

Deep mixture of linear mixed models for complex longitudinal data

Lucas Kock¹, Nadja Klein^{1,*} and David J. Nott²

November 14, 2023

¹ Chair of Uncertainty Quantification and Statistical Learning, RC Trustworthy Data Science and Security (UA Ruhr) and Department of Statistics (TU Dortmund)

² Department of Statistics and Data Science, National University of Singapore

* Correspondence should be directed to Prof. Dr. Nadja Klein, Chair of Uncertainty Quantification and Statistical Learning, Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security (UA Ruhr) and Department of Statistics (Technische Universität Dortmund), Joseph-von-Fraunhofer-Str. 25, 44227 Dortmund, Germany.

Acknowledgments: Nadja Klein acknowledges support through the Emmy Noether grant KL 3037/1-1 of the German research foundation (DFG). The work of Lucas Kock and Nadja Klein was supported by the Volkswagenstiftung (grant: 96932).

Deep mixture of linear mixed models for complex longitudinal data

Abstract

Mixtures of linear mixed models are widely used for modelling longitudinal data for which observation times differ between subjects. In typical applications, temporal trends are described using a basis expansion, with basis coefficients treated as random effects varying by subject. Additional random effects can describe variation between mixture components, or other known sources of variation in complex experimental designs. A key advantage of these models is that they provide a natural mechanism for clustering, which can be helpful for interpretation in many applications. Current versions of mixtures of linear mixed models are not specifically designed for the case where there are many observations per subject and a complex temporal trend, which requires a large number of basis functions to capture. In this case, the subject-specific basis coefficients are a high-dimensional random effects vector, for which the covariance matrix is hard to specify and estimate, especially if it varies between mixture components. To address this issue, we consider the use of recently-developed deep mixture of factor analyzers models as the prior for the random effects. The resulting deep mixture of linear mixed models is well-suited to high-dimensional settings, and we describe an efficient variational inference approach to posterior computation. The efficacy of the method is demonstrated on both real and simulated data.

Keywords: Deep mixture of factor analyzer; irregularly sampled data; random effects; temporal trends; variational inference

1 Introduction

Mixtures of linear mixed models (MLMMs) (e.g. Verbeke and Lesaffre (1996)) are widely used for the analysis of longitudinal data for which observation times differ by subject, and in cases where there is a need to “borrow strength” between subjects in a flexible way. A common approach to modelling temporal trends in MLMMs uses a flexible basis expansion, with basis coefficients treated as a random effect varying across individuals. The mixture structure for the distribution of the random effects provides flexibility when the random effects are non-Gaussian, and also provides a natural mechanism for clustering which enhances interpretability. In settings where there are a large number of observations per subject and the temporal trends are complex, many basis functions may be required, which results in high-dimensional random effects. The main contribution of this paper is to address the issue of high-dimensionality in MLMMs by using a deep mixture of factor analyzers (DMFA) model as the prior for the random effects distribution. The result is a new deep mixture of linear mixed model (DMLMM) specification. We discuss efficient variational methods for computation and demonstrate the good performance of our approach in simulations and a number of real examples involving within subject prediction for unbalanced longitudinal data, likelihood-free inference and missing data imputation.

A common application of MLMMs has been in clustering of time course gene expression data. Several authors have considered linear mixed models (LMMs) with basis expansions for modelling temporal trends, and extensions to mixtures for clustering (Bar-Joseph et al.; 2002; Luan and Li; 2003; Qin and Self; 2006). A similar approach in the functional data analysis literature is described by James and Sugar (2003). Celeux et al. (2005) consider MLMMs for clustering of gene expression datasets with replication, where gene level random effects are shared between replicates. Ng et al. (2006) extend this model with a random effect

for different tissues, and Tan and Nott (2014) consider a similar model with two random effects, one for subjects and one for the mixture component, and allow for covariate-dependent mixing weights. They consider Bayesian inference in their model, with computations carried out using variational approximation methods. Scharl et al. (2010) consider initialization of EM algorithms for mixtures of regression models, including MLMMs, for clustering time series gene expression data. Pfeifer (2004) cluster longitudinal data using LMMs, where the random effects distribution is either a finite mixture of normals, or some arbitrary distribution approximated discretely. Coke and Tsao (2010) consider clustering of electrical load series.

MLMMs also arise in the literature on model-based functional clustering, where approximations to continuous time processes can lead to processes defined from finite basis expansions and a LMM formulation. Examples include Chiou and Li (2007), who consider a nonparametric random effects model and a truncated Karhunen-Loève expansion, and Jacques and Preda (2014) in which the authors cluster multivariate functional data assuming that multivariate functional principal components are normally distributed. McDowell et al. (2018) perform functional clustering of gene expression data using a Dirichlet process Gaussian process mixture model. Shi and Wang (2008) develop a mixture of Gaussian process functional regressions model where the mixing weights can be covariate-dependent.

There are a variety of generalizations or closely related models to finite MLMMs. These include partition models (Heard et al.; 2006; Booth et al.; 2008) mixtures of generalized LMMs (GLMMs; e.g., Lenk and DeSarbo; 2000; Proust and Jacqmin-Gadda; 2005, among many others) and mixtures of nonlinear hierarchical models (Pauler and Laird; 2000; De la Cruz-Mesía et al.; 2008). Bai et al. (2016) robustify mixtures of linear mixed models by assuming a multivariate- t distribution for the responses and random effects jointly within each mixture component. LMMs with nonparametric priors, include infinite mixtures of

LMMs or more general hierarchical models have been considered in the literature on Bayesian nonparametrics (Bush and MacEachern; 1996; Kleinman and Ibrahim; 1998; Müller and Rosner; 1997; Heinzl and Tutz; 2013, among many others).

In our model, the DFMA introduced by Viroli and McLachlan (2019) serves as a prior for the random effects in MLMMs. It considers a mixture of factor analyzers model (Ghahramani and Beal; 2000; McLachlan et al.; 2003) but instead of assuming factors to be Gaussian, allows the factors to themselves be modelled as a mixture of factor analyzers recursively for multiple layers. The model of Viroli and McLachlan (2019) builds on an earlier formulation described in Tang et al. (2012), where components are split recursively and the fitting is done layerwise. However, Viroli and McLachlan (2019) use a similar architecture to that in van den Oord and Schrauwen (2014), where the authors allow parameter sharing between mixture components, although they do not consider factor structures for the mixture component covariance matrices. Other related mixture models are considered in Yang et al. (2017), Li (2005) and Malsiner-Walli et al. (2017). We build on the Bayesian formulation of DMFAs proposed by Kock et al. (2022) and implement efficient variational methods for computation.

