarm::stan_lmer`)
  - Bayesian Logistic Regression Random Effects Model (`rstanarm::stan_glmer`)
- Bayesian two-part #2
  - Bayesian Gamma Regression Random Effects Model (`rstanarm::stan_glmer`)
  - Bayesian Logistic Regression Random Effects Model (`rstanarm::stan_glmer`)

## 5.4 Performance metrics

As mentioned previously, due to the fact that our data has a clustered structure, we chose to evaluate all of our models on a single group. Thus all of the following performance metrics were computed for the same individual group (group 1) which had a true mean value of  $Y_1 = 23.7$

The most broadly used performance metric of an estimator is the Mean Squared Error (MSE). We use the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) which is just a rescaling of this metric and is computed as follows:

$$\text{RMSE}_j = \sqrt{\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left( \hat{Y}_{j,s} - Y_j \right)^2}$$

Here  $S$  is the total number of simulation reps,  $\hat{Y}_{j,s}$  is the estimated mean of the response variable in group  $j$  for simulation rep  $s$ , and  $Y_j$  is the true mean of the response variable in group  $j$ . Since we get this true value from our generated population, it does not vary by simulation rep.

Next we will be examining the Empirical Bias of each model:

$$\text{Empirical Bias}_j = E[\hat{Y}_j] - Y_j \quad \text{where} \quad E[\hat{\mu}_j] = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \hat{Y}_{j,s}$$

As well as the Empirical Variance of each model:

$$\text{Empirical Var}_j = \frac{1}{(S-1)} \sum_{s=1}^S \left( \hat{Y}_{j,s} - E[\hat{Y}_j] \right)^2$$

We will look at Predictive Interval (PI) coverage at a 95% confidence level for the Bayesian Models:

$$\text{Coverage}_j = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{I}(Y_j \in \text{PI}(\hat{Y}_{j,s}))$$

And finally we will look at the total number of model failures.

- For the Frequentist models, a model failure was registered whenever one of the “Model failed to converge” warnings from `lme4` was returned, although even in small sample sizes our data was robust enough to elicit zero model failures.
- For the Bayesian models, a model failure was registered whenever the MCMC algorithm failed one or more of the diagnostics that indicate that the algorithm has converged and is stable. The Stan programming language is robust enough that you should never trust the results when one of these warnings are administered, and so while potentially overly harsh in some cases, we chose to count any convergence warning as a model failure.

Importantly, one solution to combating MCMC convergence issues is to bump up the number of iterations that the algorithm progresses through. That being said, this is not a sure fire solution, and always comes at the cost of longer computation time. The default number of iterations is 2000 and is considered a reasonable number of iterations for most models. Because the models we are fitting are fairly complex, ran a few tests to gauge how many iterations we should use in order to try to minimize model failures while keeping model run-times reasonable. We saw good improvements up to 5000 iterations and then diminishing returns afterwards, so we used 5000 iterations for all of our Bayesian models.





# Chapter 6

## Results

We now present the results from the simulation study. Each section compares each model with regards to a specific performance metric as laid out in Section 5.4. Across all of these sections we will label simulation settings like  $n = \cdot - J = \cdot$ . For example if we have  $(n = 15, J = 10)$  then this means that the data sets used in that simulation setting had 10 groups with 15 observations each, and thus the models were trained on  $n \times J = 150$  data points.

Additionally, since the logistic regression component remained the same across all of the Bayesian models, we will refer to each distinct Bayesian model by describing what the GLM used to model the non-zero response was. We use the following syntax:

- [Type of priors, distribution used to model the non-zero response]

For example, [Flat Priors, Normal] refers to the Bayesian model that used flat priors and modeled the non-zero response using a Normal distribution.

### 6.1 Expectations

Before diving into the actual results, we'll first give a brief overview of what we were expecting to see.

One of the main expectations we had was that we'd see improvements of some kind when using Bayesian models with informative priors compared to Bayesian models with flat priors. At the very least, we hoped to see that the informative priors would assist in reducing the rate at which Bayesian models failed to converge in small sample size settings. Additionally, in these small sample size settings we expected to see the Bayesian models with informative priors outperform all other models in terms of RMSE due to the fact that they might be able to pick up the variance structure for

the random effects more effectively. In particular, in the settings with small numbers of groups, the Frequentist model should struggle significantly, while the informative priors may give the Bayesian model a chance to correctly estimate those parameters.


Secondly, we expected to see slightly higher bias in the Bayesian models as compared to the Frequentist models. The reason for this is that our data was generated in a Frequentist way. The parameters were set as fixed constants and not as random variables as a Bayesian conceptualizes them to be. Since we designed the data generating process we could have centered the priors directly on top of the true values of the parameters. This would have likely removed this source of bias, but to do so would blatantly advantage the Bayesian models in this simulation. Therefore, the Bayesian models should be slightly misspecified and thus should pick up some bias.

