## APTS Stat Comp Assessment 2009

APTS does not conduct assessments. The material here is intended to provide the basis for assessment by student's home departments, but it is assumed that those departments will decide locally how much of the assessment it is appropriate to use, as well as on the *level* expected. So **before** starting the assessment, discuss which parts of the assessment you should complete, with your advisor/supevisor or local APTS co-ordinator. The work should take up to half a week.

A generalized linear model (GLM) relates independent response variables,  $y_i$ , to some predictors, via the following structure

$$g(\mu_i) = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}$$
 where  $\mathbb{E}(y_i) = \mu_i$  and  $y_i \sim \text{exponential family}$ 

g is a known smooth monotonic 'link function',  $\mathbf{X}$  is a model matrix, determined by the predictors (as in a linear model) and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated. A key feature of GLMs is that the exponential family assumption implies that a known function V relate the variance and mean of  $y_i$  via  $\text{var}(y_i) = V(\mu_i)\phi$ . In a likelihood framework GLMs are usually estimated by a version of Newton's method in which the expected hessian of the log likelihood replaces the actual Hessian. This approach gives rise to the method of iteratively re-weighted least squares (IRLS).

IRLS: Starting from initial guesses at  $\mu_i$  and hence  $\eta_i [\equiv \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} \equiv g(\mu_i)]$ , iterate the following steps to convergence:

- 1. Using the current  $\mu_i$ ,  $\eta_i$  estimates, evaluate pseudodata  $z_i = g'(\mu_i)(y_i \mu_i) + \eta_i$  and iterative weights  $w_i = g'(\mu_i)^{-1}V(\mu_i)^{-0.5}$ .
- 2. Find  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  to minimize  $\|\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{z} \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})\|^2$ . Obtain the next estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  as  $\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , and hence the next  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  estimate.

At convergence the final  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  maximizes the likelihood of the model (which is equivalent to minimizing the deviance defined as  $D = 2\{l_s - l(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}$ , where  $l_s$  is the saturated log-likelihood for the data, and  $l(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  is the actual model log-likelihood).<sup>1</sup>

- 1. If **X** is  $n \times p$ , what is the leading order operations count for the IRLS algorithm?
- 2. Would you recommend solving the weighted least squares problem at step 2 of the IRLS by a Choleski related method or by a QR decomposition method? Explain.
- 3. When working with very large datasets (e.g. remote sensing data or gene expression data) and complicated model structures, the computational cost and storage requirements of fitting by IRLS can become burdensome. It would be advantageous to find fitting algorithms which had a lower leading order cost than IRLS, and required only the evaluation of  $\mathbf{X}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{x}$  for some n-vectors,  $\mathbf{x}$ . There are two obvious approaches.
  - (a) At each step of the Newton iteration the expected Hessian of the negative log likelihood  $\mathbf{X}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{w})^2\mathbf{X}$  could be replaced by an estimate,  $n\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\mathrm{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})^2\tilde{\mathbf{X}}/M$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  is a random sample of M rows of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  is the corresponding set of rows of  $\mathbf{w}$ . The full gradient vector of the negative log likelihood is left un-modified at  $-\mathbf{X}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{y}-\boldsymbol{\mu})/\{g'(\boldsymbol{\mu})V(\boldsymbol{\mu})\}$ . Of course M should be much less than n.
  - (b) The Newton iteration could be replaced by a quasi-Newton iteration.

How would the cost of these two approaches depend on n and p? Why do we expect (a) to work despite having only a rough approximation to the expected Hessian? Would using  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{X}$  in the gradient vector be likely to work? Suggest how you might find a starting Hessian for approach (b).

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ Chapter 2 of Wood (2006) Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R, or McCullagh and Nelder (1989) Generalized Linear Models contain more detailed information on GLMs.

- 4. By modifying the routine simple.glm.fit, given below, implement method (a) from part 3, in R (M = 1000 is ok). Comment your routine properly, and test it (one test example is given below).
- 5. By modifying the routine simple.glm.fit, given below, implement method (b) from part 3, in R. Again, comment your routine properly, and test it.
- 6. Comment on the relative merits of the 3 approaches in terms of efficiency, stability and reliability.

```
simple.glm.fit <- function(y,X,family,tol=1e-7) {</pre>
## y is response, X is model matrix, family is R family
## (see documentation for 'glm' for further info on family
## objects). tol is convergence tolerance.
  nobs <- length(y)</pre>
  variance <- family$variance</pre>
                                   ## extract variance function
  dev.resids <- family$dev.resids ## function to get deviance (resids)</pre>
  linkinv <- family$linkinv
                                   ## inverse link function
  mu.eta <- family$mu.eta</pre>
                                    ## reciprocal of link derivative
  eval(family$initialize)
                                    ## gets initial mu - mustart, using y
  mu <- mustart;eta <- family$linkfun(mu)</pre>
  dev0 <- sum(dev.resids(y,mu,rep(1,nobs)))</pre>
  for (iter in 1:200) { ## main IRLS loop
    mu.eta.val <- mu.eta(eta)</pre>
                                   ## reciprocal of link derivative
    z \leftarrow eta + (y - mu)/mu.eta.val
                                          ## pseudodata
    w <- sqrt(mu.eta.val^2/variance(mu)) ## iterative (sqrt) weights</pre>
    ## solve weighted least squares problem
    Wz <- w*z; WX <- w*X
    beta <- coef(lm(Wz~WX-1)) ## could do direct QR thing here
    ## Try out step...
    d.eta <- as.numeric(X%*%beta) - eta ## the trial linear predictor step</pre>
    ok <- FALSE
    while(!ok) {
      mu <- linkinv(eta+d.eta) ## try step
      dev1 <- sum(dev.resids(y,mu,rep(1,nobs)))</pre>
      if (iter >1&&(dev1>dev0)) { ## deviance increased
        d.eta <- d.eta/2
                                    ## so step half
        beta <- beta.old + (beta-beta.old)/2 ## apply to beta too
      } else ok <- TRUE
    ## step now ok....
    eta <- eta + d.eta ## accepted linear predictor, eta
    if (abs(dev0-dev1)<tol*dev0&&iter>2) break ## convergence?
    dev0 <- dev1
    beta.old <- beta
  beta ## return coeffs
} ## end of simple glm fitter
## Simple polynomial fitting example...
set.seed(1) ## simulate some data ...
n <- 100000;x <- runif(n)</pre>
f \leftarrow 0.2 * x^11 * (10 * (1 - x))^6 + 10 * (10 * x)^3 * (1 - x)^10
mu \leftarrow exp(f/5); y \leftarrow rpois(mu, mu)
X <- model.matrix(~poly(x,6))</pre>
system.time(b <- glm(y~X-1,family=poisson))</pre>
system.time(b3 <- simple.glm.fit(y,X,family=poisson()))</pre>
```