

Modeling Compositional Regression with uncorrelated and correlated errors: a Bayesian approach

Taciana K. O. Shimizu, Francisco Louzada, Adriano K. Suzuki and Ricardo S. Ehlers

Department of Applied Mathematics & Statistics, ICMC, University of São Paulo

Av. Trabalhador Saocarlense, 400 CEP 13.566-590, São Carlos, SP, Brazil

e-mail: *taci_kisaki@yahoo.com.br*, *louzada@icmc.usp.br*, *suzuki@icmc.usp.br* and *ehlers@icmc.usp.br*

Abstract

Compositional data consist of known compositions vectors whose components are positive and defined in the interval (0,1) representing proportions or fractions of a “whole”. The sum of these components must be equal to one. Compositional data is present in different knowledge areas, as in geology, economy, medicine among many others. In this paper, we introduce a Bayesian analysis for compositional regression applying additive log-ratio (ALR) transformation and assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors. The Bayesian inference procedure based on Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods (MCMC). The methodology is illustrated on an artificial and a real data set of volleyball.

Keywords: Compositional data, Additive log-ratio transformation, Inference Bayesian, Correlated errors, MCMC.

1 Introduction

Compositional data are vectors of proportions specifying G fractions as a whole. Such data often result when raw data are normalized or when data is obtained as proportions of a certain heterogeneous quantity.

By definition, a vector \mathbf{x} in the Simplex sample space is a composition, elements of this vector are components and the vectors set is compositional data [2]. Therefore, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_G)'$ to be a compositional vector, x_i is non negative value, for $i = 1, \dots, G$ and $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_G = 1$.

The first model adopted for the analysis of the compositional data was the Dirichlet distribution. However, it requires that the correlation structure is wholly negative, a fact that is not observed for compositional data, in which some correlations are positive (see for example, Aitchison [2]).

Aitchison and Shen [4] developed the logistic-Normal class of distributions transforming the G component vector \mathbf{x} into a vector \mathbf{y} in R^{G-1} and considering the Additive Log-Ratio (ALR) function. The use of Bayesian methods is a good alternative for the analysis of compositional data (see for example,

Iyengar and Dey, [11, 12]; or Tjelmeland and Lund, [19]), especially considering Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods.

The main purpose of the paper is based on the Bayesian approach for the compositional regression model assuming correlated and uncorrelated normal errors. Usually, the data (attack, block, serve and opponent error) from this type of sport have compositional restrictions, i.e., they have dependence structure, being that standard existing methods to analyze multivariate data under the usual assumption of multivariate normal distribution (see for example, Johnson et. al [13]) are not appropriate to analyze them.

We consider a real data set that is related to the first and second rounds matches of Brazilian Men's Volleyball Super League 2011/2012 obtained from the website [6]. The data concern the teams that played and won the games in such rounds; more specifically, the points of the team that won each game were defined as composition and the proportions of each composition are the volleyball skills, as attack, block, serves and errors of the opposite team.

The points of the winning team in each game were obtained by four components. We denoted x_1 the proportion of points in the attack, x_2 the proportion of points in the block, x_3 the proportion of points in the serve and x_4 the proportion of points in the errors of the opposite team.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the formulation of regression model applied through the Additive Log-Ratio (ALR) transformation; Section 3 reports a Bayesian analysis of the proposed model assuming correlated and uncorrelated Normal errors; Section 4 provides the results of the application to an artificial and a real data set related to the Brazilian Men's Volleyball Super League 2011/2012; finally, Section 5 ends the paper with some final remarks.

2 Formulation of the Model

We can consider $y_{ij} = H(x_{ij}/x_{iG})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, g$, being $H(\bullet)$ the chosen transformation function that assures resulting vector has real components, where x_{ij} represents the i -th observation for the j -th component, such that $x_{i1} > 0, \dots, x_{iG} > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^G x_{ij} = 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The ALR transformation for the analysis of compositional data is given by

$$y_{ij} = H\left(\frac{x_{ij}}{x_{iG}}\right) = \log\left(\frac{x_{ij}}{x_{iG}}\right). \quad (1)$$

The regression model assuming ALR transformation for the response variables is given by

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}z_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

where $y_{ij} = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ig})$ is a vector ($1 \times g$) of response variables where $g = G - 1$ and G number

of compositional data components; \mathbf{z}_i is a vector of covariates associated to the i -th sample; β_{0j} is a vector $(1 \times g)$ intercepts; β_{1j} is a vector $(p \times g)$ regression coefficients and ϵ_{ij} are random errors, for $j = 1, \dots, G - 1$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$.

