

Bayesian Variable Selection for Function-on-Scalar Regression Models: a comparative analysis

Supplementary Material

Pedro Henrique T. O. Sousa^{1*}, Camila P. E. de Souza², Ronaldo Dias¹

¹Department of Statistics, Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, PR, Brazil

²Department of Statistical and Actuarial Sciences, University of Western Ontario, ON, Canada

³Department of Statistics, University of Campinas, Campinas, SP, Brazil

*Correspondence: pedro.henrique3@ufpr.br

1 Linear coefficient transformations

Regarding the estimates of the coefficients and functional intercept, it is important to recall that a standardization of the covariates was carried out in a phase prior to applying the proposed model. Thus, for all i , we have the following:

$$Z_l \beta_l(\cdot) X_{li} = Z_l \beta_l(\cdot) s_l \frac{(X_{li} - \bar{X}_l)}{s_l} + Z_l \beta_l(\cdot) \bar{X}_l,$$

in which \bar{X}_l and s_l represent the mean and standard deviation of the l th covariate, respectively. Therefore, after standardization, the l th partial functional coefficient is, in fact, the quantity $s_l \beta_l(\cdot)$, instead of only $\beta_l(\cdot)$. Note that the quantity $Z_l \beta_l(\cdot) \bar{X}_l$ is not linked to X_{li} by multiplication and, therefore, is only aggregated to the intercept.

In other words, we have a linear transformation of the original partial functional coefficient. Thus, there is:

$$\tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot) = s_l \hat{\beta}_l(\cdot),$$

in which $\tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot)$ is the estimate of the l th partial functional coefficient obtained by fitting the model when using standardized covariates, while $\hat{\beta}_l(\cdot)$ is the estimate of the original l th partial functional coefficient, meaning the one returned by fitting the model without standardized covariates.

Bearing in mind the way in which the data were generated, the interest here is to know the value of $\hat{\beta}_l(\cdot)$, so that it is possible to compare it with $\beta_l(\cdot)$ used in the generation of synthetic data. So, it is necessary to obtain $\hat{\beta}_l(\cdot)$ from:

$$\hat{\beta}_l(\cdot) = \frac{1}{s_l} \tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot).$$

Similarly, the simple functional mean of the functional responses is an estimate for the intercept when using the standardized covariates, and this is also a linear transformation of what the intercept estimate would be if the covariates were considered without

standardization. Then, we have the following expression for the intercept:

$$\hat{\beta}_0(\cdot) = \tilde{\beta}_0(\cdot) - \sum_{l=1}^p \hat{Z}_l \left(\frac{1}{s_l} \tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot) \right) \bar{X}_l, \quad (1)$$

in which $\tilde{\beta}_0(\cdot)$ is the simple functional mean of the functional responses, while $\hat{\beta}_0(\cdot)$ is the estimate of the true functional intercept ($\beta_0(t) = \exp(t^2)$, in the Manuscript Section 3.1). Therefore, in Expression 1, it is noticed that only the covariates that were selected by the model are contemplated.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that $\hat{\beta}_0(\cdot)$ is calculated according to the Expression (1) and carries the estimation errors of the simple functional mean and the coefficients $\tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot)$'s. This accumulation of errors does not interfere with the final prediction values for the functional response, since

$$\hat{y}_i(\cdot) = \hat{\beta}_0(\cdot) + \sum_{l=1}^p \hat{Z}_l \hat{\beta}_l(\cdot) X_{li} = \tilde{\beta}_0(\cdot) + \sum_{l=1}^p \hat{Z}_l \tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot) X S_{li}, \quad (2)$$


in which $X S_{li}$ represents the l th covariate standardized by mean and standard deviation for the i th individual. Therefore, the quantities $\hat{\beta}_0(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\beta}_l(\cdot)$'s are used in this paper only for graphical comparison with the actual parameters, while the quantities $\tilde{\beta}_0(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\beta}_l(\cdot)$'s can be used directly for the computation of functional predictions.

2 Supplementary tables


Table 1: MSEs of the proposed Bayesian approach with μ as a hyperparameter and as a parameter, according to the different configurations of K B-spline basis functions, two dataset lengths ($m \in \{10, 15\}$) and two noise variances, $\sigma^2 = (0.2)^2$ and $\sigma^2 = (20)^2$.

