$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Eventually an introduction to the} \\ \mbox{aghq R package} \end{array}$

Statistics and Epidemiology Group Meeting

Adam Howes

Imperial College London

July 2021

Motivation I

• People on ART A_i can be used as supplementary data for small-area estimation of HIV prevalence ρ_i

$$egin{aligned} &\mathcal{A}_i \sim \mathsf{Bin}(N_i,
ho_i lpha_i), \ &y_i \sim \mathsf{Bin}(m_i,
ho_i), \ &\log (lpha_i) \sim f(artheta_lpha), \ &\log (
ho_i) \sim g(artheta_
ho), \quad &i=1,\ldots,n, \end{aligned}$$

- If f and g are Gaussian then model is almost, but not quite, a latent Gaussian model by the definition of Rue, Martino, and Chopin (2009)
 - This is due to small non-linearities (multiplying two latent Gaussian fields)
 - Each observation depends on more than one element of the latent field

Motivation II

- Previous slide is a simplified version of the Naomi evidence synthesis model
- Countries to fit the model using their own data ("in production"?)
 - Can't run long MCMC on the cluster for weeks, as might be the case if this was one paper
- Can't use R-INLA, require something more flexible
- Currently using Template Model Builder TMB (Kristensen et al. 2015)



Figure 1: A supermodel

Aside: common theme I

- Combining flawed (sparse, aggregated) gold standard (measuring the thing we want) data with other correlated (more available, high resolution) data (measuring not exactly what we want)
- Consistently resulting in models with multiple outcomes (evidence synthesis, multi-output)
- I think a lot of these are going to be not quite LGMs

Aside: common theme II

- Examples include
 - Naomi model: DHS data is "gold standard", supported by ANC data from pregnant women
 - Sexual risk behaviour model: estimates of FSW population at national level, supported by DHS data
 - The national-level FSW estimates might be more like "bronze standard"
 - DHS approximately asks "have you received money or gifts in exchange for sex in past 12 months"
 - Loa loa prevalence and eyeworm history prevalence model: measuring eyeworm history is a cheap proxy for Loa loa (Amoah, Diggle, and Giorgi 2020)

Recap on latent Gaussian models

• Three-stage model

 $\begin{array}{ll} (\text{Observations}) & \mathbf{y} \sim p(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{x}), \\ (\text{Latent field}) & \mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{x} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \\ (\text{Hyperparameters}) & \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{array}$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)$

- Interested in learning both (θ, \mathbf{x}) from data \mathbf{y}
- Covers most of the models used in spatiotemporal statistics

Recap on Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation I

- Rue, Martino, and Chopin (2009) or e.g. Blangiardo and Cameletti (2015)
- Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models (LGMs), which are three-stage models with middle layer

(Latent field)
$$p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}).$$

• R-INLA implementation takes advantage of sparsity properties of $Q(\theta)$, i.e. if x is a Gaussian Markov random field (GMRF)

Recap on Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation II

- Gives approximate posterior marginals $\{\tilde{p}(x_i | \mathbf{y})\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\tilde{p}(\theta_j | \mathbf{y})\}_{j=1}^m$
- To approximate posterior marginals below requires $\tilde{p}(\theta | \mathbf{y})$ and $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}_i | \theta, \mathbf{y})$

$$p(x_i | \mathbf{y}) = \int p(x_i, \theta | \mathbf{y}) d\theta = \int p(x_i | \theta, \mathbf{y}) p(\theta | \mathbf{y}) d\theta, \quad i = 1, ..., n, (1)$$

$$p(\theta_j | \mathbf{y}) = \int p(\theta | \mathbf{y}) d\theta_{-j} \quad j = 1, ..., m.$$
(2)

Recap on Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation III

1) First Laplace approximate hyperparameter posterior

$$\tilde{p}(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}) \propto \left. \frac{p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \theta)}{\tilde{p}_G(\mathbf{x} \mid \theta, \mathbf{y})} \right|_{\mathbf{x} = \mu^{\star}(\theta)}$$
 (3)

which can be marginalised to get $\tilde{p}(\theta_j | \mathbf{y})$

- 2) In both (1) and (2) we want to integrate w.r.t. (3), so choose integration points and weights $\{\theta^{(k)}, \Delta^{(k)}\}$
- For low m INLA uses a grid-strategy which I illustrate in the next slide
- For larger *m* this becomes too expensive and a CCD design is used



