

# Pre-Modeling Via BART

Ed George, University of Pennsylvania  
(joint work with H. Chipman and R. McCulloch)

Issac Newton Institute  
Cambridge University  
February 28, 2008

# A General Nonparametric Regression Setup

- Data:  $n$  observations on  $y$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$
- Suppose:  $y = f(x) + \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon$  symmetric around 0
- Unknowns:  $f$  and the distribution of  $\varepsilon$

For this model free setup, BART can help us to:

- estimate  $f(x) = E(y | x)$
- obtain posterior intervals for  $f(x)$
- estimate the effect of a particular  $x_j$
- select an informative subset of  $x_1, \dots, x_p$   
(making no assumptions about  $f$ )

Remark: In what follows we will assume  $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  for simplicity, but extension to a general DP process normal mixture model for  $\varepsilon$  works just fine.


# How Does BART Work?

BART (= Bayesian Additive Regression Trees) is composed of many single tree models

Let  $g(x;T,M)$  be a function which assigns a  $\mu$  value to  $x$  where:

$T$  denotes the tree structure including the decision rules

$M = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_b\}$  denotes the set of terminal node  $\mu$ 's.




A Single Tree Model:  $y = g(x;T,M) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0,1)$

# An Additive Multiple Tree Model

Let  $(T_1, M_1), (T_2, M_2), \dots, (T_m, M_m)$  identify a set of  $m$  trees and their  $\mu$ 's.

An Additive Multiple Tree Model:

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + g(x; T_2, M_2) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0, 1)$$



$E(y | x)$  is the sum of all the corresponding  $\mu$ 's at each tree bottom node.

Such a model combines additive and interaction effects.

# Completing the BART Model

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + g(x; T_2, M_2) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0, 1)$$

is determined by

$$(T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma$$

For  $m$  large:

Many, many parameters

$g(x; T_1, M_1), g(x; T_2, M_2), \dots, g(x; T_m, M_m)$  is a highly redundant “over-complete basis”

To unleash the potential of this formulation, BART is completed by **adding a regularization prior**

$$\pi((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma)$$

Strongly influential  $\pi$  is used to keep each  $(T_i, M_i)$  small

# BART Implementation

Because BART is a fully Bayesian specification, information about all the unknowns, namely  $\theta = ((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma)$ , is captured by the posterior

$$\pi(\theta | y) \propto p(y | \theta) \pi(\theta)$$

Thus, to implement BART we need to:

1. Construct the prior  $\pi(\theta)$ 
  - Independent tree generating process on  $T_1, \dots, T_m$
  - Use observed  $y$  to properly scale  $\pi(\theta | T)$
2. Calculate the posterior  $\pi(\theta | y)$ 
  - Bayesian backfitting MCMC
  - Interweaving marginalization and regeneration of  $\theta$

R package BayesTree available on CRAN

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0, 1)$$

plus

$$\pi((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma)$$

## Connections to Other Modeling Ideas

Bayesian Nonparametrics:

- Lots of parameters (to make model flexible)

- A strong prior to shrink towards simple structure (regularization)

- BART shrinks towards additive models with some interaction

Dynamic Random Basis:

- $g(x; T_1, M_1), \dots, g(x; T_m, M_m)$  are dimensionally adaptive

Gradient Boosting:

- Overall fit becomes the cumulative effort of many “weak learners”

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0, 1)$$

plus

$$\pi((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma)$$

## Some Distinguishing Features of BART

BART is NOT obtained by Bayesian model averaging of a single tree model !

Unlike boosting, BART uses a FIXED number of trees  $m$ !!

The identification of subsets for variable selection via BART is obtained by observing what happens as  $m$  is varied!!

