

stgam: An R package for GAM-based varying coefficient models

Lex Comber^{1*}, Paul Harris^{2*}, and Chris Brunsdon^{3*}

¹ School of Geography, University of Leeds, UK ² Rothamsted Research, North Wyke, UK ³ National Centre for Geocomputation, Maynooth University, Ireland * These authors contributed equally.

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

Software

- [Review](#)
- [Repository](#)
- [Archive](#)

Editor: [Open Journals](#)

Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

Summary

We are often interested in understanding how and where statistical relationships vary over space, and how they change over time. Quantifying such *process heterogeneity* (spatial and or temporal) can be done using *varying coefficient* models. The opportunity to undertake such space-time analyses are greater due to the increased generation and availability of data that include both spatial and temporal attributes (e.g. GPS coordinates and time-stamps). The **stgam** package provides a framework for creating regression models using Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990) in which the relationships between the response (dependent) variable and individual predictor (independent) variables are allowed to vary over space, time or both. It addresses a key question of the form space-time interaction to be specified in models. Frequently randomly guessed have to be made about the form of predictor-to-response relationships until an effective model form and associated model fits are found. To address this the **stgam** package includes functions to create multiple models, each specifying different relationships between the response variable y and the predictor variables $x_1 \dots x_n$. Each model is evaluated using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) (Schwarz, 1978) which approximates the likelihood (probability) of the model being the correct model, given the data used in the analysis. Where multiple models are highly probable, then these can be combined using a Bayesian Model Averaging approach (Brunsdon et al., 2023; Fragoso et al., 2018). Finally the **stgam** package contains functions for creating spatially and / or temporally varying regression coefficient estimates. These can be mapped in the usual way to show how where and when the relationships between the response and the predictor variables vary over space and time.

Statement of need

A number approaches have been established to quantify process spatial non-stationarity or heterogeneity (Brunsdon et al., 1996; Casetti, 1972; Fotheringham et al., 2002; Gelfand et al., 2003; Griffith, 2008; Jones, 1991; McMillen, 1996) and tools also exist to quantify the temporal dynamics of these (Crespo et al., 2007; Di Giacinto, 2006; Elhorst, 2003; Gelfand et al., 2004; Huang et al., 2010; Pace et al., 1998, 2000). All existing models require the user to make decisions about the nature of the space-time relationships in the data and thus the model and assume the presence of latent spatial and temporal autocorrelation in variables. The most commonly used approach in geographical analyses of space-time problems is geographically and temporally weighted regression (GTWR) (Huang et al., 2010) which seeks to optimises a single space-time kernel to define the space-time relationships of all covariates with the target variable. Some recent steps in the right direction have been taken in this regard: Liu et al. (2017) developed a semi-parametric temporal extension to mixed geographically weighted regression, in which some relationships and coefficients are assumed to be globally constant and others vary locally over time; Hong et al. (2021) used a bootstrap approach to identify

43 global coefficients in such models, but still define the same space-time relationship for each
44 varying covariate.

45 To address this gap, the **stgam** package draws from the **mgcv** GAM package (S. N. Wood,
46 2017). GAMs are able to handle many kinds of responses (Fahrmeir et al., 2021) and provide
47 an intuitive approach to fit relatively complex relationships in data with complex interactions
48 and non-linearities (S. N. Wood, 2017). The outputs of GAMs provide readily understood
49 summaries of the relationship between predictor and response variables, and how the outcome
50 is modelled. They are able to predict well from complex systems, quantify relationships,
51 and support inferences about these relationships, such as which variables are important and
52 at what range of values they are most influential (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990; S. N. Wood,
53 2017). GAMs can perform as well as or better than most machine learning models and
54 they are relatively fast (Friedman, 2001; S. N. Wood, 2017). Importantly, in the context of
55 varying coefficient modelling, GAMs combine predictive power, model accuracy and model
56 transparency. GAMs model non-linear relationships using smooths, also referred to as splines.
57 These can be of different forms depending on the problem and data (Hastie & Tibshirani,
58 1990) and, as they can be represented as linear combinations of basis functions, they are
59 sometimes referred to as Gaussian Process (GP) splines. A GP is a random process over
60 functions, and its terms can be modelled using GP-splines within a GAM. Thus GP splines
61 are represented as a linear combination of non-linear *basis functions* of predictor variables,
62 which can generate predictions of the outcome variable. Basis functions can be either single or
63 multi-dimensional in terms of predictor variables. As a result, a GAM consists of linear sums
64 of multi-dimensional basis functions that allow complex relationships to be modelled. The
65 appropriate degree of “wiggleness” in each spline is determined by the smoothing parameters,
66 which balances over-fitting versus capturing the complexity in the relationship. GAMs with
67 GP smooths parameterised with location and / or time can be used to construct regression
68 models that allow coefficient estimates to vary and capture process spatial and / or temporal
69 heterogeneity: a varying coefficient approach. While spline-based varying coefficient models
70 have been proposed, for example using a generalized linear model with reduced-rank thin-plate
71 splines (Fan & Huang, 2022), here the predictor-to-response relationship is considered over
72 space and time as a GP.

73 A final consideration is the need to determine model form. Standard approaches for constructing
74 spatially and temporally varying coefficient models, which in the absence of a theoretical model,
75 commonly assume that some degree of spatial and temporal dependence *is* present in the data
76 and in the relationship of each covariate with the target variable. In the GAM GP smooth
77 approach, each covariate would be specified in a SP smooth parameterised with location and
78 with time under the assumption that any temporal trends in coefficient estimates *will* vary
79 with location. However, each covariate can be specified in six different ways: it can be omitted,
80 included as a parametric (global) term, in a smooth with location, in a smooth with time, in
81 a smooth with location *and* time, or in two separate space and time smooths. The last five
82 options similarly apply to the intercept.

