

Detecting Feature Interactions in Bagged Trees and Random Forests

Lucas Mentch
Giles Hooker

LKM54@CORNELL.EDU
GJH27@CORNELL.EDU

Department of Statistical Science
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850, USA

June 15, 2022

Abstract

Additive models remain popular statistical tools due to their ease of interpretation and as a result, hypothesis tests for additivity have been developed to assess the appropriateness of these models. However, as data continues to grow in size and complexity, practitioners are relying more heavily on learning algorithms because of their predictive superiority. Due to the black-box nature of these learning methods, the increase in predictive power is assumed to come at the cost of interpretability and understanding. However, recent work suggests that many popular learning algorithms, such as bagged trees and random forests, have desirable asymptotic properties which allow for formal statistical inference when base learners are built with subsamples. This work extends the hypothesis tests previously developed and demonstrates that by constructing an appropriate test set, we may perform formal hypothesis tests for additivity amongst features. We develop notions of total and partial additivity and demonstrate that both tests can be carried out at no additional computational cost to the original ensemble. Simulations and demonstrations on real data are also provided.

1 Introduction

Additive models were suggested by Friedman and Stuetzle [1981] and later generalized and made popular by Hastie and Tibshirani [1990]. An underlying regression function $F: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is said to be additive if

$$F(X_1, \dots, X_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d F_i(X_i)$$

for some functions F_1, \dots, F_d . If the regression function cannot be written as, or at least be well-approximated by, a sum of univariate functions, then an interaction exists between at least two features. Many methods have been developed to estimate the additive functions F_1, \dots, F_d including a method based on marginal integration by Linton [1995], a

wavelet method suggested by Amato and Antoniadis [2001], and a tree-based method by Lou et al. [2013], but the most popular class of estimation methods are based on backfitting algorithms as found in Buja et al. [1989], Opsomer and Ruppert [1998a, 1999], and Mammen et al. [1999].

The popularity of additive models lead naturally to hypothesis tests for additivity that asses whether an additive model is appropriate. Versions of these lack-of-fit tests have been proposed by Barry [1993], Eubank et al. [1995], Dette and Derbort [2001], Dette et al. [2001], Derbort et al. [2002], and De Canditiis and Sapatinas [2004]. In some cases, such as the work of Fan and Jiang [2005], these procedures can also evaluate whether the additive functions belong to a particular parametric class. Even when additive models are not used as a primary analytical tool, scientists often utilize tests of additivity to determine whether features contribute additively to the response. If no interactions are detected, then scientists may change the level of one feature without affecting the impact on the response of the others.

Despite their usefulness, simpler, more intuitive tools like additive models often fail to capture the signal hidden within modern complex data. Learning algorithms like bagged trees and random forests, both introduced by Breiman [1996, 2001], are more robust and typically generate significantly more accurate predictions, but until recently, little was understood about their asymptotic behavior. However, Mentch and Hooker [2014] recently showed that by using subsamples instead of full bootstrap samples to build individual trees, the predictions generated by these ensemble learners are asymptotically normal. This asymptotic normality allows the authors to provide confidence intervals for predictions and formally test the significance of features. Furthermore, the authors show that by imposing structure on the subsamples used in the ensemble, variance estimates may be computed at no additional cost. Wager et al. [2014] develop an infinitesimal jackknife estimate of variance and Wager [2014] later showed that the conditions on subsample size imposed by Mentch and Hooker [2014] may be relaxed in the context of random forests for more a specific class of tree-building methods.

This paper continues this trend of inference procedures for learning algorithms by developing formal testing procedures for additivity within the context of ensemble learners like bagged trees and random forests. These tests therefore allow practitioners to formally investigate the manner in which features contribute to the response when simpler tools like additive models are insufficient. In Section 2 we propose a revised test for feature significance and in Section 3 we demonstrate how this new testing framework allows for tests of additivity. In Section 4 we provide simulations to investigate the power and α -level of our test and in Section 5 we apply our procedure to real data.

