Variance models in `earth`

Stephen Milborrow

October 10, 2020

Contents

1 Introduction

Given a predicted value from a regression model, we often want to know how reliable that prediction is. Can we trust the prediction? To this end, in earth models a *variance model* can be used to estimate prediction intervals. The left plot of Figure 1 shows an earth fit with prediction intervals estimated by the variance model. (This plot will be discussed in detail in Section 3.1.)

We tell earth to build the variance model with the `varmod.method` argument. The variance model is kept with the earth model (in the `varmod` field). It models how the residuals vary with the predicted response.

This internal mechanism is as follows. If we specify `varmod.method="lm"`, for example, earth first builds a MARS model as usual, then internally applies `lm` to the model's absolute residuals:

```
residual.model <- lm(abs(residuals) ~ predict(earth.model), ...)
```

This residual model is in fact the variance model. It is illustrated in the right plot of Figure 1. The residual model allows us to estimate the average absolute value of the errors at any predicted value, and thus their standard deviation. The variance models in the earth package assume that the errors are independent but possibly heteroscedastic.

Limitations of variance models. There is more uncertainty in the variance model than in the main earth model. The right plot of Figure 1 is typical. It shows how noisy the residuals are. We expect the R^2 of the `lm` regression here to be quite low. There is some uncertainty in the exact form of the residual model. Consequently there will be more uncertainty in the prediction intervals than in the predictions themselves.


Figure 1: *Prediction intervals.*
Left: Ozone regressed on temperature. The 95% prediction intervals are shown shaded.
Right: The internal residual model used for estimating prediction intervals.
*   The plot shows absolute residuals versus fitted values for the model on the left.*
*   The red line is the linear residual model.*

2 Theory and implementation

This section gives some details on the theory and implementation of earth's variance models. If you like you can skip this for now and proceed directly to the example in the next chapter, Chapter 3.

For more on the theory of variance models, Davidian and Carroll [2] and Carroll and Ruppert [1] are recommended. Galecki and Burzykowski [4] is also helpful.

In the earth implementation, since we are in a non-parametric setting, the methods in those references are extended to account for model variance (which is estimated with cross-validation). The methods presented here have currently been implemented only for earth, although they are in fact quite general.

2.1 Confidence intervals versus prediction intervals

There is an important distinction between the two types of interval for predictions:

(i) intervals for the prediction of the mean response (called *confidence intervals*)

(ii) intervals for the prediction of a future value (called *prediction intervals*[1]).

To understand the distinction, suppose we have a model that predicts the selling price of homes in a given area based on the number of bedrooms, etc. (This example follows Section 3.5 of Faraway [3].)

(i) **Confidence intervals are for the prediction of a mean response.** What would a house with given characteristics sell for *on average*? Out best guess is the value predicted by the model. There will be some uncertainty in the prediction because of model variance. The *confidence interval* of the prediction accounts for this model variance.

Model variance is a measure of how the model varies across training samples. Our interest is in earth models, but this applies to all models. For example, in a linear model $y = x^T \beta + \epsilon$, the predicted value at a given x_0 is $x_0^T \hat{\beta}$, and model variance is a measure of the uncertainty in our estimate of β. In an earth model, model variance includes the uncertainty in the position of the selected knots, which variables were chosen for the model, etc.

(ii) **Prediction intervals are for the prediction of a future value.** The actual value of a *specific house* with the given characteristics will also typically differ somewhat from the predicted value. The uncertainty here is worse than that for prediction of the mean response discussed above.

This noise, or irreducible error, is usually modeled as additive error ϵ. In a linear model, for instance, this noise is represented by the random value of ϵ in $y = x^T \beta + \epsilon$. To figure out a *prediction interval* the noise variance must be added to the model variance. Prediction intervals are bigger than confidence intervals.

---

[1]This terminology is not quite apt. It is what people use, but in some sense both are prediction intervals and both are confidence levels. Some call them wide and narrow intervals.

Another example is a model that estimates flood levels given the characteristics of the location (previous levels, nearby rivers, etc.). If we plan to build a flood wall, the confidence interval isn't enough — to be reasonably safe we need to use at least the upper 95% prediction interval.

2.2 Data structures

The various models are stored as follows:

```
earth model     Sometimes called the "parent model" in this context
   |
varmod          The variance model
   |
residmod        The residual submodel e.g. lm
```

The *residual submodel* is the regression of the absolute residuals on the fitted value. For example, it will be a `lm` model if `varmod.method="lm"`. Another example would be `varmod.method="gam"`, to adapt to non-linear changes in residual deviation.

The *variance model* is a wrapper for the residual submodel. It provides summary and plot methods, and takes care of rescaling absolute residuals to standard deviations (Section 2.5), and clamping to `min.sd` (Section 2.3).

The `summary.earth` function will display the variance model if present as part of the earth model.

You probably won't need to do this, but `summary(earth.mod$varmod)` will display the variance model directly (it invokes `summary.varmod`). And you can display the residual submodel directly with `summary(earth.mod$varmod$residmod)`. If `varmod.method="lm"`, the submodel is an `lm` model, and this call invokes `summary.lm`.

2.3 Minimum standard deviation

The standard deviation estimated by the variance model in this package is forced to be at least a small positive value `min.sd`. This prevents estimated prediction intervals from being negative or absurdly small. The value of `min.sd` is determined when building the variance model as one tenth the average standard deviation:

```
min.sd <- 0.1 * mean(sd(residuals))
```

The `0.1` can be changed with earth's `varmod.clamp` argument.

2.4 Iteratively Reweighted Least Squares

When building the residual model (as per the R code on page 3), earth uses Iteratively Reweighted Least Squares (IRLS). That is, it makes the call to `lm` repeatedly using the

variance estimated from the previous call to determine the weights for the current call. Iteration stops when the `lm` coefficients change by less than 1%.

