

Hierarchical Models

for Assessing Variability among Functions

BY Sam Behseta

Department of Mathematics, California State University, Bakersfield, CA, 93311, U.S.A.

sbehseta@csub.edu

Robert E. Kass

Department of Statistics and Center for Neural Basis of Cognition, Carnegie Mellon University

Pittsburgh, PA, 15213, U.S.A.

kass@stat.cmu.edu

AND Garrick L. Wallstrom

Center for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213, U.S.A.

garrick@cbmi.pitt.edu

Summary

In many applications of functional data analysis, summarising functional variation based on fits, without taking account of the estimation process, runs the risk of attributing the estimation variation to the functional variation, thereby overstating the latter. For example, the first eigenvalue of a sample covariance matrix computed from estimated functions may be biased upwards. We display a set of estimated neuronal Poisson-process intensity functions where this bias is substantial, and we discuss two methods for accounting for estimation variation. One method uses a random-coefficient model, which requires all functions to be fitted with the same basis functions. An alternative method removes the same-basis restriction by means of a hierarchical Gaussian process model. In a small simulation study the hierarchical Gaussian process model outperformed the random-coefficient model and greatly reduced the bias in the estimated first eigenvalue that would result from ignoring estimation variability. For the neuronal data the hierarchical Gaussian process estimate of the first eigenvalue was much smaller than the naïve estimate that ignored variability due to function estimation. The neuronal setting also illustrates the benefit of incorporating alignment parameters into the hierarchical scheme.

SOME KEY WORDS: Bayesian adaptive regression splines, Bayesian functional data analysis; Curve-fitting; Functional Data Analysis; Free-knot spline; Hierarchical Gaussian process; Neuron spike train; Nonparametric regression; Reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo; Smoothing.

1 Introduction

Consider the problem of describing the variability among m real-valued functions of a single variable, $f^1(t), \dots, f^m(t)$, that have been estimated from enough data to capture sharp functional variations but not enough so that uncertainty due to estimation may be safely ignored. The argument t is assumed to lie in a finite interval $[a, b]$. Figure 1 illustrates the situation with a sample of neuronal point-process histograms from which intensity functions have been estimated. A standard approach in both neurophysiology (Optican & Richmond, 1987) and statistics (Ramsay & Silverman, 1997) is to begin with the estimated functions \hat{f}^i evaluated on a grid t_1, \dots, t_p , define p -dimensional random vectors $Y^i = (\hat{f}^i(t_1), \dots, \hat{f}^i(t_p))$, and apply techniques from multivariate analysis, such as principal components. This strategy attempts to describe the variability of the unobserved random vectors $Z^i = (f^i(t_1), \dots, f^i(t_p))$ by instead describing the variability of the estimates Y^i . We will label this approach naïve functional data analysis. This approach will be successful when there is little error in estimation relative to the variability among the functions. However, in many datasets, like that depicted in Fig. 1, the variability in the estimates \hat{f}^i is substantial and the naïve method will mistakenly attribute that variability to the variability among the functions. For example, the first eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix of Y^i can be strongly biased upwards as an estimator of the first eigenvalue of the covariance matrix $V = \text{cov}(Z^i)$. In this paper we present methods for estimating V that account for the variability in estimating the curves f^i .

Our approach is similar in spirit to that of Ke & Wang (2001), and we also adopt roughly the same high-level strategy as James (2002), James et al. (2000), Rice & Wu (1998), and Shi et al. (1996). The methods developed here, however, are distinguished by two key features: they are able to fit functions that require domain-adaptive smoothing, so long as there is sufficiently much data to supply individual estimates of each function, and they are applicable to non-Gaussian data.

A natural way to describe variability among curves that are fitted with a set of basis functions is to assume that the basis coefficient vectors follow a distribution. Previous work, cited above, has emphasised such random-coefficient models, and we write down the Normally-distributed random coefficient model in §2.1. A restriction is that the basis functions must be the same across curves. While this is a reasonable simplification when there are limited data from which to estimate each curve, in cases such as that illustrated in Fig. 1 it may be preferable to fit each curve with its own empirically-selected basis. We are especially interested in fitting curves that have irregular variation, being smooth over much of their domain but subject to sudden jumps: neuronal firing-rate functions often change slowly for most of the duration of observation, but rapidly in some short time interval; see DiMatteo, et al. (2001), and Kass, et al. (2003) for good examples. We therefore investigated an alternative approach. As discussed in §2.2, this begins with the individually-obtained fits Y^i defined above and, with the assumption that the Y^i and Z^i vectors are multivariate Normal, applies a familiar Normal hierarchical model, the random-effects model. Thus, in the second approach, the function values rather than the coefficients are taken as the random effects. Since in principle this can be applied at any time resolution we will regard the functions $f^i(t)$ as realisations of a Gaussian process and will refer to the resulting model as a hierarchical Gaussian process model.

The method is easily implemented and very general in so far as it applies to any context in which the variation among curves may be safely modelled by a Gaussian process, and any curve-estimation method, and set of within-curve sample sizes, that produces roughly Normally-distributed estimators. Furthermore, as we mention in §2.3, this asymptotic Normal approximation does not need to be highly accurate. We also note there that it is possible to correct both methods for moderate nonnormality of estimators.