3 Bayesian analysis considering ALR transformation

This section presents a Bayesian analysis of the model (2) with ALR transformation (1) applied to response variables and assuming multivariate Normal distribution for the correlated and uncorrelated errors.

3.1 Bayesian analysis considering ALR transformation assuming uncorrelated errors

The points of the winning team in each game were obtained by four components. We denoted x_1 the proportion of points in the attack, x_2 the proportion of points in the block, x_3 the proportion of points in the serve and x_4 the proportion of points in the errors of the opposite team, i.e, they are the dependent variables defined for our study. On the other hand, we considered five independent variables (covariates): player who scored more points in the game belongs to the winning team (z_1), the winning team has won League at least once in the last twelve years (z_2), percentage of excellent reception of the winning team in the game (z_3) and percentage of excellent defense of the loser team in the game (z_4).

We assume an additive log-ratio (ALR) transformation given by $y_{i1} = \log(x_{i1}/x_{i4})$, $y_{i2} = \log(x_{i2}/x_{i4})$ and $y_{i3} = \log(x_{i3}/x_{i4})$.

The regression model obtained to transformed data y_{i1} , y_{i2} e y_{i3} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i1} &= \beta_{01} + \beta_{11}z_{i1} + \beta_{21}z_{i2} + \beta_{31}z_{i3} + \beta_{41}z_{i4} + \epsilon_{i1}, \\ y_{i2} &= \beta_{02} + \beta_{12}z_{i1} + \beta_{22}z_{i2} + \beta_{32}z_{i3} + \beta_{42}z_{i4} + \epsilon_{i2} \quad \text{and} \\ y_{i3} &= \beta_{03} + \beta_{13}z_{i1} + \beta_{23}z_{i2} + \beta_{33}z_{i3} + \beta_{43}z_{i4} + \epsilon_{i3}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where the covariates associated with the i -th game are described above, y_{ij} represents the transformed proportion of the j -th component (attack, block, serve and errors of the opposite team) in the i -th game, β_{0j} represents the mean of the points proportion in the j -th component related to component x_{i4} (errors of the opposite team) for the team that did not win the Super League, β_{1j} , β_{2j} , β_{3j} , β_{4j} indicate a possible covariate effect on the i -th game and ϵ_{ij} represents the error vector assuming independent random variables with a Normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_1)$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is a vector of zeros and Σ_1 variance-covariance

matrix defined by

$$\Sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_3^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

The likelihood function of parameters $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2, \boldsymbol{\beta}_3, \boldsymbol{\beta}_4, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ is given by

$$L(\boldsymbol{\nu}_1) \propto \prod_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij}^2\right), \quad (4)$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} - \beta_{1j}z_{i1} - \beta_{2j}z_{i2} - \beta_{3j}z_{i3} - \beta_{4j}z_{i4})^2$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $i = 1, \dots, 128$.

An alternative statistical approach for the analysis of compositional data is the use of Bayesian methods (see for example, Iyengar and Dey [11]; or Tjelmeland and Lund [19]), especially considering Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods (see for example, Gelfand and Smith [10]).

The Bayesian inference allows to associate previous knowledge of the parameters through a prior distribution. The Bayesian inference procedure for regression model (3) considers proper prior distributions guaranteeing proper posterior distributions. Furthermore, it was ensuring non-informative prior distributions according to the fixed hyperparameters. Thus, we assume the following prior distributions for the parameters $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0j} &\sim N(a_{0j}, b_{0j}^2) \\ \beta_{lj} &\sim N(a_{lj}, b_{lj}^2) \\ \sigma_j^2 &\sim \text{IG}(c_j, d_j), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\text{IG}(c,d)$ denotes an Inverse-Gamma distribution with mean $d/(c-1)$ and variance $d^2/[(c-1)^2(c-2)]$, for $c > 2$; $a_{0j}, b_{0j}, a_{lj}, b_{lj}, c_j$ and d_j are known hyperparameters, $j = 1, \dots, 3$ and $l = 1, \dots, 4$.

All the parameters were assumed independent a priori.

