



## **Rgbp: An R Package for Hierarchical Modeling and Method Checking**

**Joseph Kelly**  
Harvard University

**Carl Morris**  
Harvard University

**Hyungsuk Tak**  
Harvard University

---

### **Abstract**

Bayesian-frequentist reconciliation via Bayesian hierarchical modeling for Gaussian, Binomial, and Poisson data and frequentist method check for good coverage probability.

*Keywords:* hierarchical model, multilevel model, random effects mixed model, method check, coverage probability, normal, binomial, poisson, shrinkage, R.

---

## **1. Introduction**

**Rgbp** is an R package for estimating and validating a two-level model (a random-effects mixed model). The estimation procedure utilizes Bayesian machinery and the validation involves checking frequency properties of the procedure via repeated sampling (which we call “method checking”). It is found that even in small samples our procedure yields good frequency properties in comparison to other methods such as Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE). This package will be useful for frequentists and Bayesians alike. Bayesians are able to use the package to see a non-informative reference point before and after constructing their full-Bayesian hierarchical model and frequentists, now have a procedure that will provide confidence intervals of a random-effect mixed model with good repeated sampling properties.

## **2. Three Feasible Types of Data**

**Rgbp** is intended to fit a model where two levels of structure are assumed (unit and group levels). The model can be characterized by the distributional family assumed for the group level data and in the case of **Rgbp** this will be either the Normal, Poisson, or Binomial distribution. In this section, we will introduce three specific types of feasible data sets that illustrate this fact.

## 2.1. Normal: 8 Schools

The Education Testing Service (ETS) conducted randomized experiments in eight separate schools (group) to test whether students (unit) SAT scores are effected by coaching. The dataset contains the estimated coaching effects on SAT scores ( $y_j, j = 1, \dots, 8$ ) and standard errors ( $se_j, j = 1, \dots, 8$ ) of the eight schools [Rubin \(1981\)](#).

```
R> y <- c(12, -3, 28, 7, 1, 8, 18, -1)
R> se <- c(18, 16, 15, 11, 11, 10, 10, 9)
```

Due to the nature of the test each school's coaching effect has an approximately Normal sampling distribution with known sampling variance, *i.e.*, standard error of each school is assumed to be known or to be accurately estimated. So, it is reasonable to think that each school-level coaching effect is distributed as an independent Normal distribution given the unknown mean  $\mu_j$  and known standard error:  $y_j | \mu_j \overset{ind}{\sim} \text{Normal}(\mu_j, se_j^2)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 8$ . **Rgbp** includes this data set and can be called by the command `'data(schools)'` on R.

## 2.2. Poisson: 31 Hospitals

The following data are from medical profiling evaluations for Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) surgeries of 31 New York hospitals conducted in 1992 [Morris and Lysy \(2012\)](#). It comprises of the number of deaths within a month of CABG surgeries in each hospital ( $z_j, j = 1, \dots, 31$ ) and the total number of patients receiving CABG surgeries (case load) in each hospital ( $n_j, j = 1, \dots, 31$ ). The following code is an example of input based on the last ten hospital data.

```
R> z <- c( 14, 9, 15, 13, 35, 26, 25, 20, 35, 27)
R> n <- c(593, 602, 629, 636, 729, 849, 914, 940, 1193, 1340)
```

Considering the type of data, it is reasonable to assume the number of deaths in each hospital follow independent Poisson distributions given an unknown true rate parameter  $\lambda_j$ :  $z_j | \lambda_j \overset{ind}{\sim} \text{Poisson}(n_j \lambda_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 31$ , where, for each  $j$ ,  $n_j$  can be interpreted as an exposure (not necessarily an integer) and  $\lambda_j$  as the true death rate per exposure. This data set is also included in the package and can be called by `'data(hospital)'` on R.

## 2.3. Binomial: 18 Baseball Hitters

The following dataset contains information on the batting averages of 18 major league baseball players through their first 45 official at-bats of the 1970 season [Efron and Morris \(1975\)](#). In addition one covariate relating to the position each player was playing was observed and for illustrative purposes, we transform this variable into a binary indicator (1 if a player was a outfielder and 0 otherwise).

```
R> z <- c(18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 14, 13, 12, 11, 11, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 9, 8, 7)
R> n <- c(45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45)
R> x <- c( 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)
```

The data indicate that independent Binomial distribution is appropriate for each player's number of hits among 45 at-bats conditioning on the unknown true batting average  $p_j$ :

$z_j|p_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Binomial}(n_j, p_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 18$ . This data set is also a part of the package and can be called on R by ‘`data(baseball)`’.

### 3. Multilevel Structure

A two-level or multilevel model, also called a conditionally independent hierarchical model [Kass and Steffey \(1989\)](#), is a very powerful tool for exploring the hierarchical structure in data. For example, in the 8 schools dataset, we can imagine that there exists a district-level hierarchy (bigger population) for 8 schools, the state-level hierarchy for 31 hospitals, and the position-level hierarchy for 18 baseball players. `gbp`, one of the functions in **Rgbp**, fits such a hierarchical model whose first-level hierarchy has a distribution of observed data and second-level (bigger population hierarchy) has a conjugate prior distribution on the first-level parameter. The `gbp` function allows users to choose one of three types of multilevel models, such as Normal-Normal, Poisson-Gamma, and Binomial-Beta, based on their data sets.