2 An alternative test for feature significance

We begin by reformulating the test of feature significance proposed by Mentch and Hooker [2014]. Suppose first that the training set consists of only 2 features X_1 and X_2 and that the data is observed according to $Y = F(X_1, X_2) + \epsilon$. To test the significance of X_1 , Mentch and Hooker [2014] propose a procedure involving subsampled ensemble methods like bagged trees and random forests. Given a test set \mathbf{x}_{TEST} consisting of n points, we build two subsampled ensembles \hat{F} and $\hat{F}^{(RED)}$ where \hat{F} is a subsampled ensemble built using both X_1 and X_2 and $\hat{F}^{(RED)}$ is a subsampled ensemble built using only X_2 . Predictions at each point in \mathbf{x}_{TEST} are then made with each ensemble and Mentch and Hooker show that the vector of




Figure 1: Grid of test points.

differences in predictions has a multivariate normal distribution with mean μ and variance Σ . The authors also provide consistent estimators $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ so that $\hat{\mu}^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu} \sim \chi_n^2$ can be used as a test statistic to formally test the hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_0 : F(x_1, x_2) &= F^{(RED)}(x_1) \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\
 H_1 : F(x_1, x_2) &\neq F^{(RED)}(x_1) \quad \text{for some } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The testing procedure we propose follows similarly, but we impose structure on the test set which will later allow us to also perform tests for additivity.

Define a grid consisting of n total test points as in Figure 1 with n_1 levels of X_1 and n_2 levels of X_2 so that the $(i, j)^{th}$ point in the grid has true value $F_{ij} = F(X_{1i}, X_{2j})$ and predicted value \hat{F}_{ij} . Further, let V_F and $V_{\hat{F}}$ represent the vectorized versions of the true and predicted values of the test points so that $V_F = (F_{1,1}, \dots, F_{1,n_2}, \dots, F_{n_1,1}, \dots, F_{n_1,n_2})$ and define

$$\hat{f}_{\cdot j} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{F}_{ij}$$

as the average response at $X_2 = j$ across all grid levels of X_1 . Now, for each point in the grid, define the difference in predictions $\hat{F}_{ij} - \hat{f}_{\cdot j}$ which we can write in vectorized form as $DV_{\hat{F}}$ for some $n \times n$ difference matrix D of rank $n - n_1$. Let Σ denote the covariance of V_F so that we can write $\Sigma_D = cov(DV_F) = D\Sigma D^T$. We then estimate Σ using the internal covariance estimation procedure proposed by Mentch and Hooker [2014] to calculate $\hat{\Sigma}$ so that $\hat{\Sigma}_D = D\hat{\Sigma}D^T$ forms a consistent estimate of Σ_D . Then, by the theoretical results provided by Mentch and Hooker, $(DV_{\hat{F}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_D^{-1} DV_{\hat{F}} \sim \chi_{n-n_1}^2$ and we can use this as a test statistic to evaluate the hypotheses in (1). This testing procedure is laid out in Algorithm 1. The variables $n_{\hat{x}}$ and n_{MC} are covariance estimation parameters selected by the user as part of the internal covariance estimation procedure; details can be found in Mentch and Hooker [2014].

Algorithm 1: Test for Feature Significance

- 1 Select internal covariance estimation parameters $n_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}$ and n_{MC}
 - 2 Perform internal covariance estimation procedure to build ensemble and estimate V_F and Σ
 - 3 Compute $\hat{f}_{\cdot j}$ and calculate D and $\hat{\Sigma}_D = D\hat{\Sigma}D^T$
 - 4 Compute test statistic $(DV_{\hat{F}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_D^{-1} DV_{\hat{F}}$
-

After computing the test statistic, we compare the value to the critical value, the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the $\chi_{n-n_1}^2$, to achieve a test with type 1 error rate α . If the test statistic is larger than the critical value, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that X_1 is significant.

