



Nikolaus Umlauf

http://eeecon.uibk.ac.at/~umlauf/

Overview

Joint work with Nadja Klein, Thorsten Simon and Achim Zeileis.

- Introduction
- Ø Model Specification
- 3 Neural Network Distributional Regression
- Application

Zugspitze daily max. T (1900/8-2015/12).

 $T \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2).$



Zugspitze daily max. T (1900/8-2015/12).

$$\Gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = f(T_{t-1}), \log(\sigma^2) = \beta_0).$$



Zugspitze daily max. T (1900/8-2015/12).

$$\mathbf{T} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = f(\mathbf{T}_{t-1}), \log(\sigma^2) = f(\mathbf{T}_{t-1})).$$



Zugspitze daily max. T (1900/8-2015/12).

$$\Gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = f(\mathbb{T}_{t-1}), \log(\sigma^2) = f(\mathbb{T}_{t-1})).$$



Any parameter of a population distribution $\ensuremath{\mathcal{D}}$ may be modeled by explanatory variables

$$y \sim \mathcal{D}(h_1(\theta_1) = \eta_1, h_2(\theta_2) = \eta_2, \dots, h_K(\theta_K) = \eta_K),$$

Each parameter is linked to a structured additive predictor

$$h_k(\theta_k) = \eta_k = \eta_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_k) = f_{1k}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1k}) + \ldots + f_{J_kk}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_kk}),$$

 $j = 1, ..., J_k$ and k = 1, ..., K and $h_k(\cdot)$ are link functions. Vector of function evaluations $\mathbf{f}_{jk} = (f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}), ..., f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}))^\top$

$$\mathbf{f}_{jk} = \begin{pmatrix} f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}) \\ \vdots \\ f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}) \end{pmatrix} = f_{jk}(\mathbf{X}_{jk}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}).$$

Nonlinear effects of continuous covariates



Spatially correlated effects f(x) = f(s)







Random intercepts f(x) = f(id)



Model terms $f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}; \beta_{jk})$ with LASSO-type penalties $J_c(\beta_{jk})$.



Model terms $f_{jk}(\mathbf{x}; \beta_{jk})$ with LASSO-type penalties $J_f(\beta_{jk})$.



How to capture complex nonlinearities? Additive predictors $\eta_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_k)$ using regression splines have great performance, but can we do better?

- Feedforward neural networks (FNN) are extensively used in regression and classification applications.
- FNNs are universal function approximators (Hornik 1991).
- However, estimation is usually difficult and can involve thousands of parameters.
- Which makes the problem even harder in a full distributional regression setting (full Bayesian inference?).
- \Rightarrow Use FNN model term $f_{jk}(\mathbf{X}_{jk}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk})$ additional to all other effects.

Setup:

A FNN model term has a simple structure

$$f_{jk}(\mathbf{X}_{jk};\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk})=\mathbf{X}_{jk}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk},$$

where the columns of X_{jk} are a decomposition of activation functions, e.g., using the sigmoid the *l*-th column (node) is

$$h_l(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(\mathbf{w}_l^\top \mathbf{x} + b_l))},$$

where \mathbf{w}_l and b_l are inner weights and biases.

The activation function $h_l(\cdot)$ could also be Gauss (radial basis function network), sin, etc.

Basic idea:

Reduce computational complexity, avoid non-convex optimization (time consuming, sensitive to initial values, local minima), by randomly selecting \mathbf{w}_l and b_l , i.e., compute a random design matrix \mathbf{X}_{jk} .

Although the idea is not new, this is now also known by the controversial name *extreme learning machine* (ELM, Huang 2006).

There are theoretical results that ELMs are also universal function approximators using symmetric intervals for the parameter scope (Husmeier 1999), a.o.

Problems: How to randomly select \mathbf{w}_l and b_l ? Sample $w_{ld}, b_l \sim \mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$. (Schmidt et al. 1992)



Problems: How to randomly select \mathbf{w}_l and b_l ? Sample $w_{ld} \sim \mathcal{U}(-10, 10)$ and $b_l \sim \mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$



- Too small values for **w**_l and b_l lead to poor distribution of the basis functions (activation functions).
- Too large values will lead to saturated functions.
- Some literature about tuning the sampling range.
- Need a method that controls the flatness and steepness in the input hypercube.
- \Rightarrow Dudek (2017) gives a detailed description of how to select weights and biases for different activation functions.

Sampling weights: Dudek (2017)

For [0,1] scaled inputs, weights are sampled such that the most nonlinear and steepest parts are inside the data region.

1 Given r and s, sample sum of input weights

$$\sum_{[l]} \sim \mathcal{U}\left(\log\left[\frac{1-r}{r}\right], s \cdot \log\left[\frac{1-r}{r}\right]\right)$$

2 For
$$\mathbf{w}_l$$
 sample $\zeta_d \sim \mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$.

(3) Set
$$w_{ld} = \zeta_d \frac{\sum_{[l]}}{\sum_d \zeta_d}$$
.
(4) Set $b_l = -\sum_d w_{ld} z_l$, where $z_l \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$.

