





www.3blue1brown.com

Categories, Curves & Splines

Linear models can do extra-linear things

Categories (dummy, indicator & index variables)

Polynomials and other simple curves

Splines and other additive structures

Drawing Inferences

How to use statistical models to get at scientific estimands?

Need to incorporate causal thinking into how we

(1) draw the statistical models
(2) process the results

Categories

How to cope with causes that are not continuous?

Categories: discrete, unordered types

Want to **stratify** by category:
Fit a separate line for each

```
> head(Howell1)
    height   weight age male
1 151.765 47.82561  63    1
2 139.700 36.48581  63    0
3 136.525 31.86484  65    0
4 156.845 53.04191  41    1
5 145.415 41.27687  51    0
6 163.830 62.99259  35    1
>
```



Think scientifically first

How are height, weight, and sex **causally** related?

How are height, weight, and sex **statistically** related?



The causes aren't in the data

$H \longrightarrow W$

$H \longleftarrow W$



The causes aren't in the data

$H \longrightarrow S$

$H \longleftarrow S$



$W \longrightarrow S$

$W \longleftarrow S$



height influences weight



weight is influenced by both height & sex

sex influences both height & weight



$$H = f_H(S)$$

$$W = f_W(H, S)$$

height



weight

sex

Think scientifically first

Different causal questions need different statistical models

Q: Causal effect of H on W?

Q: Causal effect of S on W?

Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Think scientifically first

Different causal questions need different statistical models

Q: Causal effect of H on W?

Q: Causal effect of S on W?

Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Think scientifically first

Different causal questions need different statistical models

Q: Causal effect of H on W?

Q: Causal effect of S on W?

Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Think scientifically first

Different causal questions need different statistical models

Q: Causal effect of H on W?

Q: Causal effect of S on W?

Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



From estimand to estimate

Q: Causal effect of S on W?



Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Need to model S as categorical

Drawing Categorical Owls

Several ways to code categorical variables

(1) “dummy” and indicator (0/1) variables

(2) index variables: 1,2,3,4,…

We will use index variables:

- Extend to many categories with no change in code
- Better for specifying priors
- Extend effortlessly to multi-level models

Drawing Categorical Owls

Example:

Category	Cyan	Magenta	Yellow	Black
Index Value	1	2	3	4

Influence of color coded by:

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4]$$

Drawing Categorical Owls

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4]$$

$$y_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{\text{COLOR}[i]}$$

Using Index Variables

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha$$

intercept

Using Index Variables

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]}$$

sex of i-th person

S = 1 indicates female
S = 2 indicates male

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$$

Two intercepts, one for each value in S

Using Index Variables

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

i = 1

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]}$$

S[1]=2

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$$

Using Index Variables

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

i = 2

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]}$$

S[2]=1

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$$

Using Index Variables

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]}$$

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$$

Priors

$$\alpha_j \sim \text{Normal}(60, 10)$$

Using Index Variables

```
data(Howell1)
d <- Howell1
d <- d[ d$age>=18 , ]
dat <- list(
    W = d$weight,
    S = d$male + 1 ) # S=1 female, S=2 male

m_SW <- quap(
    alist(
        W ~ dnorm(mu,sigma),
        mu <- a[S],
        a[S] ~ dnorm(60,10),
        sigma ~ dunif(0,10)
    ), data=dat )
```

quap() does the indexing for you

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]}$$

$$\alpha_j \sim \text{Normal}(60, 10)$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 10)$$

Posterior means & predictions

```
# posterior mean W
post <- extract.samples(m_SW)
dens( post$a[,1] , xlim=c(39,50) , lwd=3 ,
col=2 , xlab="posterior mean weight (kg)" )
dens( post$a[,2] , lwd=3 , col=4 , add=TRUE )
```



Posterior means & predictions

```
# posterior mean W
post <- extract.samples(m_SW)
dens( post$a[,1] , xlim=c(39,50) , lwd=3 ,
col=2 , xlab="posterior mean weight (kg)" )
dens( post$a[,2] , lwd=3 , col=4 , add=TRUE )

# posterior W distributions
W1 <- rnorm( 1000 , post$a[,1] , post$sigma )
W2 <- rnorm( 1000 , post$a[,2] , post$sigma )
dens( W1 , xlim=c(20,70) , ylim=c(0,0.085) ,
lwd=3 , col=2 )
dens( W2 , lwd=3 , col=4 , add=TRUE )
```





Always Be Contrasting

Need to compute **contrast**, the difference between the categories

It is **never** legitimate to compare **overlap** in parameters

Must compute **contrast distribution**



It is **never** legitimate to compare **overlap** in parameters or lines



It is **never** legitimate to compare **overlap** in parameters or lines





This means no comparing **confidence intervals** or **p-values** either!