Note that this testing procedure readily extends to the more general case of d features X_1, \dots, X_d . Let $\mathbf{X}^{(R)}$ and $\mathbf{X}^{(A)}$ form a partition of the feature set $\{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$ so that $\mathbf{X}^{(R)}$ and $\mathbf{X}^{(A)}$ are disjoint and $\mathbf{X}^{(R)} \cup \mathbf{X}^{(A)} = \{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$; the set $\mathbf{X}^{(R)}$ denotes the reduced set of features and $\mathbf{X}^{(A)}$ represents the additional features that we want to test for significance. To test the hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : F(\mathbf{x}_{R_i}, \mathbf{x}_{A_i}) &= F^{(RED)}(\mathbf{x}_{R_i}) \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}_{R_i}, \mathbf{x}_{A_i}) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 : F(\mathbf{x}_{R_i}, \mathbf{x}_{A_i}) &\neq F^{(RED)}(\mathbf{x}_{R_i}) \quad \text{for some } (\mathbf{x}_{R_i}, \mathbf{x}_{A_i}) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \end{aligned}$$

we simply replace X_1 with $\mathbf{X}^{(A)}$ and X_2 with $\mathbf{X}^{(R)}$ in the above work by appropriately redefining levels of each feature set to form the grid of test points and repeat the procedure in Algorithm 1.

3 Tests for additivity

We now demonstrate how the grid structure imposed on the test set allows for tests of additivity.

Tests for total additivity

Again assume that our training set consists of only 2 features X_1 and X_2 and that our responses are observed according to $Y = F(X_1, X_2) + \epsilon$. Tests for total additivity assess whether the underlying regression function F is equal to, or at least well-approximated by, a sum of univariate functions so that in this 2-dimensional case, the hypotheses of interest are

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : \exists F_1, F_2 \text{ such that } F(x_1, x_2) &= F_1(x_1) + F_2(x_2) \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 : F(x_1, x_2) &\neq F_1(x_1) + F_2(x_2) \quad \text{for some } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \text{ for any } F_1, F_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Again define a 2-dimensional grid of test points as in Figure 1 so that each point in the grid has true value F_{ij} , predicted value \hat{F}_{ij} , and vectorized versions V_F and $V_{\hat{F}}$. Define \bar{F} to be the empirical mean of all predictions in the grid and define

$$\hat{f}_{\cdot i} = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \hat{F}_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_{\cdot j} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{F}_{ij}$$

as the mean prediction at $X_1 = i$ across all levels of X_2 and the mean prediction at $X_2 = j$ across all levels of X_1 , respectively. If the features are additive, i.e. under the null hypothesis, all points (x_{1_i}, x_{2_j}) in the grid can be written as $F_{ij} = f_{i\cdot} + f_{\cdot j} - \mu$ where $\mu = \mathbb{E}\bar{F}$ is the true mean expected prediction across all points in the grid. Thus, we may equivalently write the hypotheses in (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: F_{ij} - f_{i\cdot} - f_{\cdot j} + \mu = 0 \text{ for all } (x_i, x_j) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 &: F_{ij} - f_{i\cdot} - f_{\cdot j} + \mu \neq 0 \text{ for some } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}}. \end{aligned}$$

The natural statistic that arises is $\hat{F}_{ij} - \hat{f}_{i\cdot} - \hat{f}_{\cdot j} + \bar{F}$ which we will write in vectorized form as $D_2 V_{\hat{F}}$ for a difference matrix D_2 . Again, let Σ denote the covariance of V_F so that we can write $\Sigma_{D_2} = \text{cov}(D_2 V_F) = D_2 \Sigma D_2^T$. Given n_1 and n_2 levels of X_1 and X_2 respectively, we estimate $p = 1 + (n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - 1)$ parameters and we can use $(D_2 V_{\hat{F}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_{D_2}^{-1} D_2 V_{\hat{F}} \sim \chi_{n-p}^2$ as our test statistic. This testing procedure for total additivity is identical to the procedure in Algorithm 1 but in Steps 3 and 4 we calculate the appropriate difference matrix and test statistic.