Throughout this paper, we demonstrate the adaptability of our DMLMM approach across a range of real-world applications, each presenting distinct challenges. We consider within subject prediction for an unbalanced longitudinal study, as well as the task of predictive likelihood free inference, where each sample is a high-dimensional time series and a large number of basis functions is needed to estimate a complex temporal trend. Predictive likelihood-free inference has not been explored within the MLMM literature before. Last, we apply the DMLMM to missing data imputation for gene expression data. Mixture modelling allows adaptive local sharing of information which improves imputation. Across all these applications, the Gaussian mixture model (GMM) representation of the DMLMM is helpful for interpretation and the derivation of additional insights.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In the next section we introduce the DMLMM for longitudinal data based on a Bayesian version of the DMFA model considered in Viroli and McLachlan (2019) and outline efficient variational inference methods for posterior estimation in Section 3. Sections 4 and 5 explore the properties of our approach in aforementioned real applications and simulations. The final Section 6 gives some concluding discussion.

2 Deep mixture of LMMs

This section introduces the DMLMM. Section 2.1 describes the overall model, while Section 2.2 discusses the DMFA prior for the random effects in more detail.

2.1 The DMLMM – notation and model specification

Consider a longitudinal study where data $y_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{in_i})^\top$ is observed for subject i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, with y_{ij} an observation at time t_{ij} , $j = 1, \dots, n_i$. Writing $t_i = (t_{i1}, \dots, t_{in_i})^\top$, it is assumed that

$$y_i = B(t_i)\beta_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{n_i})$, $B(t_i) = (B(t_{i1}), \dots, B(t_{in_i}))^\top$ is a known $n_i \times d$ design matrix where $B(t_{ij})$ is a d -dimensional column vector of basis functions evaluated at t_{ij} , and $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a subject specific random coefficient vector. We consider Bayesian inference, and use a half-Cauchy prior $\sigma \sim \mathcal{HC}(A)$ for the standard deviation of the error terms ε_i , which we express hierarchically as

$$\sigma^2 | \psi \sim \mathcal{IG}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\psi}\right) \quad \psi \sim \mathcal{IG}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{A^2}\right).$$

Section 2.2 introduces a DMFA model which we use as a flexible prior distribution for the random effects β_i . Write $\beta = (\beta_1^\top, \dots, \beta_n^\top)^\top$, and $\theta = (\eta^\top, \beta^\top)$ where θ are the unknown parameters, so that η contains the unknowns except for β . The DMFA prior density for β_i

is a GMM with density of the form

$$p(\beta_i|\eta) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi(\beta_i; \mu_k, \Sigma_k),$$

where $\sum w_k = 1$, and $\phi(\cdot; \mu, \Sigma)$ denotes the multivariate normal density function with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ . In the DMFA the parameters w_k , μ_k and Σ_k are parametrized parsimoniously and this is described in detail later. With probability w_k , y_i given θ follows the LMM

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= B(t_i)\beta_i + \varepsilon_i \\ \beta_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \Sigma_k). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating out β in (1) using $p(\beta_i|\eta)$ gives the marginal likelihood

$$p(y_i|\eta) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi(y_i; B(t_i)\mu_k, B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top + \sigma^2 I_{n_i}). \quad (2)$$

The random effects β_i can be interpreted as projections of the unequal length observations y_i into a joint d -dimensional latent space. Our later applications demonstrate that the flexible DMFA prior allows complex trends to be modelled well when the number of basis functions is large, while borrowing strength between similar observations to stabilize estimation for subjects having little available data.

A key task that we address in these applications is within subject prediction. Suppose that for subject i we need predictive inferences about unobserved data \tilde{y} at time points $\tilde{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_T)$. Integrating out β , the joint density of (y_i, \tilde{y}) given η is a high-dimensional GMM,

$$p(y_i, \tilde{y}|\eta) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} y_i \\ \tilde{y} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} B(t_i)\mu_k \\ B(\tilde{t})\mu_k \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top + \sigma^2 I_{n_i} & B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(\tilde{t})^\top \\ B(\tilde{t})\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top & B(\tilde{t})\Sigma_k B(\tilde{t})^\top + \sigma^2 I_T \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

leading to a conditional density for \tilde{y} given y_i, η which is also a GMM:

$$p(\tilde{y} | y_i, \eta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{w}_k \phi(\tilde{y}; \tilde{\mu}_k, \tilde{\Sigma}_k), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}_k &= \frac{w_k \phi(y_i; B(t_i)\mu_k, B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top)}{\sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi(y_i; B(t_i)\mu_k, B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top)} \\ \tilde{\mu}_k &= B(\tilde{t})\mu_k - B(\tilde{t})\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top (B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top + \sigma^2 I_{n_i})^{-1} (y_i - B(t_i)\mu_k) \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_k &= B(\tilde{t})\Sigma_k B(\tilde{t})^\top + \sigma^2 I_T - B(\tilde{t})\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top (B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(t_i)^\top + \sigma^2 I_{n_i})^{-1} B(t_i)\Sigma_k B(\tilde{t})^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Predictive inference can be obtained from (3) either in a plug-in fashion, using a point estimate of η , or by integrating out the parameters over the posterior distribution or some approximation to it. In Section 3, we will consider posterior approximations and point estimates obtained using variational inference. Figure 1 illustrates the full DMLMM including the DMFA prior and model training process which we will discuss further next.

2.2 DMFA prior for subject specific random effects

The DMFA model was motivated by Viroli and McLachlan (2019) as a deep extension of the mixture of factor analyzers (MFA) model, which can be thought of as a DMFA model with only one layer. While Viroli and McLachlan (2019) and Kock et al. (2022) consider DMFA models for multivariate data directly, here it will be used as a prior for random effects in a LMM.