#### 3.1. Normal-Normal

The following is a general Normal-Normal hierarchical model. For reference,  $V_j (\equiv \sigma^2/n_j)$  below is assumed to be known or to be accurately estimated, and subscript  $j$  indicates  $j$ -th group in the data set.

$$y_j|\mu_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Normal}(\mu_j, V_j), \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_j|\beta, A \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Normal}(\mu_{0j}, A), \quad (2)$$

where  $j = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $\mu_{0j} = x_j^T \beta$ ,  $x_j$  is the  $j$ -th group’s covariate vector ( $m \times 1$ ),  $m$  is the number of regression coefficients and  $\beta$  and  $A$  are unknown. Note that if there is no covariate then  $x_j = 1$  for an intercept term ( $m = 1$ ) and so  $\mu_{0j} = \mu_0 = \beta_0$  for all  $j$ , resulting in an exchangeable prior distribution. For reference, a parameter with a zero subscript, such as  $\mu_{0j}$ , represents a mean parameter of the prior (second-level) distribution, *i.e.*, a prior mean. Based on this conjugate prior distribution it is easy to derive the corresponding posterior distribution

$$\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, \beta, A \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Normal}((1 - B_j)y_j + B_j\mu_{0j}, (1 - B_j)V_j), \quad (3)$$

where  $B_j \equiv V_j/(V_j + A)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , are called shrinkages.

#### 3.2. Poisson-Gamma

`gbp` is also able to build a Poisson-Gamma multilevel model. Note that a constant,  $1/r$ , multiplied to the Gamma distribution below is a scale and a square bracket below indicates [mean, variance] of distribution. And for notational consistency, let’s define  $y_j \equiv z_j/n_j$  for all  $j$ .

$$z_j|\lambda_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Poisson}(n_j \lambda_j), \quad (4)$$

$$\lambda_j|\beta, r \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \frac{1}{r} \text{Gamma}(\lambda_{0j}r) \sim \text{Gamma}\left[\lambda_{0j}, \frac{\lambda_{0j}}{r}\right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\log(\lambda_{0j}) = x'_j\beta$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , with two unknown hyper-parameters,  $r$  and  $\beta$ . The posterior distribution of this Poisson-Gamma model is

$$\lambda_j | \mathbf{z}, \beta, r \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \frac{1}{r + n_j} \text{Gamma}(r\lambda_{0j} + n_j y_j) \sim \text{Gamma} \left[ \lambda_j^*, \frac{\lambda_j^*}{r + n_j} \right], \quad (6)$$

where  $\lambda_j^* \equiv (1 - B_j)y_j + B_j\lambda_{0j}$ ,  $B_j \equiv r/(r + n_j)$ , and  $y_j \equiv z_j/n_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .

### 3.3. Binomial-Beta

Binomial-Beta hierarchical model is the last model that **gbp** can fit. Again, a square bracket below indicates [mean, variance] of distribution.

$$z_j | p_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Binomial}(n_j, p_j), \quad (7)$$

$$p_j | \beta, r \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Beta}(rp_{0j}, r(1 - p_{0j})) \sim \text{Beta} \left[ p_{0j}, \frac{p_{0j}(1 - p_{0j})}{r + 1} \right], \quad (8)$$

where  $\log(\frac{p_{0j}}{1 - p_{0j}}) = x'_j\beta$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Note that  $r$  and  $\beta$  are two unknown hyper-parameters. Then, corresponding posterior distribution is

$$p_j | \mathbf{z}, \beta, r \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Beta}(rp_{0j} + n_j y_j, r(1 - p_{0j}) + n_j(1 - y_j)) \sim \text{Beta} \left[ p_j^*, \frac{p_j^*(1 - p_j^*)}{r + n_j + 1} \right], \quad (9)$$

where  $p_j^* \equiv (1 - B_j)y_j + B_j p_{0j}$ ,  $B_j \equiv r/(r + n_j)$ , and  $y_j \equiv z_j/n_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .

### 3.4. Hyper-prior Distribution

In our examples the hyper-prior distribution is an assumed distribution on the second-level parameters and with the goal of objectivity in mind **gbp** assumes non-informative hyper-prior distributions.

$$\beta \sim \text{Uniform on } \mathbf{R}^m \text{ and } A \sim \text{Uniform}(0, \infty) \text{ (or } \frac{1}{r} \sim \text{Uniform}(0, \infty)), \quad (10)$$

where  $m$  is the number of regression coefficients. As for  $\beta$ , it is a reasonable choice to assume a flat (non-informative) distribution because information about the location gets plentiful as the number of groups increases. The next flat prior distribution of the second-level variance component  $A$  (or  $1/r$ ) was chosen for its good repeated sampling properties and for posterior propriety under moderate conditions.

## 4. Estimation

### 4.1. Shrinkage Estimation

Estimating the shrinkage factors  $(B_1, \dots, B_k)$  is the key estimation problem with the hierarchical models **gbp** assumes. As we can see in 3, 6, and 9, the posterior means are a linear function of the shrinkage factors and the posterior variances are also linear (Gaussian), quadratic

(Poisson), or cubic (Binomial) functions. A natural method then to estimate  $E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y})$  and  $Var(\mu_j|\mathbf{y})$  is to first estimate the shrinkage factors.

## 4.2. Adjustment for Density Maximization

It is noted that the shrinkage factors  $(B_1, \dots, B_k)$  are a function of the second-level variance component, *i.e.*,  $B_j \equiv V_j/(V_j + A) = B_j(A)$  for Gaussian and  $B_j \equiv r/(r + n_j) = B_j(r)$  for Poisson and Binomial models. Current popular methods of estimation via maximization (MLE or MAP) of these unknown shrinkage factors can result in estimates lying on the boundary of the parameter space. In the Normal-Normal model this situation typically arises when the variation within schools is greater than the variation between resulting in a parameter estimate of  $\hat{A} = 0$ .