Note that this procedure naturally extends to the case where we have d features X_1, \dots, X_d . To test hypotheses of the form

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \exists F_1, \dots, F_d \text{ such that } F(x_1, \dots, x_d) = F_1(x_1) + \dots + F_d(x_d) \quad \forall (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \quad (3) \\ H_1 &: F(x_1, \dots, x_d) \neq F_1(x_1) + \dots + F_d(x_d) \text{ for some } (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \text{ for any } F_1, \dots, F_d \end{aligned}$$

we require a d -dimensional grid of test points so that given n_i levels of each feature X_i , our grid contains a total of $n = \prod_{i=1}^d n_i$ test points. Further, define

$$\hat{f}_{\dots j \dots} = \frac{1}{n_1 \dots n_{p-1} n_{p+1} \dots n_d} \sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1} \dots \sum_{i_{p-1}=1}^{n_{p-1}} \sum_{i_{p+1}=1}^{n_{p+1}} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{n_d} \hat{F}_{i_1 \dots j \dots i_d}$$

to be the average prediction over all points in the grid with factor level j as the level of the p^{th} feature X_p . As in the 2-dimensional case, we can rewrite the hypotheses in (3) as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: F_{i_1 \dots i_d} - f_{i_1 \dots} - f_{\cdot i_2 \dots} - \dots - f_{\dots i_d} + (d-1)\mu = 0 \text{ for all } (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d}) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 &: F_{i_1 \dots i_d} - f_{i_1 \dots} - f_{\cdot i_2 \dots} - \dots - f_{\dots i_d} + (d-1)\mu \neq 0 \text{ for some } (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d}) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \end{aligned}$$

and write $\hat{F}_{i_1 \dots i_d} - \hat{f}_{i_1 \dots} - \hat{f}_{\cdot i_2 \dots} - \dots - \hat{f}_{\dots i_d} + (d-1)\bar{F}$ as $D_d V_{\hat{F}}$. Again, we define Σ to be the covariance of V_F so that we can write $\Sigma_{D_d} = \text{cov}(D_d V_F) = D_d \Sigma D_d^T$ and use $(D_d V_{\hat{F}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_{D_d}^{-1} D_d V_{\hat{F}} \sim \chi_{n-p}^2$ as our test statistic, where $p = 1 + (n_1 - 1) + \dots + (n_d - 1)$.

Furthermore, the additive functions need not be univariate. Define a (disjoint) partition of the feature space $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_m$ so that $\cup_{i=1}^m \mathbf{S}_i = \{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$. We can test hypotheses of the form

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \exists F_1, \dots, F_m \text{ such that } F(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_m) = F_1(\mathbf{s}_1) + \dots + F_m(\mathbf{s}_m) \quad \forall (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_m) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 &: F(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_m) \neq F_1(\mathbf{s}_1) + \dots + F_m(\mathbf{s}_m) \text{ for some } (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_m) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \text{ for any } F_1, \dots, F_m \end{aligned}$$

in exactly the same fashion by simply appropriately defining levels of an m -dimensional grid of test points.

Tests for partial additivity

We now handle the case where we are interested in testing only whether a proper subset of features contribute additively to the response. Suppose that our training set consists of 3 features and we are interested in testing the hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \exists F_1, F_2 \text{ such that } F(x_1, x_2, x_3) = F_1(x_1, x_3) + F_2(x_2, x_3) \quad \forall (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \quad (4) \\ H_1 &: F(x_1, x_2, x_3) \neq F_1(x_1, x_3) + F_2(x_2, x_3) \text{ for some } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \text{ for any } F_1, F_2. \end{aligned}$$

Rejecting this null hypothesis means that an interaction exists between X_1 and X_2 . Hooker [2004] uses the size of the deviation of F from partial additivity as a means of identifying the bivariate and higher-order interactions required to reconstruct some percentage of the variation in the values of F . Define a 3-dimensional grid of test points with n_1, n_2 and n_3 levels of X_1, X_2 and X_3 , respectively and continuing with the dot notation, define

$$\hat{f}_{i \cdot k} = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \hat{F}_{ijk} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_{\cdot jk} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{F}_{ijk}$$

to be the average prediction over all levels of X_2 in the grid at $X_1 = i$ and $X_3 = k$ and the average prediction over all levels of X_1 in the grid at $X_2 = j$ and $X_3 = k$, respectively. If there is no interaction between X_1 and X_2 , then $F_{ijk} - f_{i \cdot k} - f_{\cdot jk} + f_{\cdot \cdot k} = 0$ at all levels $(x_{1_i}, x_{2_j}, x_{3_k})$ in the grid. Thus, we can rewrite the hypotheses in (4) as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: F_{ijk} - f_{i \cdot k} - f_{\cdot jk} + f_{\cdot \cdot k} = 0 \quad \forall (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 &: F_{ijk} - f_{i \cdot k} - f_{\cdot jk} + f_{\cdot \cdot k} \neq 0 \text{ for some } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \end{aligned}$$