With these expectations in mind, we'll now move to the actual results.

## 6.2 Model Failures

Before we get into the bulk of the performance metrics, we will first examine how often each model failed in each setting across the 400 simulation reps that we ran.

Figure 6.1 is organized so that the setting with the smallest sample sizes and smallest number of groups is in the top right hand corner. As we move left and down across the grid we move into settings with larger sample sizes and larger number of groups. We can understand the “size” of our data in each simulation setting to be a combination of both of these dials and thus we have the following structure.



Importantly we omit the Frequentist model in the following plot because it registered no model failures across the entire simulation. The model failure-rate results are as follows:




Figure 6.1: Model Failure rates across all simulation settings.

Perhaps the most notable takeaway from Figure 6.1 is that the number of groups seems to drive failure rates much more than the number of observations per group. Moreover there is a massive jump in model failure rates from  $J = 10$  to  $J = 5$  that is quite alarming.

Importantly, in order to avoid biasing our results, whenever we evaluate the models we do so only across simulation reps in which none of the models that we are comparing failed. For example, if we wanted to compare all 4 of the different models using the truncated results in the table 6.2 we might be tempted to simply remove individual rows in which the model failed. But doing so would mean that each model would be evaluated on a different number of results. To avoid this issue, we simply disregard all results from Simulation Rep 1 and only use Simulation Reps where none of the models failed (e.g Simulation Rep 2).

Simulation Rep	Model	Prediction	Model Failure
1	Informative Priors, Normal	29.19	0
1	Flat Priors, Normal	29.18	1
1	Informative Priors, Gamma	29.14	1
1	Frequentist	29.05	0
2	Informative Priors, Normal	27.63	0
2	Flat Priors, Normal	27.02	0
2	Informative Priors, Gamma	27.05	0
2	Frequentist	26.98	0

Figure 6.2: Results Excerpt Example

Of course this means that the individual model failure rates have a large impact on how much of the simulation results we are able to utilize. Below, in Figure 6.3, we show what percent of the simulation results we'd be able to retain in each setting.




Figure 6.3: Percent of Results we would get to use if we only included simulation iterations where none of the models failed.

Clearly the Bayesian models fail far too much for any trustworthy and meaningful

conclusions to be made in any of the  $J = 5$  settings and so they will essentially be omitted from the rest of the evaluation. While this may seem very disappointing, there is still an interesting takeaway that can be extracted from the high failure rates in those settings.

### 6.2.1 Model Regularization through Informative Priors

If we only compare the “Flat Priors, Normal” and “Informative Priors, Normal” failure rates, we are able to get a sense for the role that the prior distributions play. After all these are the same underlying models just with different priors, and so their failure rates give us good insight into the power of priors to stabilize and regularize models.




Figure 6.4: Model Failure Rate comparison between the Bayesian Normal model with flat priors and with informative priors.

While in the  $J = 25$  and  $J = 50$  settings both models exhibit no failures, we do indeed see that in the smaller settings where  $J = 5$  and  $J = 10$  the model with informative priors does have lower failure rates than the model with flat priors. While informative priors do not completely ameliorate the model failure issues, it’s clear that they do have a positive impact on how often a Bayesian model converges. Although we aren’t saying anything about the actual performance metrics of the models here, a Bayesian model that does not converge is a model that cannot be used. This is

not to say that one should always use informative priors in every Bayesian analysis setting, in fact sometimes you have no prior knowledge to employ. Rather, the lesson here should be that if you are experiencing model convergence issues in a Bayesian analysis setting, one potential fix could be to add more information into your priors.

### 6.3 Root Mean Squared Error

We now compare the RMSE of our models. As a reminder, due to the high model failure rates, the settings with  $J = 5$  are not included in these evaluations. The performance metrics below are calculated over the simulation reps in which none of the models being evaluated failed to converge (although this is only drops results in the settings where  $J = 10$  since we observed no model failures at larger values of  $J$ ).




Figure 6.5: Root Mean Squared Error

As we'd expect, we see decreases in RMSE across all models as the number of observations per group and the number of groups increases. Essentially as the model has access to more data, we'd expect it to be able to “learn” the data structure better and thus have lower prediction error. We also see that the models that consistently have some of the lowest RMSE are the Bayesian Normal model with flat priors and the Bayesian Normal model with informative priors. The only setting in which they are outperformed is when  $J = 10$  where they are marginally outperformed by the

Frequentist model. That being said, the true value of the response for group 1 was 23.7 which gives a sense of scale for this model prediction error metric. While there are small differences in how the models performed, it would be a little unfair to cite these differences as substantive improvements between the Bayesian and Frequentist models.