To continue with a maximization-based estimation procedure but to steer clear of aforementioned issues we make use of adjustment for density maximization (ADM) [Morris and Tang \(2011\)](#). In general ADM is a procedure to obtain estimates of posterior moments via maximization if the underlying posterior can be approximated by a Pearson family. For our purposes we can approximate the posterior distribution of a shrinkage factor with the Beta distribution allowing us to finally obtain estimates of the posterior moments, *i.e.*,  $E(B_j|\text{data})$  and  $Var(B_j|\text{data})$ , without any trouble that MLE can cause. Please refer to [Morris and Tang \(2011\)](#) for additional advantages of ADM.

Once we estimate these two moments of shrinkage, we can also estimate the posterior moments given only the data. Taking the Normal-Normal model as an example we note the following identities

$$E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}) = E(E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, r, A)|\mathbf{y}) \quad (11)$$

$$Var(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}) = E(Var(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, r, A)|\mathbf{y}) + Var(E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, r, A)|\mathbf{y}). \quad (12)$$

Note that both  $E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, r, A)$  and  $Var(\mu_j|\mathbf{y}, r, A)$  are functions of the shrinkage factors (3) and since we have already can estimate  $E(B_j|\mathbf{y})$  and  $Var(B_j|\mathbf{y})$  via ADM, we can finally estimate  $E(\mu_j|\mathbf{y})$  and  $Var(\mu_j|\mathbf{y})$ .

## 4.3. Approximation to Posterior Distribution via Matching Moments

After estimating the two posterior moments,  $E(p_j|\mathbf{z})$  and  $Var(p_j|\mathbf{z})$ , `gbp` reasonably approximates a posterior distribution of the mean effects given the data by assuming a reasonable distribution and matching moments. For the Binomial-Beta model we approximate  $p_j|\mathbf{z}$  with a Beta distribution and for the Poisson-Gamma model we approximate  $\lambda_j|\mathbf{z}$  with a Gamma distribution. Finally for the Normal-Normal model we actually estimate the first three moments and approximate  $\mu_j|\mathbf{y}$  with a skewed-t distribution.

## 5. Method Checking

Like the two sides of the same coin, checking a statistical model always comes with fitting a model. If a fitted model cannot pass a validation or checking process, we usually go back and forth from estimation and checking steps iteratively. In this sense, checking a fitted model is an interactive procedure for the model justification.

There are two kinds of model justification processes; one is a model checking and the other is a method checking. The model checking is for the justification of the model 3 on a specific data set. One possible question is, “Can this data set benefit from such a multilevel modeling?” Christiansen and Morris (1997) answered this question by using the Negative-Binomial mixture model on Poisson data to justify the second-level hierarchy. They found that their data had more variation than expected of the first-level Poisson distribution and Poisson hierarchical model could successfully account for such additional variation.

Once we are sure that the hierarchical modeling can be appropriate for our data, the following question will be about the validity of interval estimates, the final product of this multilevel modeling. “Does the 95% (can be specified differently) confidence interval obtained via this Bayesian model-fitting process achieve 95% confidence level for any true parameter values?” Our answer is “yes” and **Rgbp** has a function to check this point. From now on, all the explanations will be based on the Binomial model using the baseball data because the idea is the same and can be easily applied to the other two models.

### 5.1. Pseudo-data Generation Process

Figure 1 will be helpful to understand this process. As we can see in (8), the distribution of each true batting average ( $p_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 18$ ) depends on two hyper-parameters,  $r$  and  $\beta_{(2 \times 1)}$ . So, once we fix these hyper-parameters at specific values, we can generate true batting averages. Suppose we sampled 500  $\mathbf{p}_{(18 \times 1)}$ 's, *i.e.*,  $\{\mathbf{p}_{(18 \times 1)}^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, 500\}$  from the prior distribution in (8), where  $r$  and  $\beta$  are given. Then, we can also generate  $\{\mathbf{z}_{(18 \times 1)}^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, 500\}$  given each  $p_{ij}$ , where  $i$  indicates the  $i$ -th pseudo-data set and  $j$  does the  $j$ -th player. Next, **coverage** fits the Binomial hierarchical model 500 times on  $\{(\mathbf{z}_{(18 \times 1)}^{(i)}, \mathbf{n}_{(18 \times 1)}), i = 1, \dots, 500\}$  to obtain  $500 \times 18$  interval estimates. After this generating process, as for the first player, we will have 500 pairs of  $(z_{i1}, p_{i1})$  and 500 interval estimates,  $\{(\hat{p}_{i1,low}, \hat{p}_{i1,upp}), i = 1, \dots, 500\}$ .




Figure 1: Pseudo-data generating process

### 5.2. Simple Unbiased Estimates of Coverage Probabilities

Based on the generated pseudo-data sets, let's define an indicator variable,  $I_{ij}$ , which is 1 if the  $j$ -th player's interval estimate from the  $i$ -th pseudo-data set includes  $p_{ij}$  and 0 otherwise. One way to estimate the coverage probability is taking average over these indicator variables. We call it a simple unbiased coverage probability estimate. For example,  $\bar{I}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{500} I_{i1} / 500$  is the estimated coverage probability for the first player.