and use the empirical analogues of these parameters to conduct the testing procedure. Once again, write $\hat{F}_{ijk} - \hat{f}_{i \cdot k} - \hat{f}_{\cdot jk} + \hat{f}_{\cdot \cdot k}$ as $D_3 V_{\hat{F}}$ and define Σ to be the covariance of V_F so that we can write $\Sigma_{D_3} = \text{cov}(D_3 V_F) = D_3 \Sigma D_3^T$ and use $(D_3 V_{\hat{F}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_{D_3}^{-1} D_3 V_{\hat{F}} \sim \chi_{n-p}^2$ as our test statistic, where $n = n_1 n_2 n_3$ and since we must now account for two-way interactions, $p = 1 + (n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - 1) + (n_3 - 1) + (n_1 - 1)(n_3 - 1) + (n_2 - 1)(n_3 - 1)$. As was the case in testing for total additivity, the testing procedure is the same as in Algorithm 1 with the appropriate difference matrix and test statistic calculated in Steps 3 and 4.

Note that we can perform this same test when our training set consists of d features and we are interested in determining whether an interaction exists between X_i and X_j . Denote the set of all features except X_i and X_j as $\mathbf{X}_{-i,j}$ so that our hypotheses become

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \exists F_i, F_j \text{ such that } F(X_1, \dots, X_d) = F_i(X_i, \mathbf{X}_{-i,j}) + F_j(X_j, \mathbf{X}_{-i,j}) \quad \forall (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \\ H_1 &: F(X_1, \dots, X_d) \neq F_i(X_i, \mathbf{X}_{-i,j}) + F_j(X_j, \mathbf{X}_{-i,j}) \text{ for some } (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{x}_{\text{TEST}} \text{ for any } F_i, F_j. \end{aligned}$$

By simply redefining the grid levels of X_3 to be levels of $\mathbf{X}_{-i,j}$, the testing procedure remains identical. The same holds for the case where X_i and X_j are treated as vectors.

The weighted least squares approach

The above testing procedures were each derived by choosing the model parameters that minimized the sum of squared error (SSE) with equal weight placed on each point in the test grid. We could have instead selected \hat{F}_1 and \hat{F}_2 to minimize the weighted SSE

$$WSSE = \sum_{i,j,k} w_{i,j,k} (F(x_{1_i}, x_{2_j}, x_{3_k}) - F_1(x_{1_i}, x_{3_k}) - F_2(x_{2_j}, x_{3_k}))^2$$

where the w_{ijk} are specified by the user. Hooker [2007], for example, recommends basing these weights on an approximation to the density of observations near the point $(x_{1_i}, x_{2_j}, x_{3_k})$. This procedure takes the form of a weighted ANOVA. In particular, define \vec{F} to be the $n_1 n_3 + n_2 n_3$ vector concatenating the $\hat{F}_1(x_1, x_3)$ and $\hat{F}_2(x_2, x_3)$ and as in the previous sections let $V_{\hat{F}}$ be the vector containing the \hat{F}_{ijk} . Further, let Z be the $n \times n_1 n_3 + n_2 n_3$ matrix defined so that $Z\vec{F}$ produces the corresponding $\hat{F}_1(x_1, x_3) + \hat{F}_2(x_2, x_3)$ and let W be a diagonal matrix containing the weights. Then we can write

$$WSSE = (V_{\hat{F}} - Z\vec{F})^T W (V_{\hat{F}} - Z\vec{F})$$

and we know that the solution \vec{F} that minimizes this weighted SSE is given by

$$\vec{F} = (Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W V_{\hat{F}}$$

so that under the null hypothesis

$$V_{\hat{F}} - Z\vec{F} = (I - Z(Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W) V_{\hat{F}}$$

has zero mean. Further, letting Σ denote the covariance of $V_{\hat{F}}$, the variance of $V_{\hat{F}} - Z\vec{F}$ is given by

$$C = (I - Z(Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W) \Sigma (I - Z(Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W)^T$$

so that

$$[(I - Z(Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W) V_{\hat{F}}]^T \hat{C}^{-1} [(I - Z(Z^T W Z)^{-1} Z^T W) V_{\hat{F}}]$$

has a χ_{n-p}^2 distribution. For equal weighting (W given by the identity matrix), these calculations reduce to the averages employed above, and for the sake of simplicity we have restricted ourselves to this choice.