Weighted least squares is necessary because in general the residuals of the residual model are themselves highly heteroscedastic. To determine the weighting we need the (relative) variance of the residual model predictions. Happily, a characteristic of residual models is that this can be estimated from the predictions themselves — for regression on absolute residuals, this variance is proportional to the square of the value predicted by the residual model (Carroll and Ruppert [1] Table 3.3).

No iteration is necessary when `varmod.method="const"`.

In the current implementation no iteration takes place with `varmod.method="earth"`.

2.4.1 Tracing IRLS

The iterations can be traced by specifying `trace=.3` in the call to `earth`, which will print something like this:

```
iter weight.ratio coefchange% (Intercept)       x
   1          9.9        0.00         1.7    0.17
   2         15.5       19.79         1.3    0.20
   3         17.0        4.32         1.3    0.21
   4         17.4        0.96         1.2    0.21
```

The `(Intercept)` and `x` columns show the estimated intercept and coefficients of the residual model (the results of the calls to `lm`). In this example, as is often the case, by the second iteration the estimates have settled close to their final values.

Note that these are the coefficients for the regression on the absolute residuals, not the coefficients for standard deviations, which are approximately 1.25 times these values (Section 2.6 (ii)).

The `coefchange%` column shows the mean change in these values from the previous iteration. Iteration stops when the change gets below 1%. You can adjust the convergence criterion with earth's `varmod.conv` argument, although you probably won't need to.

The `weight.ratio` column shows the ratio of the maximum to minimum weight. The weights are artificially clamped if necessary to prevent a few cases completely dominating.

2.4.2 Warning: varmod did not converge after 50 iters (oscillating-lo)

This warning means that the IRLS didn't converge.

Non-convergence may not actually be a problem. Run earth with `trace=.3` to trace the IRLS process. Though the iterations don't converge, the coefficients as printed by the trace may be stable enough, given the inherent uncertainty in residual models.

You could also try removing an observation or two before running earth, since small perturbations of the data can sometimes affect IRLS convergence quite significantly. (You could start with high leverage observations. To locate these, use `plot(earth.mod, versus=4)`.)

The `oscillating-lo` in the above example message is one of several reasons given for non-convergence. It doesn't tell us anything we can't figure out from manually examining the IRLS trace. (In this particular example, the algorithm is oscillating between two local minimums on successive iterations.)

2.5 The residual model

As stated on page 3, the residual model is a regression of the absolute residuals of the parent earth model:

$$\texttt{residual.model <- lm(abs(residuals)} \sim \texttt{predict(earth.model), ...)} \qquad (1)$$

Here `lm` could actually be one of several possibilities such as `gam` or `earth`, and the above regression is repeated several times with different weights (i.e. IRLS as explained in Section 2.4).

What we call `residuals` in the above formula are not the raw residuals $\hat{\epsilon} = y - \hat{y}$ from the earth model. The raw residuals $\hat{\epsilon}$ underestimate the (unknown) errors ϵ. This is true for any linear regression (the linear regression for an earth model is of the response on the earth basis matrix `bx`). Additionally, we need to include model variance.

We thus estimate the squared error for a future value at i as

$$\hat{\epsilon}^2_{i\_future} \quad = \quad \frac{(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{1 - h_{ii}} \quad + \quad \texttt{modvar}_i \qquad (2)$$

where

y_i is the future response,
$\hat{y}_i$ is the predicted value,
h_{ii} is the point's leverage, discussed below,
$\texttt{modvar}_i$ is the estimated model variance at the point.

The absolute residual used in the residual model (1) is the square root of the above $\hat{\epsilon}^2_{i\_future}$. Working with squared residuals allows us to combine irreducible error and model variance by simple addition.

The leverage h_{ii} is a diagonal entry of the hat matrix from the linear fit of the response on earth's basis matrix `bx`. For homoscedastic linear models, standard theory gives the formula[1] for the variance of a residual as $var(\hat{\epsilon}_i) = \sigma^2(1 - h_{ii})$. The correction factor $1/(1 - h_{ii})$ in (2) follows naturally from rearranging the formula to estimate σ^2. In our heteroscedastic situation, σ^2 is no longer constant at all points and we estimate it at each point from the single residual at the point.[2] Each residual thus gets corrected for

---

[1]The process of estimating the model using the normal equations induces a bias to the residuals so they no longer match the errors. This formula compensates for that bias (e.g. Weisberg [9]).

[2]The idea here is that we estimate the variance of the residual at the point from the single residual at the point — a sample size of 1 — and use regression to smooth this highly variable estimate across all points.

its leverage. The residuals for high leverage points get corrected the most, since they tend to underestimate the error the most. The mean value of a leverage is p/n, and if a leverage has this mean value the correction becomes

$$\frac{1}{1 - h_{ii}} = \frac{1}{1 - p/n} = \frac{n}{n - p},$$

which is the conventional degrees-of-freedom correction for error variance in a homoscedastic linear model A leverage may thus be thought of as a partial degree of freedom.

The model variance `modvar`$_i$ for a prediction is its variance over multiple models built on different training samples. We actually have only one sample at hand, so estimate model variance as the variance of the out-of-fold predicted values over `ncross` cross-validations. (Cross-validation often seems to underestimate model variance. Nevertheless, including a model variance term gives substantially more accurate prediction intervals in our simulation studies.)

2.6   Converting absolute residuals to prediction intervals

To estimate the prediction interval at a future observation point, we do the following:

(i) Estimate the mean absolute future error at the point using the residual model described in Section 2.5.

(i) Assuming normality, rescale the error to an estimated standard deviation with the formula

$$sd = 1.2533 \; mean(abs(error))$$

where the scaling factor $1.2533 \approx \sqrt{\pi/2}$ is the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean absolute deviation for normal data (Geary [5]). The ratio can also be estimated (more intuitively) with the R expression

```
1 / mean(abs(rnorm(1e8)))    # evaluates to 1.2533
```

This scaling factor unfortunately makes the variance model more sensitive to non-normality of the errors than the main earth model.