# Experimental Comparison on 42 datasets

Out-sample-performance compared for 6 methods

Neural networks (single layer)

Random Forests

Boosting (Friedman's gradient boosting machine)

Linear regression with lasso

BART (Bayesian Additive Regression Trees)

BART/default - \*NO\* tuning of parameters

Data from Kim, Loh, Shih and Chaudhuri (2006)

Up to 65 predictors and 2953 observations

Train on 5/6 of data, test on 1/6

Tuning via 5-fold CV within training set

20 Train/Test replications per dataset

# Results: Root Mean Squared Errors

Mean  
RMSE

.0963

BART default

.0951

BART

.0959

Boosting

.1015

Neural Net


.1135

Lasso


.0964

Random Forests

relative ratio of RMSE



relative ratio of RMSE (enlarged)



Left: RMSE averaged over datasets and replications

Box Plots: RMSE relative to best

**BART is a very strong performer!**

One of the 42 Datasets is the well-known Boston Housing Data

Each observation corresponds to a geographic district

$y = \log(\text{median house value})$

13 x variables, stuff about the district


eg. crime rate, % poor, riverfront, size, air quality, etc.

$n = 507$  observations

Each boxplot depicts  
20 rmse's  
**out-of-sample**  
for a version  
of a method.


eg.  
the method  
neural nets  
with a given  
number of  
nodes and  
decay value.

Smaller is better.  
***BART wins!***



# BART Offers Estimates of Predictor Effects

## Partial Dependence Plot of Crime Effect in Boston Housing



These are estimates of  $f_3(x_3) = (1/n) \sum_i f(x_3, x_{iC})$  where  $x_C = x \setminus x_3$

# Friedman's Simulated Example

$$y = f(x) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0,1)$$

where

$$f(x) = 10 \sin(\pi x_1 x_2) + 20(x_3 - .5)^2 + 10x_4 + 5x_5 + 0x_6 + \dots + 0x_{10}$$



10 x's, but only the first 5 matter!




Friedman (1991) used  $n = 100$  observations from this model with  $\sigma = 1$  to illustrate the potential of MARS

# Applying BART to the Friedman Example

We applied BART with  $m = 100$  trees to  $n = 100$  observations of the Friedman example.

95% posterior intervals vs true  $f(x)$

$\sigma$  draws



in-sample  $f(x)$

out-of-sample  $f(x)$

MCMC iteration

# Comparison of BART with Other Methods

50 simulations of 100 observations of Friedman example

The cross validation domain used to tune each method

Method	Parameter	Values considered
Boosting	# boosting iterations	<code>n.trees</code> = 1, 2, ..., 2000
	Shrinkage (multiplier of each tree added)	<code>shrinkage</code> = 0.01, 0.05, 0.10, 0.25
	Max depth permitted for each tree	<code>interaction.depth</code> = 1,2,3,4
Neural Nets	# hidden units	<code>size</code> = 10, 15, 20, 25, 30
	Decay (penalty coef on sum-squared weights)	<code>decay</code> = 0.50, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5
	(Max # optimizer iterations, # restarts)	fixed at <code>maxit</code> = 1000 and 5
Random Forests	# of trees	<code>ntree</code> = 200, 500, 1000
	# variables sampled to grow each node	<code>mtry</code> = 3, 5, 7, 10
MARS	GCV penalty coefficient	<code>gcv</code> = 1, 2, ..., 8
BART -cv	Sigma prior: $(\nu, q)$ combinations	(3,0.90), (3,0.99), (10,0.75)
	$\mu$ Prior: $k$ value for $\sigma_\mu$	1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3
	(# trees $m$ , iterations used, burn-in iterations)	fixed at (200, 1000,500)
BART -default	Sigma prior: $(\nu, q)$ combinations	fixed at (3,0.90)
	$\mu$ Prior: $k$ value for $\sigma_\mu$	fixed at 2
	(# trees $m$ , iterations used, burn-in iterations)	fixed at (200, 1000,500)

Table 1: Operational parameters for the various competing models. Names in last column indicate parameter names in R.

# BART Wins Again!



Performance measured on 1000 out-of-sample  $x$ 's by

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1000} \sum_{i=1}^{1000} (\hat{f}(x_i) - f(x_i))^2}$$

Method	average RMSE	se(RMSE)
Random Forests	2.655	0.025
Linear Regression	2.618	0.016
Neural Nets	2.156	0.025
Boosting	2.013	0.024
MARS	2.003	0.060
BART-cv	1.787	0.021
BART-default	1.759	0.019

# BART is Robust to Prior Settings

On the Friedman (1991) example, BART's robust RMSE performance is illustrated below where the  $(v, q, k, m)$  choice is varied




