

Scalable Estimation for Structured Additive Distributional Regression

Nikolaus Umlauf 
Universität Innsbruck

Johannes Seiler 
Universität Innsbruck

Mattias Wetscher 
Universität Innsbruck

Thorsten Simon 
Universität Innsbruck

Stefan Lang 
Universität Innsbruck

Nadja Klein 
Technische Universität Dortmund

Abstract

Recently, fitting probabilistic models have gained importance in many areas but estimation of such distributional models with very large data sets is a difficult task. In particular, the use of rather complex models can easily lead to memory-related efficiency problems that can make estimation infeasible even on high-performance computers. We therefore propose a novel backfitting algorithm, which is based on the ideas of stochastic gradient descent and can deal virtually with any amount of data on a conventional laptop. The algorithm performs automatic selection of variables and smoothing parameters, and its performance is in most cases superior or at least equivalent to other implementations for structured additive distributional regression, e.g., gradient boosting, while maintaining low computation time. Performance is evaluated using an extensive simulation study and an exceptionally challenging and unique example of lightning count prediction over Austria. A very large dataset with over 9 million observations and 80 covariates is used, so that a prediction model cannot be estimated with standard distributional regression methods but with our new approach.

Keywords: Generalized additive models for location, scale and shape; gradient descent; iteratively weighted least squares; stochastic optimization.

1. Introduction

Fitting distributional regression models of high complexity to large data is challenging with respect to storage and computational feasibility due to data volume or very high-dimensional vectors of model parameters required to define sufficiently flexible models. Moreover, in many applications, solving the problem also requires automatic selection of variables since manual or stepwise searches in such model spaces are impossible to be conducted. In recent years, techniques have already been developed to efficiently estimate generalized additive models (GAM; [Hastie and Tibshirani 1990](#); [Fahrmeir, Kneib, and Lang 2004](#)) and generalized additive models for location scale and shape (GAMLSS; [Rigby and Stasinopoulos 2005](#); [Klein, Kneib, and Lang 2015b](#)). For example, [Wood, Li, Shaddick, and Augustin \(2017\)](#); [Li and Wood \(2020\)](#) show how to decompose the iterative estimation algorithm for GAMs to be able to compute models for large data and gigadata with coefficients up to 10^4 and up to 10^8 observations.

Lang, Umlauf, Wechselberger, Harttgen, and Kneib (2014) present efficient algorithms for Bayesian multilevel models for example by, discretization and indexing to significantly reduce the number of floating point operations. These ideas are carried over to estimate fully Bayesian structured additive distributional regression models (Klein, Kneib, Lang, and Sohn 2015c), the Bayesian version of GAMLSS, such that e.g. modelling the precipitation climatology across Austria with over 1.2 million daily observations is possible (Umlauf, Klein, and Zeileis 2018). While in principle being easily trainable in terms of data size with the approach of Li and Wood (2020), GAMs are not suited here given the censored nature of the response daily precipitation with a spike at zero. Nevertheless, for more complicated probabilistic models or larger n , techniques such as Umlauf *et al.* (2018) also reach their limits. On the one hand, such models can no longer be computed on conventional computers since there is simply a lack of random-access memory (RAM); on the other hand, the computing time increases so much that modeling with many variables is not possible in a foreseeable time.

To break down these barriers in structured additive distributional regression models, we propose a novel estimation algorithm, which we call *batchwise backfitting* and which combines the ideas of the classic *backfitting* optimization with *stochastic gradient descent (SGD)*, an efficient algorithm based on a stochastic approximation to gradient descent for finding local maxima of an objective function $J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ (Robbins and Monro 1951). Compared to costly gradient descent methods, which involve updates of the form $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ based on the whole data set, SGD replaces the gradient $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ by a noisy (yet unbiased) estimate thereof, thus being much faster to compute. However, convergence to a local optimum, which is theoretically guaranteed as long as the learning rate vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ fulfils the Robbins-Monro conditions (Robbins and Monro 1951) can be extremely slow.

We show that our batchwise backfitting algorithm induces a learning rate that can be decomposed into the product of a scalar step length ν and an adaptive learning rate vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ based on second order information of the objective function through an unbiased estimate of the Hessian, similar to the concept of natural gradients motivated from information theory (Amari 1998; Duan, Anand, Ding, Thai, Basu, Ng, and Schuler 2020). The result is an algorithm that requires little manual tuning and ensures fast convergence. Depending on the choice of ν we show that our algorithm closely mimics special cases such as resampling or gradient boosting (Efron and Tibshirani 1993; Mayr, Fenske, Hofner, Kneib, and Schmid 2012). In addition, we demonstrate that our new algorithm does not only significantly reduce computation time and requires extremely little memory, it also has excellent properties in terms of variable selection; thus markedly contributing to a wider applicability of structured additive distributional regression to *big data* and *highly parameterized models*.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, structured additive distributional regression models are briefly reviewed. In Section 3, the new *batchwise backfitting* algorithm and its implementation for distributional regression models is presented. In an extensive simulation study in Section 4, the performance of the algorithm is investigated, whereas in Section 5 we further highlight the usefulness of the algorithm developing a distributional model for lightning count forecasting using a very large data set with ≈ 9.1 million observations and 80 covariates. The final Section 6 concludes. Additional details on how to use our software implementation and further simulation results are contained in the Appendix.

2. Structured Additive Distributional Regression Models

2.1. Model Specification

The idea in structured additive distributional regression (or GAMLSS; [Rigby and Stasinopoulos 2005](#); [Klein, Kneib, Klaser, and Lang 2015a](#)) is to model all distributional parameters of an arbitrary parametric response distribution (rather than just the mean) through covariates. Based on data (Y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) of responses Y_i (possibly non-continuous or multivariate, i.e. $Y_i = \mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $D > 1$) and available covariate information \mathbf{x}_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$ observations, we assume conditional independence of individual response observations given covariates. Specifically

$$Y|\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}_Y(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1(\mathbf{x})) = h_1^{-1}(\eta_1(\mathbf{x})), \boldsymbol{\theta}_2(\mathbf{x}) = h_2^{-1}(\eta_2(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_K(\mathbf{x}) = h_K^{-1}(\eta_K(\mathbf{x}))$$

where \mathcal{D}_Y denotes a parametric distribution with K parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}_k(\mathbf{x})$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and parametric density $d_Y(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_K)$. Each parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ is linked to an additive predictor $\eta_k \equiv \eta_k(\mathbf{x})$ using known monotonic and twice differentiable functions $h_k(\cdot)$ (with inverses h_k^{-1} also known as link- and response functions) to ensure potential parameter space restrictions on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$. The additive predictor for the k -th parameter is modeled as

$$\eta_k = \eta_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_k) = f_{1k}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1k}) + \dots + f_{J_k k}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_k k}), \quad (1)$$

based on $j = 1, \dots, J_k$ unspecified (possibly non-linear) functions $f_{jk}(\cdot)$, applied to a subset of \mathbf{x} . For a data set of $i = 1, \dots, n$ observations, let \mathbf{X} be the covariate matrix with rows \mathbf{x}_i , and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k = (\eta_{1,k}, \dots, \eta_{n,k})^\top$ be the corresponding n dimensional vector of predictors each entry containing the sum of evaluations of $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ at \mathbf{x}_i . The parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1k}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_k k})^\top$ are the regression coefficients and we denote furthermore $\mathbf{X}_k = (\mathbf{X}_{1k}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{J_k k})$ the predictor specific design matrices, whose structure only depend on the type of covariate(s) and assumptions about $f_{jk}(\cdot)$. For the models discussed here, matrices \mathbf{X}_{jk} are typically based on a basis function approach, e.g., using B-spline basis functions ([Eilers and Marx 1996](#)) or thin-plate splines ([Wood 2003](#)) for modeling smooth effects. Therefore, each function $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ may be represented by the linear combination $f_{jk}(\mathbf{X}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}) = \mathbf{X}_{jk} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}$ which leads to so-called GAM-type or structured additive predictors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ (STAR, [Fahrmeir et al. 2004](#)).

