

# Likelihood inference in complex models

Nancy Reid

December 6, 2009

with Cristiano Varin and David Firth  
Ca' Foscari University, Venice and University of Warwick



## The setup

- ▶ **Data:**  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$      $x_1, \dots, x_n$      $i = 1, \dots, n$
- ▶ **Model** for the probability distribution of  $y_i$  given  $x_i$
- ▶ **Density** (with respect to, e.g., Lebesgue measure)
- ▶  $f(y_i | x_i)$      $f(y | x) > 0, \int f(y | x) dy = 1$
- ▶ joint density for  $y = f(y | x) = \prod f(y_i | x_i)$  independence
- ▶ parameters for the density  $f(y | x; \theta)$ ,     $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$
- ▶ often  $\theta = (\psi, \lambda)$
- ▶  $\theta$  could have dimension  $d > n$  (e.g. genetics)
- ▶  $\theta$  could have infinite dimension e.g.  
 $E(y | x) = \theta(x)$  'smooth'

## Definitions

► Likelihood function

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = L(\theta; y_1, \dots, y_n) = f(y_1, \dots, y_n; \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(y_i; \theta)$$

► Log-likelihood function:

$$\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \log L(\theta; \mathbf{y})$$

► Maximum likelihood estimator (MLE)

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \sup_{\theta} L(\theta; \mathbf{y}) \quad \hat{\theta}(\mathbf{y})$$

## Example: time series studies of air pollution<sup>1</sup>

- ▶  $y_i$ : number of deaths in Toronto due to cardio-vascular or respiratory disease on day  $i$
- ▶  $x_i$ : 24 hour average of  $PM_{10}$  or  $O_3$  in Toronto on day  $i$ , maximum temperature, minimum temperature, dew point, relative humidity, day of the week, ...
- ▶ model: Poisson distribution for counts



$$f(y_i; \theta) = \{\mu_i(\theta)\}^{y_i} \exp\{-\mu_i(\theta)\}$$



$$\log \mu = \alpha + \psi PM_{10} + S(\text{time}, df_1) + S(\text{temp}, df_2)$$

- ▶  $S(\text{time}, df_1)$  a 'smooth' function
- ▶ typically  $S(\cdot, df_1) = \sum_{j=1}^{df_1} \lambda_j B_j(\cdot)$
- ▶  $B_j(\cdot)$  known basis functions usually splines
- ▶  $\theta = (\alpha, \psi, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  with dimension  $df_1 + df_2 + 2$

---

<sup>1</sup>Peng et al., 2006

## Example: longitudinal study of migraine sufferers<sup>2</sup>

- ▶ latent variable  $Y_{ij}^* = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \beta + U_i + \epsilon_{ij}$
- ▶ observed variable  $y_{ij} \in \{1, \dots, h\} \leftrightarrow \alpha_{y_{ij}-1} < Y_{ij}^* < \alpha_{y_{ij}}$
- ▶ e.g. no headache, mild, moderate, ... intense
- ▶  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}$  covariates – age, education, change in barometric pressure, use of painkillers, ...
- ▶  $U_i, \epsilon_{ij}$  random effects between and within subjects
- ▶  $\epsilon_{ij} = \rho \epsilon_{i,j-1} + (1 - \rho^2)^{1/2} \eta_{ij}$ , serial correlation over time
- ▶

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \int \cdots \int \phi_m(\mathbf{z}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{im_i}; \mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{z}_{i1} \dots d\mathbf{z}_{im_i}$$

- ▶  $R_{ij} = (\sigma^2 + \rho^{|i-j|}) / (\sigma^2 + 1)$

---

<sup>2</sup>Czado & Varin, 2010

## Very widely used

- ▶ IEEE Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
- ▶ Crop Breeding, Genetics and Cytology
- ▶ The Review of Financial Studies
- ▶ IEEE Transactions on Information Theory
- ▶ Journal of the American Medical Association
- ▶ Molecular Biology and Evolution
- ▶ Physical Review D
- ▶ US Patent Office