## 6.4 Empirical Variance

Next we look at the empirical variance which gives a sense for how variable the predictions of the various models were across the different data sets in each simulation run.




Figure 6.6: Empirical Variance

Again we see the decrease in variance as  $n$  and  $J$  increase that we'd expect to see. But besides small amounts of separation between the models in the setting ( $n=15$ ,  $J=10$ ), they all seem to perform very similarly.

## 6.5 Empirical Bias

Next we examine the Empirical Bias of the same three models. These results are by far the most unexpected as we do not see clear decreases in bias as  $n$  and  $J$  increase:




Figure 6.7: Empirical Bias

That being said, we do see that the the Bayesian Normal model with informative priors seems to consistently have the lowest bias, with the Bayesian Normal model with flat priors performing next best. These two models perform more similarly than it may initially seem in the settings where  $J = 10$  due to the fact that the Bayesian Normal model with informative priors actually has negative bias in some of those settings. If we looked at the absolute empirical bias we would see that they perform very similarly there. Finally, even though we do see lower bias for the two Bayesian Normal models, note that the scale on the y-axis of these plots is very small and again the true value of the response is 23.7. I truly wish that I could take this plot and proclaim that the Bayesian Normal model with informative priors performs far and away the best in terms of bias, but the reality is that the scale of the bias is so small for each model that there really isn't much here. In fact, it's likely this small scale that gives us the patterns that were initially a bit befuddling.

## 6.6 Coverage

And finally, we examine the coverage of the Bayesian models. Note that we do not include the Frequentist model here due to the fact that we found no good method for estimating prediction intervals for this type of model.





Interestingly, while we get close to 95% coverage in all of our Bayesian models, we do see consistent slight over-coverage in almost every setting. While there are a couple of different reasons why this might have happened, the most prominent one in my mind has to do with the fact that the Bayesian models should all be a little bit misspecified due to the fact that the parameters in the data generating process were fixed constants. While we didn't end up seeing significant differences in bias due to this misspecification, we do see slight overcoverage as a result of it.

## 6.7 General Remarks

It would be relatively easy to look at the results from Chapter 6 and conclude that the Bayesian model isn't really worth our time. After all, the best-performing Bayesian model in each setting performs practically identically to the Frequentist model while requiring a lot more computational and conceptual work to get there. It's certainly tempting to base our conclusions solely on some of the performance metrics that we procured, but to proceed in this way would be to forget the whole point of this thesis. Recall that the point was not to go through all this work to be able to appoint either the Bayesian models or Frequentist models as being the better of the two approaches. Rather we were primarily interested in learning about Bayesian models and looking to understand when and how they are useful.

It is unfortunate that the general statistical modeling discourse is so overwhelmingly focused on performance that pedagogy and intuition for a method often take


a backseat to a dense results section. There's no denying that results are important and should be presented, but problems arise when results are taken to be the only expression of a model's value. To try to break out of this mold I will walk through some takeaways from the results themselves, but I will also talk more generally about the value and usefulness of the Bayesian models that exist outside of their performance metrics.

### 6.7.1 Results Discussion

As stated previously, in terms of metrics like RMSE, empirical bias, and empirical variance, most of the models that we employed performed relatively similarly. If we were approaching these simulation results with the goal of finding a method that was better than all the rest, this would be a pretty disappointing result. Luckily, we're not doing that and instead can appreciate the fact that the Bayesian and Frequentist methods, while very different in their approaches to, and conceptualizations of, the problem, ended up producing very similar results.

Perhaps the main worry when looking at the performance of the Bayesian model has to do with the model failures metric. After all, the Frequentist model never failed in any settings, while the failure rates of the Bayesian models in the  $J = 5$  settings were so high that they rendered the results unuseable. I'll push back on this a little bit as a segway into the next portion of our discussion.

There's an argument to be made that Bayesian model convergence failures are a good safeguard against building bad models. What I mean by this is that in some cases if your Bayesian model is not properly specified or has another substantive problem with its formulation it will fail to converge and leave you without a useable model. I want to stress that I am not generalizing this to all cases, but in some cases this is actually good behavior because it forces you to think about what your data looks like and why your model is failing to fit to it. Conversely, the Frequentist models are often so robust that it takes a very serious specification problem for them to ever fail. The main point is this: having a model that never fails is not always a good thing when trying to build a good model. To make sense of why this is, we'll look at the RMSE of the Frequentist model in the  $J = 5$  settings from our simulation in Chapter 5. In these settings, the argument could be made that the Frequentist models are better due to the fact that they never failed. But if we look at the RMSE performance of the Frequentist models across *all* simulation reps in these settings we see something pretty alarming.