2.2. Penalized Likelihood Estimation

Likelihood-based estimation in this flexible model class is typically based on the penalized log-likelihood function

$$\ell_{\text{pen}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} P_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}), \quad (2)$$

where $\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is log-likelihood function

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log d_Y(y_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,1} = h_1^{-1}(\eta_1(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}_1)), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,K} = h_K^{-1}(\eta_K(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}_K))),$$

$\boldsymbol{\theta}_k = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1,k}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,k})^\top$ are the parameter vectors and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_K^\top)^\top$ the stacked vector of regression coefficients to be estimated. The overall design matrix is $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K)$,

where each \mathbf{X}_k consists of rows $\mathbf{x}_{i,k}$. To avoid the problem of overfitting, each function $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ is regularized through the penalty terms $P_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk})$, where $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}$ controls the amount of smoothness and $P_{jk}(\cdot)$ is specific to $f_{jk}(\cdot)$. In general, the penalty terms are assumed to be of the following quadratic form

$$P_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top \mathbf{K}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}. \quad (3)$$

For instance, when using P-splines, $P_{jk}(\cdot)$ is computed by a penalty matrix $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk} \mathbf{K}_{jk}$ formed by the cross-product of difference matrices. This then penalizes too abrupt jumps of neighboring coefficients to achieve a smooth functional form (a similar penalty structure results from, e.g., thin-plate splines or tensor splines; Fahrmeir, Kneib, Lang, and Marx 2013; Wood 2017). Groll, Hambuckers, Kneib, and Umlauf (2019) extend the classical smoothing penalty for GAMLSS to (fused) LASSO-type penalties $P_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top \mathbf{K}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}$, where the penalty $\mathbf{K}_{jk}(\cdot)$ is also a function of the regression coefficients accounting for (approximate) L1-regularization (Tibshirani, Saunders, Rosset, Zhu, and Knight 2005; Oelker and Tutz 2017). In the following, we will describe the algorithms with the ‘‘classic’’ penalization (3) for the sake of simplicity, but more complex penalties can be implemented just as straightforwardly.

2.3. Backfitting

To maximize (2), Rigby and Stasinopoulos (2005) proposed a modified backfitting algorithm based on iteratively reweighted (penalized) least squares (IRPLS; Marx 1996), which similar to the backfitting algorithm of Umlauf *et al.* (2018) employs updates based on iteratively weighted least squares (IWLS; Gamerman 1997). The updating equation for the jk -th model term of (1) is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]} = (\mathbf{X}_{jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{kk} \mathbf{X}_{jk} + \mathbf{K}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}))^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{kk} (\mathbf{z}_k - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,-j}^{[t+1]}), \quad (4)$$

with vector of working observations $\mathbf{z}_k = \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{[t]} + \mathbf{W}_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_k$, score vectors $\mathbf{u}_k = \partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ and working weights $\mathbf{W}_{kk} = -\text{diag}(\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_k \partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^\top)$. Here, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,-j}$ represents the predictor without the j -th model term. The backfitting iterations at (4) are computed until a certain termination criterion is met, e.g., when the relative change of the coefficients becomes very small. The optimal smoothing parameters can be estimated using e.g. stepwise selection (Belitz and Lang 2008), where in each updating step at (4) each $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk} = (\tau_{1jk}, \dots, \tau_{L_{jk}jk})^\top$ is optimized one after the other using adaptive search intervals, e.g., using the Akaike (AIC) or Bayesian information criterion (BIC), noting that in many cases, $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}$ is just a scalar. For a detailed description of the algorithm see Umlauf *et al.* (2018). Moreover, for numerical reasons it is oftentimes better to replace the Hessian by the expected Fisher information with weights $\mathbf{W}_{kk} = -\text{diag}(E(\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_k \partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^\top))$ (Klein *et al.* 2015b). To reduce computation times, the design matrix \mathbf{X}_{jk} can be modified by using only the unique values of the covariate data, which in many cases have much less observations than the number of observations in the whole data set. This leads to an updating step with reduced working observations and weights, which can be calculated quickly via a simple sum with indices of the unique values (Lang *et al.* 2014). Although this method can save quite a bit of computing time, memory issues can still occur very quickly in the GAMLSS model class.

3. Scalable Estimation

As a solution to large-scale data, we present our batchwise backfitting algorithm as part of this section first. Then we discuss some interesting properties of our algorithm depending on the step length choice but also further computational details.

3.1. Batchwise Backfitting

Instead of using all observations of the data, we replace score vector and Hessian in (4) through unbiased estimates thereof, which are readily available based on a random batch of the data. That is, we use a randomly chosen subset denoted by the subindex $[\mathbf{i}] \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ to arrive at a stochastic updating step of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]} &= (1 - \nu) \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} + \\ &\nu \cdot (\mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} + \mathbf{K}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk}))^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} (\mathbf{z}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k,-j}^{[t+1]})) \\ &= (1 - \nu) \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} + \nu \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and introduce a step length control parameter ν (or *learning rate*) specifying the amount of which $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]}$ is updated to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]}$ in the direction of the new estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}$ on batch $[\mathbf{i}]$. In each iteration, (5) is evaluated on exactly one batch $[\mathbf{i}]$, such that computational burden can be reduced considerably. As mentioned in the introduction, this mimics a second order SGD algorithm (Bottou 2012) since

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} + \nu \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} + \nu \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_{jk}^{[t]}, \quad (6)$$

where the difference $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{jk}^{[t]}$ between parameter updates from iteration t and batch $[\mathbf{i}]$ is a decomposition of first and second order derivative information with

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{jk}^{[t]} &= \boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \\ &= \left[\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} - \mathbf{H}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{[\mathbf{i}]} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \right) \right] - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \\ &= -\mathbf{H}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{[\mathbf{i}]} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{[\mathbf{i}]}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{H}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk}(\cdot)$ are unbiased estimates of the score and Hessian (see also Umlauf *et al.* 2018) evaluated on batch $[\mathbf{i}]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_{[\mathbf{i}]}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}) &= \frac{\partial \ell_{\text{pen}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}; \mathbf{y}_{[\mathbf{i}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}]})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}} = \frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}_{[\mathbf{i}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}]})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}} + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \left[\frac{\partial P(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}} \right], \\ \mathbf{H}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}) &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}_{[\mathbf{i}]}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top} = \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{pen}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}; \mathbf{y}_{[\mathbf{i}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}]})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top} \\ &= \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}; \mathbf{y}_{[\mathbf{i}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}]})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top} + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \left[\frac{\partial P(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{jk})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^\top} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using second order information can speed up convergence considerably and our updating rule resembles that of natural gradients (Amari 1998). In each iteration of the batchwise

backfitting algorithm the update step length is adaptive, because of the curvature information provided in $\delta_{jk}^{[t]}$.

The working weights $\mathbf{W}_{[i],kk}$, the working responses $\mathbf{z}_{[i],k}$ and the predictors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[i],k}$ are computed based on the current states $\beta_k^{[t]}$. For each batch $[i]$, the algorithm subsequently cycles over all parameters of the response distribution, the outer loop, and all model terms, the inner loop, in the typical backfitting manner, i.e., the predictors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[i],k}$ and model terms $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ are updated instantly within the inner loop. By iteration through the batches the batchwise backfitting algorithm updates in a memory efficient manner from batch to batch either until all observations are included once, or the algorithm runs through the data a prespecified number of *epochs*. This design principle makes the batchwise backfitting optimizer computationally simple and thus *scalable*.

3.2. Choosing the Batch Size

The size of the batches is application specific. In general, a good strategy is to first estimate intercept only models, with $\eta_k = \beta_{0k}$, using batchwise backfitting and small batches, e.g., about 1000 observations, and then inspect the coefficient paths. If these are stationary after a certain runtime, the batch size is sufficient and if not it should be increased successively. For examples of coefficient paths that are stationary after a certain “burn-in” phase, see Figure 1. This approach has proven successful, e.g., in the application Section 5.

3.3. Choosing the Step Length

Our default batchwise backfitting works with a fixed step length $\nu = 0.1$, which is a good compromise between fast updates and numerical stability and has also been shown to be very robust in simulations. In addition, we consider the following two variants of the basic algorithm.

Resampling Variant If $\nu = 1$, the algorithm can be interpreted as a *resampling* method and each update $\beta_{jk}^{[t+1]}$ resembles a “sample” of the “distribution” of β_{jk} , and convergence is achieved in distribution, i.e., once the estimates are fluctuating around a certain level. The final estimate $\hat{\beta}$ is then computed by taking the means or medians of the resulting coefficient paths after convergence.