(i) Convert the standard deviation to an estimated prediction interval for a given level α:

$$interval(\hat{y}) = \hat{y} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \; sd$$

where we use a normal approximation to the t-distribution. So for example, if the level is `0.95`, the prediction interval will be $\hat{y} \pm 1.96 \; sd$.

The above steps take place in `predict.varmod`, which is invoked by `predict.earth` when its `interval` argument is used.

2.7 Why regress on the absolute residuals?

For the earth variance model, a regression based approach (rather than a likelihood approach) was chosen for its conceptual simplicity, and its flexibility given the ease with which we can plug in different R regression functions. Also, likelihood estimation in this setting is less robust because it is sensitive to departures from the assumed distribution (Carroll and Ruppert [1] Section 2.4).

Note that we regress on the absolute residuals. Since our aim is to estimate variance (or standard deviation), why don't we regress directly on the squared residuals? That seems like the right way to go, since the expectation of the square of the residuals is their variance, up to a degrees-of-freedom correction, and is the approach suggested by some authors.

However, on simulated data we have found that regressing on the squared residuals (or log absolute residuals as suggested by some) tends to give results more unstable than using absolute residuals. An outlying residual when squared becomes even more outlying, affecting robustness of the residual model. The absolute residuals are better behaved.

The cube root of the squared residuals is closer to normality than the absolute residuals (Wilson and Hilferty [10]). But the earth implementation sticks with absolute residuals because they are close enough in practice, and slightly more intuitive.

2.8 Alternative approaches

There are other methods of forming the residuals for estimating prediction intervals. Formula (2) on page 7 has the advantage that it separates the contributions of the irreducible and model errors. This is analogous to the standard method for estimating prediction intervals in the homoscedastic linear model $y = x^T \beta + \epsilon$. For that model, from the usual theory (e.g. [3]) the estimated irreducible variance is $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-p} \Sigma (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$, the estimated model variance at a given x value x_0 is $var(x_0^T \hat{\beta}) = x_0^T (X^T X)^{-1} x_0 \hat{\sigma}^2$, and we sum these to get the estimated variance at a prediction $\hat{\sigma}^2 + x_0^T (X^T X)^{-1} x_0 \hat{\sigma}^2$.

Also, there are other ways of forming the correction factor in formula (2). The correction $1/(1 - h_{ii})$ we use is known as the HC_2 correction in the literature on Heteroscedastic Consistent Covariance Matrices (e.g. Zeileis [11]). MacKinnon and White [6] recommend HC_3, a stronger correction $1/(1-h_{ii})^2$ based on leave-one-out statistics. However it isn't known if these results for covariance matrix estimation carry over to the residual regression that we use, especially as we already incorporate a model variance term. (This could be worth looking into. We found that HC_3 gave slightly more accurate prediction intervals than HC_2 in a limited simulation study. In that study we used earth on one to three independent predictors with heteroscedastic gaussian noise.)

Figure 2: *Data generated from a sine curve (red) with an earth fit (black).*

Note the model bias at the top part of the curve.

In a residual plot (not shown), this bias would be manifest as a divergence of the lowess line from the center of the plot at high fitted values.

2.9 Model bias

An ideal modeling algorithm creates models with negligible variance and negligible bias.[1] In general this isn't possible, and like all flexible modeling techniques, MARS must balance bias and variance — not too much variance; not too much bias. Therefore the MARS model will be biased in general, at least a bit. We most often see this at sharp corners in the response (Figure 2). If we loosened up the algorithm to allow it to more closely fit the corner, we increase the risk that the curve would be too wiggly elsewhere — by reducing bias we increase variance.

The squared residuals in Section 2.5 are formed without a bias term. They have to be, because we can't reliably estimate conditional bias. Bias is a fundamental problem for estimation of prediction intervals with non-parametric models. Wasserman [8] Section 5.7 further discusses this issue.

---

[1]This means that if we had many samples of the same size drawn from the same underlying distribution, models trained on those samples would all be about the same, and a prediction averaged over all those models would be close to the true response.

3   A variance model example

The code below builds a simple model to estimate the ozone level `O3` from the temperature `temp`. We will use this model as a running example through this document. It is the model depicted on the left side of Figure 1.

```
data(ozone1)
set.seed(1) # optional, for cross-validation reproducibility
earth.mod <- earth(O3~temp, data=ozone1, nfold=10, ncross=30, varmod.method="lm")
```

The `varmod.method` argument tells earth to generate the variance model, after first generating the earth model as usual. The `nfold` and `ncross` arguments are also necessary here, because repeated cross-validation is used to estimate the earth model variance. The `ncross` argument should be at least 30 in this context, based on the rule-of-thumb that we need 30 measurements to adequately estimate variance.

We use `varmod.method="lm"` above with the assumption that the standard deviation of O3 about its conditional mean increases linearly with temperature. (Actually, the relationship is probably more complex, but, as can be seen in the right plot of Figure 1, the residuals are noisy, and determining the exact nature of the relationship may not be possible from the data alone. A linear regression is a good first choice.)

The left plot of Figure 1 was produced by the following call to `plotmo`. Note the `level=.95` argument, which tells `plotmo` to show the 95% prediction intervals.

```
plotmo(earth.mod, pt.col=1, level=.95)
```

3.1   Comments on the example plot

In the left plot of Figure 1 on page 3, the prediction intervals are quite big. It's no surprise that temperature alone isn't enough to predict ozone levels. We see some outlying points in the 40 to 60 degree temperature range, further evidence that something else is going on that isn't accounted for by temperature.