### 5.3. Rao-Blackwellized Unbiased estimates of Coverage Probabilities

Rao-Blackwellization improves accuracy of an unbiased estimator by taking conditional expectation given a sufficient statistic. Based on this idea, we define  $E(I_{ij}|z_{ij}, r, \beta)$ , where  $r$  and  $\beta$  were given at first (see 5.1) and  $z_{ij}$  is a sufficient statistic. This expectation is the same as  $\Pr(\hat{p}_{ij,low} \leq p_{ij} \leq \hat{p}_{ij,upp}|z_{ij}, r, \beta)$ , where  $(\hat{p}_{ij,low}, \hat{p}_{ij,upp})$  is the  $j$ -th player's interval estimates on the  $i$ -th data set. We can calculate this probability because we know the distribution of  $p_{ij}|z_{ij}, r, \beta$  in (9). Note that conditioning on  $z_{ij}$  is equivalent to conditioning on  $\mathbf{z}$  as long as  $r$  and  $\beta$  are known. Then, we can estimate the first player's coverage probability by  $\sum_{i=1}^{500} E(I_{i1}|z_{i1}, r, \beta)/500$ , which is also unbiased but more accurate than the previous simple estimator.

## 6. Examples

### 6.1. 31 Hospitals: Known Second-level Mean

Suppose you live in the New York state (NY) and have been suffering from severe coronary heart disease. If you are supposed to receive the coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery soon, you might want to find the most famous hospital for dealing with such a surgery. On top of that, if you can figure out each hospital's ability to handle this surgery, it will be useful for your decision in choosing a hospital.

For this purpose, you gathered data of 31 hospitals in NY composed of the number of deaths within a month of CABG surgeries and total number of patients receiving CABG surgeries in each hospital. In addition, while one looks for such information, suppose one knows that the state-level death rate per exposure of this surgery is 0.020.

The multilevel modeling that assumes a bigger population-level hierarchy will be insightful in this problem. Here, we presume a state-level (NY) hierarchy governing the true death rates of CABG surgery of all the hospitals in NY. This perspective is to view the true death rates of those 31 hospitals as sampled from the state-level population distribution whose mean is 0.020. For reference, a model check can be useful for evaluating the validity of such a view point (Christiansen and Morris, 1996).

Assuming an additional hierarchy is reasonable, a model-fitting process begins. Since the true death rate per exposure after CABG surgery might be small and the caseload ( $n_j$ ) is much bigger than the number of deaths ( $z_j$ ) in each hospital, the Poisson distribution would be the first choice to describe the uncertainty in our data. Next, `gbp` will help us fit the Poisson multilevel model with the Gamma conjugate prior distribution on the true death rate  $\lambda_j$  whose mean is 0.020 ( $\lambda_0 = 0.020$ ) as described in 3.2. For reference, the number of regression coefficients ( $m$ ) is 0 because we do not need to estimate the prior mean via log-linear regression (see section 3.2).

```
R> p <- gbp(z, n, mean.PriorDist = 0.02, model = "pr")
R> p
```

Summary for each unit (sorted by n):

```
obs.mean    n prior.mean shrinkage low.intv post.mean upp.intv post.sd
```

1	0.045	67	0.02	0.834	0.011	0.024	0.042	0.008
2	0.029	68	0.02	0.832	0.010	0.022	0.038	0.007
3	0.024	210	0.02	0.616	0.011	0.021	0.035	0.006
4	0.043	256	0.02	0.568	0.017	0.030	0.046	0.008
5	0.033	269	0.02	0.556	0.015	0.026	0.041	0.007
6	0.044	274	0.02	0.551	0.018	0.031	0.047	0.008
7	0.043	278	0.02	0.548	0.018	0.030	0.047	0.007
8	0.014	295	0.02	0.533	0.008	0.017	0.029	0.005
9	0.029	347	0.02	0.492	0.014	0.024	0.038	0.006
10	0.037	349	0.02	0.491	0.017	0.029	0.043	0.007
11	0.039	358	0.02	0.484	0.018	0.030	0.045	0.007
12	0.018	396	0.02	0.459	0.010	0.019	0.030	0.005
13	0.028	431	0.02	0.438	0.015	0.024	0.037	0.006
14	0.025	441	0.02	0.433	0.013	0.023	0.035	0.005
15	0.027	477	0.02	0.414	0.015	0.024	0.036	0.006
16	0.045	484	0.02	0.410	0.023	0.035	0.050	0.007
17	0.030	494	0.02	0.405	0.016	0.026	0.039	0.006
18	0.022	501	0.02	0.402	0.012	0.021	0.032	0.005
19	0.028	505	0.02	0.400	0.015	0.025	0.036	0.005
20	0.020	540	0.02	0.384	0.012	0.020	0.031	0.005
21	0.028	563	0.02	0.374	0.016	0.025	0.037	0.005
22	0.024	593	0.02	0.362	0.014	0.022	0.033	0.005
23	0.015	602	0.02	0.358	0.010	0.017	0.026	0.004
24	0.024	629	0.02	0.348	0.014	0.023	0.033	0.005
25	0.020	636	0.02	0.346	0.012	0.020	0.030	0.005
26	0.048	729	0.02	0.316	0.027	0.039	0.053	0.007
27	0.031	849	0.02	0.284	0.019	0.028	0.038	0.005
28	0.027	914	0.02	0.269	0.017	0.025	0.035	0.005
29	0.021	940	0.02	0.264	0.014	0.021	0.030	0.004
30	0.029	1193	0.02	0.220	0.020	0.027	0.036	0.004
31	0.020	1340	0.02	0.201	0.014	0.020	0.027	0.003
colMeans	0.029	517	0.02	0.438	0.015	0.025	0.037	0.006

For reference, we need to type ‘R> print(p, sort = FALSE)’ instead of ‘R> p’ in order to list hospitals by the order of data input in the above output. ‘R> p’ automatically sorts the output by the increasing order of caseload ( $n_j$ ).

The output contains information about sample mean (`obs.mean`), caseload (`n`), known prior mean ( $\lambda_0$ ), shrinkage estimate ( $\hat{B}_j$ ), lower interval, posterior mean ( $E(\lambda_j|\mathbf{z})$ ), upper interval, and standard deviation of posterior distribution ( $sd(\lambda_j|\mathbf{z})$ ).