## Composite likelihood

- ▶ **Model:**  $Y \sim f(y; \theta)$ ,  $Y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- ▶ **Set of events:**  $\{\mathcal{A}_k, k \in K\}$
- ▶ **likelihood for an event:**  $L_k(\theta; y) \propto f(\{y \in \mathcal{A}_k\}; \theta)$
- ▶ **Composite Likelihood:**

Lindsay, 1988

$$CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{k \in K} L_k(\theta; y)^{w_k}$$

- ▶  $\{w_k, k \in K\}$  a set of weights
- ▶ single  $p$ -dimensional response  $Y = Y_i$



## Composite conditional likelihood

- ▶ Pseudo-likelihood

Besag, 1974

$$CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=1}^p f(y_r | \{y_s : y_s \text{ a neighbour of } y_r\}; \theta)$$

- ▶ or use blocks of observations
- ▶ stratified case-control studies

Vecchia, 1988; Stein et al., 2004

Liang, 1987

$$CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=1}^p \prod_{s=r+1}^p f(y_r | y_r + y_s; \theta)$$

- ▶ pairwise conditional  $CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=1}^p \prod_{s=1}^p f(y_r | y_s; \theta)$
- ▶ full conditional  $CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=1}^p f(y_r | y_{(r)}; \theta)$

Molenberghs &amp; Verbeke, 2005

## Composite marginal likelihood



$$CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f_s(y_s; \theta), \quad \text{subvectors}$$

▶ **Independence Likelihood:**  $\prod_{r=1}^p f_1(y_r; \theta) \quad y = (y_1, \dots, y_p)$

▶ **Pairwise Likelihood:**  $\prod_{r=1}^{p-1} \prod_{s=r+1}^p f_2(y_r, y_s; \theta)$

▶ tripletwise likelihood, ...

▶ pairwise differences:  $\prod_{r=1}^{p-1} \prod_{s=r+1}^p f(y_r - y_s; \theta)$

Curriero & Lele, 1999

▶ and even mixtures of *CCL* and *CML*

## Derived quantities

- ▶ log composite likelihood:  $cl(\theta; y) = \log CL(\theta; y)$
- ▶ score function:  $U(\theta; y) = \nabla_{\theta} cl(\theta; y) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} U_s(\theta; y)$   
 $E\{U(\theta; Y)\} = 0$
- ▶ maximum composite likelihood est.:  $\hat{\theta}_{CL} = \arg \sup_{\theta} cl(\theta; y)$   
 $U(\hat{\theta}_{CL}) = 0$
- ▶ variability matrix:  $J(\theta) = \text{var}_{\theta}\{U(\theta; Y)\}$
- ▶ sensitivity matrix:  $H(\theta) = E_{\theta}\{-\nabla_{\theta} U(\theta; Y)\}$
- ▶ Godambe information (or sandwich information):

$$G(\theta) = H(\theta)J(\theta)^{-1}H(\theta)$$

- ▶  $J \neq H$

misspecified model

## Inference

- ▶ **Sample:**  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$        $CL(\theta; y) = \prod_{i=1}^n CL(\theta; y_i)$
- ▶  $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{CL} - \theta) \sim N\{0, G^{-1}(\theta)\}$        $G(\theta) = H(\theta)J(\theta)^{-1}H(\theta)$
- ▶  $w(\theta) = 2\{cl(\hat{\theta}_{CL}) - cl(\theta)\} \sim \sum_{a=1}^d \mu_a Z_a^2$        $Z_a \sim N(0, 1)$
- ▶  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d$  eigenvalues of  $J(\theta)H(\theta)^{-1}$
- ▶  $w(\psi) = 2\{cl(\hat{\theta}_{CL}) - cl(\tilde{\theta}_\psi)\} \sim \sum_{a=1}^{d_0} \mu_a Z_a^2$
- ▶ constrained estimator:  $\tilde{\theta}_\psi = \arg \sup_{\theta=\theta(\psi)} cl(\theta; y)$
- ▶  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{d_0}$  eigenvalues of  $(H^{\psi\psi})^{-1}G^{\psi\psi}$
- ▶

Kent, 1982

## Many recent applications

Longitudinal data, binary and continuous: random effects models ....