Boosting Variant In addition, (6) can also be utilized to enforce complete variable selection in a boosting type algorithm when only the model term with the best improvement in the *out-of-sample* log-likelihood is updated. An important innovation of this variant over classical gradient boosting for GAMLSS is that the smoothing parameters τ_{jk} are also updated in each iteration (see Section 3.4), i.e., the last iteration already leads to the final model. In contrast, in classical boosting for GAMLSS the optimal stopping iteration is crucial and has to be determined separately (commonly based on costly cross validation (CV); see, e.g., Mayr *et al.* 2012; Thomas, Mayr, Bischl, Schmid, Smith, and Hofner 2018). The costly CV makes boosting GAMLSS infeasible for big data. A further considerable advantage of our algorithm is that it makes the selection of the best model term relatively fair, unlike boosting variants with fixed prechosen degrees of freedom for $f_{jk}(\cdot)$. For example, with more complicated distributions, it can easily happen that certain parameters are never selected




Figure 1: Examples of coefficient paths for β_{jk} of a spline model term $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ using the three different variants of the batchwise backfitting algorithm.

because of too large differences in the gradients. Zhang, Hepp, Greven, and Bergherr (2022) try to circumvent this problem by adaptive step length selection for ν in the linear normal location-scale model, however, for the general class of GAMLSS this procedure seems to be difficult or even impossible to implement.

Graphical Illustration The three different variants of the algorithm are illustrated in Figure 1. Here, the coefficient paths are shown for a model term estimated with a thin-plate spline. The left plot shows coefficient paths of the batchwise backfitting with $\nu = 0.1$, it takes approximately 50 iterations for the coefficients to reach a steady state. The middle plot illustrates coefficients paths for the boosting version with $\nu = 0.1$ of the algorithm and possible updating only if the relative improvement of the log-likelihood on the next batch $[\hat{\mathbf{i}}]$ is larger than a prespecified constant c . In the first few iterations, the model term is not selected, all coefficients are zero. Around iteration 10, coefficients start to deviate from zero and converge to a steady state shortly after iteration 150. After that, the coefficients are no longer updated, as indicated by the strict horizontal movements. The right plot shows coefficient paths if the step length is set to $\nu = 1$ and updates are always allowed in combination with slice sampling of the smoothing parameters τ_{jk} under the AIC using the next batch $[\hat{\mathbf{i}}]$. Similar to the basic batchwise backfitting algorithm, the coefficients require about 50 iterations to reach a steady state. randomly from a proposal density and an acceptance step is not required.

3.4. Estimation of Hyperparameters

As described in Section 2.2, the smoothness of $f_{jk}(\cdot)$ is controlled by parameters τ_{jk} . In the proposed implementation these parameters are either estimated according to an information criterion like the AIC or BIC, which is computed on an *out-of-sample* batch $[\hat{\mathbf{i}}]$, or by slice

sampling under the information criterion (Neal 2003). Using the *out-of-sample* batch for selection is a novelty, aiming to improve the predictive performance of the model. Moreover, in addition to commonly used penalties in $P_{jk}(\cdot)$, complete model term selection can also be incorporated by an additional LASSO-type penalty for coefficients β_{jk} (Groll *et al.* 2019).

3.5. Computational Details and Implementation

The complete algorithm is described in pseudo code in Algorithm 1 and is implemented in the R package **bamlss** (Umlauf, Klein, Zeileis, and Köhler 2022) within the optimizer function `opt_bbfit()`. It supports all commonly used model terms for GAMs, as implemented in the **mgcv** package (Wood 2022). In addition, to overcome memory issues with very large data, the **bamlss** package now supports the binary flat file format for data frames, which is implemented in the **ff** package (Adler, Gläser, Nenadic, Oehlschlägel, Schuemie, and Zucchini 2022). By processing data and design matrices with **ff**, the usual memory limitations of the R ecosystem are circumvented. This is achieved by loading the data sequentially, using chunks that fit in memory, so that the complete data is never in the RAM. This means that the batchwise backfitting optimizer `opt_bbfit()` can work directly with **ff** objects, i.e., the batches are loaded directly by the **ff** infrastructure, which usually means only very little additional processing time. This makes it possible to use almost arbitrarily large data sets for the estimation of structured additive distributional regression models. In Appendix A, we give detailed examples on how to fit models with the new optimizer function and its handling within the **bamlss** framework using simulated data with 10^7 observations.

4. Simulation Study

To investigate the performance of the proposed batchwise backfitting algorithm in terms of variable selection, mean squared error (MSE), prediction and runtimes, we conduct a benchmark study against classical Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) and gradient boosting algorithms for GAMLSS for which we give details next before describing the simulation design and results.

4.1. Estimation Approaches

In the following, we refer to our proposed approach of batchwise backfitting throughout as `opt_bbfit` (as the model fitting function is called in the **bamlss** package). Our batchwise backfitting combines the boosting and the resampling variant as described in Section 3.1. The boosting step is run for 400 iterations including all possible covariates. This first step is used to preselect the covariates, and only covariates that are updated at least once are included in the subsequent resampling variant of the algorithm, which is run for 1500 iterations. The batch indices are drawn randomly, for the very small datasets of 500 observations we use a batchsize of 400, for larger datasets up to 10000 observations the batchsize is 63% of the data, for settings with ≥ 10000 observations, the batchsize is fixed constant at 10000.

We investigate the performance of our batchwise backfitting `opt_bbfit` approach compared to the following very popular methods in distributional regression.

1. *MCMC* (`sam_mcmc`). The default MCMC implementation of the **bamlss** package (Umlauf *et al.* 2022) in R based on IWLS proposals is used. Note that the `sam_mcmc` method

Algorithm 1 Batchwise backfitting.

Input: \mathbf{y} , \mathbf{X} , α .**Set:** Step length $\nu \in [0, 1]$, batch index $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_T)^\top$, goodness-of-fit criterion C , scaling constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, e.g., $c = 1$.**Initialize:** β , τ , e.g., $\beta = \mathbf{0}$, $\tau = 0.001 \cdot \mathbf{1}$.**for** t in 1 to number of batches $T - 1$. **do**Set current batch index $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{b}_t$.Set next batch index, e.g., with $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbf{b}_{t+1}$.**for** $k = 1$ to K **do**Initialize $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} = \mathbf{0}$.**for** $j = 1$ to J_k **do**Compute state $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} + \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]}$ on current batch.**end for****end for**Likewise compute $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}],k}$ on next batch.**for** $k = 1$ to K **do****for** $j = 1$ to J_k **do**Compute old log-likelihood on next batch $\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{[t]}, \mathbf{y}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]})$.Set the working response $\mathbf{z}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} + \mathbf{W}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{[\mathbf{i}],k}$.

IWLS step

 $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} = (\mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} + \mathbf{K}_{jk})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}^\top \mathbf{W}_{[\mathbf{i}],kk} (\mathbf{z}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],-j,k})$.Therefore find new $\tau_{jk}^{[t+1]}$ on next batch.**for** $l = 1$ to L_{jk} **do**Set search interval for $\tau_{ljk}^{[t+1]}$, e.g., $\mathcal{I}_{ljk} = [\tau_{ljk}^{[t]} \cdot 10^{-1}, \tau_{ljk}^{[t]} \cdot 10]$.Find $\tau_{ljk}^{[t+1]} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\tau_{ljk}^* \in \mathcal{I}_{ljk}} C(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk}, \tau_{ljk}^*; \mathbf{y}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]})$, or slice sample under $C(\cdot)$.**end for**Now set $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{jk} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]} + \nu \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]})$.**if** Updated log-likelihood $\ell(\mathring{\boldsymbol{\beta}}; \mathbf{y}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]}) > c \cdot \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{[t]}, \mathbf{y}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]}, \mathbf{X}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}]})$. **then**Update $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]} = \mathring{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{jk}$.Update $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\mathbf{i}],k} + \mathbf{X}_{[\mathbf{i}],jk} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]}$ and likewise $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[\tilde{\mathbf{i}}],k}$.**else**Set $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t+1]} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}^{[t]}$.**end if****end for****end for**Alternatively, only update coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{jk}$ which lead to the greatest contribution in the next batch log-likelihood.**end for****Output:** Estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{[T-1]}$; or “samples” $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{[t]}$, $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$; or boosting like coefficient paths $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{[t]}$, $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$ if only the best working model term is updated in each batch.

does not perform variable selection and therefore serves as an unconstrained benchmark.

2. *Non-Cyclical Gradient Boosting* (`gamboostLSS`). Gradient boosting for GAMLSS combines an ensemble of weak base learners. Instead of updating every distributional parameter with a base learner in each iteration (cyclical), in the non-cyclical gradient boosting version (Thomas *et al.* 2018) the algorithm updates only the base learner (model term) which leads to the highest loss reduction over all distributional parameters in every iteration. The intercepts are always updated. The optimal stopping iteration (`mstop`) is selected by five-fold CV. The non-cyclical gradient boosting algorithm is implemented in the R package `gamboostLSS` (Hofner, Mayr, Fenske, and Schmid 2022).
3. *Optimized Non-Cyclical Gradient Boosting* (`opt_boost`). The optimized version of the non-cyclic gradient boosting algorithm is implemented in the R package `bamlss` and utilizes methods for large data sets, originally designed to achieve speed improvements in MCMC algorithms (Lang *et al.* 2014). Unlike the classical non-cyclic gradient boosting algorithm, the model intercepts count as single model terms and are not automatically updated. Five-fold CV is applied to find the optimal stopping iteration.