83 Package overview

84 The **stgam** package contains functions to support varying coefficient modelling using GAMs
85 with GP smooths, that provide a wrapper for the GAM implementation in the **mgcv** package
86 (S. Wood, 2015), that create, evaluate, and aggregate multiple models. It also contains two
87 datasets that are used to illustrate the functions. These are described in Table 1.

88 The package includes two vignettes. The first, *space-time-gam-intro*, provides a gentle
89 introduction to undertaking varying coefficient regression analyses with GAMs via the **mgcv**
90 package. The second vignette, *space-time-gam-model-probs-BMA*, describes a standard **stgam**
91 workflow to create and evaluate multiple models, and then to either select the best one or to
92 combine competing models using Bayesian Model Averaging.

- 93 Brunsdon, C., Fotheringham, A. S., & Charlton, M. E. (1996). Geographically weighted
94 regression: A method for exploring spatial nonstationarity. *Geographical Analysis*, 28(4),
95 281–298.
- 96 Brunsdon, C., Harris, P., & Comber, A. (2023). *Smarter than your average model? Bayesian*
97 *model averaging as a spatial analysis tool*. 12th International Conference on Geographic
98 Information Science.
- 99 Casetti, E. (1972). Generating models by the expansion method: Applications to geographical
100 research. *Geographical Analysis*, 4(1), 81–91.
- 101 Crespo, R., Fotheringham, S., & Charlton, M. (2007). Application of geographically weighted
102 regression to a 19-year set of house price data in london to calibrate local hedonic price
103 models. *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Geocomputation*.
- 104 Di Giacinto, V. (2006). A generalized space-time ARMA model with an application to regional
105 unemployment analysis in italy. *International Regional Science Review*, 29(2), 159–198.
- 106 Elhorst, J. P. (2003). Specification and estimation of spatial panel data models. *International*
107 *Regional Science Review*, 26(3), 244–268.
- 108 Fahrmeir, L., Kneib, T., Lang, S., & Marx, B. D. (2021). Regression models. In *Regression*
109 (pp. 23–84). Springer.
- 110 Fan, Y.-T., & Huang, H.-C. (2022). Spatially varying coefficient models using reduced-rank
111 thin-plate splines. *Spatial Statistics*, 51, 100654.
- 112 Fotheringham, A. S., Brunsdon, C., & Charlton, M. (2002). *Geographically weighted regression:*
113 *The analysis of spatially varying relationships*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 114 Fragoso, T. M., Bertoli, W., & Louzada, F. (2018). Bayesian model averaging: A systematic
115 review and conceptual classification. *International Statistical Review*, 86(1), 1–28.
- 116 Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *Annals*
117 *of Statistics*, 1189–1232.
- 118 Gelfand, A. E., Ecker, M. D., Knight, J. R., & Sirmans, C. (2004). The dynamics of location
119 in home price. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 29, 149–166.
- 120 Gelfand, A. E., Kim, H.-J., Sirmans, C., & Banerjee, S. (2003). Spatial modeling with spatially
121 varying coefficient processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462),
122 387–396.
- 123 Griffith, D. A. (2008). Spatial-filtering-based contributions to a critique of geographically
124 weighted regression (GWR). *Environment and Planning A*, 40(11), 2751–2769.
- 125 Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (1990). Generalized additive models. Chapman hall & CRC.
126 *Monographs on Statistics & Applied Probability*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1.
- 127 Hong, Z., Mei, C., Wang, H., & Du, W. (2021). Spatiotemporal effects of climate factors on
128 childhood hand, foot, and mouth disease: A case study using mixed geographically and
129 temporally weighted regression models. *International Journal of Geographical Information*
130 *Science*, 35(8), 1611–1633.
- 131 Huang, B., Wu, B., & Barry, M. (2010). Geographically and temporally weighted regression for
132 modeling spatio-temporal variation in house prices. *International Journal of Geographical*
133 *Information Science*, 24(3), 383–401.
- 134 Jones, K. (1991). Specifying and estimating multi-level models for geographical research.
135 *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 148–159.
- 136 Liu, J., Zhao, Y., Yang, Y., Xu, S., Zhang, F., Zhang, X., Shi, L., & Qiu, A. (2017). A mixed
137 geographically and temporally weighted regression: Exploring spatial-temporal variations
138 from global and local perspectives. *Entropy*, 19(2), 53.

- 139 McMillen, D. P. (1996). One hundred fifty years of land values in chicago: A nonparametric
140 approach. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 40(1), 100–124.
- 141 Pace, R. K., Barry, R., Clapp, J. M., & Rodriguez, M. (1998). Spatiotemporal autoregressive
142 models of neighborhood effects. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 17,
143 15–33.
- 144 Pace, R. K., Barry, R., Gilley, O. W., & Sirmans, C. (2000). A method for spatial–temporal
145 forecasting with an application to real estate prices. *International Journal of Forecasting*,
146 16(2), 229–246.
- 147 Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 461–464.
- 148 Wood, S. (2015). Package “mgcv.” *R Package Version*, 1(29), 729.
- 149 Wood, S. N. (2017). *Generalized additive models: An introduction with r*. CRC press.

DRAFT