Posterior summaries of interest for the model (3) assuming prior distributions (5) are given using simulated samples of the joint posterior distribution for $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1$ obtained using the Bayes formula, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2, \boldsymbol{\beta}_3, \boldsymbol{\beta}_4, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 | \mathbf{y}) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^3 \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2b_{0j}^2}(\beta_{0j} - a_{0j})^2\right] \times \prod_{j=1}^3 \prod_{l=1}^4 \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2b_{lj}^2}(\beta_{lj} - a_{lj})^2\right] \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j^2)^{-(c_j+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_j}{\sigma_j^2}\right) \times \prod_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

The conditional posterior densities using Gibbs sampling algorithm (Gelfand and Smith [10]) for each

parameter are given by,

$$i) \pi(\beta_{0j} | \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}) \sim N \left[\frac{a_{0j}\sigma_j^2 + b_{0j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^{(j)}}{\sigma_j^2 + nb_{0j}^2}, \frac{b_{0j}^2\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_j^2 + nb_{0j}^2} \right], \quad (6)$$

$$ii) \pi(\beta_{lj} | \beta_0, \beta_{-l}, \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}) \sim N \left[\frac{a_{lj}\sigma_j^2 + b_{lj} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{il}\theta_i^{(j)}}{\sigma_j^2 + b_{lj}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n z_{il}^2}, \frac{b_{lj}^2\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_j^2 + b_{lj}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n z_{il}^2} \right] \text{ and} \quad (7)$$

$$iii) \pi(\sigma_j^2 | \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \mathbf{y}) \sim IG \left[c_j + \frac{n}{2}, d_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij}^2 \right], \quad (8)$$

where

$$\mu_i^{(j)} = y_{ij} - \sum_{l=1}^4 \beta_{lj} z_{il}$$

$$\theta_i^{(j)} = y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} \text{ and}$$

$$\epsilon_{ij} = y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} - \sum_{l=1}^4 \beta_{lj} z_{il}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and } l = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

For the estimation procedure we consider joint estimation where all the model parameters are estimated simultaneously in the MCMC algorithm. The conditional densities above (6), (7), (8) belong to any known parametric density family. Posterior summaries of interest for each model are simulated using standard MCMC methods through the Just Another Gibbs Sampler (JAGS) program ([15]). We used the rjags package ([16]) interacting with R software ([17]).

3.2 Bayesian analysis considering ALR transformation assuming correlated errors

This section consider correlated errors for the model given in (3) with multivariate Normal distribution, i.e., ϵ_{ij} represents the errors vector assumed to be dependent random variables with a multivariate normal distribution $N_3(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_2)$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is a vector of zeros and Σ_2 variance-covariance matrix is given by

$$\Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \rho_{12}\sigma_1\sigma_2 & \rho_{13}\sigma_1\sigma_3 \\ \rho_{12}\sigma_1\sigma_2 & \sigma_2^2 & \rho_{23}\sigma_2\sigma_3 \\ \rho_{13}\sigma_1\sigma_3 & \rho_{23}\sigma_2\sigma_3 & \sigma_3^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

Considering the assumptions above, the likelihood function of parameters $\nu_2 = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \sigma^2, \rho)$ is given by

$$L(\nu_2) \propto |\Sigma_2|^{-n/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\ \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\},$$

where $R = 2\rho_{12}\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - (\rho_{12}^2 + \rho_{13}^2 + \rho_{23}^2)$; $R_{12} = (\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - \rho_{12})/\sigma_1\sigma_2$; $R_{13} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{23} - \rho_{13})/\sigma_1\sigma_3$; $R_{23} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{13} - \rho_{23})/\sigma_2\sigma_3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} - \beta_{1j}z_{i1} - \beta_{2j}z_{i2} - \beta_{3j}z_{i3} - \beta_{4j}z_{i4})$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $i = 1, \dots, 128$.

For the Bayesian analysis, we assume the same prior distributions (5) for the β_{0j} , β_{lj} and σ_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $l = 1, \dots, 4$. The Uniform prior was considered for $\rho = (\rho_{12}, \rho_{13}, \rho_{23})$ given by

$$\rho \sim U(-1, 1) \quad (10)$$

All the parameters were assumed independent a priori.