# Detecting Low Dimensional Structure in High Dimensional Data

Added many useless x's to Friedman's example

*With only 100 observations on y and 1000 x's, BART yielded "reasonable" results !!!!*


**In-sample post int vs f(x)**

p= 20




**Out-of-sample post int vs f(x)**

p= 20




**$\sigma$  draws**

p= 20




20 x's


p= 100



p= 100




p= 100




100 x's


p= 1000



p= 1000




p= 1000



1000 x's


# Partial Dependence Plots for the Friedman Example

## The Marginal Effects of $x_1 - x_5$



# Partial Dependence Plots for the Friedman Example


## The Marginal Effects of $x_6 - x_{10}$



# Variable Selection via BART

Variable usage frequencies as the number of trees  $m$  is reduced

Notation: 2-20 means  $x_2$  with  $m = 20$  trees, etc.



# The Football Data


Each observation ( $n=245$ ) corresponds to an NCAA football game.

$y = \text{Team A points} - \text{Team B points}$

29  $x$ 's. Each is the difference between the two teams on some measure. eg  $x_{10}$  is average points against defense per game for Team A for team B.

# Variable Selection for the Football Data

For each draw, for each variable calculate the percentage of time that variable is used in a tree. Then average over trees.







Subtle point: Can't have too many trees. Variables come in without really doing anything.

# Marginal Effects of the Variables


Just used variables  
2,7,10, and 14.

Here are the four  
univariate partial-  
dependence plots.



# A Bivariate Partial Dependence Plot

The joint effect of two of the x's



# Illustrative Application to HIV Data Analysis

Y = LDHL (log of hdl level)

X's = CD4, Age, Sex, Race, Study,  
PI1,PI2,NNRTI2, NRTI1, NRTI2,  
ABI\_349, CRC\_71, CRC\_72, CRC\_55, CRC\_73, CRC\_10,  
ABI\_383, ABI\_387, ABI\_391, ABI\_395, ABI\_400, ABI\_401,  
CRC\_66, CRC\_67, CRC\_68, CRC\_69



n = 458 patients

For this data

Least Squares yields  $R^2 = 26\%$

BART yields  $R^2 = 42\%$


# The BART Fit for the HIV Data





BART suggests there is not a strong signal in  $x$  for this  $y$ .

# Partial Dependence Plots May Suggest Genotype Effects

For example, the average predictive effect of ABI\_383



# Predictive Inference about Interaction of NNRTI2 Treatment and ABI\_383 Genotype



There appears to be no interaction effect

## A Sketch of the Prior

First, introduce prior independence as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\pi((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma) &= [ \prod \pi(T_j, M_j) ] \pi(\sigma) \\ &= [ \prod \pi(\mu_{ij} | T_j) \pi(T_j) ] \pi(\sigma)\end{aligned}$$

Thus we only need to choose  $\pi(T)$ ,  $\pi(\sigma)$ , and  $\pi(\mu | T) = \pi(\mu)$


$$\pi(\mathbb{T})$$

We specify a process that grows trees:

- Step 1) Grow a tree structure with successive biased coin flips
- Step 2) Randomly assign variables to decision nodes
- Step 3) Randomly splitting rules to decision nodes

Marginal prior on  
number of  
bottom nodes.

*Hyperparameters  
chosen to put  
prior weight on  
small trees!!*



$$\pi(\mu \mid \mathcal{T})$$

For each bottom node  $\mu$ , let  $\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\mu, \sigma_\mu^2)$

which induces  $E[Y \mid X] \sim \mathcal{N}(m\mu_\mu, m\sigma_\mu^2)$

Peeking at the data, we are pretty sure that  $E(Y \mid X) \in (y_{\min}, y_{\max})$

Thus we chose  $\mu_\mu$  and  $\sigma_\mu$  so that for some  $k$  (such as 2 or 3)

$$(m\mu_\mu - k\sqrt{m}\sigma_\mu, m\mu_\mu + k\sqrt{m}\sigma_\mu) = (y_{\min}, y_{\max})$$

This conveniently done by shifting and rescaling  $y$  so that  $(y_{\min}, y_{\max}) = (-0.5, 0.5)$  and then setting  $\mu_\mu = 0$  and

$$k\sqrt{m}\sigma_\mu = .5 \Rightarrow \sigma_\mu = \frac{.5}{k\sqrt{m}}$$

Note how the prior adapts to  $m$ :  $\sigma_\mu$  gets smaller as  $m$  gets larger.