Causal contrast

```
> str(post)
List of 2
 $ sigma: num [1:10000] 5.38 5.54 5.45 5.72 5.28 ...
 $ a    : num [1:10000, 1:2] 42.8 41.5 41 41.9 42 ...
```

```
# causal contrast (in means)
mu_contrast <- post$a[,2] - post$a[,1]

dens( mu_contrast , xlim=c(3,10) , lwd=3 ,
col=1 , xlab="posterior mean weight contrast
(kg)" )
```





Weight contrast

```
# posterior W distributions
W1 <- rnorm( 1000 , post$a[,1] , post$sigma )
W2 <- rnorm( 1000 , post$a[,2] , post$sigma )

# contrast
W_contrast <- W2 - W1
dens( W_contrast , xlim=c(-25,35) , lwd=3 ,
col=1 , xlab="posterior weight contrast (kg)" )


# proportion above zero
sum( W_contrast > 0 ) / 1000
# proportion below zero
sum( W_contrast < 0 ) / 1000
```





From estimand to estimate

Q: Causal effect of S on W?



Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Index Variables & Lines

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta(H_i - \bar{H})$$

intercept *slope*

Index Variables & Lines

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]} + \beta_{S[i]}(H_i - \bar{H})$$

sex of i-th person

S = 1 indicates female
S = 2 indicates male

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \qquad \beta = [\beta_1, \beta_2]$$

Two intercepts and two slopes, one for each value in S

Index Variables & Lines

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

i = 1

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]} + \beta_{S[i]}(H_i - \bar{H})$$

S[1]=2

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \qquad \beta = [\beta_1, \beta_2]$$

Index Variables & Lines

	H	W	S
1	152	48	2
2	140	36	1
3	137	32	1
4	157	53	2
5	145	41	1
6	164	63	2
7	149	38	1
8	169	55	2
9	148	35	1
10	165	54	2
11	154	50	1
12	151	41	2

i = 2

$$W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{S[i]} + \beta_{S[i]}(H_i - \bar{H})$$

S[2]=1

$$\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \qquad \beta = [\beta_1, \beta_2]$$

Index Variables & Lines

```
data(Howell1)
d <- Howell1
d <- d[ d$age>=18 , ]
dat <- list(
    W = d$weight,
    H = d$height,
    Hbar = mean(d$height),
    S = d$male + 1 ) # S=1 female, S=2 male

m_SHW <- quap(
    alist(
        W ~ dnorm(mu,sigma),
        mu <- a[S] + b[S]*(H-Hbar),
        a[S] ~ dnorm(60,10),
        b[S] ~ dlnorm(0,1),
        sigma ~ dunif(0,10)
    ), data=dat )
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_i &\sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma) \\
\mu_i &= \alpha_{S[i]} + \beta_{S[i]}(H_i - \bar{H}) \\
\alpha_j &\sim \text{Normal}(60, 10) \\
\beta_j &\sim \text{LogNormal}(0, 1) \\
\sigma &\sim \text{Uniform}(0, 10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Contrasts at each height

(1) Compute posterior predictive for women

(2) Compute posterior predictive for men

(3) Subtract (2) from (1)

(4) Plot distribution at each height (on right)



Contrasts at each height

