

**A Handbook of Statistical Analyses Using R**  
— **3rd Edition**

---

Torsten Hothorn and Brian S. Everitt



# Scatterplot Smoothers and Generalized Additive Models: The Men's Olympic 1500m, Air Pollution in the US, Risk Factors for Kyphosis, and Women's Role in Society

---

## 10.1 Introduction

## 10.2 Scatterplot Smoothers and Generalized Additive Models

## 10.3 Analysis Using R

### 10.3.1 *Olympic 1500m Times*

To begin we will construct a scatterplot of winning time against the year the games were held. The R code and the resulting plot are shown in Figure 10.1. There is a very clear downward trend in the times over the years, and, in addition there is a very clear outlier namely the winning time for 1896. We shall remove this time from the data set and now concentrate on the remaining times. First we will fit a simple linear regression to the data and plot the fit onto the scatterplot. The code and the resulting plot are shown in Figure 10.2. Clearly the linear regression model captures in general terms the downward trend in the times. Now we can add the fits given by the lowess smoother and by a cubic spline smoother; the resulting graph and the extra R code needed are shown in Figure 10.3.

Both non-parametric fits suggest some distinct departure from linearity, and clearly point to a quadratic model being more sensible than a linear model here. And fitting a parametric model that includes both a linear and a quadratic effect for the year gives a prediction curve very similar to the non-parametric curves; see Figure 10.4.

Here use of the non-parametric smoothers has effectively diagnosed our linear model and pointed the way to using a more suitable parametric model; this is often how such non-parametric models can be used most effectively. For these data, of course, it is clear that the simple linear model cannot be suitable if the investigator is interested in predicting future times since even the most basic knowledge of human physiology will tell us that times cannot continue to go down. There must be some lower limit to the time man can

4 SCATTERPLOT SMOOTHERS AND ADDITIVE MODELS

```
R> plot(time ~ year, data = men1500m, xlab = "Year",  
+       ylab = "Winning time (sec)")
```





Figure 10.1 Scatterplot of year and winning time.

run 1500m. But in other situations use of the non-parametric smoothers may point to a parametric model that could not have been identified *a priori*.

It is of some interest to look at the predictions of winning times in future Olympics from both the linear and quadratic models. For example, for 2008 and 2012 the predicted times and their 95% confidence intervals can be found using the following code

ANALYSIS USING R

```
R> men1500m1900 <- subset(men1500m, year >= 1900)
R> men1500m_lm <- lm(time ~ year, data = men1500m1900)
R> plot(time ~ year, data = men1500m1900, xlab = "Year",
+       ylab = "Winning time (sec)")
R> abline(men1500m_lm)
```



**Figure 10.2** Scatterplot of year and winning time with fitted values from a simple linear model.

```
R> predict(men1500m_lm,
+         newdata = data.frame(year = c(2008, 2012)),
+         interval = "confidence")

  fit lwr upr
1 208 205 211
2 207 203 210


R> predict(men1500m_lm2,
+         newdata = data.frame(year = c(2008, 2012)),
+         interval = "confidence")

  fit lwr upr
1 214 210 218
2 214 210 219
```

```

R> x <- men1500m1900$year
R> y <- men1500m1900$time
R> men1500m_lowess <- lowess(x, y)
R> plot(time ~ year, data = men1500m1900, xlab = "Year",
+       ylab = "Winning time (sec)")
R> lines(men1500m_lowess, lty = 2)
R> men1500m_cubic <- gam(y ~ s(x, bs = "cr"))
R> lines(x, predict(men1500m_cubic), lty = 3)


```



**Figure 10.3** Scatterplot of year and winning time with fitted values from a smooth non-parametric model.

For predictions far into the future both the quadratic and the linear model fail; we leave readers to get some more predictions to see what happens. We can compare the first prediction with the time actually recorded by the winner of the men's 1500m in Beijing 2008, Rashid Ramzi from Brunei, who won the event in 212.94 seconds. The confidence interval obtained from the simple linear model does not include this value but the confidence interval for the prediction derived from the quadratic model does.

```
R> men1500m_lm2 <- lm(time ~ year + I(year^2),
+                      data = men1500m1900)
R> plot(time ~ year, data = men1500m1900, xlab = "Year",
+       ylab = "Winning time (sec)")
R> lines(men1500m1900$year, predict(men1500m_lm2))
```




**Figure 10.4** Scatterplot of year and winning time with fitted values from a quadratic model.

### 10.3.2 Air Pollution in US Cities

Unfortunately, we cannot fit an additive model for describing the  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration based on all six covariates because this leads to more parameters than cities, i.e., more parameters than observations when using the default parameterization of **mgcv**. Thus, before we can apply the **gam** function from package **mgcv**, we have to decide which covariates should enter the model and which subset of these covariates should be allowed to deviate from a linear regression relationship.