Molenberghs and Verbeke, 2005, Ch. 9; Zhao & Joe, 2005

Survival analysis: frailty models, copulas

Parner, 2001; Andersen, 2004; Fiocco et al., 2009

Multi-type responses: discrete and continuous; markers and event times

de Leon and Carriere, 2007; Fieuws et al., 2007

Finance: time-varying covariance models

Engle et al., 2009

Genetics/bioinformatics: large literature

Tamura et al., 2007; Li, 2008; Mardia et al., 2009

CCL for vonMises distribution: protein folding

Spatial data: geostatistics, spatial point processes

Stein, 2004; Caragea and Smith, 2008; Varin et al., 2005; ...

## and more...

- ▶ image analysis Nott and Ryden, 1999
- ▶ genetics Fearnhead, 2008; Song, 2008
- ▶ gene mapping, linkage disequilibrium Larribe and Lessard, 2008
- ▶ Rasch model, Bradley-Terry model, ...
- ▶ state space models, population dynamics: Andrieu, 2008
- ▶ computer experiments with high-dimensional Gaussian process ( $n = 20,000$ ) Bingham, 2009
- ▶ spatial extremes Padoan et al. 2009

## Point estimation

- ▶  $\hat{\theta}_{CL} \sim N\{\theta, G^{-1}(\theta)\}$
- ▶  $G(\theta) = H(\theta)J(\theta)^{-1}H(\theta)$
- ▶ how does this compare to the competition?
- ▶  $\hat{\theta}_{ML} \sim N\{\theta, I(\theta)^{-1}\}$ ,  $I(\theta)$  Fisher info matrix
- ▶ compare  $I(\theta)$  to  $G(\theta)$
- ▶ analytical calculation or simulation estimates
- ▶ compare empirical variances in simulations
- ▶ investigate choice of weights for improved efficiency

Lindsay, 1988; Joe & Lee, 2009

- ▶ most natural in context of clustered or longitudinal data  
 $y_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{im_i})$

## Some results on efficiency

- ▶ in clusters, use weights

$$\frac{1}{(n_i - 1)\{1 + 0.5(n_i - 1)\}}$$

Joe & Lee, 2009

- ▶ or treat parameters in the mean differently from association parameters
- ▶ for example using optimal score functions for the parameters in the mean, and CL for association parameters
- ▶ in time series applications, downweight observations that are far apart in time

Kuk, 2007

Joe & Lee, 2009; Varin & Vidoni, 2006



## Inference functions

- ▶ potential advantage over defining estimating equations directly (GEE)
- ▶  $w(\psi) = 2\{cl(\hat{\theta}_{CL}) - cl(\tilde{\theta}_\psi)\} \sim \sum_{a=1}^{d_0} \mu_a Z_a^2$
- ▶ approximation by matching first moment or first two moments
- ▶ or by saddlepoint approximation
- ▶ or by rescaling  $w(\psi)$       Chandler & Bate, 2007; Pace et al., 2009
- ▶ use in model selection and model averaging

## Model selection

- ▶ Akaike's information criterion Varin and Vidoni, 2005

$$AIC = -2cl(\hat{\theta}_{CL}; y) - 2 \dim(\theta)$$

- ▶ Bayesian information criterion Gao and Song, 2009

$$BIC = -2cl(\hat{\theta}_{CL}; y) - \log n \dim(\theta)$$

- ▶ effective number of parameters

$$\dim(\theta) = \text{tr}\{H(\theta)G^{-1}(\theta)\}$$

- ▶ model averaging Hjort and Claeskens, 2008
- ▶ selection of tuning parameters in Lasso Gao and Song, 2009