Depending on the activation functions, r and s can have different ranges.

Sampling weights: Dudek (2017)



Sampling weights: Scaling with *r* and *s*.



Overfitting:

We use elastic net regularization

$$\lambda_{jk1} \cdot J_{\mathsf{L}}(\beta_{jk}) + \lambda_{jk2} \cdot J_{\mathsf{R}}(\beta_{jk}),$$

with quadratic approximations of the LASSO penalties (compare Oelker & Tutz, 2017; Groll et al., 2018)

$$J_{\mathsf{L}}(\beta_{jk}) \approx J_{\mathsf{L}}(\beta_{jk}^{(t)}) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\beta_{jk}^{\top} \mathbf{P}_{jk}(\beta_{jk}) \beta_{jk} + (\beta_{jk}^{(t)})^{\top} \mathbf{P}_{jk}(\beta_{jk}^{(t)}) \beta_{jk}^{(t)} \right),$$

with

 $\mathbf{P}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{(t)}) = q_{jk}'\left(\left\|\mathbf{a}_{jk}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{(t)}\right\|_{N_{jk}}\right) \cdot \frac{D_{jk}(\mathbf{a}_{jk}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{(t)})}{\mathbf{a}_{jk}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{(t)}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{jk}\mathbf{a}_{jk}^{\top}.$

E.g., $\|\beta\|_1 = |\beta|$ is approximated by $\sqrt{\beta^2 + c}$, hence, IWLS based updating functions are relatively easy to implement.

Simulated example: Sigmoid activation.





Simulated example: Out of range predictions.





Data structure:

First analyzed by Henderson et al. (2002), investigate spatial variation in survival after accounting for subject-specific factors in northwest England. (n = 1043 patients)

| Variable | Description. |
|----------|--|
| time | Survival time in days. |
| cens | Right censoring status 0=censored, 1=dead. |
| xcoord | Coordinates in x-axis of residence. |
| ycoord | Coordinates in y-axis of residence. |
| age | Age in years. |
| sex | male=1 female=0. |
| wbc | White blood cell count at diagnosis, truncated at 500. |
| tpi | The Townsend score for which higher values indicates |
| | less affluent areas. |
| district | Administrative district of residence. |



Survival times:



Spatial distribution:



Cox model:

The hazard of an event (status dead) at time t can be described with a relative additive risk model of the form:

$$\lambda(t) = \exp(\eta(t)) = \exp(\eta_{\lambda}(t) + \eta_{\gamma}),$$

i.e., a model for the instantaneous risk conditional on being alive before time t.

The probability to not survive after time t is

$$S(t) = Prob(T > t) = \exp\left(-\int_0^t \lambda(u)du\right).$$

For the leukemia survival example, we use the following additive predictors

 $\eta_{\lambda}(\texttt{time}) = f_1(\texttt{time}) + f_2(\texttt{time}, \texttt{sex}, \texttt{age}, \texttt{wbc}, \texttt{tpi}, \texttt{xcoord}, \texttt{ycoord})$

and

$$\eta_{\gamma} = \beta_0 + \text{sex} + f_3(\text{age}) + f_4(\text{wbc}) + f_5(\text{tpi}) + f_6(\text{xcoord}, \text{ycoord}) + f_7(\text{sex}, \text{age}, \text{wbc}, \text{tpi}, \text{xcoord}, \text{ycoord}).$$

Here, functions $f_2(\cdot)$ and $f_7(\cdot)$ represent a time dependent and a time constant neural network model term.

For the other functions we use regression splines.

```
In R we set up the model by
R> library("bamlss")
R> library("survival")
R> data("LeukSurv", package = "spBayesSurv")
R> ftd <- ~ time + sex + age + wbc + tpi + xcoord + ycoord
R> ftc <- ~ sex + age + wbc + tpi + xcoord + ycoord
R > f < - list(
+
  Surv(time, cens) ~ s(time) +
      n(ftd,k=300,pt="lasso",
+
        rint=list("sigmoid"=0.1, "gauss"=0.1),
+
+
        sint=list("sigmoid"=c(5,10), "gauss"=5),
        afun=c("sigmoid", "gauss"), ndf=50),
+
   gamma \sim sex + s(age) + s(wbc) + s(tpi) + s(xcoord, ycoord, k=100) +
+
+
      n(ftc, k=300, pt="lasso",
        rint=list("sigmoid"=0.1, "gauss"=0.1),
+
        sint=list("sigmoid"=c(5,10), "gauss"=5),
+
        afun=c("sigmoid", "sin", "gauss"), ndf=50)
+
+ )
R> b <- bamlss(f, data = LeukSurv, family = "cox")
```

Performance:

We evaluate the performance of the neural network Cox model by randomly sampling 100 individuals that serve as a hold out sample and compare using the Brier score. This is done 50 times.