Posterior summaries of interest for the model defined by (3), but with correlated errors assuming priors distributions (5) are given using simulated samples of the joint posterior distribution for ν_2 obtained using the Bayes formula, that is,

$$\pi(\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \sigma^2, \rho | \mathbf{y}) \propto \prod_{j=1}^3 \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2b_{0j}^2} (\beta_{0j} - a_{0j})^2 \right] \times \prod_{j=1}^3 \prod_{l=1}^4 \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2b_{lj}^2} (\beta_{lj} - a_{lj})^2 \right] \\ \times \prod_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j^2)^{-(c_j+1)} \exp \left(-\frac{d_j}{\sigma_j^2} \right) \\ \times |\Sigma_2|^{-n/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\ \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\},$$

where $R = 2\rho_{12}\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - (\rho_{12}^2 + \rho_{13}^2 + \rho_{23}^2)$; $R_{12} = (\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - \rho_{12})/\sigma_1\sigma_2$; $R_{13} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{23} - \rho_{13})/\sigma_1\sigma_3$; $R_{23} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{13} - \rho_{23})/\sigma_2\sigma_3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} - \beta_{1j}z_{i1} - \beta_{2j}z_{i2} - \beta_{3j}z_{i3} - \beta_{4j}z_{i4})$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $i = 1, \dots, 128$.

The conditional posterior densities for each parameter are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
i) \pi(\beta_{0j} | \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \sigma^2, \rho, \mathbf{y}) &\propto \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2b_{0j}^2} (\beta_{0j} - a_{0j})^2 \right] \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\}, \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
ii) \pi(\beta_{1j} | \beta_0, \beta_{-l}, \sigma^2, \rho, \mathbf{y}) &\propto \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2b_{1j}^2} (\beta_{1j} - a_{1j})^2 \right] \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\}, \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
iii) \pi(\sigma_j^2 | \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \rho, \mathbf{y}) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j^2)^{-(c_j+1)} \exp \left(-\frac{d_j}{\sigma_j^2} \right) \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\}, \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
iv) \pi(\rho | \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}) &\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[\frac{(1-\rho_{23}^2)}{\sigma_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{13}^2)}{\sigma_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2}^2 + \frac{(1-\rho_{12}^2)}{\sigma_3^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i3}^2 \right] \right\} \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2R} \left[2R_{12} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i2} + 2R_{13} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i1} \epsilon_{i3} + 2R_{23} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i2} \epsilon_{i3} \right] \right\}, \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R = 2\rho_{12}\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - (\rho_{12}^2 + \rho_{13}^2 + \rho_{23}^2);$$

$$R_{12} = (\rho_{13}\rho_{23} - \rho_{12})/\sigma_1\sigma_2; \quad R_{13} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{23} - \rho_{13})/\sigma_1\sigma_3; \quad R_{23} = (\rho_{12}\rho_{13} - \rho_{23})/\sigma_2\sigma_3 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{ij} - \beta_{0j} - \beta_{1j}z_i), \quad \text{for } i=1, \dots, n; \quad j=1, 2, 3 \quad \text{and } l=1, 2, 3, 4.$$

For the estimation procedure we consider joint estimation where all the model parameters are estimated simultaneously in the MCMC algorithm. The conditional densities above (11), (12), (13), (14) do not belong to any known parametric density family. Posterior summaries of interest for each model are simulated using standard MCMC methods through the Just Another Gibbs Sampler (JAGS) program ([15]). We used the rjags package ([16]) interacting with R software ([17]).

4 Application

This section reports a simulation study for the compositional data and illustrates an application of the proposed methodology through ALR transformation based on data related to proportions of the points of volleyball teams.

4.1 Simulation Study

A simulation study was conducted to illustrate the proposed methodology. The artificial data were generated randomly from multivariate Normal distribution with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (0.6, -1, -1.9)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = (0.06, 0.2, 0.3)$. We considered one dichotomized covariate, namely z_{i1} (player who scored in the i -th game belongs to the winning team) generated through $z_1 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.8)$ and z_{i2} (percentage of excellent reception of the winning team in the game) generated through $z_2 \sim \text{Normal}(0.5, 0.1)$.

The simulation study was based on 1000 samples generated for each case mentioned above. Sample sizes $n = 70, 100$ and 150 (number of volleyball games) were chosen and the parameters values were fixed as $\beta_{01} = 0.5, \beta_{02} = -1, \beta_{03} = -2, \beta_{11} = \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = 0.1, \beta_{21} = \beta_{22} = \beta_{23} = 0.1$ and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 1$. We used the rjags package ([16]) interacting with R software ([17]).

Table 1 shows the simulation results, i.e., mean, standard deviation (SD) and coverage probability (CP). The CP was stable and close to the nominal coverage.

Table 2 shows the Bayesian criteria for the model assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors. The model assuming correlated errors is better when compared to the other model in all considered criteria.