4.2. Simulation Design

Response Distributions We simulate data from the normal distribution (NO), the gamma distribution (GA), and the zero-adjusted Poisson distribution (ZAP). All three distributions are implemented in the R package `gamlss.dist` (Stasinopoulos and Rigby 2022). The package uses a specific naming convention for the parameters of the distributions, supporting up to four-parameter distributions. The parameters are μ , σ , ν and τ . In the simulation study, we let parameters μ and σ depend on covariates. Since all distributions studied in this setting have two parameters, no specifications for ν and τ are needed.

Predictor Specifications We use the following predictors η_μ and η_σ for each distribution

$$\eta_\mu = \beta_{0\mu} + f_1(\mathbf{x}_1) + f_3(\mathbf{x}_3) + f_{2d}(\text{lon}, \text{lat}), \quad \eta_\sigma = \beta_{0\sigma} + f_2(\mathbf{x}_2) + f_3(\mathbf{x}_3) + f_4(\mathbf{x}_4),$$

with model intercepts $\beta_{0\mu} = 0$, $\beta_{0\sigma} = 0$ for NO, $\beta_{0\mu} = 1$, $\beta_{0\sigma} = -1$ for GA and $\beta_{0\mu} = 1$, $\beta_{0\sigma} = -1.5$ for ZAP; and

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= x \\ f_2(x) &= x + ((2 \cdot x - 2)^2)/5.5 \\ f_3(x) &= -x + \pi \cdot \sin(\pi \cdot x) \\ f_4(x) &= 0.5 \cdot x + 15 \cdot \frac{\exp(-2 \cdot (x - 0.2)^2)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(x+0.4)^2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ f_{2d}(z_1, z_2) &= \sin(z_1) \cdot \cos(0.5 \cdot z_2). \end{aligned}$$

The simulated functions are shown in Figure 2, these are centered around zero and scaled so that each effect has a similar range. The link functions for the respective parameters are as follows: $\mu = \eta_\mu$, $\log(\sigma^2) = \eta_\sigma$ for NO, $\log(\mu) = \eta_\mu$, $\log(\sigma^2) = \eta_\sigma$ for GA and $\log(\mu^2) = \eta_\mu$, $\log\left(\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}\right) = \eta_\sigma$ for ZAP. Finally, all covariates are drawn independently from uniform distributions $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_4, \text{lon}, \text{lat} \sim \mathcal{U}(-2, 2)$.




Figure 2: Functions used in the simulation study.

Further settings

- To investigate performance for small and large data settings alike, we simulate $n = 500, 1000, 10000$ and 50000 number of observations.
- To challenge variable selection, an additional number of noise variables (denoted with `noise` = 0, 10, 20 in the following) is considered. Each predictor is modeled including all available covariates. Accordingly, for each predictor three true covariates and `noise` non-relevant covariates are included. Note that variables `lon`, `lat` are counted as one covariate.
- In the first case the covariates are uncorrelated ($\rho = 0$), and in the second case correlation is introduced by the Cholesky factorization $\mathbf{LL}^\top = \mathbf{\Sigma}$ of the covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \rho^2 & \dots & \rho^{l-1} \\ \rho & 1 & \rho & \dots & \rho^{l-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho^{l-1} & \rho^{l-2} & \rho^{l-3} & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where l is the number of covariates, and correlated covariates are thus generated with $\mathbf{X}_{\text{corr}} = \mathbf{XL}^\top$ with $\rho = 0.7$.

- Each scenario is replicated 100 times.

Measures of Performance To evaluate the performance of the four algorithms, the MSE of the predictors, the MSE of the effects, the continuous ranked probability score (CRPS; Gneiting and Raftery 2007) and the number of falsely selected variables in each predictor (false positives) are calculated based on an *out-of-sample* validation data-set with 10000

observations. The validation data-set is fixed throughout each response distribution and each $\rho \in \{0, 0.7\}$. We define the MSE of the predictor as the mean of the squared differences of the estimated additive predictors and the true additive predictors ($\text{MSE}_k = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\hat{\eta}_{i,k} - \eta_{i,k})^2$, for $k = \mu, \sigma$). For the MSE of the effects we use a similar notation, namely the mean of the squared differences of the true effects and the estimated effects ($\text{MSE}_{f_{k,j}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\hat{f}_{i,k,j} - f_{i,k,j})^2$, for $k = \mu, \sigma$ and $j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 2d$). The false positive rate is defined as the number of non-informative covariates which have a sufficiently large estimated effect f , i.e. $\max(f) - \min(f) > \text{threshold}$, with `threshold = 0.1`.

Computational Details The simulation was run on the HPC infrastructure LEO4 of the University of Innsbruck. This HPC infrastructure runs on a Linux system (CentOS 7), and 50 computing nodes with Intel Xeon (Broadwell/Skylake) processors with up to 3000 gigabyte (GB) available memory. Depending on the setting, the memory requirements are between 5 and 50 GB per replication.

4.3. Results

Stopping and Computing Times Due to high computing times, we set the number of maximum iterations to identify the optimal stopping iteration `mstop` for the two boosting algorithms to 12000. Figure 3 shows the average `mstop` of all settings. For both boosting methods the average `mstop` increases with the sample size and with larger correlations between covariates. In all but the non-correlated GA settings, `opt_boost` has a lower average of `mstop` than `gamboostLSS`. With increasing n and $\rho = 0.7$, the average `mstop` is 12000 for `gamboostLSS`, indicating that more iterations are needed. Figure 4 shows the elapsed time in minutes for each setting and method. The `gamboostLSS` boosting method needs around 600 to 1100 minutes to compute a single simulation run when $n = 50000$ (similar to `opt_boost` which also needs several hours). Thus we deem increasing the maximum of available iterations as infeasible. In contrast, the batchwise backfitting method needs only 30 to 60 minutes for these settings.

MSE A comparison of the four methods in terms of MSE is made in Figure 5 for all NO-settings. The MSE decreases sharply with increasing n , except for `gamboostLSS` in η_μ with $\rho = 0.7$, this method has a much higher MSE here. This is due to the limited number of stopping iterations available for `gamboostLSS` (note again, that the stopping iteration is set very large to 12000). The `bamlss` methods perform better in the small n settings than the `gamboostLSS` method. Remarkably, the method `opt_bbfit` has the smallest MSE for η_μ when it includes noise variables, and has basically the same performance as `sam_mcmc` without noise variables. Only in η_σ and $n = 500$ is `opt_bbfit` second or third best in each case, though it always performs better than `gamboostLSS`. For larger n , the methods are very similar in terms of MSE. The results for the GA and ZAP distribution are qualitatively very similar and they can be found in the Appendix (Figures 17 and 18). For the individual effects biases, i.e. the MSE of the effects, we refer to the Figures 6 and 7 and the Appendix (Figures 19, 20, 21 and 22). The overall result is that the `opt_bbfit` is very competitive in terms of MSE of the effects, in a lot of settings it performs better than the boosting methods, although the MSE




Figure 3: Simulation study. Average $mstop$ of both boosting variants. Correlation $\rho = 0.7$ leads to higher $mstop$. For higher n and correlation the `gamboostLSS` variant hits the upper limit (horizontal dashed line at 12000) of possible stopping iterations.

of the effects converges for all methods and effects close to zero with high enough numbers of observations.




Figure 4: Simulation study. Computation times for all distributions, noise variables and correlation settings. The most computational intensive settings—the two boosting variants—depending on the number of observations require up to approximately 18 hours to compute. In the same settings `opt_bbfit` needs around 1 hour, while the MCMC method runs 3 hours.




Figure 5: Simulation study. Average MSE with the NO distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.

Predictive Accuracy Figure 8 shows the CRPS of the three different distributions with smaller values indicating higher predictive accuracy. The results are very similar to the results of the MSE. It is again noteworthy that `opt_bbfit` has the best performance when noise variables are included in the NO settings for all n , and in the other settings, when $n \geq 1000$, the performance is almost identical to `sam_mcmc` and typically better than the boosting methods. For larger data settings the methods are very similar in terms of CRPS.