Default choice is  $k = 2$ .

$$\pi(\sigma)$$


Let  $\sigma^2 \sim \frac{v\lambda}{\chi_v^2}$  and consider  $v = 3, 5$  or  $10$ .

To set  $\lambda$ , we use a rough overestimate of  $\sigma$  based on the data (such as  $\text{sd}(y)$  or the LS estimate for the saturated linear regression).

Determine  $\lambda$  by setting a quantile such as .75, .95 or .99 at this rough estimate.

$$\hat{\sigma} = 2$$

The three priors we have been using:



# A Sketch of the MCMC algorithm

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + g(x; T_2, M_2) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z$$

The “parameter“ is:  $\theta = ((T_1, M_1), \dots, (T_m, M_m), \sigma)$

“Simple“ Gibbs sampler:

- (1)  $\sigma \mid \{T_j\}, \{M_j\}, \text{data}$
- (2)  $(T_j, M_j) \mid \{T_i\}_{i \neq j}, \{M_i\}_{i \neq j}, \sigma, \text{data}$  (Bayesian backfitting)

- (1) Subtract all the  $g$ 's from  $y$  to update  $\sigma$
- (2) Subtract all but the  $j^{\text{th}}$   $g$  from  $y$  to update  $(T_j, M_j)$

Using the decomposition

$$p(T, M \mid \text{data}) = p(T \mid \text{data}) p(M \mid T, \text{data})$$

and the fact that  $p(T \mid \text{data})$  is available under our prior,  
we sample

$$(T_j, M_j) \mid \{T_i\}_{i \neq j}, \{M_i\}_{i \neq j}, \sigma, \text{data}$$

by first drawing  $T$  from  $p(T \mid \text{data})$ , and then drawing  $M$  from  $p(M \mid T, \text{data})$ .


Drawing  $M$  from  $p(M \mid T, \text{data})$  is routine

Just simulate  $\mu$ 's from the posterior under a conjugate prior


To draw  $T$  from  $p(T \mid \text{data})$ , we use a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.

Given the current  $T$ , we propose a modification and then either move to the proposal or repeat the old tree.

In particular we use proposals that change the size of the tree:



propose a more complex tree



propose a simpler tree

More complicated models will be accepted if the data's insistence overcomes the reluctance of the prior.

$$y = g(x; T_1, M_1) + g(x; T_2, M_2) + \dots + g(x; T_m, M_m) + \sigma z, \quad z \sim N(0, 1)$$

Thus, at each iteration,  $T_i$ ,  $M_i$  and  $\sigma$  are updated.

This is a Markov chain such that the stationary distribution is the posterior.

Each tree contributes a small part to the fit, and the fit is swapped around from tree to tree as the chain runs.

The Dynamic Random Basis in Action:

As we run the chain, we often observe that an individual tree grows quite large and then collapses back to a single node.

This illustrates how each tree is dimensionally adaptive.

## Using the MCMC Output to Draw Inference

At iteration  $i$  we have a draw from the posterior of the function

$$\hat{f}_i(\cdot) = g(\cdot; T_{1i}, M_{1i}) + g(\cdot; T_{2i}, M_{2i}) + \cdots + g(\cdot; T_{mi}, M_{mi})$$

To get in-sample fits we average the  $\hat{f}_i(\cdot)$  draws to obtain  $\bar{f}_i(\cdot)$

Thus,  $\bar{f}_i(x)$  estimates  $f(x)$ .

Posterior uncertainty is captured by variation of the  $\hat{f}_i(x)$

Similarly, it is straightforward to estimate functionals of  $f$  such as partial dependence functions

$$f_k(x_k) = (1/n) \sum_i f(x_k, x_{ic}) \quad \text{where } x_c = x \setminus x_k$$

# Where do we go from here?

BART (and probably other nonparametric methods) can give us a sense of

- the location of  $E(y | x)$
- the uncertainty about  $E(y|x)$
- the individual effects of the  $x_j$ 's
- a subset of  $x_1, \dots, x_p$  related to  $y$

This information would seem to be very valuable for model building. The next step is how?

To be continued...