The hierarchical DMFA prior is a generative model for the random effects β_i expressed in terms of latent variables arranged in a number of layers. Define $z_i^{(0)} := \beta_i$, and write $z_i^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{D^{(l)}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, for latent variables at layer $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. We define the model for $z_i^{(l-1)}$ $l = 1, \dots, L$, in terms of $z_i^{(l)}$ as a mixture model, with $K^{(l)}$ components. At level l , the mixing weights for the mixture are denoted $w_k^{(l)}$, $k = 1, \dots, K^{(l)}$, $\sum_k w_k^{(l)} = 1$. The model for $z_i^{(l-1)}$ given $z_i^{(l)}$ is expressed generatively as follows: for $l = 1, \dots, L$, with probability $w_k^{(l)}$,

$z_i^{(l-1)}$ is generated as

$$z_i^{(l-1)} = \mu_k^{(l)} + B_k^{(l)} z_i^{(l)} + \epsilon_{ik}^{(l)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_{ik}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_k^{(l)})$, $\mu_k^{(l)}$ is a $D^{(l-1)}$ -vector, $B_k^{(l)}$ is a $D^{(l-1)} \times D^{(l)}$ lower triangular matrix, $\delta_k^{(l)} = \text{diag}(\delta_{k_1}^{(l)}, \dots, \delta_{k_{D^{(l-1)}}}^{(l)})$ is a $D^{(l-1)} \times D^{(l-1)}$ diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\delta_{kj}^{(l)} > 0$. At the final layer $z_i^{(L)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{D^{(L)}})$. In the specification of the DFMA prior, we restrict the dimensionality of the latent variables to satisfy the Anderson-Rubin condition $D^{(l+1)} \leq \frac{D^{(l)} - 1}{2}$ for $l = 0, \dots, L$, as it is a necessary condition for ensuring model identifiability. Figure 1b) gives an example for a DMFA prior architecture with $L = 2$ layers.

Following the discussion of Viroli and McLachlan (2019), the DMFA prior can be regarded as a GMM with $K = \prod_{l=1}^L K^{(l)}$ components. The components correspond to “paths” through the factor mixture components at the different levels. Write $k_l \in \{1, \dots, K^{(l)}\}$ for the index of a factor mixture component at level l and let $k = (k_1, \dots, k_L)^\top$ index a path. Let $w_k = \prod_{l=1}^L w_{k_l}^{(l)}$,

$$\mu_k = \mu_{k_1}^{(1)} + \sum_{l=2}^L \left(\prod_{m=1}^{l-1} B_{k_m}^{(m)} \right) \mu_{k_l}^{(l)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_k = \delta_{k_1}^{(1)} + \sum_{l=2}^L \left(\prod_{m=1}^{l-1} B_{k_m}^{(m)} \right) \delta_{k_l}^{(l)} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{l-1} B_{k_m}^{(m)} \right)^\top.$$

Then the DMFA prior corresponds to the Gaussian mixture density $\sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi(y; \mu_k, \Sigma_k)$.

To get some intuition for the DMFA prior construction, it is helpful to consider the case of a single layer, $L = 1$. In this case, the DMFA prior is a mixture of factor analyzers (MFA) prior on the random effects. Abusing notation by writing simply $K = K^{(1)}$, $w_k = w_k^{(1)}$, $\mu_k = \mu_k^{(1)}$, $B_k = B_k^{(1)}$, $\delta_k = \delta_k^{(1)}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $z_i = z_i^{(1)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, (4) specifies the prior for β_i through the following single generative layer: with probability w_k , generate β_i as

$$\beta_i = \mu_k + B_k z_i + \epsilon_{ik},$$

where $\epsilon_{ik} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_k)$. Integrating out the latent variables z_i , the corresponding density of β_i

is

$$\sum_{k=1}^K w_k \phi(\beta_i; \mu_k, B_k B_k^\top + \delta_k).$$

The low-dimensional latent variables z_i allow a parsimonious description of the dependence between the possibly high-dimensional components in β_i ; conditionally on z_i , components of β_i are independent. The latent variables z_i are called factors, and the matrices B_k are called factor loadings or factor loading matrices. The key idea of the DMFA prior is to replace the Gaussian assumption $z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ with the assumption that the z_i 's themselves follow a MFA model.

In a Bayesian framework, Kock et al. (2022) propose the following marginally independent priors for the parameters of a DMFA model, and we use similar priors for the hyperparameters on the DMFA prior for the random effects. They use thick-tailed Cauchy priors on the component mean parameters $\mu_k^{(l)}$ and half-Cauchy priors on the standard deviations $\delta_k^{(l)}$. In the DMLMM the same prior is used also for the standard deviation σ of the error terms ε_i . For the component factor loading matrices $B_k^{(l)}$, they use the sparsity-inducing horseshoe prior of Carvalho and Polson (2010). Kock et al. (2022) show that this prior choice is helpful with regularizing the estimation. Additionally, in the DMLMM imposing sparsity on the factor loadings is motivated by the fact that the entries of the coefficient vector β_i control local information and therefore each of the latent factors should control only a subset of components, but not the full vector. Typically the basis functions are chosen such that $B(t)$ is sparse as well. Lastly, the marginal prior for $w^{(l)}$ is a Dirichlet distribution allowing to select the number of clusters in a computationally thrifty way, using overfitted mixtures (Rousseau and Mengersen; 2011). A precise description of the priors is given in Web Appendix A.

3 Posterior computation

Next we review basic ideas of variational inference and explain how the scalable variational inference algorithm for the DMFA model in Kock et al. (2022) can be extended to the new DMLMM with DMFA prior for the random effects.