Figure 2. An illustration of the INLA grid method for selecting integration points using a toy

10

Recap on Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation IV

- 3) Choose approximation for $\tilde{p}(x_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y})$
- Simplest version (Rue and Martino 2007) is to marginalise the $p_G(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y})$

$$\tilde{p}(x_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_i^{\star}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), 1/q_i^{\star}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$$
(4)

- The above is referred to as "Gaussian" approximation, and confusingly there are two more complex ones called "simplified Laplace" and "Laplace"
- You can pick which one in R-INLA using the method option
- 4) Finally use quadrature to get

$$\tilde{p}(x_i | \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \tilde{p}(x_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}) \times \tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} | \mathbf{y}) \times \Delta^{(k)}$$
(5)

Template Model Builder I

- R package which implements the Laplace approximation for latent variable models using AD (via CppAD)
 - For more about AD see e.g. Griewank and Walther (2008)
 - Useful for getting the mode, Hessian
- Write an objective function $f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ in C++ ("user template")
 - We select $f(\mathbf{x}, \theta) = -\log p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \theta) p(\mathbf{x} | \theta) p(\theta)$

Template Model Builder II

```
#include <TMB.hpp>
```

```
template <class Type>
Type objective_function<Type>::operator()() {
 // Define data e.g.
 DATA_VECTOR(v):
 // Define parameters e.g.
 PARAMETER(mu):
 // Calculate negative log-likelihood e.g.
 nll = Type(0.0);
 nll -= dnorm(y, mu, 1, true).sum()
 return(nll);
}
```

Template Model Builder III

- Performs the Laplace approximation $L_f(\theta) \approx L_f^*(\theta)$ and use R to optimise this with respect to θ to give $\hat{\theta}$ (the central point in Figure 2)
 - This is done by specifying the random argument to be the parameters that you want to integrate out with a Laplace approximation (the latent field)
- MAP estimate of **x** conditional on $\hat{ heta}$
- Standard errors calculated using the δ -method (a Gaussian assumption)

Adaptive Gaussian Hermite Quadrature

- Recent work by Alex Stringer and coauthors on AGHQ
 - aghq R package and vignette (Stringer 2021)
 - Theory paper (Bilodeau, Stringer, and Tang 2021)
- Gauss-Hermite quadrature is a way of picking nodes and weights, and is based on the theory of polynomial interpolation
- The adaptive part means that it uses the location (mode) and curvature (Hessian) of the target (posterior)
- Use *k* quadrature points
 - If *k* is odd then they include the mode
 - If k = 1 then it's a Laplace approximation
 - In the vignette k = 3 (for each dimension, so 3^m total) is chosen quite often

Epil example I

- Epilepsy example from Section 5.2. of Rue, Martino, and Chopin (2009) (previously from BUGS):
 - Patients *i* = 1,..., 59 each either assigned treatment $\operatorname{Trt}_i = 1$ or placebo $\operatorname{Trt}_i = 0$ to help with seizures
 - Visits to clinics j = 1, ..., 4 times with y_{ij} the number of seizures of the *i*th person in the two weeks proceeding their *j*th visit to the clinic
 - Covariates age Age_i, baseline seizure counts Base_i and an indicator for the final clinic visit V₄

Epil example II

This is what the model looks like (it's a Poisson GLMM):

```
y_{ii} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{ii}),
\lambda_{ii} = e^{\eta_{ij}}
\eta_{ii} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{Base}} \log(\text{Baseline}_i/4) + \beta_{\text{Trt}} \operatorname{Trt}_i + \beta_{\text{Trt} \times \text{Base}} \operatorname{Trt}_i \times \log(\text{Baseline}_i/4)
      + \beta_{Age} \log(Age_i) + \beta_{V_4} V_{4i} + \epsilon_i + \nu_{ii}, \quad i = 1:59, \quad j = 1:4,
  \beta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 100^2), \quad \forall \beta.
 \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\tau_\epsilon),
\nu_{ii} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\tau_{\nu}),
 \tau_{e} \sim \Gamma(0.001, 0.001),
\tau_{\nu} \sim \Gamma(0.001, 0.001).
```

