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#### Abstract

This vignette illustrates focused model comparison with the fic package for linear regression models. Examples are given of covariate selection and polynomial order selection, with focuses defined by the mean, median or other quantiles of the outcome.


Keywords: models.

The linear regression model considered here has the general form

$$
y_{i} \sim N\left(\mu_{i}, \sigma^{2}\right), \quad \mu_{i}=\alpha+\sum \beta_{s} x_{i s}
$$

for observations $i=1, \ldots, n$. The regressors $x_{i s}$ might represent different covariates, contrasts between levels of a factor, functions of covariates such as polynomials, or interactions between different covariates.

## 1. Covariate selection in linear regression

Firstly we present a simple covariate selection problem in the well-known mtcars dataset from the datasets package distributed with standard R installations. The outcome $y_{i}$ is the fuel efficiency of car model $i$ measured in MPG. The wide model is taken to be the model suggested in Henderson and Velleman (1981) which includes the following predictors

- am: transmission type ( $0=$ automatic, $1=$ manual $)$
- wt: weight in 1000 lbs
- qsec: quarter mile time in seconds
- disp: displacement (cubic inches)
- hp: gross horsepower

Paired scatterplots of these variables suggest that mpg is correlated with all of these predictors, but many of the predictors themselves are correlated with each other.

```
mtcars$am <- factor(mtcars$am)
library(ggplot2)
if (requireNamespace("GGally",quietly=TRUE)){
    GGally::ggpairs(mtcars[,c("mpg","am", "wt","qsec","disp","hp")], aes(colour=am))
} else pairs(mtcars[,c("mpg","am","wt","qsec","disp","hp")])
```

wide.lm <- lm(mpg ~ am + wt + qsec + disp + hp, data=mtcars)
wide.lm <- lm(mpg ~ am + wt + qsec + disp + hp, data=mtcars)

We compare all submodels of this wide model, with the minimal model including only an intercept. The all_inds function constructs a matrix of indicators inds for whether each coefficient (column) is included in each submodel (row).

```
library(fic)
ncovs_wide <- length(coef(wide.lm)) - 1
inds0 <- c(1, rep(0, ncovs_wide))
inds <- all_inds(wide.lm, inds0)
```

The focus is taken as the mean outcome (focus=mean_normal) for a car with covariate values supplied in X : automatic transmission $\mathrm{am}=0$ and values of the other four continuous covariates defined by their means in the data.

```
cmeans <- colMeans(model.frame(wide.lm)[,c("wt","qsec","disp","hp")])
X <- rbind(
    "auto" = c(intercept=1, am=0, cmeans),
    "manual" = c(intercept=1, am=1, cmeans)
)
ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=mean_normal, X=X)
summary(ficres)
## $min
## index pars focus
## auto 26 (Intercept),am1,disp,hp 18.5
## manual 26 (Intercept),am1,disp,hp 22.3
## ave 26 (Intercept),am1,disp,hp 20.4
##
## $ranges
## min(focus) max(focus) min(RMSE) max(RMSE)
## auto 16.5 20.1 0.572 
## manual 20.1 25.4 0.699
## ave 20.1 20.9 0.638
##
## attr(,"class")
## [1] "summary.fic"
```

There is a cluster of submodels whose focus estimates are judged to have relatively low bias and mean square error. The model with minimal mean square error, for either focus, omits wt and qsec. Given the strong correlation of wt with disp and qsec with hp , these two variables do not improve the precision of the focus estimate.

## 2. Polynomial order selection

A common model selection problem is to choose an appropriate level of flexibility for a nonlinear relationship of an outcome with a predictor. This is often implemented through polynomial regression.
In this example, a linear model with orthogonal polynomials is used to represent the relationship of life expectancy to GDP per capita for 1704 countries (worldwide) and years from 1952 to 2007, using data from http://www.gapminder.org, packaged by Bryan (2017). The


Figure 1: Focused comparison of linear regression models for the mtcars data.
dataset used for analysis excludes Kuwait, whose data follow a distinct pattern. The scatterplot shows a diminishing increase in life expectancy as GDP increases above a certain level.

```
library(gapminder)
gap2 <- gapminder[gapminder$country !="Kuwait",]
pal <- heat.colors(5)
p <- ggplot(gap2, aes(x=gdpPercap, y=lifeExp)) +
    geom_point() +
    xlab("GDP per capita (US$, inflation-adjusted)") +
    ylab("Life expectancy (years)") +
    geom_point(data=gapminder[gapminder$country =="Kuwait",], col="gray") +
    annotate("text", x=80000, y=70, label="Kuwait", col="gray")
```