Figure 6.8: Struggles for the Frequentist model in  $J = 5$ 

Clearly, Figure 6.8 gives us plenty of reason to worry about proceeding in this way. While the Frequentist model did not fail to converge, it clearly struggled mightily in those settings. Importantly, this is not a knock against Frequentist models in *all* modeling settings, but rather in this situation it actually is advantageous that the Bayesian models are more sensitive to poor model specification. In a more applied setting we likely could have tweaked the priors and the model structure to get our Bayesian models to converge more often and at times it's nice that the Bayesian procedure forces us to do this. This leads us nicely into a larger point about the ways in which Bayesian modeling as a procedure encourages intentionality and understanding.

### 6.7.2 Procedural Discussion

One big barrier to Bayesian models is the added computational work involved with MCMC and the general software that exists for these methods. I won't sugar coat this part- MCMC is hard and writing code for Bayesian models in **Stan** is a laborious process. There have been enormous advances in computing that have made this aspect of Bayesian modeling more approachable, but for a general modeler, debugging MCMC problems is a real struggle. The one spin here is that with all of that additional computational work, comes variance estimates and prediction intervals at no extra cost. Though recall that these variance estimates are only correct when the Bayesian models are correctly specified. That being said, regardless of how interesting and useful Bayesian modeling is, the computational burden will likely continue to keep

people from utilizing it. Even though packages like `rstanarm` and `R2WinBUGS` really streamline the process, I want to acknowledge that this aspect of Bayesian modeling is still a sizeable barrier to entry.

Another way in which Bayesian models are perhaps more unattractive has to do with the conceptual load associated with building them. While I agree that computational burden is a downside of the current state of Bayesian modeling, I want to push back on the idea that this extra conceptual load is as well. Through the process of learning about Bayesian data analysis and in particular Bayesian modeling, I came to realize the ways in which the workflows can really be conducive to understanding your data and your problem more fully. For example, in order to attach informative priors to your model parameters you have to really understand where those parameter values might lie and how they might vary. Even though these decisions make the Bayesian modelling process a slower one, I ultimately think the effect is net positive, due to the fact that it requires you to intuit connections between the data and the model. Of course, in larger sample size settings the prior distribution tends to have less of an effect on the model and so it can be reasonable to choose priors that are more uninformative. But even in these settings you have to restrict your priors to the range of values that your parameters could possibly take on, which requires some understanding of that connection between data and model. It's true that there's something very nice about just throwing a model formula into the `lm` function in R and getting a reasonable output, but it can sometimes become too easy to just default to using that simple linear regression without thinking about why you're doing it or if it's justified. Thus, in my mind, the extra conceptual work required by Bayesian models adds value in that it can lead to greater intentionality in model building decisions.

Hopefully these points have shed light on the ways in which Bayesian models have value outside of their performance metrics. Ultimately, the goal for any data analysis methodology is to learn from data. Bayesian methods, models, and conceptualizations do just that and hopefully I've made it clear that they are interesting and valuable beyond the results that they produce.

# Chapter 7

## Package Vignette

So far, this thesis has spent a great deal of time explaining why these cluster zero-inflation models are interesting and useful, but no matter how good a method is, it can't be used if the tooling doesn't exist to actually perform it. Thus, the last portion of this thesis will be devoted to describing the very early stages of an R software package that we have written to build and utilize these zero-inflation models. We will start by describing the motivation for the package and its structure, before returning to the forestry data from Chapter 1 to show how it can be used.

### 7.1 R Package: `zinf`

We can start by installing the developmental version of the package and loading it into our R session.

```
devtools::install_github("joshyam-k/zinf")  
library(zinf)
```

The two main functions that `zinf` contains are `zinf_bayes` and `zinf_freq` which as the names suggest relate to the Frequentist and Bayesian versions of the zero-inflation models.

The challenge of writing a software package for these zero-inflation models was truthfully a lot trickier than I initially thought it would be. There were two different possible structural versions that I considered to be viable:

1. Write a function that takes as argument all the individual pieces needed to build each of the two models and internally builds the two models and then define all of the necessary functionality for the two-part model (i.e prediction).

2. Write a function that takes as argument each of the two already built models and internally combine the models into a single object and define all of the necessary functionality for that object.

On the one hand, version (1) is nice in that it “does it all” for the user. But the main problem with version (1) is that the functions `lme4::lmer` and `lme4::glmer` for Frequentist models and `rstanarm::stan_lmer` and `rstanarm::stan_glmer` for Bayesian models are already so popular, well developed, and robust that it seems silly not to rely on that pre-existing software. After all, as we showed in Section 4, the Bayesian models can be built separately and made as complex as desired, and this is also the case for the Frequentist models. So, while there’s an argument to be made for the abstraction of all model building processes, the reality is that under version (1) if I wanted my package to be as familiar and robust as the pre-existing software for building the individual models, I would have to essentially take as arguments every possible function argument that those `lme4` and `rstanarm` functions take, and internally feed them back into those functions. At that point the question becomes: why not just have the user build the individual models separately and then feed those finished models into our function? And that lands us directly at version (2).