4 Simulations

We now provide a short simulation study to investigate both the α -level and power of our proposed testing procedures. We begin with perhaps the simplest model, linear regression. Suppose that we have two features X_1 and X_2 and that our responses are generated according to $Y = X_1 + X_2 + \epsilon$ in the simulations to assess the α -level and $Y = X_1 + X_2 + X_1 X_2 + \epsilon$ in estimating the power. For these simulations, we repeat the test for total additivity on 1000 datasets for each model, taking our empirical α -level as the proportion of tests that incorrectly reject the null hypothesis and our estimate of power as the proportion of tests that correctly reject the null hypothesis. For reference, we also build 1000 linear regression models and perform the traditional t-test used to determine whether the interaction coefficient is significant on each dataset and record the empirical α -level and power of this testing procedure. This was repeated for training set sizes of 250, 500, and 1000 using subsample sizes of 30, 50, and 75 respectively and the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Empirical α -levels and power for the linear model example.

Method	n	α -level	Power
Linear Model	250	0.056	1.000
Subbagged Ensemble		0.065	0.954
Linear Model	500	0.048	1.000
Subbagged Ensemble		0.047	0.998
Linear Model	1000	0.046	1.000
Subbagged Ensemble		0.020	0.999

Table 2: Empirical α -level and power for a variety of underlying regression functions.

Model	Test	α -level	Model	Test	Power
$y = x_1$	Total	0.000	$y = x_1x_2$	Total	1.000
$y = e^{x_1}$	Total	0.000	$y = x_1x_2x_3$	Partial	0.605
$y = e^{x_1} + \sin(\pi x_2)$	Total	0.004	$y = e^{5(x_1+x_2)}/(1 + e^{5(x_1+x_2)}) - 1$	Total	0.948
$y = x_1 + x_2 + x_3$	Total	0.002	$y = 0.5(1 + \sin(2\pi(x_1 + x_2)))$	Total	1.000
$y = e^{x_1} + e^{x_2} + e^{x_3}$	Total	0.004	$y = 0.5(1 + \sin(2\pi(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)))$	Partial	0.778
$y = x_1x_3 + x_2x_3$	Partial	0.000	$y = 64(x_1x_2)^3(1 - x_1x_2)^3$	Total	1.000
$y = e^{x_1x_3} + e^{x_2x_3}$	Partial	0.000	$y = 64(x_1x_2x_3)^3(1 - x_1x_2x_3)^3$	Partial	0.956

Examining Table 1, we see that in each case, our test for total additivity using a subbagged ensemble performed nearly exactly as well as the traditional t-test for a coefficient of 0. We also selected a number of more complex regression functions to further investigate the α -level and power. Many of these underlying regression functions were studied in previous publications relating to tests for additivity, such as De Canditiis and Sapatinas [2004] and Barry [1993]. Each estimate is the result of 1000 simulations with a sample size of 500, sub-sample size of 50, and internal covariance estimation parameters $n_{\bar{x}} = 50$ and $n_{MC} = 250$ with a test grid consisting of 16 points in the 2-dimensional tests for total additivity and 27 points in the 3-dimensional tests for total and partial additivity. The results are shown in Table 2. Note that even though the response in the first two models does not depend on X_2 , this additional feature was still included in the training sets and the same test for total additivity performed. In each case, we see that our false rejection rate is very conservative and with the exception of a few tests for partial additivity, we also maintain very high power.