As we can see in (6), the posterior mean,  $(1 - B_j)y_j + B_j\lambda_0$ , is a linear function of shrinkage,  $B_j \equiv r/(r + n_j)$ , locating between the sample mean and prior mean ( $\lambda_0 = 0.02$ ). It makes sense because  $r$  can be interpreted as the amount of prior information and  $n_j$  as the amount of observed information. If the second level has more information than the first level, then the sample mean shrinks towards the prior mean more than 50%. This point is clear in the above output because, as caseload increases, shrinkage decreases, depending less on the second level information.



A function “summary” shows selective information on hospitals and more detailed estimation result as below. To be specific, it displays some hospitals (not all as above) with minimum, median, and maximum caseloads ( $n_j$ ). On top of that, more specific estimation results, such as the estimation result of  $\alpha \equiv \log(1/r)$ , follow. Note that when we do not know the prior mean in advance unlike this hospital problem, **gbp** fits a linear regression for the Normal model, a log-linear regression for the Poisson model, or a logistic regression for the Binomial model and a summary of regression fit will appear.

```
R> summary(p)
```

Main summary:

	obs.mean	n	prior.mean	shrinkage	low.intv	post.mean
Unit w/ min(n)	0.045	67	0.02	0.834	0.011	0.024
Unit w/ median(n)	0.045	484	0.02	0.410	0.023	0.035
Unit w/ max(n)	0.020	1340	0.02	0.201	0.014	0.020
Overall Mean	0.029	517	0.02	0.438	0.015	0.025

	upp.intv	post.sd
	0.042	0.008
	0.050	0.007
	0.027	0.003
	0.037	0.006

Second-level Variance Component Estimation Summary:

$\alpha = \log(A)$  for Gaussian and  $\log(1/r)$  for Binomial and Poisson data:

	post.mode.alpha	post.sd.alpha
1	-5.818	0.411

Since estimated  $\alpha$  is -5.818, we can easily calculate  $\hat{r} = \exp(5.818) = 336$ , which is a good indicator of how valuable and informative the hypothetical second-level hierarchy is. As mentioned before,  $r$  can be interpreted as the amount of prior information, although we do not know its true value. So, **gbp** asked the data how much credit they wanted to give to this hypothetical second-level hierarchy and  $\hat{r} = 336$  was their answer. It means that observed sample means of hospitals whose caseloads are less than 336 will shrink toward the prior mean (0.020) more than 50%.

For example, the shrinkage estimate of the first hospital ( $\hat{B}_1 = 0.834$ ) was calculated by  $336 / (336 + 67)$ , where 67 is its caseload ( $n_1$ ), and its posterior mean is  $(1 - 0.834) * 0.045 + 0.834 * 0.020 = 0.024$ . As for this hospital, using more information from the prior distribution is an appropriate choice because its observed amount of information (67) is far less than the amount of state-level information (336).

We also need a graphical summary that can give us valuable insight buried in pile of numbers and a function ‘plot’ is exactly for this purpose.

```
R> plot(p)
```




Figure 2: Shrinkage plot and 95% interval plot

The regression towards the mean (RTTM) is obvious in the left-side graph; the observed sample means, empty dots on the upper line, are shrinking towards the known second-level mean (a blue vertical line at 0.02) to the different extents. Note that some hospitals' ranks have changed by shrinking much harder towards 0.02 than others. For example, the empty square symbol at the crossing point of the two left-most lines (8th and 23rd hospitals on the list above) indicates that seemingly safest hospital among 31 hospitals in terms of the observed sample mean was not actually safer than the second safest hospital. Without this hierarchical modeling, we might have made a wrong decision in choosing a hospital.

Intuitively, the result of multilevel modeling makes more sense than that of naive sample mean. For example, suppose there are two hospitals, whose sample means ( $z_j/n_j$ ) are 0 and 0.001 and caseloads ( $n_j$ ) are 1 and 1000 each. Do you believe that the former hospital, whose observed death rate is 0, is better than the latter and are you going to choose the former hospital? Borrowing information from state-level hierarchy seems reasonable for the former hospital because it is hard to judge its true death rate per exposure with just one caseload. Though somewhat extreme, this is what happened to the two left-most hospitals in the first plot and this is why hierarchical modeling is a reasonable choice for this data set.

The estimated 95% intervals are displayed on the right-side plot. We can clearly see that all the posterior means (red dots) are between sample mean (empty dots) and second-level mean (a blue horizontal line). For reference, if we want to draw this plot by the order of data input, `plot(p, sort = FALSE)` is a right adjustment. Overall, as the caseload increases towards the right and as the posterior mean gets closer to 0, the length of interval gets shorter, which the formula of posterior variance in (6) implies.

This interval plot can give us one more valuable insight, which we could not have noticed. Let's look at the 8th and the 31st hospitals on the graph (or on the outcome for numeric reference). The point estimate of the true death rate per exposure of the 31st hospital is higher than the one of the 8th. But, the upper bound of interval estimate of this 31st hospital is lower than that of the 8th. This interval plot makes the 31st hospital emerge as one of your candidates. (Could you regard this 31st hospital as a possible candidate before you observe this plot?)

Also it reveals that the 23rd hospital, whose estimated true rate was the smallest, has also the smallest upper bound. If you are a risk-averse, this hospital will attract you most strongly.