The relatively gentle kink of the main earth model hinge suggests that instead of earth for the main model, we could use a standard linear regression on say the square or cube root of `temp`. But we ignore these issues for our current purposes.

On the far left of the plot the estimated lower prediction limit is below zero, which is impossible (the ozone level cannot be negative). So we have to be sensible about how we interpret the prediction intervals.

Residual deviation is somewhat overestimated at low and high temperatures. This may be a consequence of our decision to use `lm` for the residual model. A GAM model might have been a better choice (`varmod.method="gam"`), although less easily interpretable and more prone to overfitting.

The residual model assumes that the residuals are symmetric. That assumption may not be valid for temperatures in the say 70 to 80 degree range, where the points seem to be dispersed asymmetrically about the regression line — the estimated prediction band is too big for points below the line, and maybe too small for points above the line.

The assumption of symmetry follows from the fact that the residual model regresses on the absolute values of the residuals, thus making no distinction between positive and negative residuals. (Of course the implementation could be modified to generate one-sided intervals with separate regressions on the positive and negative residuals. That may be an option worth adding to the earth code. A disadvantage is that it halves the data for regression, in an already noisy situation.)

This example is univariate (one predictor). With multivariate models (multiple predictors), displaying the prediction intervals isn't so easy (`plotmo` will do it, but the results can be confusing). For such models, residual plots are essential to represent a multidimensional model in two dimensions on a page. Residual plots will be discussed in Section 5.2.

3.2 Extensions to `summary.earth` for variance models

A call to `summary(earth.mod)` shows the variance model for our example:

```
> summary(earth.mod)

    ... usual text omitted here ...

varmod: method "lm"    min.sd 0.464    iter.rsq 0.139

stddev of predictions:
           coefficients iter.stderr iter.stderr%
(Intercept)       1.562       0.341           22
O3                0.262       0.036           14

                        mean   smallest   largest   ratio
95% prediction interval 18.2       8.57      35.7    4.17

                                      68%   80%   90%   95%
response values in prediction interval 70    82    92    97
```

The various items in the above summary are described below.

(i) The `iter.rsq` figure is the R^2 of the weighted `lm` variance model. The low value of `0.139` isn't unusual here because of the difficulty of building a model from the main model residuals, which tend to be noisy (right plot of Figure 1). The R^2 of the main earth model is `0.66`, substantially higher.

 The prefix `iter.` reminds us that this R^2 is for the final iteration of IRLS (Section 2.4). As always with IRLS there is some concern about the validity of this R^2 value. This is because the uncertainty in the iterated estimation of the regression parameters isn't fully accounted for in the final R^2.

(i) The standard deviation estimated by the variance model is never allowed to be less than `min.sd`, in this case `0.464`. (Section 2.3 describes `min.sd`.)

(i) The `stddev of predictions` table gives the standard deviation of the predictions made by the earth model. In this example, it says the standard deviation

of the predicted `O3` level is estimated to be `1.562 + 0.262 * O3` in units of `O3` concentration. This is the core of the variance model.

The `iter.stderr` shows the standard error of the coefficients, much like the output of `summary.lm`. These standard errors are calculated from the final model of the IRLS iteration. As in `iter.rsq` above, there is some concern about the validity of these numbers — they may be too small — and because of this concern, the formality of t-tests isn't justified. In general, inference on residual models is a difficult problem, whether one uses regression based methods, as we do here, or likelihood based methods (e.g. Galecki and Burzykowski [4] Section 7.8).

The `iter.stderr%` column shows `iter.stderr` as a percentage of the coefficient value. For instance, in the first line of the table:

```
iter.stderr%  =  iter.stderr / coefficient  =  0.341 / 1.562  =  22%
```

(i) The `95% prediction interval` table shows the `mean`, `smallest`, and `largest` estimated 95% prediction intervals for the `O3` response. In the left plot of Figure 1, the smallest prediction interval is at the extreme left and the largest is at the extreme right, since estimated variance increases with the response, as is often the case.

The ratio of the `largest` to the `smallest` prediction interval is also shown. This is a measure of overall heteroscedasticity. The current figure `4.17` indicates considerable heteroscedasticity.

(i) The `response values in prediction interval` table is a sanity check of the variance model. It shows what fraction of the training response values (`O3`) are in some standard prediction intervals. The 95% interval corresponds to the bands in the left plot of Figure 1 because `level=.95` was used to generate that plot. The percentage figures in the current table are acceptable. (We expect only an approximate match to the theoretical values unless we have a huge training sample.)

We can print the table for new data by invoking `summary.earth` with a `newdata` argument. This will also print R^2 for the main earth model on the new data, as shown in the following example. (The example uses bogus new data which is just a subset of the training data.)

```
> summary(earth.mod, newdata=ozone1[sample.int(nrow(ozone1), 100), ])

RSq 0.642 on newdata (100 cases)

                              68%    80%    90%    95%
newdata in prediction interval  74    86    94    98
```

By definition only 5% of the predictions fall out the 95% interval. With 100 cases this works out to just 5 cases, about two below and two above. You thus need a fair amount of data to get stable results in the table — ideally much more than the 100 cases in the above example.

4 Prediction intervals and `predict.earth`

Use `predict.earth`'s `interval="pint"` and `level` arguments to get estimated prediction intervals on new data. For example (using the model built on on page 11):

```
predict(earth.mod, newdata=ozone1[1:3,], interval="pint", level=.95)
```

Here `predict` returns a dataframe with three columns showing the fit, and the lower and upper prediction limits for the given `level = .95` (the limits will be at 2.5% and 97.5%):

```
     fit    lwr   upr
1 4.75 -0.748 10.24
2 5.53 -0.365 11.43
3 6.95  0.325 13.57
```

The `predict.earth` function calls `predict.varmod` internally with the given `interval` and `level` arguments. See `help(predict.varmod)` for details.