5 Real data

We now demonstrate our testing procedures on two real datasets. We begin with the Boston Housing dataset which has been used in many previous additivity publications including Opsomer and Ruppert [1998b], Breiman and Friedman [1985], and Fan and Jiang [2005]. This dataset consists of 506 observations on 13 features with median home value (MV) as the response. Opsomer and Ruppert [1998b] fit an additive model using the following features: number of rooms (RM), log of full property tax rate (TAX), pupil/teacher ratio by town

(PTRATIO), and log of the proportion of the population that is lower status (LSTAT). Fan and Jiang [2005] employed their additivity tests and determined that the linear term for PTRATIO and the logarithmic terms for TAX and LSTAT used by Opsomer and Ruppert [1998b] were appropriate. We performed our test for total additivity on the 4 features of interest. This test requires a 4-dimensional grid and our test points consisted of the 0.33 and 0.66 quantiles of each feature for a total of 16 test points. Using a subsample size of 50 and internal covariance estimation parameters $n_{\bar{x}} = 50$ and $n_{MC} = 250$, we calculate a test statistic of only 4.75, far below 19.68, the 0.95 quantile of the χ_{11}^2 , so we fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that these 4 features do indeed contribute additively to the response.

We also examined a dataset provided by a team of ornithologists as part of the *ebird* project described in Sullivan et al. [2009]. This ongoing project relies on citizens to submit reports of bird observations and from these reports, researchers are able to monitor things like migration patterns and species abundance. The data we were provided was compiled in order to determine how pollution levels affect the change in Wood Thrush population. The data consists of 3 pollutant features, mercury deposition (*md*), acid deposition (*ad*), and soil PH level (*sph*) as well as 2 non-pollutant features, elevation (*elev*) and abundance (*ab*). We begin our analysis by testing whether the pollutant and non-pollutant features are additive, so our null hypothesis is

$$H_0 : F(md, ad, sph, elev, ab) = F_1(md, ad, sph) + F_2(elev, ab). \quad (5)$$

We performed a test for total additivity using 4 levels of each feature set, the 0.20, 0.40, 0.60, and 0.80 quantiles of each feature, for a total of 16 test points. Our test statistic was 52.30 which is larger than the critical value, the 0.95 quantile of the χ_9^2 , of 16.92 so we reject the null hypothesis in (5) and conclude that an interaction exists between the pollutant and non-pollutant features. Next, we investigated how the pollutants contributed to the response. Based on preliminary investigations, *ebird* researchers suspected an interaction between *md* and *ad* but believed that *sph* contributed additively with respect to *md* and *ad*. In performing these tests for partial additivity, our test grid consisted of 3 points for each feature set, the 0.30, 0.50, and 0.70 quantiles of each feature for a total of 27 test points and a critical value, the 0.95 quantile of the χ_{12}^2 , of 21.03. Our test for partial additivity between *md* and *ad* yielded a significant result with a test statistic of 41.00 so our test supports the belief that an interaction exists between *md* and *ad*. Our test for partial additivity between *sph* and the vector (*md, ad*) yielded a test statistic of only 10.91, so we fail to reject the null hypothesis and again find support for the researchers' suspicions, namely that there is no interaction between *sph* and (*md, ad*).

6 Discussion

This work continues the recent trend of developing formal statistical inference procedures within the context of learning algorithms. The desirable asymptotic properties of subsampled ensembles explored by Mentch and Hooker [2014] and Wager [2014] have begun to shed light on the black-box learning algorithms and the tests for additivity developed here further demonstrate that traditional scientific and statistical questions need not be seen as a sacrifice of less interpretable machine learning procedures.

An important aspect of our testing procedures is the definition of the test grid. In our applications we chose a relatively small grid in order to achieve reasonably accurate covariance estimates while still maintaining an acceptable amount of power. Selecting levels of each feature away from the boundary of the feature space is also important as trees are known to exhibit bias near the edge of the feature space.

In the preceding work, all of our tests were carried out using subbagged ensembles. However, by the theory established by Mentch and Hooker [2014] and Wager [2014], we could have instead employed subsampled random forests or any other ensemble learner conforming to the regularity conditions established by Mentch and Hooker [2014] and Wager [2014]. However, given that our base learners are built with subsamples instead of full bootstrap samples, we expect the predictive improvement sometimes seen with random forests to be less significant.