Epil example III

- aghq package interfaces really easily with TMB!
- $\bullet\,$ This is the code I used to fit the model with ${\tt TMB}$

```
obj <- MakeADFun(
  data = dat,
  parameters = param,
  # These are the ones integrated out with a Laplace approximation
  random = c("epsilon", "nu"),
  DLL = "epil"
)</pre>
```

Epil example IV

• Then to fit it with aghq it's only a very small modification

```
fit <- aghq::marginal_laplace_tmb(
    obj,
    k = 3,
    startingvalue = c(param$beta, param$l_tau_epsilon, param$l_tau_nu)
)</pre>
```

	Stan	INLA_G	INLA_SL	INLA_L	ТМВ	glmmTMB	tmbstan	aghq
beta_0	1.572	1.626	1.573	1.573	1.579	1.579	1.571	1.573
sd(beta_0)	0.076	0.077	0.078	0.078	0.073	0.073	0.081	0.076
beta_1	-0.968	-0.927	-0.954	-0.956	-0.949	-0.949	-0.961	-0.955
sd(beta_1)	0.420	0.419	0.419	0.419	0.396	0.396	0.426	0.411
beta_2	0.879	0.859	0.880	0.881	0.880	0.880	0.875	0.881
sd(beta_2)	0.136	0.138	0.138	0.138	0.129	0.129	0.135	0.135
beta_3	-0.103	-0.101	-0.103	-0.104	-0.103	-0.103	-0.105	-0.103
sd(beta_3)	0.087	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.086
beta_4	0.488	0.471	0.484	0.485	0.490	0.490	0.489	0.486
sd(beta_4)	0.352	0.364	0.364	0.364	0.342	0.342	0.375	0.357
beta_5	0.356	0.340	0.350	0.351	0.349	0.349	0.360	0.351
sd(beta_5)	0.212	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.200	0.200	0.215	0.209

Plan

- Test aghq for toy Naomi example
 - Do as above with the Epil example, testing versus a long MCMC run
 - Sometimes you have to look pretty hard for a node (element of the latent field) where there are differences. In the INLA paper they do this by computing a SKLD and ordering by maximum difference. Probably good to do here as well
- Extend aghq to replicate INLA functionality by adding the more complex versions of $\tilde{p}(x_i | \theta, \mathbf{y})$ then test that wih Naomi
 - Håvard Rue philosophy: "do one thing and do it well"
 - R-INLA implementation of INLA based on sparsity of $m{Q}(m{ heta})$ that doesn't hold up for extended LGMs
 - Wood (2020) on how to still do it
- Try the INLA without R-INLA on other almost LGMs and see how far it can be pushed

References I

Amoah, Benjamin, Peter J Diggle, and Emanuele Giorgi. 2020. "A Geostatistical Framework for Combining Spatially Referenced Disease Prevalence Data from Multiple Diagnostics." *Biometrics* 76 (1): 158–70. Bilodeau. Blair. Alex Stringer, and Yanbo Tang. 2021. "Stochastic Convergence Rates and Applications of Adaptive Quadrature in Bayesian Inference." https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.06801. Blangiardo. Marta. and Michela Cameletti. 2015. Spatial and spatio-temporal Bavesian models with R-INLA. John Wiley & Sons. Griewank, Andreas, and Andrea Walther. 2008. Evaluating derivatives: principles and techniques of algorithmic differentiation. Vol. 105. Siam. Kristensen, Kasper, Anders Nielsen, Casper W Berg, Hans Skaug, and Brad Bell. 2015. "TMB: automatic differentiation and Laplace approximation." arXiv Preprint arXiv:1509.00660.

References II

- Rue, Håvard, and Sara Martino. 2007. "Approximate Bayesian inference for hierarchical Gaussian Markov random field models." *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 137 (10): 3177–92.
- Rue, Håvard, Sara Martino, and Nicolas Chopin. 2009. "Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series b (Statistical Methodology)* 71 (2): 319–92.
- Stringer, Alex. 2021. "Implementing Approximate Bayesian Inference Using Adaptive Quadrature: The Aghq Package."

https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.04468.

Wood, Simon N. 2020. "Simplified Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation." *Biometrika* 107 (1): 223–30.