A wide model is fitted with a polynomial relationship of degree 5. Fitted values from each model are added to the scatterplot.

```
wide.lm <- lm(lifeExp ~ poly(gdpPercap,5), data=gap2)
yilab <- c(0, 50, 100, 65, 85)
for (i in 2:5) {
    poly.lm <- lm(lifeExp ~ poly(gdpPercap,i), data=gap2)
    ft <- data.frame(x=gap2$gdpPercap, y=fitted(poly.lm))
    ft <- ft[order(ft$x),]
    p <- p +
        geom_line(data=ft, aes(x=x,y=y), col=pal[i], lwd=2, alpha=0.8) +
        annotate("text", x=60000, y=yilab[i], col="black",
            label=sprintf("Polynomial degree %s", i))
}
gdp_focus <- c(10000, 25000, 40000)
p <- p +
    geom_vline(xintercept=gdp_focus, col="gray") +
    scale_x_continuous(breaks=c(0, gdp_focus, 60000, 80000, 100000))
p
```



Submodels of degrees 2, 3 and 4 are compared in terms of how well they estimate three focuses: the average life expectancy at GDP per capita of $\$ 10,000, \$ 25,000$ and $\$ 40,000$. Note that the parameters include the intercept, so, for example, the simplest model, the quadratic polynomial model, has three parameters indicated by entries of 1 in the first row of inds.

```
inds <- rbind("quadratic"= c(1,1,1,0,0,0),
    "cubic" =c(1,1,1,1,0,0),
    "quartic" =c(1,1,1,1,1,0),
    "degree 5" =c(1,1,1,1,1,1))
X <- newdata_to_X(list(gdpPercap=gdp_focus), wide.lm, intercept=TRUE)
rownames(X) <- gdp_focus
(ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=mean_normal, X=X))
## vals mods rmse rmse.adj bias se FIC focus
```

```
## 1 10000 quadratic 1.701
## 5 10000 cubic 0.989
## 9 10000 quartic 1.153
## 13 10000 degree 5 0.373
## 2 25000 quadratic 3.768
## 6 25000 cubic 1.518
## 10 25000 quartic 2.483
## 14 25000 degree 5 0.673
## 3 40000 quadratic 6.459
## 7 40000 cubic 2.970 2.970 2.60e+00 1.433 15660 79.1
## 11 40000 quartic 8.331 8.331 8.19e+00 1.513 118171 84.5
## 15 40000 degree 5 1.952 1.952 0.00e+00 1.952 
## 4 ave quadratic 4.335 4.335 -4.26e+00 0.809 30955 72.6
## 8 ave cubic 2.009 2.009 1.79e+00 0.909 5987 74.9
## 12 ave quartic 5.063 5.063 4.97e+00 0.952 42534 76.4
## 16 ave degree 5 1.211 1.211 -1.35e-31 1.211 1643 74.0
summary(ficres)
## $min
## index
## 10000 4
## 25000 4
## 40000 4
## ave 4
##
## 10000 (Intercept), poly(gdpPercap, 5)1,poly(gdpPercap, 5)2,poly(gdpPercap, 5)3,poly(gdpP
## 25000 (Intercept),poly(gdpPercap, 5)1,poly(gdpPercap, 5)2,poly(gdpPercap, 5)3,poly(gdpP
## 40000 (Intercept),poly(gdpPercap, 5)1,poly(gdpPercap, 5)2,poly(gdpPercap, 5)3,poly(gdpP
## ave (Intercept),poly(gdpPercap, 5)1,poly(gdpPercap, 5)2,poly(gdpPercap, 5)3,poly(gdpP
## focus
## 10000 69.7
## 25000 76.2
## 40000 76.2
## ave 74.0
##
## $ranges
## min(focus) max(focus) min(RMSE) max(RMSE)
## 10000 68.0 
## 25000 13.8 80.0 0.673 3.77
## 40000 69.9 84.5 1.952 8.33
## ave 
##
## attr(,"class")
## [1] "summary.fic"
```