4.1 Plotting the prediction intervals

We can plot the prediction intervals with `plotmo` (left plot of Figure 1):

```
plotmo(earth.mod, pt.col=1, level=.95)
```

We can also plot the intervals manually (Figure 3):

```
predict <- predict(earth.mod, newdata=ozone1, interval="pint", level=.95)
# x values have to be ordered to plot lines correctly
order <- order(ozone1$temp)
temp <- ozone1$temp[order]
O3 <- ozone1$O3[order]
predict <- predict[order,]
in.interval <- O3 >= predict$lwr & O3 <= predict$upr
plot(temp, O3, pch=20, col=ifelse(in.interval, "black", "red"),
  main=sprintf(
  "Prediction intervals\n%.0f%% of the training points are in the estimated 95%% band",
  100 * sum(in.interval) / length(O3)))
lines(temp, predict$fit)          # regression curve
lines(temp, predict$lwr, lty=2)   # lower prediction intervals
lines(temp, predict$upr, lty=2)   # upper prediction intervals
```

4.2 The `interval` argument

The `interval` argument instructs `predict.earth` to return prediction intervals. This argument gets passed internally to `predict.varmod` as its `type` argument.

When `interval="pint"`, the prediction intervals are as described in Section 2.6.

Prediction intervals
97% of the training points are in the estimated 95% band

Figure 3: *Prediction intervals using* `predict.earth`.

The plot was produced with the code on page 14.

It is essentially the same as the left plot of Figure 1, which was produced with `plotmo`.

When `interval="cint"`, the confidence intervals are returned. Their standard deviations are taken to be the square root of the model variance estimated by cross validation (Section 2.5). The `newdata` argument isn't allowed.

5   Plotting residuals

This section discusses some of the plots that can be used to plot residuals. They are important for establishing credibility (or otherwise) of the earth model's prediction intervals

5.1   Extensions to `plotmo` for variance models

As we have already seen, `plotmo` will show prediction intervals if given the `level` argument (pages 11 and 14).

`Plotmo` also knows how to draw prediction intervals for some other kinds of model, not just earth models. See its vignette for details.

5.2   `plot.earth` with variance models

Use the `level` argument of `plot.earth` to display prediction bands in the residuals plot (left plot of Figure 4). We want just the residual plot for this example, so use `which=3`, although in general that isn't necessary.

```
plot(earth.mod, which=3, level=.95)
```

In this plot:

- The darker grayish band shows the confidence limits; the wider pink band shows the prediction limits (Section 2.1 "Confidence levels versus prediction levels"). In this example the confidence limits widen at low and high fitted values, indicating greater model uncertainty in those sparsely populated regions.


Figure 4: `plot.earth` *residuals with a variance model*
Left: `plot(earth.mod, which=3, level=.95)`
Right: `plot(earth.mod, which=3, standardize=TRUE)`

- The red line is a lowess fit to the residuals. In this example, the line remains close to the center line, so indicates that the model is a good fit to the training data. (Remember that since this is a residual plot, the center line corresponds to the predicted fit.)

- The pale blue line is the cross-validation `oof.meanfit`. Once again, in this example the line is close to the center line, indicating that the mean out-of-fold predictions generated by the fold models approximately match those of the final model on all the data.

  If the blue lines are obscuring your plot, remove them by passing `col.cv=NA` or `0` to `plot.earth`.

  (The `oof.meanfit` value is the mean of the out-of-fold predictions. These predictions are made from observations not in the data used to build the fold model. In `ncross` cross-validations, there will be a total of `ncross` out-of-fold predictions for each observation.)

5.3 The `standardize` argument of `plot.earth`

Set the `standardize` argument to standardize the residuals before display (right plot of Figure 4):

```
plot(earth.mod, which=3, standardize=TRUE)
```

In the current example we didn't display the prediction bands, to make it easier to visually detect heteroscedasticity, although for your purposes you may want to add a `level` argument to the call to `plotmo`.

The standardized residuals will be homoscedastic when the variance model holds. To standardize the residual at observation i, we divide it by $sd(\epsilon_i)\sqrt{1 - h_{ii}}$, where $sd(\epsilon_i)$ is the error standard deviation as estimated by the variance model, and h_{ii} is the residual's diagonal entry in the hat matrix. The hat matrix here is from the linear fit on earth's basis matrix `bx`.

We mention that there is some inconsistency in the literature and R documentation on the precise definition of the term "standardized residuals".

5.4 The `info` argument of `plot.earth`

Figure 5 is the same as the right plot of Figure 4 but also includes the argument `info=TRUE`:

```
plot(earth.mod, which=3, standardize=TRUE, info=TRUE)
```

This tells `plot.earth` to display additional information:

(i) The bottom of the plot shows the distribution of fitted values. In this example, most are bunched near the left of the graph. It becomes apparent that the outlying points in this region may be less important than they may seem at first — the outliers represent only a small fraction of the high number of points in the region.

17

Standardized Residuals vs Fitted
info=TRUE

Figure 5: *The* `info` *argument of* `plot.earth`.

Same as the right plot of Figure 4 but includes an `info=TRUE` *argument.*

The density is plotted along the bottom.

Also shown is the Spearman Rank Correlation of absolute residuals with fitted values.

(i) Also shown is the Spearman Rank Correlation of absolute residuals with the fitted values. This is a measure of heteroscedasticity: the correlation will be positive if the residuals tend to increase as the fitted values increase. Similarly, a negative correlation would indicate decreasing variance (much less common). Remember that this correlation is subject to sampling variation.

In the current graph, the displayed value `0.05` is small. It indicates virtually no heteroscedasticity of the residuals after standardization. The displayed text `abs` is a reminder that the correlation is measured on the absolute residuals, even though the plot itself isn't showing absolute residuals.