## Some special cases

- ▶ Example: multivariate normal:
- ▶  $Y \sim N(\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ : pairwise likelihood estimates  $\equiv$  mles
- ▶  $Y \sim N(\underline{\mu}\mathbf{1}, \sigma^2 R)$ ,  $R_{ij} = \rho$ : pairwise likelihood est.  $\equiv$  mles
- ▶  $Y \sim N(\underline{\mu}\mathbf{1}, R)$ : loss of efficiency (although small for  $\rho > 0$ )
  
- ▶ closed exponential families
- ▶  $f(y; \theta) = \exp\{\theta^T t(y) - c(\theta)\} = f(t_{A;B} | t_B; \theta) f(t_B; \theta)$
- ▶ require  $\theta$  to separate in conditional and marginal pieces
- ▶ leads to  $\hat{\theta}_{CL} = \hat{\theta}$  and full efficiency
- ▶ multivariate vonMises distribution
- ▶ Mardia et al., 2008, 2009

## Markov chains <sup>3</sup>

- ▶ comparison of likelihood

$$L(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=2}^p \text{pr}(Y_r = y_r \mid Y_{r-1} = y_{r-1}; \theta)$$

- ▶ adjoining pairs CML

$$CML(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=1}^p \text{pr}(Y_r = y_r, Y_{r-1} = y_{r-1}; \theta)$$

- ▶ composite conditional likelihood (= Besag's PL)

$$CCL(\theta; y) = \prod_{r=2}^{p-1} \text{pr}(Y_r = y_r \mid \text{neighbours}; \theta)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Hjort and Varin, 2008

## ... Markov chain example

- ▶ Random walk with  $\rho$  states and two reflecting barriers
- ▶ Transition matrix

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 - \rho & 0 & \rho & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \rho & 0 & \rho & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

## ... Markov chain example

- Reflecting barrier with five states
- efficiency of pairwise likelihood (dashed line)
- and composite conditional likelihood (solid line)

## Time series and state space models

- ▶  $f(y_t, \dots, y_1; \theta) = f(y_t | y_{(t-1)}; \theta) f(y_{t-1} | y_{(t-2)}; \theta) \dots f(y_1; \theta)$
- ▶ proposal by Azzalini, 1983: replace  $f(y_{t-j} | y_{(t-j+1)}; \theta)$  by  $f(y_{t-j} | y_{t-j+1}; \theta)$
- ▶ a version of composite conditional likelihood
- ▶ pairwise likelihood  $\prod_{s < t} f(y_t, y_s; \theta)$
- ▶ more natural to down-weight, or ignore, pairs with  $|t - s| > m$
- ▶ simplest example,  $AR(1)$  with  $m = 1$ ; pairwise likelihood asymptotically fully efficient Jin, 2009
- ▶ efficiency decreases with increasing  $m$  Davis & Yau, 2009
- ▶ extension to  $AR(1)$  with additive noise (and more)
- ▶

$$y_t = \mu + x_t + \epsilon_t$$

$$x_t = \gamma x_{t-1} + \eta_t$$

## Spatial data

- ▶ composite conditional likelihood more natural
- ▶ but composite marginal likelihood can have better performance
- ▶ if the margins are carefully chosen

- ▶ Lele & Taper, 2002:  $\prod_{i < j} f(y_i - y_j; \theta)$

- ▶ reproduces REML for Gaussian case
- ▶ better than maximum likelihood



## Aspects of robustness

- ▶ model robustness
- ▶ univariate and bivariate margins only, for example
- ▶ means, variances, association parameters
- ▶ similar in flavour to generalized estimating equations
- ▶ specify lower order distributions, instead of lower order moments
- ▶ if there are several joint distributions with the same lower dimensional margins, inference will be robust over that class
- ▶ but are there?