Variable Selection The average false positive rates with the NO distribution are displayed in Figure 9. The false positive rate is defined as the number of non-informative covariates which have a sufficiently large estimated effect f , i.e. $\max(f) - \min(f) > \text{threshold} = 0.1$. The proposed batchwise backfitting method `opt_bbfit` outperforms every other method in terms of false positive rates. In all, except two GA distribution settings, $n \geq 5000$ observations are always sufficient to exclude all non-informative covariates with the novel approach. In all




Figure 6: Simulation study. Average MSE of spatial effect of η_μ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.

settings, the true positive rates are 1 for all methods (not shown). We also evaluate the false positive rate with a whole range of thresholds starting very restrictive from 0.0001 up to 0.3 for a NO-setting with different numbers of observations ($n = 250, 500, 5000, 10000$) and find that except in the $n = 250$ case the `opt_bbfite` is performing best (see Appendix Figure 25). The results for the GA and ZAP distribution are qualitatively the same and can be found in




Figure 7: Simulation study. Average MSE of f_3 effect of η_μ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.

the Appendix (Figures 23 and 24).

Summary Our batchwise backfitting algorithm has basically the same performance on small datasets ($n \leq 1000$) in terms of MSE and CRPS compared to the other three methods used in this study, and on medium and large datasets ($n \geq 5000$) it is almost consistently the best




Figure 8: Simulation study. Average CRPS for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.

method. Compared to boosting, where computationally intensive CV (or similar) is needed to determine $mstop$ batchwise backfitting does not require such additional time-consuming tuning. This makes our algorithm particularly convenient when applied on very large data sets. Our novel method is also considerably faster than both boosting variants (even with a determined $mstop$). The speed advantage ranges from around five times faster for $n = 500$ up




Figure 9: Simulation study. Average false positive rate with the $N(0)$ distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.

to 15 to 20 times faster in the large data setting with $n = 50000$ observations. Compared with the **bamlss** MCMC implementation, the speed advantage is evident from $n = 50000$ settings, and we expect it to increase dramatically in even larger data settings. The false positive rates of our batchwise backfitting method are excellent in all settings which makes this method also an ideal option for variable selection. Please note once more, that due to computational costs of benchmark methods the maximum number of observations was 50000 only. However, in the next Section 5 we show a model estimated with ≈ 9.1 million observations and in the Appendix A we exemplify that our batchwise backfitting method can easily handle up to 10^7 and more observations.

5. Application: Lightning Count Model

Lightning is a major source of atmospheric nitrogen oxides (Schumann and Huntrieser 2007) which is an important greenhouse gas (Figure SPM.2 in Masson-Delmotte, Zhai, Pirani, Connors, Péan, Berger, Caud, Chen, Goldfarb, Gomis *et al.* 2021). Thus, lightning affects the climate. At the same time lightning is affected by climate change. This effect is subject to scientific debate (Murray 2018). As lightning processes cannot be resolved by numeric models of the atmosphere, this debate is mainly based on proxies of lightning that have a simple formulation and often consider only a particular aspect of the physical processes

involved in lightning. Such simple formulations might be the cloud top height (Price and Rind 1992), iceflux in the mid atmosphere (Finney, Doherty, Wild, Huntrieser, Pumphrey, and Blyth 2014) or wind shear (Taszarek, Allen, Brooks, Pilguy, and Czernecki 2021), among others.

As a reaction, scholars proposed to analyse lightning using machine learning (ML) approaches that incorporates numerous physical processes (e.g., Ukkonen and Mäkelä 2019; Simon, Mayr, Morgenstern, Umlauf, and Zeileis 2022). These are capable to process large amounts of data and identify most relevant variables from a pool of inputs, but focus on describing the occurrence of lightning via binary classification and *not* on the number of lightning counts which would be crucial to investigate the important quantity of *flash rates* (Cecil, Buechler, and Blakeslee 2014).

The batchwise backfitting method proposed in this manuscript allows, for the first time, the estimation of a high-dimensional, fully probabilistic count data model, including variable selection, using a very large data set.

Data We use high-resolution data from the Austrian Lightning Detection and Information System (ALDIS, Schulz, Cummins, Diendorfer, and Dorninger 2005) and explain the lightning counts with reanalysis data from ERA5, the fifth generation of ECMWF (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts) atmospheric reanalyses of global climate (Copernicus Climate Change Service 2017; Hersbach and et al. 2020). ERA5 provides globally complete and consistent pseudo-observations of the atmosphere using the laws of physics. The horizontal resolution is approx. 32 km, while the temporal resolution is hourly and covers the years from 1950 to present. The model is not only interesting for a more comprehensive description of lightning, but also for a full reanalysis to study climate trends in lightning (Simon *et al.* 2022), because homogeneous lightning observations from ALDIS are only available for the period in the order of a decade, here 2010–2019.

We develop a model for the complete lightning count distribution using our proposed batchwise backfitting algorithm from Section 3.1. Therefore, we aggregate the hourly lightning counts to the ERA5 grid cells, resulting in a final data set of ≈ 9.1 million observations. To estimate a well-calibrated model, we preselect 76 ERA5 covariates that are potentially good candidates for lightning and convective processes, such as convective available potential energy (*cape*), convective precipitation (*cp*), cloud top height (*cth*), specific cloud snow water content between $-20^\circ C$ and $-40^\circ C$ (*cswc2040*), among others (for a detailed description of variables see Morgenstern, Stucke, Simon, Mayr, and Zeileis 2022). Since the distributional model is quite complex and very many covariates also have strong skewness, these are standardized before estimation using the empirical cumulative distribution function estimated with the training data, so that all covariates are in the value range $[0, 1]$ and thus numerical problems can be avoided. To examine the final model performance, we split the data into a training and a test data set with ≈ 8.2 million (2010–2018) and ≈ 0.9 million (2019) observations, respectively. The distribution of hourly lightning counts is shown in Figure 10 and indicates that the data contain a very large number of zero counts.

Model Specification For this reason, in a distributional model for the number of lightnings, the extreme frequency of zeros must be considered. We found that the discretized version of the generalized Pareto distribution, $DGP(\xi, \sigma)$, provides promising results (see the




Figure 10: Distribution of hourly lightning counts, gray bars, along with estimated frequencies using a discretized generalized Pareto distribution, $\text{DGP}(\xi, \sigma)$, blue dots and lines. Note the y-axis is broken because of the large number of zeros in the data, 97.4%.

first row of Figure 13 and the next paragraph). For details on construction of the DGP, and discrete distributions in general we refer to Subrata (2015); Krishna and Singh Pundir (2009).

As a first overall check, we fitted an intercept only model using the batchwise backfitting algorithm to assess the goodness of fit of the unconditional distributional model with DGP. The model estimates the two parameters with a batchsize of 50000 and 1000 batches within about 5 minutes on a conventional laptop with Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8550U CPU 1.80GHz processor. This fitted DGP density is shown in Figure 10 by the blue dots and lines and indicates that the model follows the observed relative frequencies well. However, some probabilities are overestimated, e.g., for one and two lightnings, which is due to the fact that the model does not yet include covariates.

Thus, we consider the following prediction model $\text{counts} \sim \text{DGP}(\log(\xi) = \eta_\xi, \log(\sigma) = \eta_\sigma)$ and additive predictors

$$\eta_k = f_{1k}(\text{doy}) + f_{2k}(\text{hour}) + f_{3k}(\text{lon}, \text{lat}) + f_{4k}(\text{cape}) + \dots + f_{80k}(\text{mcc}),$$

where covariate `doy` is the day of the year, `hour` the hour of the day and model term $f_{3k}(\text{lon}, \text{lat})$ specifies a spatial effect of longitude and latitude coordinates. Model terms $f_{4k}(\cdot), \dots, f_{80k}(\cdot)$ represent the effects of further ERA5 covariates, such as convective available potential energy (`cape`) or the medium cloud cover (`mcc`). For the scope of simplicity, we do not elaborate on these covariates in this manuscript; we refer the reader to Copernicus Climate Change Service (2017); Hersbach and et al. (2020) for details.

Model Fitting For fitting this model we proceed as follows. We use the boosting variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm to select the most suitable of the 80 model terms. We use the AIC for selecting suitable covariates with 200 batches of size 50000. The estimation time is about 12 hours, which is not very long considering the huge data set and the very




Figure 11: Batchwise backfitting log-likelihood contributions for parameters ξ and σ of selected covariates.