If we used `info=TRUE` on the raw residuals in the left plot of Figure 4 (not shown), the displayed Spearman correlation would be `0.38`, confirming that there is correlation between the absolute residuals and the fitted values, i.e., the raw residuals are heteroscedastic.

Unlike the more usual Pearson Correlation Coefficient, the Spearman correlation is insensitive to outliers (since it doesn't use the actual values, just their ranks). It is also invariant to monotone transforms to the response. Thus it doesn't change if measured on the squared or log absolute residuals.

Correlation measures only monotone variance trends (it won't detect variance that increases and then decreases by the same amount), so ultimately your eyeball is the best detector of heteroscedasticity, although it can be deceived by varying degrees of density along the horizontal axis.

(i) The linear regression line is drawn if the plot shows absolute residuals (`which=5` or `9`, so not in this graph, but see the next section and Figure 6).

5.5   Plotting absolute residuals

The `plot.earth` function can also plot absolute residuals (Figure 6):

```
plot(earth.mod, which=5, info=TRUE}   # which=5 for absolute residuals
```

See the description of the `which` argument on the `plot.earth` help page for further possibilities.

Abs Residuals vs Fitted

Figure 6: *A plot of the absolute residuals* `plot.earth(..., which=5)` *with a lowess line (red).*

The `info=TRUE` *argument was also specified, so we see some additional information, including a robust linear regression line (blue) and its slope (0.16).*

With `info=TRUE`, a robust linear regression line is added to the absolute residual plot, and its slope displayed. The absolute residuals are regressed against the fitted values with robust linear regression to show the overall trend unaffected by outliers. A standard (non-robust) linear fit would be steeper.

At low and high fitted values, the lowess curve estimates less variance than the robust linear fit. However, it is possible that the lowess curve is overfitting on the right where the density is low.

5.6 Multimapped variances

Figure 7 shows simulated data where the same value of the response is associated with more than one value of variance — there is a one-to-many, or multimapped, relationship between the response and the variance.

A real-world example (not shown): the average rainfall at a certain location is the same for the months of March and November, but the amount of rain from year to year varies less in March than in November.

The usual residual plot for the model (left side of Figure 8) isn't so helpful in exposing the pattern of heteroscedasticity. The right plot is much more informative. Here the residuals are plotted against the predictor, instead of the fitted values. We see clearly that variance increases with the predictor.

The two plots in Figure 8 were generated with the following lines of code. The second line uses `plot.earth`'s `versus` argument to tell it to plot the residuals against the predictors (in this example there is only one predictor).

```
plot(earth.mmap, which=3)               # default    residuals versus fitted
plot(earth.mmap, which=3, versus="")    # versus=""  residuals versus predictors
```

Another option is `versus="b:"` to plot the residuals against the MARS basis functions. See the `plot.earth` help page for details.

Figure 7: *Data with multimapped variances. The black line is an* earth *fit.*

The variance is quite different, for instance, at x *equal to* 1 *and* 3*, although the mean response is about the same.*

The variance must be modeled as a function of x*. We used* varmod.method="x.lm" *(Section 6.1).*

It can't be modeled as a function of the mean response (don't use varmod.method="lm"*).*


Figure 8: *Residual plots for the multimapped data in the above figure.*
Left: Residuals versus the fitted values. Not so informative.
Left: Residuals versus the predictor. Better.

Our example in this section has a single predictor and a non-monotonic response. With multiple predictors, non-monotonicity of the response isn't necessary for multimapped variances, although it makes them more likely. With multiple predictors, determining if multimapping is occurring is difficult. Certainly, non-monotonicity is possible when predictors interact, even when the effect on the response of each of the predictors in isolation is monotonic. But non-monotonicity doesn't necessarily imply multimapping.

5.7   Residuals versus the fitted values or the response?

You will notice that plot.earth plots the residuals against the fitted values $\hat{y}$. Sometimes people plot the residuals against the response y instead. Generally, that isn't a

Figure 9: *Two residual plots with lowess lines for the model in Figure 1.* R^2 *is* `0.66`.
Left: Residuals versus fitted. Uncorrelated (although heteroscedastic)
Right: Residuals versus response. Correlated as expected. The graph doesn't really reveal
anything new about the model. Hetero- or homo-scedasticity is hard to detect.

good idea. Even when the errors ϵ are uncorrelated with the response (as ideally they should be, independence of the errors is one of the standard assumptions for linear and related models), the residuals $\hat{\epsilon}$ are positively correlated with the response. The lower the R^2, the higher the correlation. Figure 9 illustrates.

5.8   The `plot.varmod` function

Use `plot.varmod` to display the variance model embedded in the earth model. For example (Figure 10):

```
plot(earth.mod$varmod)    # invokes plot.varmod
```

The top left plot shows the absolute residuals of the main earth model versus the fitted value of that model (the plotted points are the same as in Figure 6). The term *parent model* in these plots refers to the main earth model. The variance model is shown as a red line — a straight line in this case because we used `varmod.method="lm"` when we called earth. The axis on the right of the plot shows the standard deviation. (Section 2.6 explains how the absolute residuals are rescaled to standard deviation.) This plot is similar to Figure 6, except that Figure 6 shows a *robust* linear regression line.

The horizontal dashed red line shows the clamping level set by `min.sd` (Section 2.3). But in this example is so happens that clamping of predicted standard deviations is unnecessary because the solid red regression line stays well clear of the dashed red line.

The top right plot shows how variance changes as the first predictor changes. In this example, the first and only predictor is the temperature `temp`, but for multivariate models we can generate similar plots for all predictors as follows. The `type` argument gets passed to `predict.varmod`.

```
plotmo(earth.mod$varmod, type="abs.residual")
```

Figure 10: `plot.varmod`

The bottom left graph shows the residuals of the variance model (the residuals of the `lm` regression on the parent earth model residuals). The red line is a lowess fit. It curves here in the same way as it curves in Figure 6.