Figure 7.1: Two Software Versions

In the Frequentist setting, version (1) doesn’t seem that bad, especially since most of the time a user only specifies the model formula and the data set within the `lme4` functions, but things grow a lot worse in the bayesian versions where all kinds of priors and MCMC settings need to be specified. In the end, I decided that it made more sense to build version (2). While this does leave more work for the user than I would have liked, I think that the `zinf` functions still have enormous usefulness in that they define methods for producing a summary of the zero-inflation model and most importantly for performing prediction with the zero-inflation model.

## 7.2 Forestry Data

In order to show off the functionality of the package that we wrote, we'll apply it to the Forestry data that we introduced all the way back in Chapter 1. Recall that this forestry data is both zero-inflated and clustered making it a perfect setting for us to employ our models.

The particular subset of Forestry data that we'll be looking at comes from the State of Washington and contains 6960 observations across 49 Eco-Subsections (which define our clusters). The summary statistics of the number of observations per group are as follows:

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
9	43	88	142	188	544

The covariate that we will be using from the forestry data is called “Tree Canopy Cover” (tcc) which is defined as the proportion of forest floor covered by a vertical projection of the tree crowns (Toney, Shaw, & Nelson, 2008). This is one of the FIA’s remote sensed variables, so the information is associated with the pixels that overlay the individual plot.

The response variable that we will be using is called “Dry Above Ground Biomass from Live Trees” and is expressed in the units of per area density. This Dry Above Ground Biomass variable is one that is very important for understanding the health of forest ecosystems and plays a role in decisions regarding merchantable timber and fire hazard. For these reasons its vitally important for the FIA to be able to produce accurate estimates of this variable. The zero-inflation models presented in this thesis provide a reasonable approach for trying to do exactly that, and the software package `zinf` provides an early stage version of a tool to do so.

## 7.3 Application

We'll start by setting aside a small amount of the data set to make predictions on. In particular, Ecosubsections M242Ba and M242Db have quite a few data points so we'll sample 100 points from each one to test our model on. The only other data preparation we need to do is to create a training data set that only contains training data points with a non-zero response value.

```
set.seed(5)
test <- data %>%
  filter(ECOSUBCD %in% c("M242Ba", "M242Db")) %>%
  group_by(ECOSUBCD) %>%
  slice_sample(n = 100) %>%
  ungroup()

train <- anti_join(data, test)

nonzero_train <- train %>%
  filter(DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ > 0)
```

### 7.3.1 Individual Frequentist models

We'll start by building the individual Frequentist models.

```
library(lme4)

freq_reg <- lmer(
  DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ ~ tcc + (1 | ECOSUBCD),
  data = nonzero_train
)

freq_log_reg <- glmer(
  DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ != 0 ~ tcc + (1 | ECOSUBCD),
  family = binomial,
  data = train
)
```

The key characteristics of these models are the specification of the covariates and the response, the random intercept term for the Ecosubsection (ECOSUBCD), and the use of the non-zero data set to fit the first model.



## 7.3.2 Individual bayesian models

### Logistic Regression Model

Next we'll build the individual Bayesian models. We'll start with the logistic regression model that requires priors for

- The fixed effect slope (for tcc)
- The fixed effect intercept
- The variance of the random intercepts

The prior fixed effect slope should reflect our vague sense for how the probability of Dry Above Ground Biomass from Live Trees being non-zero changes with Tree Canopy Cover. With limited knowledge of how forest attributes interact we'll assume that the slope is positive and centered somewhere around 0.5, so we'll use a prior of  $\mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.25^2)$ .

The fixed effect intercept that `rstanarm::stan_glmer` asks for is actually the centered intercept. This can be conceptualized as our guess for the probability of being non-zero for an average plot. Given that the response variable is non-zero in around 40% of the plots in our data set we'll guess that this probability is around 0.4. We have to be careful here, since logistic regression employs a logit link, we actually want to set the prior mean to be on the log-odds scale, so we use  $\log(0.4/(1 - 0.4)) = -0.4$  as the center. We might guess that the probability of being non-zero for an average plot might range from 0.1 to 0.7 which translates to a log odds range of  $(-2.2, 0.85)$ . Thus the prior for the centered fixed effect intercept will thus be  $\mathcal{N}(-0.4, 0.7^2)$ .

Finally, the variance of the random intercepts is not really a parameter that we can use the data to get a great guess for, so we'll utilize a weakly informative prior of `Exponential(1)`. In `rstanarm::stan_glmer` this is written slightly differently using a function called `decov` but in this setting that is just the `Exponential(1)` prior that we want.