And if you already chose this 23rd hospital compared to the 8th from the shrinkage plot, your decision might become stronger at this point, excluding the 8th hospital with more certainty. Then, how reliable are these intervals? Does our procedure to generate interval estimates have good repeated sampling property? The following method checking will answer this question. The `coverage` function below generates 10,000 pseudo-data sets regarding the estimated  $r$  ( $= 336.37$ ) as a given true value. For reference, we can try any other value of  $r$ , for example  $r = 200$ , by replacing below code with ‘`R> pcv <- coverage(p, A.or.r = 200, mean.PriorDist = 0.02, nsim = 10000)`’.

Also, `gbp` can give us interval estimates with different confidence level, for example 90%, and the appropriate code adjustment is `R> p <- gbp(z, n, Alpha = 0.9, mean.PriorDist = 0.02, model = "pr")`. Then, the function `coverage` will evaluate whether interval estimates achieve 90% confidence level.

```
R> pcv <- coverage(p, nsim = 10000)
```




Figure 3: Coverage plot via method checking

It estimated coverage probabilities by simple unbiased estimates (a blue dashed line) and Rao-Blackwellized unbiased estimates (a red line). Both lines are indistinguishable from the horizontal line at 0.95 and the estimated overall average coverage rate is 0.950 from the Rao-Blackwellized estimate and 0.951 from the simple unbiased estimate. Considering this result, we finally conclude that the interval estimates from the suggested multilevel modeling on this particular data set has nice repeated sampling property.

[Morris and Christiansen \(1995\)](#) also looked into a similar ranking problem in hierarchical modeling, taking shrinkage into account.

## 6.2. 8 Schools: Unknown Second-level Mean and No Covariate

As stated in [2.1](#) the Education Testing Service (ETS) conducted randomized experiments in eight separate schools (group) to test whether students (unit) SAT scores are effected by coaching. The dataset contains the estimated coaching effects on SAT scores ( $y_j, j = 1, \dots, 8$ ) and standard errors ( $se_j, j = 1, \dots, 8$ ) of the eight schools [Rubin \(1981\)](#).

```
R> y <- c(12, -3, 28, 7, 1, 8, 18, -1)
R> se <- c(18, 16, 15, 11, 11, 10, 10, 9)
```

Due to the nature of the test each school's coaching effect has an approximately Normal sampling distribution with known sampling variance, *i.e.*, standard error of each school is assumed to be known or to be accurately estimated. Hence, we can use `gbp` to fit a Normal-Normal hierarchical model:

```
R> data(schools)
R> attach(schools)
R> g <- gbp(y, se, model = "gr")
R> g
```

Summary for each unit (sorted by n):

	obs.mean	se	prior.mean	shrinkage	low.intv	post.mean	upp.intv	post.sd
5	-1.00	9.0	8.168	0.408	-13.297	2.737	16.692	7.634
2	8.00	10.0	8.168	0.459	-7.255	8.077	23.361	7.810
7	18.00	10.0	8.168	0.459	-1.289	13.484	30.821	8.176
4	7.00	11.0	8.168	0.507	-8.780	7.592	23.602	8.257
6	1.00	11.0	8.168	0.507	-13.027	4.633	20.131	8.441
1	28.00	15.0	8.168	0.657	-2.315	14.979	38.763	10.560
3	-3.00	16.0	8.168	0.685	-17.130	4.650	22.477	10.096
8	12.00	18.0	8.168	0.734	-10.208	9.189	29.939	10.227
colMeans	8.75	12.5	8.168	0.552	-9.163	8.168	25.723	8.900

The output from `gbp` provides an easy way to read summary of the results of the estimation. From this there seems to be little evidence that the training provided much of an added benefit with every school's 95% posterior interval containing 0. **Rgbp** also provides functionality to plot the results of the analysis as seen in 6.2.

```
R> plot(g)
```

Plotting the results provides a visual aid to understanding but is only largely beneficial when the number of groups ( $k$ ) is small. In the case where the number of groups is large **Rgbp** provides a summary feature:

```
R> summary(g)
```

Main summary:

	obs.mean	se	prior.mean	shrinkage	low.intv	post.mean
Unit w/ min(se)	-1.00	9.0	8.168	0.408	-13.297	2.737
Unit w/ median(se)1	1.00	11.0	8.168	0.507	-13.027	4.633
Unit w/ median(se)2	7.00	11.0	8.168	0.507	-8.780	7.592
Unit w/ max(se)	12.00	18.0	8.168	0.734	-10.208	9.189




Figure 4: Shrinkage plot and 95% interval plot for 8 schools

Overall Mean	8.75	12.5	8.168	0.552	-9.163	8.168
--------------	------	------	-------	-------	--------	-------

	upp.intv	post.sd
	16.692	7.634
	20.131	8.441
	23.602	8.257
	29.939	10.227
	25.723	8.900

Second-level Variance Component Estimation Summary:

alpha = log(A) for Gaussian and log(1/r) for Binomial and Poisson data:

	post.mode.alpha	post.sd.alpha
1	4.768	1.139

Regression Summary:

	estimate	se	z.val	p.val
beta0	8.168	5.73	1.425	0.154

An integral part of fitting any model is to check the method of estimation. Namely we can generate new pseudo-data from our assumed model by fixing the hyper-parameter values ( $A$  and  $\mu_0$  in this example) at their estimates. It is then possible to simulate “true”  $\theta_i$  for each group  $i$  and re-fit the model many times to estimate the coverage probabilities of our procedure.

```
R> gcv <- coverage(g, nsim = 10000)
```

As seen in 6.2 the desired 95% coverage probability was achieved for each group in this example.




Figure 5: Coverage plot via method checking for 8 schools

### 6.3. 18 Baseball Players: Unknown Prior Mean and One Covariate

In this example, suppose you read the New York Times published on 26 April 1970. One article in this magazine covered 18 baseball players' batting averages through their first official 45 at-bats of the 1970 season. And then, you became interested in their batting averages over the remaining season. How could you predict? For reference, the data set `baseball` has each player's batting average over the remaining season.

