

Ensembling Treed Basis Regressions

Sameer K. Deshpande

May 15, 2019

1 General Setup

Suppose we observe time series data for n individuals sampled irregularly in the intervals $[0, T]$. For individual i , we observe $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ a vector of covariates and also $y_{i,j}$ at time $t_{i,j} \in [0, T]$. We model

$$y_{i,j} = f(\mathbf{x}_i, t_{i,j}) + \sigma \varepsilon_{i,j}$$

where $\varepsilon_{i,j} \sim N(0, 1)$. We express the unknown function f as the sum of m “functional regression trees.”

To set our notation, let T denote a binary decision tree partitioning \mathbb{R}^p that consists of a collection of interior nodes and $L(T)$ terminal or *leaf* nodes. We associate an axis-aligned decision rule of the form $\{x_j < c\}$ or $\{x_j \geq c\}$ to each internal (i.e. non-leaf) node of T . In this way, T defines a partition of \mathbb{R}^p into $L(T)$ rectangular cells, corresponding to the leaves of T , and we let $\ell(\mathbf{x}, T)$ be the function that returns the index of the cell containing the point \mathbf{x} . A *functional regression tree* (T, φ, Θ) consists of a decision tree T , a fixed feature map $\varphi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ and a collection $M = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{L(T)}\}$ where each $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^D$. We define the evaluation function

$$g(\mathbf{x}, t; T, \varphi, \Theta) = \varphi(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\ell(\mathbf{x}; T)}.$$

For a given tree T and leaf index ℓ , let $I(\ell; T)$ be the collection of indices i such that $\ell(\mathbf{x}_i; T) = \ell$.

For our purposes, we will consider the cosine basis function where $\varphi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_D)$ where

$\phi_d(t) = \left(\frac{2}{T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{d\pi t}{T}\right)$. We approximate

$$f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{m=1}^M g(\mathbf{x}, t; T_m, \phi, \Theta_m).$$

Upon placing a prior on the regression trees and updating it with the observed data, we can induce a posterior distribution over f .

The prior over regression trees consists of two parts: a decision tree prior and the conditional prior of $M \mid T$. For the first part, we use exactly the same prior as [Chipman et al. \(2010\)](#): the probability that node at depth d is internal is $\alpha(1 + d)^{-\beta}$ and conditional on a node being internal, the splitting rule is picked uniformly from the set of all available splitting rules. Conditional on the decision tree T , the associated leaf parameters are modeled as i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma_\theta^2 D \Lambda_\theta)$ where $\Lambda_\theta = \text{diag}(e^{-\gamma c_d})$. We follow [Lenk \(1999\)](#) and take $c_d = d$ (the ‘‘algebraic smoother’’) or $\log d$ (the ‘‘geometric smoother’’). The parameter γ controls how quickly the Fourier coefficients in θ_ℓ decay to zero, implicitly controlling the smoothness of $g(\mathbf{x}, t; T, M)$ as a function of t .

2 A Backfitting Strategy

We now briefly summarize how to extend [Chipman et al. \(2010\)](#)’s backfitting strategy to this functional setting. We have m regression trees $(T_1, \Theta_1), \dots, (T_M, \Theta_M)$, which we update one at a time, holding all else fixed. Let (T_{-m}, Θ_{-m}) be the set of all $M - 1$ regression trees besides (T_m, Θ_m) and define

$$r_{i,j,m} = y_{i,j} - \sum_{m' \neq m} g(\mathbf{x}_i, t_{i,j}; T_{m'}, \Theta_{m'}).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(T_m, \Theta_m \mid \mathbf{y}, T_{-m}, \Theta_{-m}, \sigma) &\propto \pi(T_m) \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{i \in I(\ell; T)} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(r_{i,j,m} - \varphi(t_{i,j})^\top \theta_\ell)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} \\ &\times \prod_{\ell=1}^L \sigma_\theta^{-D} |\Lambda_\theta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\theta_\ell^\top \Lambda_\theta^{-1} \theta_\ell}{2\sigma^2} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

From here, we immediately see that the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell$'s are independent *a posteriori* with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell \sim N(M_\ell, V_\ell)$ where

$$V_\ell = \left[\sigma_\theta^{-2} \Lambda_\theta^{-1} + \sigma^{-2} \sum_{i \in I(\ell; T)} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \varphi(t_{i,j}) \varphi(t_{i,j})^\top \right]^{-1}$$

$$M_\ell = V_\ell \left[\sigma^{-2} \sum_{i \in I(\ell; T)} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} r_{i,j,m} \phi(t_{i,j}) \right].$$

Marginalizing over Θ_m , we have the following conditional posterior probability over the decision tree T

$$\pi(T \mid T_{-m}, \Theta_{-m}, \mathbf{y}, \sigma^2) \propto \pi(T) \prod_{\ell=1}^L \sigma_\theta^{-D} |\Lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |V_\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} M_\ell^\top V_\ell^{-1} M_\ell \right\}$$

To carry out the update $(T, \Theta) \rightarrow (T^*, \Theta^*)$, we first propose a new tree T_{prop} by either growing T at one leaf node or by pruning two leafs back to their common parent node. We accept this proposal with probability

$$\alpha(T_{prop}, T) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{q(T, T_{prop}) \pi(T_{prop} \mid \mathbf{y}, T_{-m}, \Theta_{-m}, \sigma)}{q(T_{prop}, T) \pi(T \mid \mathbf{y}, T_{-m}, \Theta_{-m}, \sigma)} \right\}.$$

If we accept the proposal we set $T^* = T_{prop}$; otherwise we set $T^* = T$. We then update Θ^* conditionally on T^* by making conjugate normal draws. It should be noted that to carry out this update requires computing the inverse and determinant of $L(T) + 1$ covariance matrices V_ℓ . So the computational cost of each regression tree update is $O(L(T)D^3)$. [skd]: there's probability a factor of n lurking in there somewhere because we need to sum over $\varphi(t_{i,j}) \varphi(t_{i,j})^\top$

References

- Chipman, H. A., George, E. I., and McCulloch, R. E. (2010). Bart: Bayesian additive regression trees. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):266 – 298.
- Lenk, P. J. (1999). Bayesian inference for semiparametric regression using a Fourier representation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (Series B)*, 61(4):863 – 879.