We'll stick with the default MCMC settings and build the model as follows

```
library(rstanarm)
bayes_log_reg <- stan_glmer(
  DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ > 0 ~ tcc + (1 | ECOSUBCD),
  data = train,
  family = binomial,
  prior = normal(0.5, 0.25),
  prior_intercept = normal(-0.4, 0.7^2),
```

```
prior_covariance = decov(reg = 1, conc = 1, shape = 1, scale = 1),
chains = 4, iter = 2000, seed = 84735,
cores = parallel::detectCores()
)
```

## GLM 1: Normal with Identity link

We now turn to the two versions of the generalized linear model for the non-zero response. We'll start with the model that uses a Normal distribution and the identity link- i.e Normal linear regression. This time the parameters that need priors are all the same as from the previous one, except now we also need a prior for the variance of the error term.

We can examine a scatter plot of Tree Canopy Cover on Dry Above Ground Biomass from Live Trees to choose our prior for the fixed effect slope. We can do some rise-over-run calculations to end up with a guess that the fixed effect slope is around 2 and probably doesn't go outside of the range (0.5, 5). Thus we'll use a  $\mathcal{N}(2, 1^2)$  prior here.




Figure 7.2: Relationship between Tree Canopy Cover and Dry Above Ground Biomass from Live Trees

Again we can refer back to Figure 7.2 to get our guess for the the centered in-

tercept. At an average value of  $tcc$  (say 50), the value of the response looks to be around 100, but this could plausibly range anywhere between 20 and 180, so we'll use a  $\mathcal{N}(100, 40^2)$  prior for the centered intercept.

Finally we'll stick with an `Exponential(1)` prior for the two variance parameters since we don't know enough to say more about them. We can plug all of this in to `rstanarm::stan_lmer` as follows.

```
bayes_normal_reg <- stan_lmer(
  DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ ~ tcc + (1 | ECOSUBCD),
  data = nonzero_train,
  prior = normal(2, 1),
  prior_intercept = normal(100, 40),
  prior_aux = exponential(1),
  prior_covariance = decov(reg = 1, conc = 1, shape = 1, scale = 1),
  chains = 4, iter = 2000, seed = 84735,
  cores = parallel::detectCores()
)
```

## GLM 2: Gamma with log link

We'll stick with the same priors for the fixed effects as before except we'll put all of the parameter values on a log scale due to the fact that we're using a log link function.

- fixed effect slope:  $\mathcal{N}(0.7, 0.1^2)$
- fixed effect intercept:  $\mathcal{N}(4.6, 3.6^2)$

Similarly we'll keep our weakly informative prior for the variance of the random intercepts, and so all that's left is to decide what prior we should use for the shape parameter of the Gamma distribution. We'll follow the logic employed in Section 5.2.3 to do this. The estimation simply relies on the fact that the mean of a  $\text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$  distribution is  $\alpha/\beta$  and the variance is  $\alpha/\beta^2$ . Here  $\bar{y}$  and  $s^2$  represent the sample mean and variance of Dry Above Ground Biomass from Live Trees.

$$\bar{y} = 80.45 \approx \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad s^2 = 6029 \approx \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \quad (7.1)$$

but now,

$$\frac{\bar{y}}{s^2} = 0.013 \approx \frac{\alpha/\beta}{\alpha/\beta^2} = \beta \quad (7.2)$$

and if we put our estimate for  $\beta$  back into (7.1) to get

$$\frac{\alpha}{0.013} \approx 80.45 \implies \alpha \approx 1.04 \quad (7.3)$$

We aren't positive about this guess but we know that the actual parameter has to be non-negative so we'll use a Half-Cauchy(1,1) prior here. Note that `rstanarm::stan_glmer` assumes all `prior_aux` parameters are positive so we don't have to specify that it's a bounded Cauchy distribution.

```
bayes_gamma_reg <- stan_glmer(
  DRYBIO_AG_TPA_live_ADJ ~ tcc + (1 | ECOSUBCD),
  data = nonzero_train,
  family = Gamma(link = "log"),
  prior = normal(0.7, 0.1),
  prior_intercept = normal(4.6, 3.6),
  prior_aux = cauchy(1, 1),
  prior_covariance = decov(reg = 1, conc = 1, shape = 1, scale = 1),
  chains = 4, iter = 2000, seed = 84735,
  cores = parallel::detectCores()
)
```

Again, just from the length of these Bayesian model building sections compared to the Frequentist sections, it's clear how much extra work is required if you want to use informative priors. That being said, I hope it's clear how going through this process does force you to understand the dynamics of the data and know how to connect them back to the model, which in my mind is a very positive thing.