When `varmod.method="earth"`, the model selection plot is also displayed (not in the current example).

If `info=TRUE` is passed to `plot.varmod`, extra information is added, including lowess fits in the first two plots.

6   Variance model arguments

This section discusses some aspects of `varmod.method` and other arguments for the variance model.

6.1   Variance as a function of x or of $\hat{y}$?

For simplicity, our examples thus far have used `varmod.method="lm"`. There are several other possibilities, as described on the earth help page.

As a general rule, you should model variance as a function of the fitted response rather than of the predictors. That is, use the non-`x.` varmod methods (for example, prefer `varmod.method="lm"` to `"x.lm"`). This allows the main earth model to do the work of estimating the response from the predictors, leaving the variance model to do the generally simpler job of estimating the variance from the fitted response.

However, it is worthwhile trying a few different options on your data. For example, in our running example of ozone-vs-temperature, replacing `varmod="lm"` with `varmod="x.lm"` gives narrower prediction intervals that appear to fit the residuals better.

The `x.` varmod methods should be used for multimapped variances, where the residual variance has a many-to-one relationship with the response, and thus cannot be modeled as a function of the response (Section 5.6). This will often be the case when the response is non-monotonic (for example, it increases then decreases as a predictor increases).

6.2   `varmod.method="power"`

In many datasets with a positive response, standard deviation increases as a power of the mean response, at least approximately:

```
error.std.dev  <-  intercept + coef * response ^ exponent
```

where the parameters `intercept`, `coef`, and `exponent` depend on the distribution of the data. This is a *power-of-the-mean* residual model. (More pedantically, it's a power-of-the-mean model with an offset. The "mean" here refers to the mean or true response.) For example, in a Poisson distribution the standard deviation increases with the square root of the response (`exponent = .5`). In a Gamma or lognormal distribution, the standard deviation increases linearly with the response (`exponent = 1`).

Often when applying `earth` we don't know the exact distribution of the errors but can sometimes estimate them accurately enough using a power-of-the-mean model. Use `varmod.method="power"` to estimate the `exponent` and other parameters. Internally, earth will make the estimates using a non-linear regression on the absolute residuals by means of `nls` in the standard `stats` package.

We illustrate with simulated data:

```
set.seed(1) # optional, for reproducibility
```

23

```
x <- 1:300
y <- x + (10 + 10 * sqrt(x)) * rnorm(length(x))   # y equals x + noise
earth.power <- earth(y~x, linpreds=TRUE,
                     nfold=10, ncross=30, varmod.method="power")
```

Note that when generating the data in the code above we (somewhat arbitrarily) used intercept = 10, coef = 10, and exponent = 0.5 (square root). A call to summary(earth.power) yields

```
stddev of predictions:
            coefficients iter.stderr iter.stderr%
(Intercept)        9.944       17.35          174
coef               5.417        5.51          102
exponent           0.614        0.17           28
```

The estimated parameters differ somewhat from those used to generate the data. For example, the estimated exponent is 0.614 rather than 0.5. Also, even though we have a decent sized dataset (300 cases), we have large standard errors.

The example illustrates that estimating these parameters accurately isn't possible from typically noisy residuals. There is simply not enough information in the residuals to pinpoint the underlying distribution. So in general we can't expect too much of varmod.method="power", although it may give us some understanding of the distribution. Another problem is that the internal call to nls on noisy residual data sometimes fails to converge, or causes the message Error in numericDeriv.

Use the special value trace=.31 to trace the nls iterations while estimating the power model. This will also cause plotting of IRLS weights.

Another option is varmod.method="power0". This is the same as "power" but without the intercept term, to force a zero offset.

The power-of-the-mean model is for data with a positive response. When estimating the model, the earth function forces negative predicted responses to zero (because in general one can't take the power of a negative number). This allows for some model error in the main earth model that causes a few negative predictions that in theory are always non-negative. An error message will be issued if more than 20% of the responses are negative.

6.3   varmod.exponent

If the power-of-the-mean model described in the previous section applies to the data and the exponent is known, we can use varmod.method="lm" and specify the exponent with earth's varmod.exponent argument. Earth applies the specified exponent to the right side of the formula before building the residual model.

For example, if you expect the standard deviation to increase with the square root of the response, use varmod.method="lm" and varmod.exponent=0.5. (Negative predicted values will be treated as 0, and you will get an error message if more than 20% of them are negative.)

Figure 11: *Prediction intervals with two different settings of* `varmod.exponent`

Large changes to the exponent typically cause relatively small changes to the estimated prediction intervals.

The data here were generated by the code on page 23. The true value of the exponent is 0.5.

We can get an estimate of the exponent by generating a preliminary model using `varmod.method="power"`. We may want to round the estimate from the preliminary model. For example, an estimated exponent of `0.68`, could indicate that the standard deviation increases with the square root of the response (the difference between `0.68` and `0.5` being due to sampling variance). So we would build our earth model using `varmod.method="lm"` and `varmod.exponent=0.5`. On the other hand, there may be no compelling reason not to use the exponent `0.68` estimated by the preliminary model.

From the preliminary model, we wouldn't go so far as to infer that the data has a known distributional form — all we are hoping to do is solve the practical problem of estimating prediction intervals. Exact specification of the exponent usually isn't important. Changes to the exponent usually make relatively small changes to the estimated prediction intervals (Figure 11).

6.4 `varmod.method="rlm"`

The `varmod.method="rlm"` variance model is like `varmod.method="lm"`, but uses robust instead of standard linear regression on the absolute residuals. The code uses `rlm` in the `MASS` package [7].

The `rlm` estimated prediction intervals tend to be narrower than the `lm` intervals. This is because a standard linear regression line will be pulled by outlying residuals, whereas a robust line will tend to follow the general pattern.