σ	m	K	μ (Hyperparameter)									μ (Parameter)	
			0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9		
0.2	5	5	0.90531	0.90336	0.88969	0.88341	0.91821	0.91849	0.89837	0.89995	0.91710	0.88802	
		10	0.08700	0.15229	0.19107	0.14702	0.13304	0.15841	0.10374	0.12840	0.09280	0.21730	
		15	0.46405	0.32608	0.39309	0.74008	0.45050	0.41925	0.43491	0.52743	0.55020	0.64612	
	10	5	0.91527	0.91841	0.91653	0.91829	0.91293	0.92054	0.92025	0.92007	0.91930	0.92293	
		15	0.02716	0.03917	0.02872	0.02942	0.01801	0.02089	0.02890	0.02723	0.01994	0.02456	
		15	0.09215	0.07390	0.16706	0.12765	0.10490	0.06630	0.16293	0.07826	0.05692	0.06983	
	20	5	5	36.26610	36.16406	34.79331	35.99577	32.02700	30.50700	33.82998	39.78591	38.77678	36.08834
			10	48.26145	39.24513	43.34065	46.52245	44.98702	48.97598	54.27919	43.12962	48.73781	42.22430
			15	75.35545	70.10816	66.12114	76.12941	85.12853	67.12481	64.62520	73.46087	60.47929	61.64159
		15	5	18.34214	17.21293	17.09297	34.03930	32.26425	30.61627	28.33563	31.57612	36.45118	19.08434
			10	28.82329	29.70966	34.56420	31.83856	32.22336	29.52405	31.30894	31.57785	46.33399	28.78035
			15	45.94990	45.65931	43.40093	49.07942	45.36731	40.10978	47.95165	45.63433	45.05256	45.74638

3 Supplementary figures



(a) Data with $\sigma = 0.2$.



(b) Data with $\sigma = 20$.

Figure 1: Boxplots of the MSEs for the various model configurations tested when μ is a hyperparameter, according to the data dispersion degree.




Figure 2: Boxplots of the metric (6) (presented in the article) for the model configuration with μ as a parameter, according to the data dispersion degree.




Figure 3: Boxplots of the MSEs for the model configuration with μ as a parameter, according to the data dispersion degree.




Figure 4: Intercept and partial functional coefficients (3rd and 5th, true in red and estimated for the replications in which the coefficients were selected in black) from the model that considers μ as a parameter, according to the data dispersion degree (top row $\sigma = 0.2$, bottom row $\sigma = 20$).






Figure 5: Estimated partial functional coefficients (1st, 2nd, 4th and 6th), from the model that considers μ as a parameter, according to the data dispersion degree (for the replications whose coefficients were excluded among the total of 100 replications).




(a) Data with $\sigma = 0.2$.




(b) Data with $\sigma = 20$.

Figure 6: Boxplots of the MSEs, according to the model used and the data dispersion degree. The “1st Proposed Model” is considered to be the version with $\lambda = \sqrt{2}$ and μ as a parameter, while the “2nd Proposed Model” is the version with $\lambda = \sqrt{2}$ and μ as a hyperparameter ($\mu = 0.3$ para $\sigma = 0.2$ e $\mu = 0.1$ para $\sigma = 20$).



(a) Data with $\sigma = 0.2$.



(b) Data with $\sigma = 20$.

Figure 7: Boxplots of the MSEs, according to the model used and the data dispersion degree. The “1st Proposed Model” is considered to be the version with $\lambda = \sqrt{2}$ and μ as a parameter, while the “2nd Proposed Model” is the version with $\lambda = \sqrt{2}$ and μ as a hyperparameter ($\mu = 0.3$ para $\sigma = 0.2$ e $\mu = 0.1$ para $\sigma = 20$).




Figure 8: Estimated curves of the partial functional coefficients associated with the covariates that were excluded by the proposed model with $K = 5$ ($\beta_2(\cdot)$ for the HDI and $\beta_7(\cdot)$ for the number of hospital beds per 10000 inhabitants).