### 7.3.3 Using zinf

In order to turn our individual models into a zero-inflation model we simply feed them into the appropriate `zinf_*` function.

```
frequentist_zi_mod <- zinf_freq(freq_reg, freq_log_reg)
bayesian_zi_mod_normal <- zinf_bayes(bayes_normal_reg, bayes_log_reg)
bayesian_zi_mod_gamma <- zinf_bayes(bayes_gamma_reg, bayes_log_reg)
```

If we examine the class of these objects we'll find that they're of class `zinf_freq` and `zinf_bayes` respectively.

```
class(frequentist_zi_mod)
```

```
[1] "zinf_freq"
```

```
class(bayesian_zi_mod_normal)
```

```
[1] "zinf_bayes"
```

At first this might not seem like much, but the real usefulness of the software package lies in the fact that it defines `zinf_bayes` and `zinf_freq` as S3 generics. In R “the job of an S3 generic is to perform method dispatch, i.e. find the specific implementation for a class.” (Wickham, 2019). So what `zinf` is really doing is defining methods like `predict()` and `summary()` for these zero-inflation model objects. The upshot is that we can now use these model objects much in the same way as we do for typical model objects in R.

And as we can see below, making predictions on the test dataset using our Frequentist zero-inflation model is a very familiar process. Since the estimand we’re interested in is the Ecosubsection level mean and our test data set included two Ecosubsections, we get an output with two rows.

```
predict(frequentist_zi_mod, newdata = test)
```

```
# A tibble: 2 x 2
  ECOSUBCD prediction
  <chr>         <dbl>
1 M242Ba       88.5
2 M242Db       71.0
```

While the output will look slightly different for the Bayesian model, the process of getting the predictions with code is exactly the same. We’ll start by looking at the Bayesian model where the GLM component assumes a Normal response

```
bayes_preds_normal <- predict(bayesian_zi_mod_normal, newdata = test)
```

The object returned by running `predict` on one of the Bayesian zero-inflation models is a list that contains two items:

- A data frame containing the group level predictions which in this case are the centers of the posterior predictive distributions for each group.

- A data frame containing the raw posterior predictive distributions for each group.

If we examine the first item we see a very similar result to that of the direct output of the Frequentist predictions, except now we also have upper and lower bounds for 95% prediction intervals.

```
bayes_preds_normal$posterior_predictive_centers
```

	group	post_pred_centers	lower	upper
1	M242Ba	88.41021	73.39606	102.72571
2	M242Db	71.04143	56.44706	85.59905

But since Bayesian predictions are distributions themselves, we can access the raw distributions as follows. We'll just look at the first five rows of this data frame to get an idea of what it looks like.

```
bayes_preds_normal$posterior_predictive_distribution %>%
  head(5)
```

```
# A tibble: 5 x 2
  x group
<dbl> <chr>
1  81.1 M242Ba
2  89.6 M242Ba
3  90.5 M242Ba
4  86.4 M242Ba
5  75.5 M242Ba
```

With this we can actually plot the posterior predictive distributions for each group.

```
bayes_preds_normal$posterior_predictive_distribution %>%
  ggplot(aes(x = x, fill = group)) +
  geom_density(alpha = 0.5, color = NA) +
  theme_bw()
```




Figure 7.3: Posterior Predictive Distributions for the two groups in our test dataset

Finally if we also compute the predictions for our Bayesian model with a Gamma GLM, then we can aggregate and compare how the models performed.

group	Bayes Gamma	Bayes Normal	Frequentist	True Mean
M242Ba	87.26	88.41	88.55	95.73
M242Db	68.86	71.04	70.99	80.12

It's nice to see that the models performed similarly, as we saw in our simulation study, but again this is just an example about how to use the package and we shouldn't read too much into these short results.

## 7.4 Next Steps

Right now the package is fairly limited in that it can only deal with the models that we worked with in this thesis, so there's plenty of work to be done in that regard. Moreover, while zero-inflated data are fairly common, zero-inflated clustered data are much less common, so a good extension would be to extend the package to work with models without random effects. That being said, I still believe that the package is enormously useful as is. In particular Bayesian prediction is an incredibly cumbersome

task to do on your own, and it's even more difficult in this two-part model setting. Thus, having a package like `zinf` that will abstract away a lot of that messy process contributes a lot to the field of research surrounding these zero-inflation models.



# Chapter 8

## Conclusion

In this thesis I have gone in depth into the methodology and results of cluster zero-inflation models built in a Bayesian framework. The work departed from that of a traditional statistical modeling paper in that it was just as concerned with understanding and appreciating the procedural aspects of the method as it was with the results. Within the suite of Bayesian models that we explored we found that informative priors do have the capacity to prevent model failures although this trend was not as strong as we initially expected it to be. When comparing the suite of Bayesian models to an analogous Frequentist one we found that they performed very similarly in terms of traditional performance metrics like RMSE, bias, and variance. Although this may feel like a null result, there's certainly reassurance in seeing that the two methods produce very similar results. Moreover, it allows us to think critically about other sources of value and usefulness in each model building process. I argue that in the case of the Bayesian models, the extra conceptual work required to build them can actually be a positive aspect of the model building process.