While the most complex model gives the most precise estimates of mean life expectancy at all focuses, the preference for the complex model is less strong for GDP $=10000$ - at this point there are more data, the models give more consistent focus estimates, and the bias incurred by using a simpler model is less.
This is a simplified example - alternative approaches to nonlinear regression might involve, e.g. splines or fractional polynomials. In theory, these can be implemented as linear additive models of the form shown here. Though exact details of implementing focused model comparison have not been investigated for these classes of models - note that this would require all submodels to be nested within a single wide model. Note also the importance of considering knowledge of the underlying mechanism when building a regression model, for example, we might be sure that the relationship is monotonic.

### 2.1. Quantiles as the focus

Claeskens and Hjort (2008) show that for a normal linear regression model, FIC and MSE are the same for a focus defined by the mean outcome as for a focus defined by any quantile of the outcome.
We can check this in this example, while demonstrating how to implement quantiles as focus functions in fic.
Firstly, the median of a normal distribution is equal to the mean, and is independent of the variance. Therefore we will get identical answers to the results for focus=mean_normal above by doing:

```
median_normal<- function(par,X){
    qnorm(0.5, mean = as.numeric(X %*% par))
}
ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=median_normal, X=X)
```

Other quantiles, however, depend on the variance. Therefore a sigma argument should be defined for the focus function. This allows, e.g. a $10 \%$ quantile focus to be implemented as

```
q10_normal <- function(par, X, sigma){
    qnorm(0.1, mean = as.numeric(X %*% par), sd=sigma)
}
ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=q10_normal, X=X)
```

However, we can define focus functions with arbitrary additional arguments. This allows any quantile to be defined using one common function, with an argument, say, focus_p, specifying the particular quantile to return. in a

```
quantile_normal <- function(par, X, sigma, focus_p=0.5){
    qnorm(focus_p, mean = as.numeric(X %*% par), sd=sigma)
}
```

This argument can be passed to fic, along with the focus function, to fully specify the focus of interest. If a vector of values is supplied in focus_p, then multiple focuses are evaluated
at once. ${ }^{1}$

```
ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=quantile_normal,
    X=X[1,], focus_p=c(0.1,0.5,0.9))
```

We can check that the results match between the alternative ways of setting up fic for the same focus.

## 3. Relation of focused model comparison with AIC

Using the mtcars example, we illustrate when focused model comparison agrees with model comparison using AIC. The following code performs focused model comparison for 32 distinct focus parameters, defined as the log likelihood contribution from each of the 32 observed covariate combinations in the mtcars data.
Firstly the focus function is defined as the log density for an individual outcome. Claeskens and Hjort (2003) show that differences between submodels in the expected mean square error of this focus are asymptotically equivalent to differences in AIC.

```
focus_loglik <- function(par,X,sigma,Y){
    mu <- as.numeric(X %*% par)
    dnorm(Y,mu,sigma,log=TRUE)
}
```

To illustrate this result, we run fic with $n=32$ variants of this focus defined by the observed outcomes $Y$ and covariates $X$ in the mtcars data.

```
wide.lm <- lm(mpg ~ am + wt + qsec + disp + hp, data=mtcars)
ncovs_wide <- length(coef(wide.lm)) - 1
inds0 <- c(1, rep(0, ncovs_wide))
inds <- all_inds(wide.lm, inds0)
X <- model.matrix(wide.lm)
Y <- model.response(model.frame(wide.lm))
ficres <- fic(wide.lm, inds=inds, focus=focus_loglik, X=X, Y=Y)
```

We then extract the results averaged over these focuses, automatically computed by fic with each focus weighted equally, and extract the AICs of the submodels. The preference among models from the averaged FIC result agrees with AIC, up to sampling error.

```
ficres <- ficres[ficres$vals=="ave",]
aics <- sapply(attr(ficres,"sub"), AIC)
qplot(ficres$rmse, aics,
```
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note that vectors for X are treated differently from vectors for other focus arguments. If a named vector is supplied for $X$ it is assumed to refer to multiple covariate values defining a single focus. If a vector is supplied for any other argument, it is assumed to identify multiple focuses. To completely avoid ambiguity for any argument, a matrix can be supplied, where the rows identify focuses and the columns identify, e.g. covariate values.