It is also worth noting that the particular additive forms for which we developed testing procedures were selected only because of their scientific utility. Other similar testing procedures could also be developed in the same manner by establishing the appropriate model parameters from an ANOVA set-up and defining the difference matrix D accordingly. These methods can also be extended to provide formal statistical guarantees for the screening procedures described in Hooker [2004].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the following grants: NSF DEB-125619, NSF CDI Type II 1125098, and NSF DMS-1053252. The authors would also like to thank the Lab of Ornithology at Cornell University for providing interesting data.

References

- Umberto Amato and Anestis Antoniadis. Adaptive wavelet series estimation in separable nonparametric regression models. *Statistics and Computing*, 11(4):373–394, 2001.
- Daniel Barry. Testing for additivity of a regression function. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 235–254, 1993.
- Leo Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning*, 24:123–140, 1996.
- Leo Breiman. Random Forests. *Machine Learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
- Leo Breiman and Jerome H Friedman. Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80(391):580–598, 1985.
- Andreas Buja, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Linear smoothers and additive models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 453–510, 1989.
- Daniela De Canditiis and Theofanis Sapatinas. Testing for additivity and joint effects in multivariate nonparametric regression using fourier and wavelet methods. *Statistics and Computing*, 14(3):235–249, 2004.
- Stephan Derbort, Holger Dette, and Axel Munk. A test for additivity in nonparametric regression. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 54(1):60–82, 2002.

- Holger Dette and Stephan Derbort. Analysis of variance in nonparametric regression models. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 76(1):110–137, 2001.
- Holger Dette, Carsten Von Lieres Und Wilkau, et al. Testing additivity by kernel-based methods-what is a reasonable test? *Bernoulli*, 7(4):669–697, 2001.
- RL Eubank, Jeffrey D Hart, DG Simpson, Leonard A Stefanski, et al. Testing for additivity in nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 23(6):1896–1920, 1995.
- Jianqing Fan and Jiancheng Jiang. Nonparametric inferences for additive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(471):890–907, 2005.
- Jerome H Friedman and Werner Stuetzle. Projection pursuit regression. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 76(376):817–823, 1981.
- Trevor J Hastie and Robert J Tibshirani. *Generalized Additive Models*, volume 43. CRC Press, 1990.
- Giles Hooker. Discovering additive structure in black box functions. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 575–580. ACM, 2004.
- Giles Hooker. Generalized functional anova diagnostics for high-dimensional functions of dependent variables. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 16(3), 2007.
- Oliver Linton. A kernel method of estimating structured nonparametric. *Biometrika*, 82(1): 93–100, 1995.
- Yin Lou, Rich Caruana, Johannes Gehrke, and Giles Hooker. Accurate intelligible models with pairwise interactions. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 623–631. ACM, 2013.
- Enno Mammen, Oliver Linton, J Nielsen, et al. The existence and asymptotic properties of a backfitting projection algorithm under weak conditions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(5):1443–1490, 1999.
- Lucas Mentch and Giles Hooker. Ensemble Trees and CLTs: Statistical Inference for Supervised Learning. arXiv:1404.6473 [stat.ML], April 2014.
- Jean D Opsomer and David Ruppert. A fully automated bandwidth selection method for fitting additive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(442):605–619, 1998a.
- Jean D Opsomer and David Ruppert. A fully automated bandwidth selection method for fitting additive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(442):605–619, 1998b.
- Jean D Opsomer and David Ruppert. A root-n consistent backfitting estimator for semi-parametric additive modeling. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 8(4): 715–732, 1999.
- Brian L Sullivan, Christopher L Wood, Marshall J Iliff, Rick E Bonney, Daniel Fink, and Steve Kelling. ebird: A citizen-based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biological Conservation*, 142(10):2282–2292, 2009.

Stefan Wager. Asymptotic Theory for Random Forests. arXiv:1405.0352 [math.ST], May 2014.

Stefan Wager, Trevor Hastie, and Bradley Efron. Confidence Intervals for Random Forests: The Jackknife and the Infinitesimal Jackknife. arXiv:1311.4555 [stat.ML], March 2014.