## ... aspects of robustness

- ▶ simulation under the wrong model
- ▶ example: binary data with higher order correlations simulated
- ▶ model with only mean and pairwise correlations fitted
- ▶ pairwise likelihood continues to have good efficiency

Jin, 2009

- ▶ example: sparse clustered binary data
- ▶ fitted model has wrong correlation structure
- ▶ composite conditional likelihood continues to have high efficiency

Wang & Williamson, 2005

## ... aspects of robustness

- ▶ computational robustness
- ▶ composite log-likelihood functions are **smoother** than log-likelihood functions
- ▶ easier to maximize, easier to work with
- ▶ especially in high dimension cases Liang and Yu, 2003
- ▶ adapting the EM algorithm
- ▶ example: hidden Markov model for transitions between  $N$  genes
- ▶ in principle requires estimation of  $2^N \times 2^N$  matrix
- ▶ pairwise likelihood reduces computation to  $O(N^2)$  Song and Gao, 2009

## Missing data

- ▶ binary responses Yi, Zeng and Cook, 2009
- ▶  $(y_{ij}, y_{ik}, r_{ij}, r_{ik})$ :  $r_{ij}$  records missing (0) or not (1)
- ▶ generalization to more flexible mean functions  
(non-parametric) He & Yi, 2009

## Questions about inference

- ▶ When Is composite **marginal** likelihood preferred to **conditional** composite likelihood ? (always?)
- ▶ why is composite likelihood seemingly so efficient?
- ▶ where are the exceptions?
- ▶ model classes that lead to asymptotic efficiency?
- ▶ role of sufficiency?

Mardia et al, 2009

## ... questions

- ▶ asymptotic theory: is composite likelihood ratio test preferable to Wald-type test?
- ▶ estimation of Godambe information  $J = \text{var}U(\theta)$   
jackknife, bootstrap, empirical estimates
- ▶ estimation of eigenvalues of  $(H^{\psi\psi})^{-1}G^{\psi\psi}$

## ... questions

- ▶ approximation of distribution of  $w(\psi) \sim \sum \mu_a Z_a^2$
- ▶ Satterthwaite type? ( $f\chi_d^2$ ): Geys et al, 1999
- ▶ saddlepoint approximation? Kuonen, 2004
- ▶ direct adjustment? Pace et al., 2009
- ▶ **large  $p$ , small  $n$  asymptotics: time series, genetics**

## ... questions

- ▶ compatibility Yi, CMS talk
- ▶ can composite likelihood be used for modeling when no multivariate distribution exists that is compatible with margins?
- ▶ e.g. extreme values, survival data Parner, 2001
- ▶ Hammersley-Clifford theorem for conditional distributions
- ▶ analogue for marginal distributions?
- ▶ Does theory of multivariate copulas help in understanding this?
- ▶ Example: pair specific parameters

$$CL(\omega) = \prod_i \prod_{r < s} f(y_{ir}, y_{is}; \omega_{rs}), \quad \theta = A\omega_{rs}$$

Molenberghs & Verbeke, 2005; Fieuws et al, 2007



## ... questions

- ▶ How do we ensure identifiability of parameters? Yi, CMS talk
- ▶ Relationship to modelling via GEE?
- ▶ how to investigate robustness systematically?
- ▶ how to make use of objective function
- ▶ design of composite likelihoods Lindsay, Yi & Sun, 2009
- ▶ can we really think beyond means and covariances in multivariate settings?

## References

- ▶ Varin, C., Reid, N. and Firth, D. (2009). An overview of composite likelihood methods.
- ▶ Varin, C. (2008) *Adv. Stat. Anal.* **92**, 1–28.  
[www.dst.unive.it/~sammy](http://www.dst.unive.it/~sammy)
- ▶ Lindsay, B. (1988) *Contemp. Math.* **80** 221–240
- ▶ Cox, D.R. and Reid, N. (2004) *Biometrika* **91** 729–737
- ▶ Molenberghs, G. and Verbeke, G. (2005) *Models for discrete longitudinal data*. Springer-Verlag. [Ch. 9]
- ▶ Hjort and Varin (2008) *Scand. J. Statistics* **35**, 64–82
- ▶ Joe and Lee (2009) *J Multiv. Anal.* **100** 670–685

Special issue of *Statistica Sinica* 2010

<http://www3.stat.sinica.edu.tw/statistica/>