3.1 Variational inference

Variational Inference (VI) (e.g. Blei et al. (2017)) learns an approximation to the posterior density $p(\theta | y)$ in Bayesian inference using an approximating family of densities $\{q_\lambda(\theta), \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ where λ are variational parameters to be chosen. The optimal approximation is obtained by finding the value λ^* of λ minimizing some measure of dissimilarity between $p(\theta | y)$ and $q_\lambda(\theta)$. A common choice for the dissimilarity measure is the reverse Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{KL}} [q_\lambda(\theta) || p(\theta | y)] = \mathbb{E}_{q_\lambda} \{\log(q_\lambda(\theta)/p(\theta | y))\},$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{q_\lambda}(\cdot)$ denotes expectation with respect to $q_\lambda(\theta)$. Minimizing the reverse KL divergence is equivalent to maximizing the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO),

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\lambda} \{\log(h(\theta)) - \log(q_\lambda(\theta))\}, \tag{5}$$

where $h(\theta) = p(y | \theta)p(\theta)$. For the DMLMM model with a DMFA prior for the random effects, we consider variational approximations leading to a closed form expression for the ELBO, similar to Kock et al. (2022). We optimize the ELBO using a stochastic gradient ascent (SGA) method which uses mini-batch sampling to effectively deal with large datasets. We give a high level discussion of the approach next, a detailed discussion can be found in Kock et al. (2022).

3.2 VI for the DMFA

The SGA algorithm for the original DMFA model of Kock et al. (2022) adapts stochastic VI (Hoffman et al.; 2013) by partitioning the variational parameters into “global” parameters λ_G , which parametrize variational posterior terms for shared model parameters such as the factor loading matrices $B_k^{(l)}$ or the component mean shift vectors $\mu_k^{(l)}$, and “local” parameters λ_L , which parametrize variational posterior terms for observation-specific latent variables, such as $z_i^{(l)}$. Write $\lambda = (\lambda_G^\top, \lambda_L^\top)^\top$, and denote the value of λ_L maximizing the ELBO for a given value of λ_G as $M(\lambda_G)$. We then consider the ELBO as a function of λ_G , with λ_L fixed at $M(\lambda_G)$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_G) := \mathcal{L}(\lambda_G, M(\lambda_G)).$$

The stochastic VI algorithm we use optimizes $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_G)$ where at step $m = 1, \dots, M$ of the SGA algorithm there are two nested steps. First, the optimal local parameters $\hat{\lambda}_L$ for the current global parameter vector $\lambda_G^{(m-1)}$ are updated. Then, the global parameters are updated as

$$\lambda_G^{(m)} = \lambda_G^{(m-1)} + a_m \circ \widehat{\nabla_{\lambda_G} \bar{\mathcal{L}}}(\lambda_G^{(m-1)}), \quad (6)$$

where a_m is a vector-valued step size sequence, \circ denotes elementwise multiplication, and $\widehat{\nabla_{\lambda_G} \bar{\mathcal{L}}}(\lambda_G^{(m-1)})$ is an unbiased estimate of the natural gradient (Amari; 1998) of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_G^{(m-1)})$ based on a random data mini-batch, where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ denotes the ELBO with local parameters fixed at $\hat{\lambda}_L$. Optimization of local variational parameters is only required for the observations in the data mini-batch, which leads to an efficient algorithm for large data sets.

3.3 VI for DMLMMs

The deep structure of the DMLMM corresponds to a DMFA model with an additional regression layer of the form (1) on top (see Figure 1b)). The regression layer has a very similar structure to a single layer in the DMFA model, (4), where the factor loading matrix is fixed at $B(t_i)$ and the mean shift vector is zero. This perspective allows us to extend the

efficient VI scheme for DMFA developed in Kock et al. (2022) to DMLMM as follows.

Let θ_{DMFA} denote the vector of all unknown model parameters for the DMFA prior and $\theta_{\text{Reg}} = (\beta^\top, \sigma^2, \psi)^\top$ be the vector of the remaining parameters. The full set of unknown model parameters for the DMLMM is then $\theta = (\theta_{\text{DMFA}}^\top, \theta_{\text{Reg}}^\top)$. We assume a factorized variational approximation to the posterior density of the form

$$q_\lambda(\theta) = q_{\lambda_{\text{DMFA}}}(\theta_{\text{DMFA}})q_{\lambda_{\text{Reg}}}(\theta_{\text{Reg}}), \quad (7)$$

where $q_{\lambda_{\text{DMFA}}}(\theta_{\text{DMFA}})$ is the density for θ_{DMFA} with variational parameters λ_{DMFA} and

$$q_{\lambda_{\text{Reg}}}(\theta_{\text{Reg}}) = q(\sigma^2)q(\psi) \prod_{i=1}^n q(\beta_i),$$

where $q(\sigma^2)$ and $q(\psi)$ are inverse gamma densities and $q(\beta_i)$ is a multivariate Gaussian density with independent marginals. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(\theta) &= p(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | \theta) \\ &= p(\theta_{\text{DMFA}})p(\sigma^2 | \psi)p(\psi) \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | \beta_i, \sigma^2)p(\beta_i | \theta_{\text{DMFA}}), \end{aligned}$$

and (5) can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}^{\text{DMFA}}(\lambda) + \mathcal{L}^{\text{Reg}}(\lambda),$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{DMFA}}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}q_\lambda \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \log(p(\beta_i | \theta_{\text{DMFA}})) + \log(p(\theta_{\text{DMFA}})) - \log(q_{\lambda_{\text{DMFA}}}(\theta_{\text{DMFA}})) \right]$$

can be derived from the ELBO for the DFMA model and

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{Reg}}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}q_\lambda \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \log(p(y_i | \beta_i, \sigma^2)) + \log(p(\sigma^2 | \psi)p(\psi)) - \log(q_{\lambda_{\text{Reg}}}(\theta_{\text{Reg}})) \right]$$

is available in closed form. More details on the calculation of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ can be found in the Web Appendix B.

$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ has a similar structure to the ELBO for the DMFA model, where β is an additional

“local” parameter and σ, ψ are “global” parameters. As a result, it is straightforward to adapt the updating approach explained in Section 3.2 to the DMLMM.

In the DMFA model the use of overfitted mixtures and ELBO values of short runs allows to choose a suitable architecture in a computationally thrifty way and this idea directly translates to the DMLMM. The choice of the number of layers and factors in our DMLMM also follows the choices made in the DMFA model. Due to the parameter sharing, some components of the GMM representation (2) might be empty, even when there are data points assigned to every component in each layer (Selosse et al.; 2020). While this does not affect the clustering induced by the DMFA prior it can have negative impact on the resulting density estimation. Hence, we recommend that after the full model is fitted the weights for empty components of the GMM density are manually set to zero and remaining weights are rescaled. Predictive inference in the DMLMM is carried out using the variational posterior mean as a point estimate for η .