A point stressed by Ramsay & Silverman (1997) Wang & Gasser (1997), and others is that in describing variability among functions it is often important first to align the functions, partly to avoid attributing alignment variability to between-curve variability,

and partly to make the overall mean function similar to the individual function; an extreme case occurs when curves are identical in shape but shifted by varying amounts, in which case one would first shift the curves to align them, and then discover that their shapes exhibited no variability. Thus, any analysis scheme that purports to treat functional data should accommodate alignment in some way. In §2.4 we note the relative ease with which alignment may be incorporated into the hierarchical modelling framework, thereby providing a complete accounting for the dominant sources of variability among a set of curves. This becomes an additional use of hierarchical modelling in functional data analysis.

Many methods could be used to obtain estimates \hat{f}^i of the curves f^i from available data. We apply here an especially powerful approach called 'Bayesian adaptive regression splines' (DiMatteo et al, 2001; Kass & Wallstrom, 2002), which can be applied to a wide class of nonlinear models, including Poisson and other generalized nonparametric regression models. Although we use Bayesian methods throughout this paper, the general hierarchical model in §2.2 could be used with alternative estimation methods, such as restricted maximum likelihood in conjunction with bootstrap estimates of the variability of the fitted curves \hat{f}^i based on kernel smoothers.

2 Hierarchical Models

2.1 Random-Coefficient Models

For individual units (neurons) $i = 1, \dots, m$ observed at times u_{ij} for $j = 1, \dots, n_i$, suppose we have data W_{ij} that follow distributions

$$W_{ij} \sim p\{w_{ij} | f^i(u_{ij})\} \tag{1}$$

where the functions f^i have the form $f^i(t) = \sum_h b_h^i(t)\beta_h^i$ for some basis functions $b_j^i(t)$. We will below use a spline basis defined by a set of knots ξ and these will be determined empirically: we will obtain a posterior distribution on the knot set. We therefore will use ξ to index the coefficients, and so on. For the moment the formulation may be more general, with ξ standing for an abstract index that in some way defines the basis. Now suppose that each function is evaluated at points u_1, \dots, u_n and that we collect the function evaluations into a vector $X_\xi \beta_\xi^i$, where X_ξ is the design matrix and β_ξ^i is the coefficient vector for the i th function. In principle X_ξ could vary with the function, and thus could be subscripted with i , but for notational convenience we assume that all functions are evaluated at the same values of t . We then define the random-coefficient model

$$\begin{aligned} (f^i(u_1), \dots, f^i(u_n))^T &= X_\xi \beta_\xi^i \\ \beta_\xi^i | \xi, \alpha_\xi, D_\xi &\sim N(\alpha_\xi, D_\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$ independently. Since all curves have the same basis functions, variation among curves may be described in terms of variation among the coefficients; conditionally on ξ , this is summarised by the matrix D_ξ . As a consequence of their dependence on ξ , the D_ξ matrices produced are not comparable, in the case of splines being produced with different knot sets ξ and perhaps having different dimensionalities, and therefore they should not be interpreted directly. Instead, we view the functions f^i as draws from a Gaussian process defined conditionally on ξ . For any collection of t values $(\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_p)$ the corresponding matrix $\tilde{X}_\xi D_\xi \tilde{X}_\xi^T$ is the covariance matrix of $(f^i(\tilde{t}_1), \dots, f^i(\tilde{t}_p))$ under (ξ, α_ξ, D_ξ) . This, or some functional of it, would be the object of inference.

For a given ξ , model (2) is a generalised linear mixed model. However, fitting of (2) will be computationally demanding because it involves the estimation of the parameters $\beta_\xi^1, \dots, \beta_\xi^m, \alpha_\xi$ and D_ξ nested within estimation of ξ . One simplification we have adopted here is to replace (1) with $\hat{\beta}_\xi^i | \xi, \beta_\xi^i \sim N(\beta_\xi^i, R^i)$, where $\hat{\beta}_\xi^i$ is the maximum likelihood estimator and R^i is the inverse of the observed information matrix; that is, for each ξ , we estimate $\beta_\xi^1, \dots, \beta_\xi^m$ by maximum likelihood and then apply the conditional hierarchical

model

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_\xi^i | \xi, \beta_\xi^i &\sim N(\beta_\xi^i, R^i) \\ \beta_\xi^i | \xi, \alpha_\xi, D_\xi &\sim N(\alpha_\xi, D_\xi).\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

We elaborate this in §3.1, in the context of spline fitting.

2.2 Hierarchical Gaussian Processes

For our alternative approach we begin by assuming that each estimated curve \hat{f}^i may be considered a Gaussian process with mean f^i and covariance function $\Gamma_{\hat{f}^i}$, which we write as

$$\hat{f}^i \sim GP(f^i, \Gamma_{\hat{f}^i}).\tag{4}$$

although the covariance functions $\Gamma_{\hat{f}^i}$ will be estimated during the procedure that fits \hat{f}^i to f^i , we treat them as known. We then assume that the underlying functions are themselves independent realisations of a Gaussian process,

$$f^i \sim GP(\alpha, \Gamma_f).\tag{5}$$

We implement this by choosing a grid of values, t_1, \dots, t_p , as in the naïve approach, thereby obtaining a familiar Normal hierarchical model,

$$\begin{aligned}Y^i &\sim N_p(Z^i, S^i) \\ Z^i &\sim N_p(\mu, V),\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where Y^i and Z^i are defined above, N_p is used to denote a p -dimensional multivariate Normal distribution, the S^i covariance matrices are defined from the fitting procedure, and assumed known, and the covariance matrix V is the object about which we will make inferences. We will call (4) and (5) a hierarchical Gaussian process model, though we modify (4) in important ways below. Model (6) is a discrete form of (4) and (5).