In sample Brier score: GAM=0.24, GAM+NET=0.18.


```
R> summary(b)
## Subset of full model summary.
Formula lambda:
Surv(time, cens) \sim s(time) + n(ftd, k = 300, pt = "lasso",
    rint = list(sigmoid = 0.1, gauss = 0.1),
    sint = list(sigmoid = c(5, 10), gauss = 5),
    afun = c("sigmoid", "gauss"), ndf = 50)
Smooth terms:
             parameters
s(time).tau21
                0.000
s(time).edf
               0.984
n(ftd).tau21 76.543
n(ftd).edf
             34.061
___
```

```
Formula gamma:
gamma ~ sex + s(age) + s(wbc) + s(tpi) + s(xcoord, ycoord, k = 100) +
    n(ftc, k = 300, pt = "lasso", rint = list(sigmoid = 0.1,
        gauss = 0.1), sint = list(sigmoid = c(5, 10), gauss = 5),
        afun = c("sigmoid", "sin", "gauss"), ndf = 50)
Smooth terms:
                       parameters
s(age).tau21
                            0.000
s(age).edf
                            0.997
s(wbc).tau21
                            0.000
s(wbc).edf
                            0.977
s(tpi).tau21
                           86.135
s(tpi).edf
                            7.954
s(xcoord,ycoord).tau21
                          0.147
s(xcoord,ycoord).edf
                           7.935
n(ftc).tau21
                            0.000
n(ftc).edf
                            0.000
```

R> plot(b, model = "lambda", term = "s(time)")

R> plot(b, model = "gamma", term = c("s(age)", "s(wbc)", "s(tpi)"))

GAM

32 CO

GAM

-0.72 0.00 0.72 -0.63 0.00 0.63

GAM+NET

Accumulated local effects (ALE) plots: (Apley D.W., 2016)

Accumulated local effects (ALE) plots: (Apley D.W., 2016)

Interaction plots: (females, remaining variables fixed at means)

Interaction plots: (females, remaining variables fixed at means)

Interaction plots: (females, remaining variables fixed at means)

Probabilities: Blackpool vs. Manchester.

Summary & Outlook

- Neural networks really seem to have good approximation skills.
- Capable to find high-order interactions.
- However, this needs to be further investigated.
- Good predictive performance, but interpretation is still difficult.
- Linears vs. nonlinear direct connectors?
- Tune weights instead of random sampling?
- Full Bayesian inference for weights?
- Deep networks?

References & Software

2

2

Ø

2

- 2 Apley D.W. (2016). Visualizing the effects of predictor variables in black box supervised learning models. arXiv:1612.08468.
- 2 Dudek G. (2017). A method of generating random weights and biases in feedforward neural networks with random hidden nodes, arXiv:1710.04874,
 - Groll A., Hambuckers J., Kneib T. & and Umlauf N. (2018), Lasso-type penalization in the framework of generalized additive models for location, scale and shape. Working papers, Faculty of Economics and Statistics, University of Innsbruck. https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/innwpaper/2018-16.htm.
 - Henderson R., Shimakura S. & and Gorst D. (2002). Modeling spatial variation in leukemia survival data. Journal of the American Statistical Association 70(460).
 - Hornik K. (1991). Approximation capabilities of multilaver feedforward networks Neural Networks 4(2). 251 - 257
 - Huang G.B., Zhu Q.Y. & Siew, C.K. (2006). Extreme Learning Machine: Theory and Applications. Neurocomputing 70, 489-501.
- V Husmeier D. (1999), Random vector functional link (RVFL) networks, Neural Networks for Conditional Probability Estimation: Forecasting Beyond Point Predictions, Chapter 6, Springer.
- V Lang S., Umlauf N., Wechselberger P., Harttgen K. & and Kneib T. (2012). Multilevel structured additive regression. Statistics and Computing. URL: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11222-012-9366-0

References & Software

- Oelker M.R. & Tutz G. (2017). A uniform framework for the combination of penalties in generalized structured models. Advances in Data Analysis and Classification 11(1), 97–120.
- Rigby R.A. & Stasinopoulos D.M. (2005). Generalized additive models for location, scale and shape. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics) 54(3), 507-554.
- Schmidt W.F., Kraaijveld M. & Duin R.P. (1992). Feedforward neural networks with random weights. Proc. 11th IAPR IEEE Inter. Conf. on Pattern Recognition, 1–4.
- Stasinopoulos D.M., & Rigby R.A. (2007) Generalized additive models for location scale and shape (GAMLSS) in R. Journal of Statistical Software 23(7).
- 5
- Tibshirani R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B 58 267-288.
- Umlauf N., Klein N. & Zeileis A. (2018). BAMLSS: Bayesian additive models for location, scale and shape (and beyond). Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 2018. to appear. doi:10.1080/10618600.2017.1407325.
- William M., Klein N., Zeileis A., Köhler M. & Thorsten S. (2019). bamlss: Bayesian additive models for location, scale and shape (and beyond). R package version 1.0-1, URL: http://cran.r-project.org/package=bamlss.