First of all, the independent Binomial distribution given a true batting average of each player (see (7)) seems an appropriate probability distribution describing the uncertainty in this data set. And we know that the sample mean (MLE) under this distribution is an uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimator (UMVUE) with nice asymptotic properties. It is also the simplest way to estimate their true batting averages. But can we say this is the best way to predict their batting averages?

Efron and Morris (1975) said “no,” and suggested James-Stein estimator, making each players' sample mean shrink towards an estimated mean of the second-level prior distribution. They showed that this estimator was more than three times efficient than the sample mean under squared error loss. On top of that, a few years later Morris (1983) introduced interval estimates that could successfully catch the batting averages over the remaining season, which MLE and its interval estimate could not.

Our hierarchical modeling is a sequel to these researches, which can add one more unique value. Suppose you strongly believe that the outfielder's batting averages are different from other positions' ones, not giving a credit to the assumption that all players' batting averages shrink towards the same mean. Instead, you want to assume two different second-level hierarchies for outfielders and for other positions, within each of which sharing information and regressing toward the mean (RTTM) occur. This perspective considers true batting averages of outfielders as sampled from the one and those of other positions from the other. Our multilevel modeling provides a way to incorporate such information (covariate) seamlessly into the second-level hierarchy.

```
R> b <- gbp(z, n, x, model = "br")
R> b
```

Summary for each unit (sorted by n):

	obs.mean	n	X1	prior.mean	shrinkage	low.intv	post.mean	upp.intv	post.sd
1	0.400	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.248	0.335	0.429	0.046
2	0.378	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.244	0.329	0.420	0.045
3	0.356	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.240	0.323	0.411	0.044
4	0.333	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.236	0.316	0.403	0.043
5	0.311	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.230	0.310	0.396	0.042
6	0.311	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.179	0.256	0.341	0.041
7	0.289	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.175	0.249	0.331	0.040
8	0.267	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.171	0.243	0.323	0.039
9	0.244	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.166	0.237	0.315	0.038
10	0.244	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.210	0.291	0.379	0.043
11	0.222	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.161	0.230	0.308	0.038
12	0.222	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.161	0.230	0.308	0.038
13	0.222	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.161	0.230	0.308	0.038
14	0.222	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.202	0.285	0.375	0.044
15	0.222	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.202	0.285	0.375	0.044
16	0.200	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.155	0.224	0.302	0.038
17	0.178	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.148	0.218	0.297	0.038
18	0.156	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.140	0.211	0.292	0.039
colMeans	0.265	45	0.44	0.267	0.715	0.191	0.267	0.351	0.041

Our model reflects on the additional information, *i.e.*, indicator covariate (1 for outfielder and 0 for other positions), estimating two different prior means, 0.310 and 0.233. Also note that shrinkage estimates are the same for all players. It makes sense because shrinkage ( $B_j \equiv r/(r + n_j)$ ) is determined by the relative amount of information between the first-level and the second-level hierarchies. The fact that all players have the same amount of observed information ( $n_j = 45$ ) and  $\hat{r} = \exp(4.727) = 113$  from below summary tell why the estimated shrinkage is 0.715 ( $=113 / (113 + 45)$ ).

For reference, we can run the Normal hierarchical model using  $y_j = z_j/n_j$  and  $V_j = \bar{y}(1-\bar{y})/n$ , where  $\bar{y} = \sum_j z_j / \sum_j n_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 18$ . For comparison, we calculated squared error losses,  $\sum_{j=1}^{18} (p_{j,remaining} - \hat{p}_j)^2$ , where  $p_{j,remaining}$  is each player's batting average over the remaining season and  $\hat{p}_j$  is estimate from the Binomial and Normal multilevel models and from the sample mean (MLE) using the first 45 at-bats. These values were 0.042, 0.043, and 0.086 each, indicating that estimates from the Normal and Binomial models are twice better than MLE in terms of squared error loss.

One more thing to note is that the posterior standard deviation tends to be bigger among outfielders than among others. Let's see its formula in (9). We can notice that the estimated posterior mean is a critical factor that makes posterior variances different from each player because every player has the same at-bats ( $n_j$ ) and  $r$ . As the posterior mean gets closer to 0.5, the posterior variance gets bigger and has the biggest value when the posterior mean is 0.5. Intuitively, it makes sense. If a true batting average is 0.1, we can easily expect less hits. But if it is 0.5, we are less certain whether an at-bat would be more likely a hit or not, like a coin tossing. Our model is automatically reflecting on such uncertainty.

R> `summary(b)`

Main summary:

	obs.mean	n	X1	prior.mean	shrinkage	low.intv
Unit w/ min(obs.mean)	0.156	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.140
Unit w/ median(obs.mean)1	0.244	45	0.00	0.233	0.715	0.166
Unit w/ median(obs.mean)2	0.244	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.210
Unit w/ max(obs.mean)	0.400	45	1.00	0.310	0.715	0.248
Overall Mean	0.265	45	0.44	0.267	0.715	0.191

	post.mean	upp.intv	post.sd
	0.211	0.292	0.039
	0.237	0.315	0.038
	0.291	0.379	0.043
	0.335	0.429	0.046
	0.267	0.351	0.041

Second-level Variance Component Estimation Summary:

alpha = log(A) for Gaussian and log(1/r) for Binomial and Poisson data:

	post.mode.alpha	post.sd.alpha
1	-4.727	0.957

Regression Summary:

	estimate	se	z.val	p.val
beta0	-1.194	0.131	-9.129	0.000
beta1	0.389	0.187	2.074	0.038

This summary also includes the result of logistic regression fit because we did not know prior means in advance. We had to estimate them via this logistic regression model. Let's look at the p-value of the indicator covariate (**beta1**). It shows that the two prior means distinguishing outfielders from other positions were significantly different, supporting your initial belief. The positive sign of  $\hat{\beta}_1$  reflects on the first five players, outfielders, whose observed batting averages were higher than others.