As briefly discussed in Section ??, we can fit an additive model using the iterative boosting algorithm as described by Bühlmann and Hothorn (2007). The complexity of the model is determined by an AIC criterion, which can also be used to determine an appropriate number of boosting iterations to

```
R> USair_gam <- USair_boost[mstop(USair_aic)]
R> layout(matrix(1:6, ncol = 3))
R> plot(USair_gam, ask = FALSE)
```



**Figure 10.5** Partial contributions of six exploratory covariates to the predicted  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration.

choose. The methodology is available from package **mboost** (Hothorn et al., 2013). We start with a small number of boosting iterations (100 by default) and compute the AIC of the corresponding 100 models:

```
R> library("mboost")
R> USair_boost <- gamboost(SO2 ~ ., data = USairpollution)
R> USair_aic <- AIC(USair_boost)
R> USair_aic
```

```
[1] 6.77
Optimal number of boosting iterations: 47
Degrees of freedom (for mstop = 47): 8.31
```

The AIC suggests that the boosting algorithm should be stopped after 47 iterations. The partial contributions of each covariate to the predicted  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration are given in Figure 10.5. The plot indicates that all six covariates enter the model and the selection of a subset of covariates for modeling isn't appropriate in this case. However, the number of manufacturing enterprises seems to add linearly to the  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration, which simplifies the model. Moreover, the average annual precipitation contribution seems to deviate from zero only for some extreme observations and one might refrain from using the covariate at all.

As always, an inspection of the model fit via a residual plot is worth the



effort. Here, we plot the fitted values against the residuals and label the points with the name of the corresponding city using the `textplot` function from package `wordcloud`. Figure 10.6 shows at least two extreme observations. Chicago has a very large observed and fitted  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration, which is due to the huge number of inhabitants and manufacturing plants (see Figure 10.5 also). One smaller city, Providence, is associated with a rather large positive residual indicating that the actual  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration is underestimated by the model. In fact, this small town has a rather high  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration which is hardly explained by our model. Overall, the model doesn't fit the data very well, so we should avoid overinterpreting the model structure too much. In addition, since each of the six covariates contributes to the model, we aren't able to select a smaller subset of the covariates for modeling and thus fitting a model using `gam` is still complicated (and will not add much knowledge anyway).

### 10.3.3 Risk Factors for Kyphosis

Before modeling the relationship between kyphosis and the three exploratory variables age, starting vertebral level of the surgery, and number of vertebrae involved, we investigate the partial associations by so-called *spinograms*, as introduced in Chapter 2. The numeric exploratory covariates are discretized and their empirical relative frequencies are plotted against the conditional frequency of kyphosis in the corresponding group. Figure 10.7 shows that kyphosis is absent in very young or very old children, children with a small starting vertebral level, and high number of vertebrae involved.

The logistic additive model needed to describe the conditional probability of kyphosis given the exploratory variables can be fitted using function `gam`. Here, the dimension of the basis ( $k$ ) has to be modified for `Number` and `Start` since these variables are heavily tied. As for generalized linear models, the `family` argument determines the type of model to be fitted, a logistic model in our case:

```
R> (kyphosis_gam <- gam(Kyphosis ~ s(Age, bs = "cr") +
+       s(Number, bs = "cr", k = 3) + s(Start, bs = "cr", k = 3),
+       family = binomial, data = kyphosis))
```

```
Family: binomial
Link function: logit
```

```
Formula:
Kyphosis ~ s(Age, bs = "cr") + s(Number, bs = "cr", k = 3) +
  s(Start, bs = "cr", k = 3)
```

```
Estimated degrees of freedom:
2.23 1.22 1.84 total = 6.29
```


```
UBRE score: -0.234
```

The partial contributions of each covariate to the conditional probability of kyphosis with confidence bands are shown in Figure 10.8. In essence, the same conclusions as drawn from Figure 10.7 can be stated here. The risk of kyphosis

```


R> S02hat <- predict(USair_gam)
R> S02 <- USairpollution$S02
R> plot(S02hat, S02 - S02hat, type = "n",
+       xlim = c(-20, max(S02hat) * 1.1),
+       ylim = range(S02 - S02hat) * c(2, 1))
R> textplot(S02hat, S02 - S02hat, rownames(USairpollution),
+          show.lines = FALSE, new = FALSE)
R> abline(h = 0, lty = 2, col = "grey")

```



**Figure 10.6** Residual plot of  $\text{SO}_2$  concentration.

```
R> layout(matrix(1:3, nrow = 1))
R> spineplot(Kyphosis ~ Age, data = kyphosis,
+           ylevels = c("present", "absent"))
R> spineplot(Kyphosis ~ Number, data = kyphosis,
+           ylevels = c("present", "absent"))
R> spineplot(Kyphosis ~ Start, data = kyphosis,
+           ylevels = c("present", "absent"))
```



**Figure 10.7** Spinograms of the three exploratory variables and response variable *kyphosis*.

being present decreases with higher starting vertebral level and lower number of vertebrae involved. Children about 100 months old are under higher risk compared to younger or older children.