Stated in this form, it is apparent that many different methods may be used to estimate the functions f^i , and thereby create alternative hierarchical Gaussian process models. Strictly speaking $S^i = \text{var}(Y^i|Z^i)$ is unknown. However, we simply plug in the estimate \hat{S}^i obtained from fitting f^i . That is, we take $S^i = \hat{S}^i$ and treat this plug-in estimator as if it were fixed and known. In §3.3 we take $S = \hat{S}^i$ to be the posterior covariance matrix obtained from Bayesian adaptive regression splines. Similarly, alternative methods may be used to estimate the 'random-effects' covariance matrix V . In §3.3 we estimate V in a Bayesian way by completing the hierarchical model in (6) with a flat prior on μ and an inverse-Wishart prior on V .

2.3 Improvement on Normality

Both (3) and (6) involve a replacement of (1) by Normally-distributed estimators. We have found these approximations to be entirely adequate for our applications. One explanation for this is that the use of (3) in place of the exact hierarchical model based on (1) is, for the estimation of second-stage parameters, equivalent to using Laplace's method at the first stage (Daniels & Kass, 1998), which has accuracy of order $O(n^{-1})$ rather than $O(n^{-1/2})$. Nonetheless, it may be desirable to do better. To obtain improved approximations to the posteriors corresponding to hierarchical models based on (1), we may use importance reweighting in conjunction with samples drawn from either (3) or (6). This is a special case of a quite general method that applies when a Normal approximation is used in the first stage of a two-stage hierarchical model. This importance reweighting has been discussed and shown to be effective, for moderate departures from Normality, by Daniels & Kass (1998, 1999). As we said, we have found it unnecessary in our applications, so we omit any detailed examination here.

2.4 Alignment

In many applications it is important to include additional parameters to align or 'register' curves and make them comparable (Ke & Wang, 2001; Ramsay & Li, 1998; Wang & Gasser, 1997). In principle, alignment should be performed on the curves f^i themselves. In the usual approach where estimation variability of \hat{f}^i is ignored, the alignment is instead performed on the estimated curves \hat{f}^i . Models (4) – (6) provide a natural framework in which alignment of curves f^i can take place, so that variability associated with alignment estimation may be accounted for. Based on our experience with the flexible multiple-curve-fitting procedures described here, we do not expect alignment to improve fits greatly. Rather, its purpose is to apportion the variability appropriately, separating out that due to differing locations or scales of the variable t among the m different functions. This often provides a distinct interpretation of the data.

The simplest type of alignment, which will be illustrated in §5, is to allow each curve to involve shift in time. In this case the functions $f^i(t)$ must be replaced by $f^i(t - \phi^i)$, where ϕ^i is the shift on location parameter parameter for the i th curve. In more general formulation, f^i is replaced by $f^i \circ h^i$, where $h^i(t)$ is a transformation of time, the 'time-warping' function. In the case of shifts, we have $h^i(t) = t - \phi^i$. More generally, h^i will depend on some vector of parameters ϕ^i . To treat alignment in hierarchical Gaussian process models we thus replace (4) with

$$\hat{f}^i \sim GP(f^i \circ h^i, \Gamma_{\hat{f}^i}) \quad (7)$$

and we could modify (1) similarly. The parameter vectors ϕ^i would be incorporated into the hierarchical model (6) and, in a Bayesian application, into an appropriate Markov chain Monte Carlo implementation; that is, the model (6) is written conditionally on the parameter vector ϕ^i using (7) and then we also write

$$\phi^i \sim g(\phi^i | \gamma, \tau) \quad (8)$$

for some suitable probability density g that depends on parameter vectors γ and τ , which

would typically involve location and scale parameters for the components of ϕ^i . This requires an additional Metropolis-Hastings step for the posterior of ϕ^i given the rest of the parameters, which is easily implemented.

The parameters γ and τ need to be estimated. For this, it should be recognised at the outset that some regularisation is needed to overcome nonidentifiability; the freedom in picking the time-realignment function h^i is traded against the freedom in picking the functional form f^i . In our Bayesian framework we introduce informative priors on the alignment hyperparameters γ and τ , and these priors will penalise alternative configurations differentially; see the discussion of identifiability in Wang & Gasser (1997), and Ramsay & Li (1998). For example, it would often be sensible to put a strong prior on the time-alignment hyperparameters that would force h to be close to the identity transformation; this is similar to using a strong penalty in the approach of Ramsay & Li (1998). In §5 we illustrate with an analysis of neuronal data in which we introduce location parameters to allow each intensity function its own origin in time.

2.5 Choice of grid

An essential part of the implementation of (6) is the choice of grid t_1, \dots, t_p . Here p must be large enough that function variability is captured, but increasing p may create a covariance matrix of such dimensionality that estimation of it becomes difficult. In this context there may well be some advantage in crafting a specialised covariance estimation method (Daniels & Kass, 2001; Daniels, 2003). Furthermore, the grid points do not need to be equally spaced. On the other hand, our experience to date suggests that, as in the usual applications of functional data analysis (Ramsay & Silverman, 1997), results are not very sensitive to choice of grid.