4 Real data illustrations

In this section we showcase our DMLMM in three diverse applications on longitudinal CD4 counts, malaria transmission and missing data imputation for gene expression data.

4.1 Longitudinal CD4 counts

Data and model description CD4 percentages are a popular prognostic marker of disease stage among human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)-infected individuals. Here, we consider data from the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study (Kaslow et al.; 1987) which has been analyzed by many previous authors (e.g. by Fan and Zhang; 2000; Wu and Chiang; 2000; Yao et al.; 2005). The dataset contains repeated measurements for 283 MSM (men who have sex with men) who were tested HIV-positive between 1984 and 1991. Even though individuals were expected to get their measurements taken in regular 6 month time intervals, the

number of measurements and the measurement times differ per individual. The observed trajectories for all individuals are shown in Figure 2a).

The goal is to model the CD4 percentage trajectories in continuous time as well as to dynamically predict CD4 percentages at future time points. To this end, we denote by y_i the n_i -dimensional vector of observed CD4 measurements on the probit scale for individual i . The design matrices $B(t_i)$ are constructed from 7 Legendre polynomials. Let \tilde{y} denote the unobserved CD4 measurements on a fine equidistant grid \tilde{t} over $[0, 6]$ with 120 grid points.

Results Figure 2b) shows the estimated mean effects $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{y} \mid y_i, \hat{\eta})$ with 95% pointwise credible intervals for three randomly selected individuals based on the observed measurements. Even in cases with limited measurement data, the method reconstructs meaningful trajectories by combining information from both the specific individual and the entire dataset. As expected, credible intervals are wider in regions where no measurements are observed and near the end of the time interval, where fewer data points are observed. In a diagnostic context, within subject forecasting is of particular interest. By (2), the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a GMM can be expressed as a mixture of Gaussian CDFs. This allows for a simple calculation of the risk of the CD4 percentage of an individual falling below a threshold at a given time. Figure 2c) shows the predicted CDFs $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid y_i, \hat{\eta})$ for three selected individuals at $\tilde{t} = 4.5$.

Further insight can be obtained through the predictive marginal density for an individual for which no data has been observed, $p(\tilde{y} \mid \hat{\eta})$, which is depicted in Figure 2b). Computation of this marginal density is simple as the mean effect, the variance function and the correlation function are available in closed form for a Gaussian mixture density. The mean effect shows an overall decreasing trend among individuals. The variance function is non-stationary and increases over time. The marginal distribution for time points near the end of the observation

period becomes bimodal. As expected, time-points close to each other are estimated to be highly correlated.

4.2 Predicting malaria transmission in Afghanistan

We reanalyze monthly data reporting malaria cases registered in Afghanistan from January 2005 to September 2015 (Anwar et al.; 2016). In a recent analysis Alahmadi et al. (2020) considered the data in a classical Bayesian parameter inference setting. Here we are interested in forecasting future case counts based on the observed data.

Model description White et al. (2009) and Alahmadi et al. (2020) propose a nonlinear ordinary differential equation (ODE) model incorporating a seasonal forcing associated with malaria transmission to describe temporal population dynamics. The model consists of five coupled and highly parameterized ODEs modelling four population compartments (uninfected and non-immune, infected with no prior immunity, uninfected with immunity and infected with prior immunity) as well as the total number of treated cases. We observe $y_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\log(z_j), \sigma^2)$, where z_j denotes the number of new cases at time $t_j \in [0, T]$. A full description of the underlying latent ODE model can be found in Alahmadi et al. (2020). We write $y_{t_1:t_2}$ for the vector of observations at time-points $t = (t_1, \dots, t_2)$.

Since the ODE model is not fully observed, $p(y_{t:T} \mid \theta, y_{1:t})$ is not available in closed form and $p(y_{1:T} \mid \theta)$ is costly to evaluate as it involves numerically approximating a solution to the ODE. While likelihood-free inference methods such as Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC; Sisson et al.; 2018) are commonly used for parameter estimation and model comparison with computationally expensive likelihoods, predictive inference, such as computing the posterior predictive distribution of future observations or missing data, remains challenging due to the complexity of the underlying dynamics and the high dimensionality of the observations. In contrast, the DMLMM enables closed form calculations of the predictive

distribution without the need for direct inference on the model parameters, tedious calibration of hyperparameters, or selection of summary statistics based on expert knowledge. Instead, the flexibility of the DMLMM allows us to learn a low-dimensional representation of the high-dimensional observations that captures the relevant information for prediction.

Experimental design As the uninformative prior $p(\theta)$ used in Alahmadi et al. (2020) results in many unrealistic time series, we reject any simulated time series for which the number of simulated cases never exceeds 100. Since we regard $p(y) = p(y_{1:128})$ as a black box simulator, we do not need to make this constraint explicit in the model formulation. We generate 7,500 samples from $p(y)$, which we split into a training set with 5,000 samples and a test set with 2,500 samples. Our goal is to approximate $p(y_{81:128} \mid y_{1:80})$ using the joint samples from $p(y_{1:128})$. Järvenpää and Corander (2023) discuss how ordinary ABC can be used in this setting and we use their approach, which we label ABC, as a benchmark. The design matrices $B(\cdot)$ used for DMLMM incorporate a 20-dimensional spline basis, with 6 splines modelling a yearly seasonality and the remaining basis functions modelling an additive trend.

Results Figure 3a) shows the predicted time series for the observed data. Both, ABC and the DMLMM recover the general behaviour of the unobserved data points well. Studying the 95% credible intervals for both methods shows no large difference between the DMLMM approach and ABC, although our approach has slightly better coverage properties.

The DMLMM also performs slightly better in terms of the root mean square error (RMSE) $\sqrt{\frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{t'=t}^T (y_{t'} - \hat{y}_{t'})^2}$ with a mean of 0.41 (ABC: 0.43), median of 0.4 (ABC: 0.41) and a standard deviation of 0.04 (ABC: 0.2) across all repetitions from the test data, as summarized in Figure 3b). Here, $\hat{y}_{t'}$ are the posterior predictive mean estimates for $y_{t'}$. While the pointwise credible intervals for both methods seem very well calibrated at levels

0.05, 0.5, 0.95 (Figure 3c)), observed coverage rates of elliptical credible sets from the 48-dimensional predictive distribution $p(y_{81:128} \mid y_{1:80})$ are closer to the nominal levels for the DMLMM as shown in Figure 3d).