#### 10.3.4 Women's Role in Society

In Chapter ??, we saw that a logistic regression with an interaction between gender and level of education described the data better than a main-effects only model. Using an additive logistic regression model, we can fit separate, possibly nonlinear, functions of levels of education to both genders:

```
R> data("womensrole", package = "HSAUR3")
R> fm1 <- cbind(agree, disagree) ~ s(education, by = gender)
R> womensrole_gam <- gam(fm1, data = womensrole,
+                       family = binomial())
```

The resulting model is best inspected by a plot (Figure 10.9). For males, the log-odds of agreement decreases linearly with each additional year of education. For females, the log-odds is more or less constant up to five years of education and only then begins to decrease. After 15 years, there seems to be

```
R> trans <- function(x)
+   binomial()$linkinv(x)
R> layout(matrix(1:3, nrow = 1))
R> plot(kyphosis_gam, select = 1, shade = TRUE, trans = trans)
R> plot(kyphosis_gam, select = 2, shade = TRUE, trans = trans)
R> plot(kyphosis_gam, select = 3, shade = TRUE, trans = trans)
```



**Figure 10.8** Partial contributions of three exploratory variables with confidence bands.


no further impact on the log-odds. When we plot the resulting fitted probabilities in a way similar to Figure ??, we see that the interaction is even more pronounced in the additive compared to the linear model. The flat curve for women with less than five years of education can be explained by the rather large variability of the answers in this area but the plateau to the right is due to two groups of highly educated women with a rather large proportion of agreement.

#### 10.4 Summary of Findings

**Olympic 1500m times** Here the use of a generalized additive model suggested that a quadratic model might best describe the data. When such a model was fitted it made reasonable predictions of the winner's times in the Olympic Games of 2008 and 2012.

**Air pollution data** Finding a suitable model for these data was problematic because of the outliers in the data and the high correlations between some pairs of explanatory variables. Except for wind, the fitted partial contributions are well approximated by a linear function for most of the obser-

```
R> layout(matrix(1:2, nrow = 1))
R> plot(womensrole_gam, select = 1, shade = TRUE)
R> plot(womensrole_gam, select = 1, shade = TRUE)
```



**Figure 10.9** Effects of level of education for males (right) and females (left) on the log-odds scale derived from an additive logistic regression model. The shaded area denotes confidence bands.

variations and it might be questioned if the more complex additive model is really needed.


**Kyphosis** The risk of kyphosis being present decreases with higher starting vertebral level and lower number of vertebrae involved. Children about 100 months old are under higher risk compared to younger or older children.

**Women's role in society** For males, the log-odds of agreement decreases linearly with each additional year of education. For females, the log-odds is more or less constant up to five years of education and only then begins to decrease. After 15 years, there seems to be no further impact on the log-odds.

### 10.5 Final Comments

Additive models offer flexible modeling tools for regression problems. They stand between generalized linear models, where the regression relationship is assumed to be linear, and more complex models like random forests (see Chapter 9) where the regression relationship remains unspecified. Smooth functions describing the influence of covariates on the response can be easily interpreted. Variable selection is a technically difficult problem in this class of models; boosting methods are one possibility to deal with this problem.

```
R> myplot(predict(womensrole_gam, type = "response"))
```



**Figure 10.10** Effects of level of education for males (right) and females (left) on the log-odds scale derived from an additive logistic regression model. The shaded area denotes confidence bands.

### Exercises

Ex. 10.1 Consider the body fat data introduced in Chapter 9, Table ??.

First fit a generalized additive model assuming normal errors using function `gam`. Are all potential covariates informative? Check the results against a generalized additive model that underwent AIC-based variable selection (fitted using function `gamboost`).

Ex. 10.2 Again fit an additive model to the body fat data, but this time for a log-transformed response. Compare the two models, which one is more appropriate?

Ex. 10.3 Try to fit a logistic additive model to the glaucoma data discussed in Chapter 9. Which covariates should enter the model and how is their influence on the probability of suffering from glaucoma?

Ex. 10.4 Investigate the use of different types of scatterplot smoothers on the Hubble data in Table ?? in Chapter ??.





---

## Bibliography

---

- Bühlmann, P. and Hothorn, T. (2007), “Boosting algorithms: Regularization, prediction and model fitting,” *Statistical Science*, 22, 477–505.
- Hothorn, T., Bühlmann, P., Kneib, T., Schmid, M., and Hofner, B. (2013), *mboost: Model-Based Boosting*, URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mboost>, R package version 2.2-3.