That being said, the realm of modeling software is still lacking in its current ability to ease the computational intensity of running Bayesian models. The aim of this thesis was not to tackle a problem of this magnitude, but it did try to contribute with an R software package that abstracts many of the most cumbersome aspects of prediction in Bayesian zero-inflation modeling.

Overall I see zero-inflation models having enormous usefulness in applied settings. In particular, the Bayesian models that we employed provide an intuitive way to balance prior information with the structure of the observed data. Moreover, in settings where uncertainty estimates of any kind are desired, a properly specified Bayesian model provides these at no extra cost. In forestry settings standard errors for predictions are often especially important, so the ability to easily and accurately

estimate these is an incredibly valuable tool.

## 8.1 Future Work

Ultimately there remains much to be done in this area of research on zero-inflation models. While the Bayesian models that we employed were well suited for the particular setting we were working in, these models could be extended in a couple of ways that would make them more robust to a wider variety of settings. For starters, the models could be enhanced by allowing for random slopes instead of only utilizing random intercepts. Secondly, in the Normal regression models we assumed constant variance of the errors, but it might make more sense to treat that variance as heteroskedastic. Additionally, while the zero-inflated setting where the non-zero portion of the response belongs to a positive continuous distribution is a relatively common one, it would be worthwhile to build models for discrete settings and settings in which the response is bounded in other ways. Finally, taking a step back, it would be interesting to utilize different types of classification and regression models in the two-part model. For example more advanced statistical models like random forests and support vector machines could be used to try to more accurately classify points as being zero or not and some kind of a nonparametric regression model could be used to model the nonzero response. While these ideas were outside of the scope of this thesis, I think that each one has the capacity to substantially enhance these zero-inflation models.

It would also be interesting to compare the performance of these zero-inflation models to simpler models. For example, a singular simple linear regression model or a model that first takes the average of each group and fits a model to these aggregated data points. While we'd expect the zero-inflation models to broadly outperform these models, it would be interesting to quantify to what degree they do so, and to try to understand how the characteristics of a data set play into this.

Additionally, while we were unable to figure out how to bootstrap the prediction errors for the Frequentist zero-inflation model, such a process would be extremely important to this area of research. Not only would it allow for comparisons between the coverage metrics of each model, but it would provide the tooling necessary to run a speed test between the Bayesian and Frequentist processes. It's true that for the models used in this thesis, the Bayesian ones took much longer to run than the Frequentist ones, but bootstrapping is not an especially quick process and so a more fair comparison could be made if the Frequentist models were generating prediction

---

intervals as well.



# References

- Chandra, H., & Sud, U. (2012). Small area estimation for zero-inflated data. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 41(5), 632–643.
- Datta, G. S., & Ghosh, M. (1991). Bayesian prediction in linear models: Applications to small area estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1748–1770.
- Dreassi, E., Petrucci, A., & Rocco, E. (2014). Small area estimation for semicontinuous skewed spatial data: An application to the grape wine production in tuscany. *Biometrical Journal*, 56(1), 141–156.
- Gelman, A. (2006). Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models (comment on article by browne and draper).
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., & Rubin, D. B. (1995). *Bayesian data analysis*. Chapman; Hall/CRC.
- Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2006). *Data analysis using regression and multi-level/hierarchical models*. Cambridge university press.
- Johnson, A. A., Ott, M. Q., & Dogucu, M. (2022). *Bayes rules!: An introduction to applied bayesian modeling*. CRC Press.
- Krieg, S., Boonstra, H. J., & Smeets, M. (2016). Small-area estimation with zero-inflated data—a simulation study. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 32(4), 963–986.
- McConville, K. S., Moisen, G. G., & Frescino, T. S. (2020). A tutorial on model-assisted estimation with application to forest inventory. *Forests*, 11(2), 244.
- Pfeffermann, D., Terry, B., & Moura, F. A. (2008). Small area estimation under a two-part random effects model with application to estimation of literacy in developing countries. *Survey Methodology*, 34(2), 235–249.
- Rao, J. N., & Molina, I. (2015). *Small area estimation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Toney, C., Shaw, J. D., & Nelson, M. D. (2008). A stem-map model for predicting tree canopy cover of forest inventory and analysis (FIA) plots. In *Forest inventory and analysis symposium*.
- White, G. W., McConville, K. S., Moisen, G. G., & Frescino, T. S. (2021). Hierarchical bayesian small area estimation using weakly informative priors in ecologically

homogeneous areas of the interior western forests. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, 178.

Wickham, H. (2019). *Advanced r*. CRC press.