Figure 12: DGP lightning model. Selection of estimated smooth effects of the final model for parameter ξ , top row, and parameter σ , bottom row. The gray shaded areas show the variation of estimates in the resampling variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm.

large number of covariates. In Figure 11 the log-likelihood contributions for the selected covariates are shown indicating that the algorithm converged running 200 iterations/batches. Note that using the AIC in the batchwise backfitting algorithm results in a rather sparse

model that selects only the most relevant variables, and that the final selected covariates are consistent with the study of [Simon *et al.* \(2022\)](#) which use binary classification only. This fact is noteworthy because variable selection is done for the entire data set and in one run of the batchwise backfitting algorithm, as opposed, e.g., to the costly CV commonly used in boosting such models. In a second step, the model is refitted with the selected variables using the resampling variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm to improve the predictive performance. We again use 200 batches of size 50000, not using the first 100 iterations as burn-in. The estimation time is approximately 35 minutes using the training data with ≈ 8.2 million observations. The reason why the resampling variant is so much faster is mainly due the very sparse model and the use of slice sampling of the smoothing variances under the “out-of-sample” AIC (see [Section 3.4](#)).

Results The estimated smooth effects of the final model are shown in [Figure 12](#). The effects show that some of the covariates could be modeled by linear functions, such as the effects for the variables `cape` and `cswc2040` for the parameter ξ . Instead, others, such as the effect for `hh` for both ξ and σ , are nonlinear. The estimated effects appear plausible, e.g., an increase in `cape` for the location parameter ξ increases the number of lightning counts, shifting the probability mass of the DGP distribution to larger counts. Similarly, for the scale parameter σ , increasing `cape` also results in a shift in the probability mass towards larger lightning counts. The effects for `hh` also show that higher counts can be expected in the afternoon, when the ground air temperature reaches its maximum.

In the first row of [Figure 13](#), a worm plot is shown along with a probability integral transform (PIT) histogram of the quantile residuals calculated using the test data (year 2019). Both plots show that the model is quite well calibrated, only for the very large count observations (about 2% in the worm plot) the model does not seem to be optimally balanced. The reason for this is certainly the extremely low number of cases for large lightning counts, these are simply extremely difficult to model as a result. In the second row of [Figure 13](#) we show the prediction from the DGP model together with the observed lightning counts for two days and locations in the test data set. The predictions show well that the model is indeed able to reflect the observed lightning activity. In addition, we also show in the plot for comparison the prediction from a logistic model for lightning yes/no (using the same selected covariates), marked by the black dashed line. It can be seen that the DGP model and the binomial model give basically the same point predictions, however the DGP model is much more informative as it allows to derive prediction probabilities at different thresholds rather just a binary decision rule yes/no.

These promising results show that the proposed method is capable to process large amounts of data, select the most relevant covariates and explain full probability distributions. This scalable method promises that distributional regression can be applied to large data sets such as satellite observations (for new developments see, e.g., [Holmlund, Grandell, Schmetz, Stuhlmann, Bojkov, Munro, Lekouara, Coppens, Viticchie, August, Theodore, Watts, Dobber, Fowler, Bojinski, Schmid, Salonen, Tjemkes, Aminou, and Blythe 2021](#)), which will enable better descriptions of flash rates across Europe and Africa (for a recent climatology see, e.g., [Chakraborty, Menghal, Harshitha, and Sodunke 2022](#)).




Figure 13: DGP lightning model. The top left panel shows a worm plot of the out-of-sample randomized quantile residuals. The top right panel the corresponding probability integral transform (PIT) histogram. Out-of-sample predictions from the DGP lightning model for two locations and dates are shown in the second row. Observed lightning counts are represented by the black dot line, predicted probabilities are shown in the background in heat colors. Predictions for lightning yes/no from a logistic model are shown by the black dashed lines. Prediction location is shown by the red cross in the map of Austria.

6. Summary

This paper presents a novel algorithm for batchwise backfitting with structured additive distributional regression models, which is applicable to a much broader class of models as compared to the approach of [Li and Wood \(2020\)](#). The algorithm combines traditional backfitting with the ideas of SGD algorithms developed for very large data sets. It converges extremely fast due to an adaptive learning rate vector employing readily available unbiased estimates of the Hessian, similar to natural gradients. In combination with the flat file data format, it is thus

possible to estimate virtually arbitrarily large models on a conventional laptop, e.g., with 10^7 observations and more.

Moreover, depending on the hyperparameter settings, smoothing parameter and variable selection is performed on-the-fly without requiring further computations on additional validation data. This is, to the best of our knowledge, novel and has never been presented before in structured additive distributional regression. Besides an extensive simulation study, the advantages of the new algorithm are demonstrated using complex distributional regression models on a huge data set for lightning count prediction.

In terms of extensions to the presented framework, the confidence intervals that are not yet available should be mentioned. Therefore, for the future we plan to extend the algorithm towards Bayesian estimation.

Acknowledgments

This project was partially funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) grant number 33941, and FWF grant number 31836 (Thorsten Simon). We are grateful for data support by Gerhard Diendorfer and Wolfgang Schulz from OVE-ALDIS. The computational results presented here have been achieved (in part) using the LEO HPC infrastructure of the University of Innsbruck. Nadja Klein was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Emmy Noether grant KL 3037/1-1.

References

- Adler D, Gläser C, Nenadic O, Oehlschlägel J, Schuemie M, Zucchini W (2022). **ff**: *Memory-Efficient Storage of Large Data on Disk and Fast Access Functions*. R package version 4.0.7, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ff>.
- Amari S (1998). “Natural Gradient Works Efficiently in Learning.” *Neural Computation*, **10**(2), 251–276. doi:10.1162/089976698300017746.
- Belitz C, Lang S (2008). “Simultaneous Selection of Variables and Smoothing Parameters in Structured Additive Regression Models.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **53**, 61–81. doi:10.1016/j.csda.2008.05.032.
- Bottou L (2012). “Stochastic Gradient Descent Tricks.” In G Montavon, GB Orr, KR Müller (eds.), *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, 2nd edition, pp. 421–436. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-35289-8. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-35289-8_25.
- Cecil DJ, Buechler DE, Blakeslee RJ (2014). “Gridded Lightning Climatology from TRMM-LIS and OTD: Dataset Description.” *Atmospheric Research*, **135**, 404–414. doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2012.06.028.

- Chakraborty R, Menghal PS, Harshitha M, Sodunke MA (2022). “Climatology of Lightning Activities Across the Equatorial African Region.” In *2022 3rd URSI Atlantic and Asia Pacific Radio Science Meeting (AT-AP-RASC)*, pp. 1–4. doi:10.23919/AT-AP-RASC54737.2022.9814276.
- Copernicus Climate Change Service (2017). “ERA5: Fifth Generation of ECMWF Atmospheric Reanalyses of the Global Climate.” Copernicus Climate Change Service Climate Date Store (CDS). Date of access: June 2019, <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/home>.
- Duan T, Anand A, Ding DY, Thai KK, Basu S, Ng A, Schuler A (2020). “NGBoost: Natural Gradient Boosting for Probabilistic Prediction.” In HD III, A Singh (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2690–2700. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/duan20a.html>.
- Efron B, Tibshirani RJ (1993). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Number 57 in Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, USA.
- Eilers PHC, Marx BD (1996). “Flexible Smoothing Using B-Splines and Penalized Likelihood.” *Statistical Science*, **11**, 89–121. doi:10.1214/ss/1038425655.
- Fahrmeir L, Kneib T, Lang S (2004). “Penalized Structured Additive Regression for Space Time Data: A Bayesian Perspective.” *Statistica Sinica*, **14**, 731–761. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-34333-9_9.
- Fahrmeir L, Kneib T, Lang S, Marx B (2013). *Regression – Models, Methods and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Finney DL, Doherty RM, Wild O, Huntrieser H, Pumphrey HC, Blyth AM (2014). “Using Cloud Ice Flux to Parametrise Large-Scale Lightning.” *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, **14**(23), 12665–12682. doi:10.5194/acp-14-12665-2014.
- Gamerman D (1997). “Sampling from the Posterior Distribution in Generalized Linear Mixed Models.” *Statistics and Computing*, **7**(1), 57–68. doi:10.1023/a:1018509429360.
- Gneiting T, Raftery AE (2007). “Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **102**(477), 359–378. doi:10.1198/016214506000001437.
- Groll A, Hambuckers J, Kneib T, Umlauf N (2019). “LASSO-Type Penalization in the Framework of Generalized Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **140**, 59–74. doi:10.1016/j.csda.2019.06.005.
- Hastie T, Tibshirani R (1990). *Generalized Additive Models*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, New York.
- Hersbach H, et al (2020). “The ERA5 Global Reanalysis.” *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **146**(730), 1999–2049. doi:10.1002/qj.3803.