3 Multiple Curve-Fitting with Bayesian Adaptive Regression Splines

3.1 Overview of Bayesian Adaptive Regression Splines

We begin with the single-curve spline-based generalised nonparametric regression model for data W_j depending on a variable t :

$$\begin{aligned} W_j &\sim p(w_j|\theta_j, \zeta) \\ \theta_j &= f(t_j) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with f being a spline having knots at unknown locations ξ_1, \dots, ξ_k . Model (9) includes a vector of nuisance parameters ζ to indicate generality, though in the Poisson case there is no nuisance parameter. If we write $f(t)$ in terms of basis functions $b_{\xi,h}(t)$ as $f(t) = \sum_h b_{\xi,h}(t)\beta_{\xi,h}$, the function evaluations $f(t_1), \dots, f(t_n)$ may be collected into a vector $(f(t_1), \dots, f(t_n))^T = X_\xi \beta_\xi$, where X_ξ is the design matrix and β_ξ is the coefficient vector. For a given knot set $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ model (9) poses a relatively easy estimation problem; for exponential-family responses, such as Poisson, it becomes a generalised linear model. The hard part of the problem is determining the knot set ξ , and using the data to do so provides the ability to fit a wide range of functions, as reviewed by Hansen & Kooperberg (2002). Bayesian adaptive regression splines is an Markov chain Monte Carlo based algorithm that samples from a suitable approximate posterior distribution on the knot set ξ . This, in turn, produces samples from the posterior on the space of splines. In practice, cubic splines and the natural spline basis have been used in most applications. Bayesian adaptive regression splines can be viewed as a powerful engine for searching for an 'optimal' knot set, but, because it generates a posterior on the space of splines, it produces an improved spline estimator based on model averaging (Kass & Raftery, 1995) and it also provides uncertainty assessments.

Key features of the Markov chain Monte Carlo implementation of Bayesian adaptive regression splines include (i) a reversible-jump chain on ξ after integration of the marginal density

$$p(w|\xi) = \int p(w|\beta_\xi, \xi, \zeta) \pi(\beta_\xi, \zeta|\xi) d\beta_\xi d\zeta, \quad (10)$$

the integration being performed exactly for Normal data and approximately, by Laplace's method, otherwise, (ii) continuous proposals for ξ , and (iii) a locality heuristic for the proposals that attempts to place potential new knots near existing knots. For notational convenience here and throughout the paper we are, following Hansen & Kooperberg (2002), suppressing the dependence of the knot set ξ on the number of knots k , but Bayesian adaptive regression splines explores the space of generalised regression models defined by ξ and k and the prior on k can, in some cases, control the algorithm in important ways (DiMatteo et al., 2001; Hansen & Kooperberg, 2002; and Kass & Wallstrom, 2002).

The first implementation feature, item (i) above, introduces an analytical step within the Markov chain Monte Carlo partly to simplify the problem of satisfying detailed balance and partly for the sake of Markov chain Monte Carlo efficiency, which is generally increased when parameters are integrated; see Liu et al. (1994). In addition, the method takes advantage of the high accuracy of Laplace's method in this context. In so doing the 'unit-information' prior discussed by Kass & Wasserman (1995) and Pauler (1998) has been used, and this gives the interpretation that the algorithm is essentially using BIC to define a Markov chain on the knot sets. The importance of performing the integral (10), at least approximately, has been stressed by Kass & Wallstrom (2002). Continuous proposals and the locality heuristic, items (ii) and (iii), together allow knots to be placed close to one another, which is advantageous when there is a sudden jump in the function.

For each draw $\xi^{(a)}$ from the posterior distribution of ξ , a draw $\beta_\xi^{(a)}$ is obtained from the conditional posterior of β_ξ , conditionally on $\xi^{(a)}$. The conditional posterior of β_ξ often may be assumed Normal, but it also may be obtained more accurately with additional sampling, as described by DiMatteo, et al. (2001) via importance reweighting, along

the lines of the reweighting discussed in §2.3 above. We have generally found that for moderate sample sizes it is unnecessary to correct the Normal approximation. From $\beta_\xi^{(a)}$ we may obtain fitted values $f^{(a)}(\tilde{t}) = \sum b_{\xi,h}(\tilde{t})\beta_{\xi,h}^{(a)}$ for selected \tilde{t} and these, in turn, may be used to produce a draw $\phi^{(a)}$ from the posterior distribution of any characteristic $\phi = \phi(f)$, such as the value at which the maximum of $f(t)$ occurs. Software for Bayesian adaptive regression splines is described by Wallstrom, et al. (2004) and is available at www.stat.cmu.edu/~kass.

We next discuss the assessment of variability among the curves f^1, \dots, f^m via fitting with alternative versions of Bayesian adaptive regression splines.

3.2 Random-Coefficient Hierarchical Models

It is natural to consider using the random-coefficient model (2) to describe the variation across multiple curves that are fitted with splines. One way of proceeding would be to devise a method for selecting a single knot set ξ^* that is reasonably effective for all the curves. Fitting model (2), or its approximate version (3), is then straightforward. A simple modification of Bayesian adaptive regression splines allows it to be used to select such a ξ^* : the m curves may be fitted simultaneously, constraining them to use the same knot set. This is carried out by replacing the single-curve marginal density (10) with the joint density

$$p(w^1, \dots, w^m | \xi) = \prod_i \int p(w^i | \beta_\xi^i, \xi) \pi(\beta_\xi^i | \xi) d\beta_\xi^i. \quad (11)$$

A sample then may be generated from the resulting posterior on ξ and the sampled knot set having the highest posterior density, the posterior modal knot set, may be selected as ξ^* .