Prior-data conflict Recently Nott et al. (2020) proposed a method for detecting prior-data conflicts in Bayesian models based on comparing prior-to-posterior Rényi divergences of the observed data with the prior-to-posterior divergence under the prior predictive distribution for the data. Since the marginal distribution $p(y_{t+1:T})$ acts as a prior to the implicit likelihood $p(y_{1:t} \mid y_{t+1:T})$, these checks translate directly to the predictive model described above. A tail probability for a model check can be computed as $p = \mathbb{P} \left[G(y_{1:t}) \geq G(y_{1:t}^{(\text{obs})}) \right]$, where $G(y_{1:t}) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{KL}} [p(y_{t+1:T} \mid y_{1:t}) \parallel p(y_{t+1:T})]$. A small p -value indicates that the observed data is surprising under the assumed model and Chakraborty et al. (2022) discuss how p can be estimated in likelihood-free models through GMM-approximations. It is straightforward to translate their approach to the DMLMM, as the DMFA prior allows for closed form GMM approximations of all quantities necessary to calculate p . The tail probability is estimated as $p = 0.0024$ indicating that the latent ODE-model might need to be reexamined. This result is in line with the posterior-predictive checks for the malaria data conducted in Alahmadi et al. (2020).

4.3 Missing data imputation for gene expression data

Missing data imputation in time-course gene expression data is an important task in modern genomics. Here, we consider a publicly available dataset describing the temporal expression of 1,444 genes in the 150-min cell cycle of the bacterium *Caulobacter crescentus*. RNA was harvested from cell samples at regular 15-min time intervals leading to a total of 15,884 observations in the microarray denoted y_{ij} , where i indexes genes and j indexes observation times. A full description of the dataset is available in Laub et al. (2000).

Experimental design The original data frame does not contain any missing values, so we remove measurement of the i th gene at time t_j , y_{ij} , with probability α and call α the (induced) level of sparsity. Additionally, we enforce that for each gene y_i at least one measurement is available $n_i \geq 1$. This allows us to compare imputed values with the ground truth. An example of a sparsified dataset is given in Figure 4a). We repeat the experiment $M = 10$ times for each level of sparsity $\alpha = 0.2, \dots, 0.8$. For the DMLMM the design matrices contain a B-spline basis with inner knots set at the 11 measurement times. We benchmark the DMLMM against popular imputation approaches including replacement with the row / column wise mean, the mean value from 10-th nearest neighbors (KNN) and imputation based on the singular value decomposition (SVD).

Results Figure 4 shows one example run with sparsity level $\alpha = 0.5$. We find that the DMLMM reasonably combines information of similarly behaving genes to impute missing values. Figure 5a) shows that point-wise credible intervals derived by DMLMM are well calibrated even for high levels of sparsity. In terms of RMSE, DMLMM is compatible with the benchmarks and performs best for levels of sparsity up to $\alpha = 0.6$ (Figure 5b)).

5 Simulation

In this section, we illustrate the effectiveness of the DMLMM in a number of simulated scenarios motivated by the data in the applications.

Simulation design and benchmarks Specifically, we consider three different data generating processes (DGPs). For each DGP we draw 50 independent datasets. For DGP 1, we reanalyze the simulation study conducted in Wang et al. (2021), which incorporates two groups and observation specific functional errors. For DGP 2, we consider a stochastic differential equation model, which enforces a complex dependence structure between nearby time

points, for which the DMLMM is misspecified. For DGP 3 we consider a task on missing value imputation, sparsifying some synthetic data from Mao and Nott (2021), similar to the gene expression data from Section 4.3.

We compare our DMLMM method to several other benchmarks, including a (non-deep) mixture of linear mixed models fitted by expectation maximization (MLMM), a random coefficient model (LMM), a mixture of linear models (MLM) and functional principal component analysis (FPCA).

Results Performance is evaluated in terms of the in-sample RMSE and the negative log-score on an additional 51st hold-out test set. The results are summarized in Figure 6. We find that DMLMM performs well across all data sets. Noting that DGP 1 is of form (2) with only 2 components, the deep structure of our DMLMM may not be fully leveraged. Thus, the more conventional MLMM slightly outperforms DMLMM in terms of predictive performance. However, DMLMM is still able to meaningfully cluster the two groups (not shown). On the more complex DGPs 2 and 3, the DMLMM outperforms all benchmarks. The DMLMM has superior performance in terms of density estimation for unobserved data, as measured by the log-score. This indicates that the DMLMM predictive distributions are useful for capturing predictive uncertainty, which is important for both prediction as well as other purposes such as the prior-data conflict checks considered in Section 4.2.

6 Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we have introduced the DMLMM, which leverages the DMFA model as a prior for the random effects distribution. We demonstrate the effectiveness of the approach in simulations and real-world applications in various scenarios, including within-subject prediction for unbalanced longitudinal data, likelihood-free inference, and missing data imputation. Our DMLMM outperforms existing methods in these applications. While our focus has

been on longitudinal data analysis, the DMLMM framework can be applied in other domains, including functional data analysis and Bayesian nonparametrics and it is a flexible model for researchers across different fields. While we have focused on temporal trends, many applications involve covariates that can influence the response. Extending the DMLMM to accommodate covariate-dependent effects is a further direction for future research.




Figure 1: Schematic description of the DMLMM. a) represents the subspace projection. The number of observations n_i as well as the time points t_i may vary between individuals i . By means of a basis approximation, all vectors y_i get projected into a lower dimensional sub-space of dimension d controlled through the random coefficients β_i . b) represents the model training. The DMLMM consists of a regression layer of the form (1) and the DMFA prior for β_i . Here, we give an exemplary DMFA architecture with $L = 2$ layers. The latent input variables $z_i^{(2)}$ are fed through a fully connected network with $L = 2$ layers, with $K^{(1)} = 3$ and $K^{(2)} = 2$ components, respectively. The components of the network correspond to a factor analyzer of form (4). Each of the $K^{(1)} \cdot K^{(2)} = 6$ possible paths through this model corresponds to a GMM component. c) represents posterior predicted inference based on the fitted DMLMM for new unobserved data \tilde{y} conditional on y_i exploiting (3).