- Hofner B, Mayr A, Fenske N, Schmid M (2022). **gamboostLSS**: Boosting Methods for *GAMLSS* Models. R package version 2.0-6, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gamboostLSS>.
- Holmlund K, Grandell J, Schmetz J, Stuhlmann R, Bojkov B, Munro R, Lekouara M, Coppens D, Viticchie B, August T, Theodore B, Watts P, Dobber M, Fowler G, Bojinski S, Schmid A, Salonen K, Tjemkes S, Aminou D, Blythe P (2021). “Meteosat Third Generation (MTG): Continuation and Innovation of Observations from Geostationary Orbit.” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **102**(5), 990–1015. doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0304.1.
- Klein N, Kneib T, Klasen S, Lang S (2015a). “Bayesian Structured Additive Distributional Regression for Multivariate Responses.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society C*, **64**, 569–591. doi:10.1111/rssc.12090.
- Klein N, Kneib T, Lang S (2015b). “Bayesian Generalized Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape for Zero-Inflated and Overdispersed Count Data.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **110**(509), 405–419. doi:10.1080/01621459.2014.912955.
- Klein N, Kneib T, Lang S, Sohn A (2015c). “Bayesian Structured Additive Distributional Regression with an Application to Regional Income Inequality in Germany.” *Annals of Applied Statistics*, **9**, 1024–1052. doi:10.1214/15-aoas823.
- Krishna H, Singh Pundir P (2009). “Discrete Burr and discrete Pareto Distributions.” *Statistical Methodology*, **6**(2), 177–188. doi:10.1016/j.stamet.2008.07.001.
- Lang S, Umlauf N, Wechselberger P, Harttgen K, Kneib T (2014). “Multilevel Structured Additive Regression.” *Statistics and Computing*, **24**(2), 223–238. doi:10.1007/s11222-012-9366-0.
- Li Z, Wood SN (2020). “Faster Model Matrix Crossproducts for Large Generalized Linear Models With Discretized Covariates.” *Statistics and Computing*, **30**(1), 19–25. doi:10.1007/s11222-019-09864-2.
- Marx BD (1996). “Iteratively Reweighted Partial Least Squares Estimation for Generalized Linear Regression.” *Technometrics*, **38**(4), 374–381. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1271308>.
- Masson-Delmotte V, Zhai P, Pirani A, Connors SL, Péan C, Berger S, Caud N, Chen Y, Goldfarb L, Gomis M, et al. (2021). “Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis.” *Contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*, pp. 3–32.
- Mayr A, Fenske N, Hofner B, Kneib T, Schmid M (2012). “Generalized Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape for High Dimensional Data: A Flexible Approach Based on Boosting.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society C*, **61**(3), 403–427. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9876.2011.01033.x.
- Morgenstern D, Stucke I, Simon T, Mayr GJ, Zeileis A (2022). “Differentiating Lightning in Winter and Summer With Characteristics of the Wind Field and Mass Field: Supplementary Material.” doi:10.5281/zenodo.5851700. Funding: Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG), project no. 872656.

- Murray LT (2018). “An Uncertain Future for Lightning.” *Nature Climate Change*, **8**(3), 191–192. doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0094-0.
- Neal RM (2003). “Slice Sampling.” *The Annals of Statistics*, **31**(3), 705–767. doi:10.1214/aos/1056562461.
- Oelker MR, Tutz G (2017). “A Uniform Framework for the Combination of Penalties in Generalized Structured Models.” *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, **11**(1), 97–120. doi:10.1007/s11634-015-0205-y.
- Price C, Rind D (1992). “A Simple Lightning Parameterization for Calculating Global Lightning Distributions.” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **97**(D9), 9919–9933. doi:10.1029/92JD00719.
- Rigby RA, Stasinopoulos DM (2005). “Generalized Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society C*, **54**(3), 507–554. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9876.2005.00510.x.
- Robbins H, Monro S (1951). “A Stochastic Approximation Method.” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **22**(3), 400–407. doi:10.1214/aoms/1177729586.
- Schulz W, Cummins K, Diendorfer G, Dorninger M (2005). “Cloud-to-Ground Lightning in Austria: A 10-Year Study Using Data from a Lightning Location System.” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **110**(D9). doi:10.1029/2004JD005332.
- Schumann U, Huntrieser H (2007). “The Global Lightning-Induced Nitrogen Oxides Source.” *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, **7**(14), 3823–3907. doi:10.5194/acp-7-3823-2007. URL <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/7/3823/2007/>.
- Simon T, Mayr GJ, Morgenstern D, Umlauf N, Zeileis A (2022). “Amplification of Annual and Diurnal Cycles of Alpine Lightning.” *Preprint*, Research Square. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-965951/v3.
- Stasinopoulos DM, Rigby RA (2022). **gamlss.dist**: *Distributions for Generalized Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape*. R package version 6.0-5, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gamlss.dist>.
- Subrata C (2015). “Generating Discrete Analogues of Continuous Probability Distributions: A Survey of Methods and Constructions.” *Journal of Statistical Distributions and Applications*, **2**(6). doi:10.1186/s40488-015-0028-6.
- Taszarek M, Allen JT, Brooks HE, Pilguy N, Czernecki B (2021). “Differing Trends in United States and European Severe Thunderstorm Environments in a Warming Climate.” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **102**(2), 296–322. doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0004.1.
- Thomas J, Mayr A, Bischl B, Schmid M, Smith A, Hofner B (2018). “Gradient boosting for distributional regression - faster tuning and improved variable selection via noncyclical updates.” *Statistics and Computing*, **28**(3), 673–687. doi:10.1007/s11222-017-9754-6.

- Tibshirani R, Saunders M, Rosset S, Zhu J, Knight K (2005). “Sparsity and Smoothness via the Fused Lasso.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **67**(1), 91–108. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00490.x.
- Ukkonen P, Mäkelä A (2019). “Evaluation of Machine Learning Classifiers for Predicting Deep Convection.” *J. Adv. Model. Earth Sy.*, **11**(6), 1784–1802. doi:10.1029/2018MS001561.
- Umlauf N, Klein N, Simon T, Zeileis A (2021). “**bamlss**: A Lego Toolbox for Flexible Bayesian Regression (and Beyond).” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **100**(4), 1–53. doi:10.18637/jss.v100.i04.
- Umlauf N, Klein N, Zeileis A (2018). “BAMLSS: Bayesian Additive Models for Location, Scale, and Shape (and Beyond).” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **27**(3), 612–627. doi:10.1080/10618600.2017.1407325.
- Umlauf N, Klein N, Zeileis A, Köhler M (2022). **bamlss**: *Bayesian Additive Models for Location Scale and Shape (and Beyond)*. R package version 1.1-9, URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bamlss>.
- Wood SN (2003). “Thin Plate Regression Splines.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **65**(1), 95–114. doi:10.1111/1467-9868.00374.
- Wood SN (2017). *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. 2nd edition. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Wood SN (2022). **mgcv**: *Mixed GAM Computation Vehicle with Automatic Smoothness Estimation*. R package version 1.8-41, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mgcv>.
- Wood SN, Li Z, Shaddick G, Augustin NH (2017). “Generalized Additive Models for Gigadata: Modelling the UK Black Smoke Network Daily Data.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **112**(519), 1199–1210. doi:10.1080/01621459.2016.1195744.
- Zhang B, Hepp T, Greven S, Bergherr E (2022). “Adaptive Step-Length Selection in Gradient Boosting for Gaussian Location Scale Models.” *Computational Statistics*. doi:10.1007/s00180-022-01199-3.

A. Batchwise Backfitting in `bamlss`

This section provides introductory examples on how to fit distributional regression models for very large data sets with the `bamlss` package and the new batchwise backfitting algorithm.

After loading the package with

```
R> library("bamlss")
```

we simulate a data set with 10^7 observations using the `GAMart()` function with

```
R> set.seed(123)
R> d <- GAMart(n = 1e+07, sd = -1)
```

Then we save the data as a `.csv` file and remove the R data frame from the global environment.

```
R> write.csv(d, file = "d.csv", row.names = FALSE)
R> rm(d)
```

To design the scenario very realistic with respect to a very large data set, we read the data back into R as a flat file data frame.

```
R> library("ff")
R> dff <- read.csv.ffdf(file = "d.csv", header = TRUE)
```

The `GAMart()` function with `sd = -1` simulates Gaussian data with $y \sim N(\mu = \eta_\mu, \log(\sigma) = \eta_\sigma)$ and predictors given by

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_\mu &= f_1(\mathbf{x}_1) + f_2(\mathbf{x}_3) + f_{2d}(\text{lon}, \text{lat}) \\ \eta_\sigma &= f_3(\mathbf{x}_2) + f_2(\mathbf{x}_3) + f_4(\mathbf{x}_4).\end{aligned}$$

Here functions $f_1(\cdot), \dots, f_4(\cdot)$ represent univariate smooth functions and function $f_{2d}(\cdot)$ a smooth two dimensional effect of coordinates `lon` and `lat`. Note that the data set contains additional noise variables `x5` and `x6`.