Selecting a single $\xi = \xi^*$ and then fitting (2), however, would miss possible benefits from model averaging, here averaging across alternative knot sets. We have, instead, used (11) and generated a sample of draws $\xi^{(a)}$ from the posterior. The nontrivial problem of

fitting (3) for each of many simulated vectors $\xi^{(a)}$ is greatly reduced because, in practice, it turns out that it often suffices to use a very small posterior sample of values $\xi^{(a)}$. To explain this, suppose we wish to make inferences about a functional $\phi = \phi(f)$ representing an interesting characteristic of a curve. In the total variance formula

$$\text{var}(\phi|y) = E_{\xi|y}\{\text{var}(\phi|\xi, y)\} + \text{var}_{\xi|y}\{E(\phi|\xi, y)\}, \quad (12)$$

the second term, representing the uncertainty across alternative knot sets, will often be comparatively small, not so small that it can be ignored, but small enough that small posterior samples suffice for estimating ϕ or its variance. This is related to the observation that, while free-knot spline fitting poses a difficult optimisation problem, fits that represent suboptimal local posterior maxima, which may be noticeably inferior from visual inspection, can be close, in mean-squared difference, to the correct posterior model fit. We have here subsampled a small set of values $\xi^{(a)}$ with $a = 1, \dots, n_a$ and, for each $\xi^{(a)}$ used Gibbs sampling, via BUGS (Spiegelhalter et al. 1996), applied to (3) to compute the posterior mean of the desired vector of function values $\tilde{X}_{\xi^{(a)}} D_{\xi^{(a)}} \tilde{X}_{\xi^{(a)}}^T$. This produced n_a conditional posterior means. These n_a values were averaged to obtain the marginal posterior mean. See the 2003 Carnegie Mellon Ph.D. thesis of S. Behseta for implementation details.

In principle it would be possible to build a chain on $(\xi, \beta_\xi^1, \dots, \beta_\xi^m, \alpha_\xi, D_\xi)$ but this would be delicate and rather different than the approximate integration strategy of Bayesian adaptive regression splines. We have not attempted it. It would also be possible, in principle, to use (2) to define the joint density for the data conditionally on the knots according to

$$p(w^1, \dots, w^m|\xi) = \prod_i \int p(w^i|\beta_\xi^i, \xi) \pi_R(\beta_\xi^i|\xi, \alpha_\xi, D_\xi) \pi_{\alpha, D}(\alpha_\xi, D_\xi) d\alpha_\xi dD_\xi d\beta_\xi^i,$$

where $\pi_R(\beta_\xi^i|\xi, \alpha_\xi, D_\xi)$ is the Normal random-effects distribution. However, evaluation of this density still poses a difficult integration problem nested within the knot selection problem. Instead, our use of the unit-information prior in (11) produces very mild shrinkage of the coefficients towards the origin, while the random-effects prior would produce

data-controlled shrinkage of the coefficients towards their mean. We would not expect the resulting relative weights attached to alternative knot sets to be dramatically different. In any case, as we have said, (11) provides an easily-implemented method of finding knot sets that do a reasonably good job of fitting all curves simultaneously.

3.3 Hierarchical Gaussian Process Models

The virtue of the model given in (4) – (7), is that each function may be fitted separately with different knot sets. Our approach is to apply Bayesian adaptive regression splines to each of the m curves. We pick a grid t_1, \dots, t_p , and compute the posterior covariance matrix $S^i = \text{var}(f^i(t_1), \dots, f^i(t_p) | w^i)$, where w^i is the vector of all data available for the i th function, not necessarily data observed at t_1, \dots, t_p . This matrix S^i is obtained as the sample covariance matrix of the Markov chain Monte Carlo draws $(f^{i(a)}(t_1), \dots, f^{i(a)}(t_p))$ where, as in the introduction to §3 above, these fitted-value draws are, in turn, obtained from the draws $\beta_{\xi}^{i(a)}$ using $f^{i(a)}(\tilde{t}) = \sum b_{\xi,h}^i(\tilde{t}) \beta_{\xi,h}^{i(a)}$. We then apply (6) and estimate V using Gibbs sampling, based on a flat prior on μ and an inverse-Wishart prior on V . While we are mainly interested in the covariance function Γ_f , or its finite-dimensional representation V , it should be observed that the posterior distributions on the functions f^i will produce some shrinkage away from \hat{f}^i and toward their mean, the amount depending of course on the relative magnitudes of the between-curve covariance matrix V and the within-curve estimation covariance matrices S^i .

4 Simulation Study

We conducted a small simulation study using as ground truth the fitted curves displayed in Fig. 1. We compared the hierarchical Gaussian process and random-coefficient methods with naïve functional data analysis in estimating the first eigenvalue and first proportion

of variance. To be specific, to obtain a single data replication we simulated Poisson data as in (2), with u_{ij} values as in Fig. 1, after simulating 30 vectors $(f^i(u_{i1}), \dots, f^i(u_{ip}))$ from a multivariate Normal distribution with mean μ and variance matrix V ; we set μ and V equal to the sample mean and sample covariance matrix of the curves in Fig. 1. We replicated this procedure 30 times, thereby obtaining 30 datasets and their resulting estimates from those approaches. The mean squared error results are given in the Table 1. They indicate that the hierarchical Gaussian process method yields a large reduction in mean squared error compared to the random-coefficient model and a huge reduction compared to naïve functional data analysis. An explanation for the improvement of the hierarchical Gaussian process model over the random-coefficient model is that the latter uses extra knots to fit a diversity of curves and therefore undersmooths in some cases. An illustration appears in Fig. 2, which is discussed below.