Figure 2: CD4 data. **a)** Spaghetti plot for all observed trajectories on the probit scale. Three randomly selected trajectories y_i are marked in color. **b)** Predicted trajectories (bold) and 95% credible intervals for the three randomly selected individuals, with observed measurements given by dots. The gray lines correspond to the estimated marginal densities $p(\tilde{y} | \hat{\eta})$ at different times \tilde{t} and the mean $\mathbf{E}(\tilde{y} | \hat{\eta})$ is given in black. **c)** Plot of the predicted CDF $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{y}_j \leq \cdot | y_i, \hat{\eta})$ at $\tilde{t}_j = 5.5$ for the three individuals. The CDF of the marginal $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{y}_j \leq \cdot | \hat{\eta})$, $\tilde{t}_j = 5.5$ is given in black.




Figure 3: Malaria data. **a)** Prediction of the real, observed time series on registered malaria cases in Afghanistan. Shown is the predictive mean (bold) as well as a 95% credible interval for DMFA (red) and ABC (blue). **b)** Boxplots for the logarithmic RMSE across 2,500 independent realizations from the true model for DMFA (left) and ABC (right). **c)** Observed coverage rates for pointwise 95%, 50% and 5% credible intervals for DMFA (red) and ABC (blue). **d)** Observed coverage of elliptical credible sets from the 48-dimensional predictive distribution $p(y_{t+1:T} | y_{1:t})$.




Figure 4: Gene expression data (50% sparse). Results from one randomly selected run. **a)** Spaghetti plot for all observed genes. Three randomly selected genes y_i are marked in color. **b)** Predicted trajectories (bold) and 95% credible intervals for the three randomly selected genes, with observed measurements given by dots and missing data given by crosses. **c)** Scatter plot of true missing values versus imputed values $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{y}_j | y_i, \hat{\eta})$.




Figure 5: Gene expression data **a)** Observed coverage rates for point-wise symmetrical credible intervals for different levels of sparsity derived by DMLMM. **b)** RMSE (y-axis) for different levels of sparsity (x-axis). Individual runs are shown by dots, while the bold lines indicate the mean across all independent repetitions for DMLMM (red), row mean (green), column mean (yellow), KNN (blue) and SVD (grey).




Figure 6: Simulation study. Boxplots summarize the performance of DMLMM, MLMM, LMM, MLM and FPCA for the three simulation scenarios (rows) in terms of RMSE and negative log-score (columns) across 50 independent repetitions.

References

- Alahmadi, A. A., Flegg, J. A., Cochrane, D. G., Drovandi, C. C. and Keith, J. M. (2020). A comparison of approximate versus exact techniques for bayesian parameter inference in nonlinear ordinary differential equation models, *Royal Society open science* **7**(3): 191315.
- Amari, S.-i. (1998). Natural Gradient Works Efficiently in Learning, *Neural Computation* **10**(2): 251–276.
- Anwar, M. Y., Lewnard, J. A., Parikh, S. and Pitzer, V. E. (2016). Time series analysis of malaria in afghanistan: using arima models to predict future trends in incidence, *Malaria journal* **15**(1): 1–10.
- Bai, X., Chen, K. and Yao, W. (2016). Mixture of linear mixed models using multivariate t distribution, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **86**(4): 771–787.
- Bar-Joseph, Z., Gerber, G., Gifford, D. K., Jaakkola, T. S. and Simon, I. (2002). A new approach to analyzing gene expression time series data, *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual International Conference on Computational Biology*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 39–48.
- Blei, D. M., Kucukelbir, A. and McAuliffe, J. D. (2017). Variational inference: A review for statisticians, *Journal of the American statistical Association* **112**(518): 859–877.
- Booth, J. G., Casella, G. and Hobert, J. P. (2008). Clustering using objective functions and stochastic search, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **70**(1): 119–139.
- Bush, C. A. and MacEachern, S. N. (1996). A semiparametric Bayesian model for randomised block designs, *Biometrika* **83**(2): 275–285.

- Carvalho, C. M. and Polson, Nicholas, G. (2010). The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals, *Biometrika* **97**(2): 465–480.
- Celeux, G., Martin, O. and Lavergne, C. (2005). Mixture of linear mixed models for clustering gene expression profiles from repeated microarray experiments, *Statistical Modelling* **5**(3): 243–267.
- Chakraborty, A., Nott, D. J. and Evans, M. (2022). Weakly informative priors and prior-data conflict checking for likelihood-free inference, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09993* .
- Chiou, J.-M. and Li, P.-L. (2007). Functional clustering and identifying substructures of longitudinal data, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **69**(4): 679–699.
- Coke, G. and Tsao, M. (2010). Random effects mixture models for clustering electrical load series, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **31**(6): 451–464.
- De la Cruz-Mesía, R., Quintana, F. A. and Marshall, G. (2008). Model-based clustering for longitudinal data, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **52**(3): 1441–1457.
- Fan, J. and Zhang, J.-T. (2000). Two-step estimation of functional linear models with applications to longitudinal data, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **62**(2): 303–322.
URL: <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-9868.00233>
- Ghahramani, Z. and Beal, M. (2000). Variational inference for Bayesian mixtures of factor analysers, in S. Solla, T. Leen and K. Müller (eds), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 12, MIT Press, pp. 449–455.