```
xseq <- seq(from=130,to=190,len=50)

muF <-
link(m_adults2,data=list(S=rep(1,50),H=xseq,Hbar=mean(d$height)))
lines( xseq , apply(muF,2,mean) , lwd=3 , col=2 )

muM <-
link(m_adults2,data=list(S=rep(2,50),H=xseq,Hbar=mean(d$height)))
lines( xseq , apply(muM,2,mean) , lwd=3 , col=4 )

mu_contrast <- muF - muM
plot( NULL , xlim=range(xseq) , ylim=c(-6,8) , xlab="height (cm)"
, ylab="weight contrast (F-M)" )
for ( p in c(0.5,0.6,0.7,0.8,0.9,0.99) )
    shade( apply(mu_contrast,2,PI,prob=p) , xseq )
abline(h=0,lty=2)
```



Nearly all of the causal effect of S acts through H

From estimand to estimate

Q: Causal effect of S on W?



Q: Direct causal effect of S on W?



Full Luxury Bayes

We used two models for two estimands

But alternative and equivalent approach is to use one model of entire causal system

Then use joint posterior to compute each estimand



Full Luxury Bayes

```
m_SHW_full <- quap(
    alist(

        # weight
        W ~ dnorm(mu,sigma),
        mu <- a[S] + b[S]*(H-Hbar),
        a[S] ~ dnorm(60,10),
        b[S] ~ dlnorm(0,1),
        sigma ~ dunif(0,10),

        # height
        H ~ dnorm(nu,tau),
        nu <- h[S],
        h[S] ~ dnorm(160,10),
        tau ~ dunif(0,10)

    ), data=dat )
```



Full Luxury Bayes

```
m_SHW_full <- quap(
    alist(

        # weight
        W ~ dnorm(mu,sigma),
        mu <- a[S] + b[S]*(H-Hbar),
        a[S] ~ dnorm(60,10),
        b[S] ~ dlnorm(0,1),
        sigma ~ dunif(0,10),

        # height
        H ~ dnorm(nu,tau),
        nu <- h[S],
        h[S] ~ dnorm(160,10),
        tau ~ dunif(0,10)

    ), data=dat )
```





Full Luxury Bayes

```
m_SHW_full <- quap(
    alist(

        # weight
        W ~ dnorm(mu,sigma),
        mu <- a[S] + b[S]*(H-Hbar),
        a[S] ~ dnorm(60,10),
        b[S] ~ dlnorm(0,1),
        sigma ~ dunif(0,10),

        # height
        H ~ dnorm(nu,tau),
        nu <- h[S],
        h[S] ~ dnorm(160,10),
        tau ~ dunif(0,10)

    ), data=dat )
```

```
> precis(m_SHW_full,depth=2)
          mean   sd   5.5%  94.5%
a[1]     45.17 0.44  44.47  45.87
a[2]     45.09 0.46  44.37  45.82
h[1]    149.53 0.40 148.89 150.18
h[2]    160.36 0.43 159.67 161.04
b[1]      0.66 0.06   0.56   0.75
b[2]      0.61 0.05   0.52   0.70
sigma     4.23 0.16   3.97   4.48
tau       5.52 0.21   5.19   5.85
>
```

Causal effect is consequence of intervention

Now simulate each intervention

Simulating Interventions

```
post <- extract.samples(m_SHW_full)
Hbar <- dat$Hbar
n <- 1e4

with( post , {
# simulate W for S=1
H_S1 <- rnorm(n, h[,1] , tau )
W_S1 <- rnorm(n, a[,1] +
  b[,1]*(H_S1-Hbar) , sigma)

# simulate W for S=2
H_S2 <- rnorm(n, h[,2] , tau)
W_S2 <- rnorm(n, a[,2] +
  b[,2]*(H_S2-Hbar) , sigma)

# compute contrast
W_do_S <<- W_S2 - W_S1
})
```

Total causal effect of S on W:
Consequence of changing S at birth

"$p(W|\text{do}(S))$"



Simulating Interventions

```
post <- extract.samples(m_SHW_full)
Hbar <- dat$Hbar
n <- 1e4

with( post , {
# simulate W for S=1
H_S1 <- rnorm(n, h[,1] , tau )
W_S1 <- rnorm(n, a[,1] +
  b[,1]*(H_S1-Hbar) , sigma)