5 Neuronal Data Analysis

5.1 The Data

The data in Fig. 1 came from a study of primary motor cortex neurons in monkeys during two conditions of a sequential pointing task (Matsuzaka, et al. 2001). Relevant experimental details are summarised in the Ph.D. thesis of S. Behseta; some analysis has been reported in Behseta et al. (2002). In brief, firing times of a single neuron were recorded while a monkey completed the task, with increased firing rate of the neuron indicating increased functional activity. The task required the monkey to touch a particular sequence of 3 illuminated buttons, among 5 buttons in all. In the first experimental condition the button-touches were in a predetermined and highly-practised order, while in the second condition they were in random order. The experiment was repeated thousands of times, over the course of more than a year, while recordings were made on single

neurons. On a given day several new neurons were typically examined; it was not possible to re-examine neurons across days. A standard practice is to aggregate firing times for a given neuron across experimental replications into 10 millisecond time bins, thereby reducing the data to a count for each bin, the information lost being negligible, and this is the form in which we have analysed the data here. Figure 1 displays the resulting histograms for 30 of the neurons, out of a total of 347, over a 300-millisecond period in the random-order condition. The histograms have been normalised by dividing by the number of experimental replications for each neuron, thereby making the units events per second per replication, which are the units associated with the Poisson process intensity functions. For a general discussion of statistical methods in a related neurophysiological context, see Ventura, et al. (2002). Among other things, that work verified that it is safe to treat such aggregated and binned data as generating Poisson-distributed counts.

5.2 Initial Variability Assessment

As we indicated in §1 the variability among curves is often described using principal components. The degree to which first principal component summarises variability is quantified by the first proportion of variance, $\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p)$, where λ_j is the j th eigenvalue. We examined the first eigenvalue and first proportion of variance for the neuronal data using both naïve functional data analysis and the hierarchical Gaussian process model.

To obtain the fitted curves \hat{f}^i plotted in Fig. 1 we applied Bayesian adaptive regression splines with a Poisson model in (9). We also computed posterior variance matrices S^i , using the centres of the 30 time bins as our grid. We applied the hierarchical Gaussian process model in the form (6), using on V an inverse-Wishart prior with 31 degrees of freedom and a scale matrix equal to the harmonic mean of the matrices S^i , the inverse of the mean of the $(S^i)^{-1}$ matrices. This prior, using minimal integer degrees of freedom

$31 = p + 1$, seems a sensible default to us because, in the absence of other knowledge, we would want the prior to be very diffuse and we have no other starting point for the between-curve variability than the within-curve variability. Using Gibbs sampling we obtained the posterior distributions of the first eigenvalue of V and the corresponding first proportion of variance. These are displayed in Fig. 2 (b) and (c). In addition, we computed the sample covariance matrix from the fitted function values, i.e. the vectors Y^i in (6), and obtained its first eigenvalue and corresponding proportion of variance due to the first principal component. These two values, which represent a standard assessment of variability and which we have here called naïve functional data analysis, are displayed as vertical lines in Fig. 2 (b) and (c). The posterior distributions are shifted substantially downwards from the naïve method values that are obtained when the fitting variability is ignored. Multiplying and dividing the Wishart prior scale matrix by 2 produced small but nontrivial variations in the posterior on the first eigenvalue; however, these alternative priors produced negligible alterations of the posterior on the first proportion of variance. Based on the simulation study in §4 the hierarchical Gaussian process estimators portrayed in Fig. 2 (b) and (c) are highly likely to be much more accurate than their naïve functional data analysis counterparts.

An additional result from the simulation study in §4 was the superiority of the hierarchical Gaussian process model over the random-coefficient model. In Fig. 2 (a) we have displayed some of the results of fitting the random-coefficient model to these data. These fits use the same basis functions for all neurons. While most fitted curves are nearly the same as those obtained from fitting the curves individually, with different basis functions, several same-basis fits are a little too wiggly, especially that in the first row third column. This illustrates a general experience we have had in examining similar data: the assumption of same basis functions can lead to excessive numbers of knots and therefore to overfitting. This is apparently the cause of the much poorer simulation results for the random-coefficient model.

5.3 Alignment

We now illustrate the use of alignment within the hierarchical Gaussian process model using a subset of 16 neurons. These 16 neurons were classified as having similar firing-rate curves by a functional cluster analysis performed on the 347 neurons, described in more detail in the Ph.D. thesis of S. Behseta. While the similarity of the firing-rate curves for these 16 neurons indicates probable similarity of physiological function, their networked connections to muscles controlling arm movement are complex and it would be reasonable to expect the 16 neurons to have variable lags in firing activity with respect to the experimental clock time, with lags varying by perhaps tens of milliseconds. We therefore incorporated an alignment function of the form $h^i(t) = t - \theta^i$ in (7) and took θ^i , which is then a scalar, to be Normally distributed with mean and standard deviation γ and τ as in (8). We set $\gamma = 0$ and took the distribution on τ to be the square-root of an inverse-chi-squared centred at 20 milliseconds with standard deviation of 20 milliseconds, reflecting knowledge of the likely magnitude of shifts. Modest changes in the prior on τ did not appreciably alter the results. Figure 3 (a) shows the 16 original fitted intensity functions, while Fig. 3 (c) displays the resulting aligned versions.