*R> plot(b)*

Let's see shrinkage and 95% interval plots for more intuition. It is obvious that sample means (empty dots) on the upper line shrink towards two different means, 0.310 and 0.233. For reference, the red line symbols on dots are for when two or more points have the same mean and are plotted over each other. For example, five players (from the 11th player to the 15th) have the same sample mean (0.222) and at this point on the upper line, there are short red lines toward five directions. This symbol also means that the seemingly two lines crossing over others were actually three lines for those who were outfielders (10th, 14th, and 15th hitters). For reference, the observed sample mean among outfielders is 0.308 and that among other positions is 0.231. But why are the estimated two prior means from this Binomial model






Figure 6: Shrinkage plot and 95% interval plot

0.310 and 0.233 each? This can be attributed to the logistic regression which estimates prior mean by a non-linear logit function of  $x'\beta$ , causing a small bias (see 3.3). The Normal model can avoid this small bias because it uses a linear regression to estimate these prior means.

The 95% interval plot shows us range of true batting average for each player, which clarifies the regression toward the mean (RTTM) within two groups. Let's see the 10th, 14th, and 15th players on the graph for example. They are outfielders but their batting averages (sample mean) are far lower than the first five outfielders. RTTM means that it can happen by their bad luck though in the long run their batting averages will come back to their expected ones as outfielders (blue horizontal line). The fact that their sample means are located at the lower part of their 95% intervals supports this argument. So, their posterior means (red dots) can also be interpreted as their RTTM.

One more thing to emphasize is that observed sample means are all within the interval estimates. And these interval estimates also covered the batting averages over the remaining season successfully, although the result was left out. Then, how much can we trust these interval estimates? The following method check will answer it.

```
R> bcv <- coverage(b, nsim = 10000)
```

The meaning of putting the `gbp` object, `b`, without any additional argument in the above `coverage` function is to make this function regard the estimated values, such as  $\hat{r}$  ( $=112.95$ ) and  $\hat{\beta}$  ( $=(-1.194, 0.389)^T$ ), as true values when it generates pseudo-data sets.

Finally, the estimated average coverage probability is 0.973 based on the Rao-Blackwellization, conservatively satisfying the definition of the 95% confidence interval.

## 7. Discussion

**Rgbp** is an R package for estimating and validating a two-level hierarchical model. The package aims to provide a procedure that is not only fast and easy to use but has good frequency properties and can be used in many scenarios. The package provides “method checking” functionality to examine repeated sampling properties and test that the method is valid at a particular parameter value.




Figure 7: Coverage plot via method checking

In addition to good frequency properties Bayesians will be able to use the package to see the results from a non-informative reference point. This allows the user to examine whether it is worth to implement a full Bayesian model (which is often more time consuming).

Due to the fact that the estimation procedures in **Rgbp** rely on differentiation the package is extremely quick in fitting the available models. This makes the package ideal to be used in simulation studies where a hierarchical model needs to be fitted at every iteration and where running a full Bayesian model (via MCMC) would be computationally impractical.

In short the **Rgbp** is an R package that utilizes Bayesian machinery to provide a method of estimating two-level hierarchical models from many families in a fast and computationally efficient manner.

## 8. Acknowledgments

## References

- Christiansen CL, Morris CN (1997). “Hierarchical Poisson Regression Modeling.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**(438), pp. 618–632. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2965709>.
- Efron B, Morris C (1975). “Data Analysis Using Stein’s Estimator and its Generalizations.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **70**(350), pp. 311–319. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2285814>.
- Kass RE, Steffey D (1989). “Approximate Bayesian Inference in Conditionally Independent Hierarchical Models (Parametric Empirical Bayes Models).” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **84**(407), pp. 717–726. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2289653>.
- Morris C, Tang R (2011). “Estimating Random Effects via Adjustment for Density Maximiza-

- tion.” *Statistical Science*, **26**(2), pp. 271–287. ISSN 08834237. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23059992>.
- Morris CN (1983). “Parametric Empirical Bayes Inference: Theory and Applications.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **78**(381), pp. 47–55. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2287098>.
- Morris CN, Christiansen C (1995). “Hierarchical Models for Ranking and for Identifying Extremes, With Application.” In J Bernardo, J Berger, A Dawid, A Smith (eds.), *Bayesian Statistics 5*, pp. 227–296. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morris CN, Lysy M (2012). “Shrinkage Estimation in Multilevel Normal Models.” *Statistical Science*, **27**(1), 115–134.
- Rubin DB (1981). “Estimation in Parallel Randomized Experiments.” *Journal of Educational Statistics*, **6**(4), pp. 377–401. ISSN 03629791. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1164617>.

**Affiliation:**

Joseph Kelly  
Department of Statistics  
Harvard University  
1 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA  
E-mail: [kelly2@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:kelly2@fas.harvard.edu)  
URL: <http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~kelly2/>

Carl Morris  
Department of Statistics  
Harvard University  
1 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA  
E-mail: [morris@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:morris@fas.harvard.edu)

Hyungsuk Tak  
Department of Statistics  
Harvard University  
1 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA  
E-mail: [hyungsuk.tak@gmail.com](mailto:hyungsuk.tak@gmail.com)