- Heard, N. A., Holmes, C. C. and Stephens, D. A. (2006). A quantitative study of gene regulation involved in the immune response of anopheline mosquitoes, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**(473): 18–29.
- Heinzl, F. and Tutz, G. (2013). Clustering in linear mixed models with approximate Dirichlet process mixtures using EM algorithm, *Statistical Modelling* **13**(1): 41–67.
- Hoffman, M. D., Blei, D. M., Wang, C. and Paisley, J. (2013). Stochastic variational inference, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **14**(1): 1303–1347.
- Jacques, J. and Preda, C. (2014). Model-based clustering for multivariate functional data, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **71**: 92–106.
- James, G. M. and Sugar, C. A. (2003). Clustering for sparsely sampled functional data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **98**(462): 397–408.
- Järvenpää, M. and Corander, J. (2023). On predictive inference for intractable models via approximate bayesian computation, *Statistics and Computing* **33**(2): 42.
- Kaslow, R. A., Ostrow, D. G., Detels, R., Phair, J. P., Polk, B. F. and Rinaldo Jr, C. R. (1987). The Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study: rationale, organization, and selected characteristics of the participants, *American journal of epidemiology* **126**(2): 310–318.
- Kleinman, K. P. and Ibrahim, J. G. (1998). A semiparametric Bayesian approach to the random effects model, *Biometrics* **54**(3): 921–938.
- Kock, L., Klein, N. and Nott, D. J. (2022). Variational inference and sparsity in high-dimensional deep Gaussian mixture models, *Statistics and Computing* **32**(5): 70.
- Laub, M. T., McAdams, H. H., Feldblyum, T., Fraser, C. M. and Shapiro, L. (2000). Global

- analysis of the genetic network controlling a bacterial cell cycle, *Science* **290**(5499): 2144–2148.
- Lenk, P. and DeSarbo, W. (2000). Bayesian inference for finite mixtures of generalized linear models with random effects, *Psychometrika* **65**(1): 93–119.
- Li, J. (2005). Clustering based on a multilayer mixture model, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **14**(3): 547–568.
- Luan, Y. and Li, H. (2003). Clustering of time-course gene expression data using a mixed-effects model with B-splines, *Bioinformatics* **19**(4): 474–482.
- Malsiner-Walli, G., Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. and Grün, B. (2017). Identifying mixtures of mixtures using Bayesian estimation, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **26**(2): 285–295.
- Mao, Y. and Nott, D. J. (2021). Bayesian clustering using random effects models and predictive projections, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15847*.
- McDowell, I. C., Manandhar, D., Vockley, C. M., Schmid, A. K., Reddy, T. E. and Engelhardt, B. E. (2018). Clustering gene expression time series data using an infinite Gaussian process mixture model, *PLoS Computational Biology* **14**(1).
- McLachlan, G. J., Peel, D. and Bean, R. (2003). Modelling high-dimensional data by mixtures of factor analyzers, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **41**(3-4): 379–388.
- Müller, P. and Rosner, G. L. (1997). A bayesian population model with hierarchical mixture priors applied to blood count data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92**(440): 1279–1292.

- Ng, S. K., McLachlan, G. J., Wang, K., Ben-Tovim Jones, L. and Ng, S.-W. (2006). A Mixture model with random-effects components for clustering correlated gene-expression profiles, *Bioinformatics* **22**(14): 1745–1752.
- Nott, D. J., Wang, X., Evans, M. and Englert, B.-G. (2020). Checking for Prior-Data Conflict Using Prior-to-Posterior Divergences, *Statistical Science* **35**(2): 234–253.
- Pauler, D. K. and Laird, N. M. (2000). A mixture model for longitudinal data with application to assessment of noncompliance, *Biometrics* **56**(2): 464–472.
- Pfeifer, C. (2004). Classification of longitudinal profiles based on semi-parametric regression with mixed effects, *Statistical Modelling* **4**(4): 314–323.
- Proust, C. and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2005). Estimation of linear mixed models with a mixture of distribution for the random effects, *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **78**(2): 165–173.
- Qin, L.-X. and Self, S. G. (2006). The clustering of regression models method with applications in gene expression data, *Biometrics* **62**(2): 526–533.
- Rousseau, J. and Mengersen, K. (2011). Asymptotic behaviour of the posterior distribution in overfitted mixture models, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **73**(5): 689–710.
- Scharl, T., Grün, B. and Leisch, F. (2010). Mixtures of regression models for time course gene expression data: evaluation of initialization and random effects, *Bioinformatics* **26**(3): 370–377.
- Selosse, M., Gormley, C., Jacques, J. and Biernacki, C. (2020). A bumpy journey: exploring deep Gaussian mixture models, *“I Can’t Believe It’s Not Better!” NeurIPS 2020*.

- Shi, J. Q. and Wang, B. (2008). Curve prediction and clustering with mixtures of Gaussian process functional regression models, *Statistics and Computing* **18**(3): 267–283.
- Sisson, S., Fan, Y. and Beaumont, M. (2018). *Handbook of Approximate Bayesian Computation*, 1st edn, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Tan, S. L. and Nott, D. J. (2014). Variational approximation for mixtures of linear mixed models, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **23**(2): 564–585.
- Tang, Y., Salakhutdinov, R. and Hinton, G. (2012). Deep mixtures of factor analysers, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’12, Omnipress, Madison, WI, USA, pp. 1123–1130.
- van den Oord, A. and Schrauwen, B. (2014). Factoring variations in natural images with deep Gaussian mixture models, in Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence and K. Q. Weinberger (eds), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 27, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Verbeke, G. and Lesaffre, E. (1996). A linear mixed-effects model with heterogeneity in the random-effects population, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **91**(433): 217–221.
- Viroli, C. and McLachlan, G. J. (2019). Deep Gaussian mixture models, *Statistics and Computing* **29**(1): 43–51.
- Wang, Q., Farahat, A., Gupta, C. and Zheng, S. (2021). Deep time series models for scarce data, *Neurocomputing* **456**: 504–518.
- White, L. J., Maude, R. J., Pongtavornpinyo, W., Saralamba, S., Aguas, R., Van Effelterre, T., Day, N. P. and White, N. J. (2009). The role of simple mathematical models in malaria elimination strategy design, *Malaria journal* **8**: 1–10.

- Wu, C. O. and Chiang, C.-T. (2000). Kernel smoothing on varying coefficient models with longitudinal dependent variable, *Statistica Sinica* pp. 433–456.
- Yang, X., Huang, K. and Zhang, R. (2017). Deep mixtures of factor analyzers with common loadings: A novel deep generative approach to clustering, *in* D. Liu, S. Xie, Y. Li, D. Zhao and E.-S. M. El-Alfy (eds), *Neural Information Processing*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 709–719.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G. and Wang, J.-L. (2005). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data, *Journal of the American statistical association* **100**(470): 577–590.