Some special circumstances of the experiment offered a nice opportunity to examine effectiveness of alignment according to an external criterion. As part of the experiment electromyograms for various muscle groups were also recorded for the same task. After identifying the 16 neurons by clustering we found two muscles whose electromyogram recordings have a comparable time-dependent activity pattern. These two muscles are the Abductor Pollicis Longus, a finger muscle and the Extensor Carpi Radialis, a wrist muscle. We then re-fitted each shift parameter θ^i by maximising the correlation, over time, between the shifted Bayesian adaptive regression splines fit and the electromyogram; that is, we maximised the function

$$\rho(\theta^i) = \frac{\langle \hat{f}^i(t - \theta^i), g(t) \rangle}{\|\hat{f}^i(t - \theta^i)\| \cdot \|g(t)\|}$$

where g is the electromyogram signal and the numerator and denominator use the ordinary Euclidean inner product and norm, calculated from the discrete representation of the functions along a grid. The results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 3 (d) with the electromyogram signals in Fig. 3 (c). We observe that the functions aligned internally in Fig. 3 (c), are quite similar those aligned externally, in Fig. 3 (d). This lends support to the use of alignment in this context. Further details may be found in the Ph.D. thesis of S. Behseta.

As mentioned above, alignment is important because it is often desirable to separate the variability due to alignment from that due to variation in curve shape. For these 16 neurons we found that the proportion of variability due to the first principal component increased from 0.62 without alignment to 0.71 after alignment.

6 Discussion

The distinction between the random-coefficient and hierarchical Gaussian process models is important. The Normal random-coefficient model implies that the functions $f^i(t)$ are Gaussian processes conditionally on the knot set, while the hierarchical Gaussian process model takes them to be Gaussian processes marginally. The marginal Gaussian process assumption may seem more natural, in that conceptually the variability is between the curves rather than the somewhat artificially-invoked coefficients, but either approach may be reasonable and effective, and part of the purpose of this paper was to compare them. The random-coefficient model is likely to be most useful when the data are sparse, as, for example, in James et al. (2000). The hierarchical Gaussian process framework will be helpful when there is sufficiently much data per function that irregular variation may be estimated, but not so much that the estimation variability becomes negligible, relative to the variability across functions. To substantiate this point we performed additional simulations as in § 4, either decreasing or increasing μ so as to decrease or increase the signal

to noise ratio. When μ was decreased by a factor of 5 we found the hierarchical Gaussian process model no longer superior to the random-coefficient model: the mean squared error values for the proportion of variance were 0.055 (± 0.019) for random-coefficient model and 0.066 (± 0.016) for the hierarchical Gaussian process model, with 0.098 (± 0.010) for naïve functional data analysis. When μ was increased by a factor of 20 we found naïve functional data analysis to be adequate: the mean square error values for the proportion of variance were 0.0733 (± 0.0260) for random-coefficient model, 0.0694 (± 0.0277) for the hierarchical Gaussian process model, and 0.0815 (± 0.0299) for naïve functional data analysis.

It should be noted that, in general, effects of curve estimation on the magnitude and direction of bias in the proportion of variance associated with the first principal component can be subtle and will depend on the relationship of the within-curve variance matrices S^i matrices to the between-curve variance matrix V : it is possible to construct theoretical examples where the first eigenvalue is biased upward but the bias in the proportion of variance is negligible or downward. One explanation for the very large improvement seen here in HGP estimators compared to those of naïve method is that, in the neuronal setting we used, large estimation variability tends to occur in the peaks of the curves, which dominate the first principal component. Therefore, the within-curve estimation variability contributes quite substantially to the naïve functional data analysis estimate of the first eigenvalue, exaggerating the extent to which the first principal component summarizes the variability among the functions. We would expect this to be a fairly common situation, not limited to neurophysiology.

The procedure we have applied is easily implemented in two steps: first, the m separate data sets are smoothed, and then available software, such as BUGS, may be applied to fit the Normal hierarchical model (6). The general framework of models (4) – (7) allows several elaborations we have not implemented. First, as we noted, importance reweighting will in some cases improve the Normal approximation of (4) to the more ac-

curate hierarchical model that would result from (1). Second, more complicated alignment schemes could be used. Third, while we have been satisfied with the use of straightforward Bayesian estimation of V , including our choice of prior, in (6), it should be possible to devise improved procedures for choosing the grid t_1, \dots, t_p and then taking advantage of the special covariance structure induced by functions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is based in part on a portion of the first author's Ph.D. dissertation under the supervision of the second author, and was partially supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. The authors are grateful for helpful comments from the referees.