# simulate W for S=2
H_S2 <- rnorm(n, h[,2] , tau)
W_S2 <- rnorm(n, a[,2] +
  b[,2]*(H_S2-Hbar) , sigma)

# compute contrast
W_do_S <<- W_S2 - W_S1
})
```

```
# automated way
HWsim <- sim(m_SHW_full,
             data=list(S=c(1,2)),
             vars=c("H","W"))
W_do_S_auto <- HWsim$W[,2] - HWsim$W[,1]
```

"$p(W|\text{do}(S))$"





Inference With Linear Models

With more than two variables, scientific (causal) model and statistical model not always same

(1) State each estimand
(2) Design **unique statistical model** for each
(3) **Compute** each estimand

ONE STAT MODEL FOR EACH ESTIMAND

Or

(1) State each estimand
(2) Compute joint posterior for **causal system**
(3) **Simulate** each estimand as an **intervention**

ONE SIMULATION FOR EACH ESTIMAND

Categorical variables

Easy to use with index coding

Must later use samples to compute relevant contrasts

Always summarize (mean, interval) as the last step

Want **mean difference** and not **difference of means**



PAUSE

Curves from lines

```
library(rethinking)
data(Howell1)
```

H –> *W* obviously not linear

Linear models can easily fit curves

But this is not **mechanistic**



Curves from lines

```
library(rethinking)
data(Howell1)
```

Linear models can easily fit curves

Two popular strategies

(1) polynomials — be wary

(2) splines and generalized additive models — better



Polynomial linear models

Strategy: polynomial functions

Problems: strange symmetries, explosive uncertainty at edges

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 x_i^2$$




n = 0
b2
b1
-2
-1
0
1
2
y = a + b1*x + b2*x^2
y value
x value
-6
-4
-2
0
2
4

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_1 H_i + \beta_2 H_i^2$$



$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_1 H_i + \beta_2 H_i^2 + b_3 H^3 + b_4 H^4$$



Thinking vs Fitting

Linear models can fit anything (Geocentrism)

Better to think

$$\log W_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma)$$
$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta(H_i - \bar{H})$$

Will revisit in lecture 19



Splines

Basis-Splines: Wiggly function built from many local functions

Basis function: A local function

Local functions make splines better than polynomials, but equally geocentric




TRANSOM SHAPE


Prior, a ~ N(0,10)
doy first bloom
90
100
110
120
1000
1200
1400
1600
1800
2000
year


Prior, a ~ N(0,10)
doy first bloom
90
100
110
120
Posterior
doy first bloom
90
100
110
120
1000
1200
1400
1600
1800
2000
year

Going Local — B-Splines

B-Splines are just linear models, but with some weird synthetic variables:

$$\mu_i = \alpha + w_1 B_{i,1} + w_2 B_{i,2} + w_3 B_{i,3} + \ldots$$

Weights w are like slopes

Basis functions B are synthetic variables

B values turn on weights in different regions

Detailed example starting on page 114



$$w = [1, -1, 1, -1]$$


weighted basis function
1.0
0.5
0.0
-0.5
-1.0
Basis1
Basis3
Basis2
Basis4
Spline

$$w = [-1, -1, 1, -1]$$



$$w = [-1, 1, 1, -1]$$



$$w = [-1, 1, -1, -1]$$



Height as a function of age

Obviously not linear

Fit spline as example

But biological model would do a lot better




10 individuals
height (cm)
60
80
100
140
180
0
20
40
60
80
age (years)


10 individuals
Spline
Weighted basis functions
height (cm)
60
80
100
140
180
0
20
40
60
80
age (years)

Curves and Splines

Can build very non-linear functions from linear pieces

Polynomials and splines are powerful geocentric devices

Adding scientific information always helps

e.g. Weight only increases with height
e.g. Height only increases with age, then levels off (or declines)

Ideally **statistical** model has some form as **scientific** model


height (cm)
60
80
100
140
180
0
20
40
60
80
age (years)


infancy
childhood
puberty
adulthood
height (cm)
60
80
100
140
180
0
20
40
60
80
age (years)

Course Schedule

Week 1	Bayesian inference	Chapters 1, 2, 3
Week 2	Linear models & Causal Inference	Chapter 4
Week 3	Causes, Confounds & Colliders	Chapters 5 & 6
Week 4	Overfitting / Interactions	Chapters 7 & 8
Week 5	MCMC & Generalized Linear Models	Chapters 9, 10, 11
Week 6	Integers & Other Monsters	Chapters 11 & 12
Week 7	Multilevel models I	Chapter 13
Week 8	Multilevel models II	Chapter 14
Week 9	Measurement & Missingness	Chapter 15
Week 10	Generalized Linear Madness	Chapter 16

`https://github.com/rmcelreath/statrethinking_2022`