A.1. Boosting Variant

We first illustrate the usage of the new model fitting engine using the boosting variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm, see Section 3.1. Therefore, we set up a list of model formulae, where each formula includes all covariates.

```
R> f <- ~ s(x1) + s(x2) + s(x3) + s(x4) + s(x5) + s(x6) + s(lon, lat)
R> f <- list(update(f, y ~ .), f)
```

Before estimation can be started, batch indices can be specified with

```
R> set.seed(456)
R> n <- nrow(dff)
R> batch_ids <- lapply(1:400, function(...) sample(n, size = 10000))
```

I.e., we use 400 batches with batchsize of 10000 such that the algorithm can practically see the entire data once. Then, the model is estimated with

```
R> b <- bamlss(f, data = dff, family = "gaussian",
+   sampler = FALSE, optimizer = opt_bbfit,
+   nu = 0.1, always = FALSE, AIC = TRUE, eps_loglik = 0.0001,
+   batch_ids = batch_ids, select = TRUE,
+   ff_name = "ff_simdata", delete = FALSE, overwrite = FALSE,
+   light = TRUE)
```

Note that the data frame `dff` is an "ffdf" data frame. For processing all the design matrices for estimating the model, we therefore specify a directory name with `ff_name = "ff_simdata"`, where all matrices can be stored as `ff` objects. The directory `ff_simdata` is created in the current working directory and will not be deleted after estimation if `delete = FALSE`. This has the advantage, that the `ff` matrices can be reused for other models, e.g., using a different distribution, i.e., setting up more models will be much faster. If `overwrite = FALSE`, the directory for storing the `ff` objects will not be overwritten when calling `bamlss()`. Moreover, option `light = TRUE` can be used to reduce the memory footprint of the final returned object even more. Here, we need to set `sampler = FALSE` in order to switch off subsequent MCMC sampling. The `opt_bbfit()` optimizer function is used as the model fitting engine, for which we specify the step length control parameter `nu = 0.1`. Argument `always = FALSE` causes model terms to be updated only if the relative improvement of the *out-of-sample* log-likelihood (on the next batch) is larger than 0.0001 (controlled by argument `eps_loglik`). By setting `AIC = TRUE` the smoothing variances are selected by the *out-of-sample* AIC, otherwise the *out-of-sample* log-likelihood is used. As we are interested in the boosting variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm in this case, we need to set argument `select = TRUE`, i.e., only the model term with the largest contribution to the log-likelihood in the next batch will be updated. On a Linux system with Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8550U CPU 1.80GHz processors, the estimation time is about 55 minutes, which is considerably fast for such a large data set. Selection frequencies of the 400 boosting iterations and individual log-likelihood contributions can be shown with

```
R> contribplot(b)
```

```
mu
      Sel. freq.
s.s(x1)      0.116
s.s(x3)      0.116
s.s(lon,lat)  0.112
p            0.004
s.s(x2)      0.000
s.s(x4)      0.000
s.s(x5)      0.000
s.s(x6)      0.000

sigma
      Sel. freq.
```




Figure 14: Log-likelihood contribution paths for selected terms of the Gaussian model.

p	0.220
s.s(x3)	0.156
s.s(x4)	0.140
s.s(x2)	0.136
s.s(x1)	0.000
s.s(x5)	0.000
s.s(x6)	0.000
s.s(lon,lat)	0.000

The selection frequencies reveal that the boosting variant of the batchwise backfitting algorithm selected the correct model terms, the corresponding contribution paths are shown in Figure 14. The paths also show the convergence of the algorithm already at about iteration 200.

A.2. Resampling

This section demonstrates the *resampling* variant with slice sampling of smoothing variances of the batchwise backfitting algorithm. From the selected model terms we set up a new formula

```
R> f <- list(
+   y ~ s(x1) + s(x3) + s(lon, lat),
+     ~ s(x2) + s(x3) + s(x4)
+ )
```

and only slightly modify the arguments supplied to the main model fitting function `bamlss()`

```
R> m <- bamlss(f, data = dff, family = "gaussian",
+   sampler = FALSE, optimizer = opt_bbfity,
+   AIC = TRUE, slice = TRUE, batch_ids = batch_ids,
+   ff_name = "ff_simdata", delete = FALSE, overwrite = FALSE,
+   light = TRUE)
```

Estimation takes about 24 minutes. Note that we use a wrapper version `opt_bbfity()` for estimating the model. The only difference is that the parameters are stored as "mcmc" "samples" in the returned object, so all extractor functions such as `predict()`, `residuals()`, etc., can be used similarly to estimating full Bayesian models with MCMC. For details on using `bamlss`, see Umlauf, Klein, Simon, and Zeileis (2021) and the project website <http://bamlss.org/>. A major advantage of the new infrastructures, including the `ff` package, is that all design matrices can be reused and do not need to be recomputed, saving large amounts of runtime. To use this feature, all that is required is careful handling of the `ff_name`, `delete` and `overwrite` arguments (use as described in the last section). By setting `slice = TRUE`, slice sampling of smoothing parameters in combination with the resampling variant with `nu = 1`, `eps_loglik = -Inf` and `always = TRUE` is used for batchwise backfitting, i.e., updates are always accepted. Convergence of the algorithm can be inspected by, e.g., coefficient paths of the parameters.

B. Simulation Results

In this section we show all the results of the simulation study presented in Section 4.




Figure 15: Functions used in the simulation study. Green lines correspond to the estimated effects of the `opt_bbfite` model of the 100 replications in the simulation setting: normal distribution `N0`, observations `n = 5000`, noise variables `noise = 10` and correlation `rho = 0`.




Figure 16: Spatial effect used in the simulation study. Spatial effects correspond to the estimated two-dimensional effects of the method `opt_bbfite` in the 100 replications of the simulation setting: normal distribution `N0`, observations `n = 5000`, noise variables `noise = 10` and correlation `rho = 0`. The mean was calculated over the 100 different estimates of the two-dimensional effect.




Figure 17: Simulation study. Average MSE with the GA distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.




Figure 18: Simulation study. Average MSE with the ZAP distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.




Figure 19: Simulation study. Average MSE of f_1 effect of η_μ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.




Figure 20: Simulation study. Average MSE of f_2 effect of η_σ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.




Figure 21: Simulation study. Average MSE of f_3 effect of η_σ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.




Figure 22: Simulation study. Average MSE of f_4 effect of η_σ for all distributions, different number of observations, correlation and noise variables.




Figure 23: Simulation study. Average false positive rate of the GA distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.




Figure 24: Simulation study. Average false positive rate of the ZAP distribution for predictor η_μ and η_σ for different number of observations, correlation and noise variable settings.




Figure 25: Simulation study. Average false positive rate of 10 replications per setting for different threshold values. Setting: Number of observations varies, NO , $\rho = 0.7$ and $\text{noise} = 10$. For $n \geq 500$ the method `opt_bbfite` is the best in terms of excluding non-informative variables.

Affiliation:

Nikolaus Umlauf, Johannes Seiler, Mattias Wetscher, Thorsten Simon, Stefan Lang
Department of Statistics

Faculty of Economics and Statistics

Universität Innsbruck

Universitätsstr. 15

6020 Innsbruck, Austria

E-mail: Nikolaus.Umlauf@uibk.ac.at,
Johannes.Seiler@uibk.ac.at,
Mattias.Wetscher@uibk.ac.at,
Thorsten.Simon@uibk.ac.at,
Stefan.Lang@uibk.ac.at

URL: <https://eeecon.uibk.ac.at/~umlauf/>,
<https://www.uibk.ac.at/statistics/personal/lang/>

Nadja Klein

Chair of Uncertainty Quantification and Statistical Learning

Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security (UA Ruhr)

Department of Statistics (Technische Universität Dortmund)

Joseph-von-Fraunhofer-Str. 25

44227 Dortmund, Germany

E-mail: nadja.klein@statistik.tu-dortmund.de

URL: <https://rc-trust.ai/klein/>