However, in our tests on simulated data with gaussian errors, `varmod.method="lm"` gives noticeably better results than `"rlm"`, which tends to underestimate the error variance. When the errors are mostly gaussian but with some outliers, it is difficult to say which method is better. The robust approach may at first seem better: the general pattern of residual variation is what we are interested in. However, the outliers might be the very residuals that matter, and if so the prediction intervals from the robust model wil be optimistic.

25

7 Checking the variance model

When building a variance model, the methods described in this document make the following assumptions. Basically all the usual assumptions for regression with additive errors apply (although we allow heteroscedasticity), but when generating a variance model some of these assumptions become more critical.

(i) The errors are independent.

(i) The errors are symmetric. Dots should be dispersed roughly symmetrically about the center line of the residuals plot. The residual model uses absolute residuals, so makes no distinction between positive and negative residuals.

(i) Conditional variance (given x) is approximately gaussian. One instance where this assumption is used is when converting the absolute residual predicted by the residual model to a standard deviation (Section 2.6).

(i) The predicted value is close to the true value — if our main earth model is no good, there's no hope for a satisfactory variance model.

(i) Cross-validation gives a reasonable estimate of model variance. This isn't too important if the model error is much smaller than the irreducible error. (Which is the case in our running example — not surprisingly, considering that the model has only one hinge and over 300 cases.) Use the residuals plot of `plot.earth` to see the estimated model-variance bands.

(i) There is enough information in the residuals to form a decent residual model. The residuals are usually quite noisy, and the residual model may have a low R^2, but we assume it is still usable.

(i) The residual model doesn't overfit. Overfitting is unlikely with `varmod.method` `"const"` or `"lm"`, although a possibility with other methods. Use plots to check that the residual model has no implausible curves or kinks.

7.1 Checking the variance model

The data may suffice to build an adequate main earth model but not be sufficient to build a valid variance model. This is especially true with smaller samples. Earth with the `varmod` argument will quite happily build a variance model, but we need to check the validity of that model.

For example, in the right plot of Figure 1, is there really enough information in the residuals to build a valid residual model? Probably so, but is there enough information for a non-linear residual model that curves to fit the residuals? Maybe also so, but we need to verify the model.

The first thing to do is to check earth's residual plot. The red lowess line should be approximately straight and on the axis, indicating that the model fits the data. If the line is too curved, the estimated prediction intervals won't be trustworthy. (Although

some curviness where the data is sparse isn't something to worry about.) The residuals should be dispersed approximately symmetrically about the center line, and the prediction bands should match the general pattern of the point cloud.

We can check interval coverage by looking at the chart printed by `summary.earth`. For example:

```
                                        68%    80%    90%    95%
    Response values in prediction interval   70     83     88<    97
```

The "`<`" printed above by `summary.earth` points out that only 88% of the training data is covered by the 90% prediction interval. The estimated prediction interval is too small. This is a hint that there may be some overfitting in the variance model, although some small variation like is expected and not really an issue.

Remember that this chart is for the training data, and so is only a sanity check for what would happen with new data. If possible, we should also print and check the table with new data. Do this by passing a `newdata` argument to `summary.earth` (Section 3.2 (v) on page 13). This is a highly recommended check of the credibility of the variance model.

8 Miscellaneous

8.1 Linear models with heteroscedasticity

The standard `lm` function doesn't support variance models for heteroscedastic data. (It does support weights, and thus with manual IRLS you can estimate residual variance, but only pointwise for observations in the training set.)

Instead we can use earth's `linpreds=TRUE` argument to build a linear model with earth. (There is a chapter on that in the main earth vignette.) Together with the `varmod` arguments, this allows us to get prediction intervals for linear models with heteroscedastic errors.

The `gls` function in the `nlme` package should also be considered.

8.2 Heteroscedasticity when building the earth model

Although earth's variance model estimates heteroscedasticity, it doesn't actually account for it when building the MARS model. Although there is loss of efficiency, heteroscedasticity generally doesn't affect estimation of the model much. (Your mileage may differ.) It does affect inference, which we don't really do in earth anyway. Weights aren't yet fully implemented in earth[1], so IRLS with earth isn't yet possible.

---

[1]Actually they are now (earth 4.4.0, May 2015)

Acknowledgments

References

[1] Raymond J. Carroll and David Ruppert. *Transformation and Weighting in Regression*. CRC, 1988. Cited on pages 4, 6, and 9.

[2] M. Davidian and R.J. Carroll. *Variance Function Estimation*. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1987. Cited on page 4.

[3] Julian Faraway. *Linear Models With R*. CRC, 2009. Cited on pages 4 and 9.

[4] Andrzej Galecki and Tomasz Burzykowski. *Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using R: A Step-by-Step Approach*. Springer, 2013. Cited on pages 4 and 13.

[5] R.C. Geary. *The Ratio of the Mean Deviation to the Standard Deviation as a Test of Normality*. Biometrika, 1935. Cited on page 8.

[6] James G. MacKinnon and Halbert White. *Some Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimators with Improved Finite Sample Properties*. Journal of Econometrics, 1985. Cited on page 9.

[7] W.N. Venables and B.D. Ripley. *MASS: Support Functions and Datasets for Venables and Ripley's MASS*, 2014. R package, `http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4`. Cited on page 25.

[8] Larry Wasserman. *All of Nonparametric Statistics*. Springer, 2007. Cited on page 10.

[9] Sanford Weisberg. *Applied Linear Regression (4th Edition)*. Wiley, 2013. Cited on page 7.

[10] E.B. Wilson and M. M. Hilferty. *The Distribution Of Chi-Squared*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 1931. Cited on page 9.

[11] Achim Zeileis. *Econometric computing with HC and HAC covariance matrix estimators*. Institut für Statistik und Mathematik, WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, 2004. Cited on page 9.