References

- Behseta, S., Matsuzaka, Y. Picard, N., Kass, R.E. & Strick, P.L. (2002). Muscle-like activity of M1 neurons during multi-joint movements. *Soc. Neurosci. Abstr.*, no. 61.13.
- Daniels, M.J. (2003). A class of shrinkage priors for the dependence structure in longitudinal data. (under review)
- Daniels, M.J. & Kass, R.E. (1998). A note on first-stage approximation in two-stage hierarchical models. *Sankhya B*, **60**, 19-30.
- Daniels, M.J. & Kass, R.E. (1999). Nonconjugate Bayesian estimation of covariance matrices and its use in hierarchical models. *J.Am.Statist.Assoc.* **94**, 1254-63.
- Daniels, M.J. & Kass, R.E. (2001). Shrinkage estimators for covariance matrices. *Biometrics* **57**, 1173-84.
- DiMatteo, I., Genovese, C.R. & Kass, R.E. (2001). Bayesian curve fitting with free-knot splines. *Biometrika* **88**, 1055-73.
- Green, P.J. (1995). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination. *Biometrika* **82**, 711-32.
- Hansen, M.H. & Kooperberg, C. (2002). Spline adaptation in extended linear models (with discussion). *Statist.Sci* **17**, 2-51.
- James, G. (2002). Generalized linear models with functional predictors. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, **64**, 411-32.
- James, G.M., Hastie, T.J. & Sugar, C.A. (2000). Principal component models for sparse functional data. *Biometrika* **87**, 587-602.
- Kass, R.E. & Raftery, A.E. (1995). Bayes factors. *J.Am.Statist.Assoc.* **90**, 773-95.
- Kass, R.E., Ventura, V., & Cai, C. (2003). Statistical smoothing of neuronal data. *NETWORK: Computation in Neural Systems* **14**, 5-15.
- Kass, R. & Wallstrom, G. (2002). Comment on 'Spline adaptation in extended linear models' by Mark H. Hansen and Charles Kooperberg. *Statist.Sci.* **17**, 24-9.

- Kass, R.E. & Wasserman, L.A. (1995). A reference Bayesian test for nested hypotheses and its relationship to the Schwarz criterion. *J.Am.Statist.Assoc.* **90**, 928-34.
- Ke, C. and Wang, Y. (2001). Semiparametric nonlinear mixed-effects models and their applications (with discussion). *J.Am.Statist.Assoc* **96**, 1272-98.
- Liu, J.S., Wong, W.H., & Kong, A. (1994) Covariance structure of the Gibbs sampler with applications to the comparisons of estimators and augmentation schemes. *Biometrika* **81**, 27-40.
- Matsuzaka, Y. Picard, N., & Strick, P.L. (2001). Sequence learning in monkeys. *Soc. Neurosci. Abstr.*, no. 24.174.
- Optican, L. & Richmond, B. (1987). Temporal encoding of two-dimensional patterns by single units in primate inferior temporal cortex. An information theoretic analysis. *J. Neurophysiol.*, **57**, 162-78.
- Pauler, D.K. (1998). The Schwarz criterion and related methods for normal linear models. *Biometrika*, **85**, 13-27.
- Ramsay, J.O. (2001). Comment on 'Semiparametric nonlinear mixed-effects models and their applications' by C. Ke and Y. Wang. *J.Am.Statist.Assoc.* **96**, 1283-84.
- Ramsay, J.O. & Li, X. (1998). Curve registration. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, **60**, 351-63.
- Ramsay, J.O. & Silverman, B.W. (1997). *Functional Data Analysis*. New York; Springer.
- Rice, J. & Wu, C. (2000). Nonparametric mixed effects models for unequally sampled noisy curves. *Biometrics* **57**, 253-59.
- Shi, M.S., Weiss, R.E., & Taylor, J.M.G. (1996). An analysis of paediatric CD4 counts for acquired immune deficiency syndrome using flexible random curves. *J.R.Stat.Soc. C*, **45**, 151-63.
- Spiegelhalter, D.J., Thomas, A., Best, N.G., & Gilks, W.R. (1996). BUGS: Bayesian inference Using Gibbs Sampling, Version 0.5. MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge.
- Ventura, V., Carta R., Kass R.E., Gettner S.N., & Olson, C.R. (2002). Statistical analysis of temporal evolution in single-neuron firing rates. *Biostatistics* **3**, 1-23.
- Wallstrom, G., Liebner, J., & Kass, R.E. (2004). An implementation of Bayesian adaptive regression splines (BARS) in C with S and R wrappers. *J. Statist. Software*.

Wang, K. & Gasser, T. (1997). Alignment of curves by dynamic time warping. *Ann.Statist.* **25**, 1251-76.

	Näive-FDA ¹	Random-Coefficient BARS ²	HGP ³
eigenvalue	2.98 (0.201)	1.335 (0.132)	0.284 (0.045)
proportion	0.060 (0.001)	0.018 (0.003)	0.0075 (0.001)

¹ FDA, functional data analysis

² BARS, Bayesian adaptive regression splines

³ HGP, hierarchical Gaussian process

Table 1: Simulation study. Mean squared error in estimating first eigenvalue and first proportion of variance across the 30 data replications, with simulation standard errors in parentheses.




Figure 1: Normalized histograms displaying observed firing rates for 30 neurons from an experiment described in §5, together with fitted firing-rate curves obtained from Bayesian adaptive regression splines (which is discussed in §3). Horizontal axes run from 200 milliseconds before the target hit to 100 milliseconds after; vertical axes from 0 to 100 events (neuronal spikes) per second.




Figure 2: (a): Nine sets of fitted curves using the hierarchical Gaussian process model (solid lines) and the random-coefficient model (dashed lines). The former appear in Figure 1, rows 4 to 6, and columns 2 to 4. (b): The posterior distribution of the first eigenvalue of V together with the naïve functional data analysis estimate (vertical bar). (c): The posterior distribution of the proportion of variance associated with the first principal component of V , together with the naïve method estimate of the same quantity (vertical bar). Horizontal axis runs from 0 to 100 per cent.




Figure 3: (a): Fits to firing-rate histograms from 16 neurons before alignment. (b): Electromyogram signals for the finger and wrist muscles. (c): Fits to the neuronal histograms after alignment using (8) in (7), as described in the text. (d): Fits to the neuronal histograms after alignment based on correlation with the electromyogram signals.