4.2 Real data application

In this section, we consider a Bayesian analysis of the real data set presented in the Appendix (Table A) to illustrate an application of the proposed methodology, in particular, data related to proportions of the points volleyball teams. We apply the compositional data methodology to this set considering as components proportions the winning team points in 128 games of Brazilian Men's Volleyball Super League 2011/2012. This study was based on the four components: attack (x_{i1}), block (x_{i2}), serve (x_{i3}) and errors of the opposite team (x_{i4}), for $i = 1, \dots, 128$.

Table 1: Simulation Data. Summary of the posterior distributions for the models parameters assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors.

Sample Size	Model (3) assuming uncorrelated errors				Model (3) assuming correlated errors			
	Parameter	Mean	SD	CP	Parameter	Mean	SD	CP
n=70	β_{01}	0.6009	0.1647	0.899	β_{01}	0.6011	0.1644	0.896
	β_{02}	-0.9970	0.2985	0.908	β_{02}	-0.9960	0.2976	0.899
	β_{03}	-1.9189	0.3575	0.917	β_{03}	-1.9164	0.3613	0.902
	β_{11}	0.0023	0.0758	0.631	β_{11}	0.0024	0.0759	0.626
	β_{12}	-0.0003	0.1362	0.824	β_{12}	0.0016	0.1387	0.806
	β_{13}	0.0118	0.1608	0.865	β_{13}	0.0131	0.1619	0.868
	β_{21}	-0.0062	0.2996	0.881	β_{21}	-0.0064	0.2997	0.879
	β_{22}	0.0025	0.5595	0.898	β_{22}	-0.0039	0.5572	0.895
	β_{23}	0.0165	0.6537	0.900	β_{23}	0.0097	0.6637	0.907
	σ_1	0.0622	0.0108	0.897	σ_1	0.0613	0.0107	0.898
	σ_2	0.2055	0.0360	0.898	σ_2	0.2032	0.0350	0.895
	σ_3	0.3068	0.0527	0.896	σ_3	0.3035	0.0536	0.886
					ρ_{12}	0.4519	0.0986	0.883
					ρ_{13}	0.3695	0.1066	0.882
				ρ_{23}	0.2021	0.1204	0.879	
n=100	β_{01}	0.6040	0.1401	0.884	β_{01}	0.6042	0.1398	0.884
	β_{02}	-1.0016	0.2512	0.893	β_{02}	-0.9979	0.2519	0.897
	β_{03}	-1.8968	0.3056	0.890	β_{03}	-1.8939	0.3106	0.898
	β_{11}	-0.0024	0.0635	0.502	β_{11}	-0.0024	0.0635	0.496
	β_{12}	0.000	0.1092	0.786	β_{12}	-0.0020	0.1124	0.767
	β_{13}	-0.0030	0.1369	0.829	β_{13}	-0.0047	0.1382	0.823
	β_{21}	-0.0063	0.2585	0.856	β_{21}	-0.0067	0.2581	0.853
	β_{22}	0.0036	0.4598	0.897	β_{22}	-0.0025	0.4585	0.879
	β_{23}	-0.0093	0.5626	0.883	β_{23}	-0.0135	0.5750	0.882
	σ_1	0.0610	0.0089	0.897	σ_1	0.0604	0.0088	0.890
	σ_2	0.2031	0.0287	0.900	σ_2	0.2013	0.0287	0.905
	σ_3	0.3068	0.0436	0.900	σ_3	0.3034	0.0425	0.906
					ρ_{12}	0.4524	0.0803	0.889
					ρ_{13}	0.3667	0.0846	0.900
				ρ_{23}	0.2053	0.0950	0.907	
n=150	β_{01}	0.5995	0.1143	0.894	β_{01}	0.5995	0.1144	0.893
	β_{02}	-0.9865	0.2002	0.889	β_{02}	-0.9885	0.2024	0.897
	β_{03}	-1.8908	0.2495	0.897	β_{03}	-1.8910	0.2456	0.897
	β_{11}	0.0000	0.0526	0.371	β_{11}	0.0000	0.0525	0.367
	β_{12}	-0.0062	0.0939	0.686	β_{12}	-0.0056	0.0917	0.703
	β_{13}	0.0019	0.1128	0.780	β_{13}	0.0015	0.1113	0.787
	β_{21}	0.0023	0.2050	0.847	β_{21}	0.0023	0.2050	0.849
	β_{22}	-0.0172	0.3649	0.883	β_{22}	-0.0131	0.3671	0.886
	β_{23}	-0.0195	0.4545	0.880	β_{23}	-0.0177	0.4485	0.887
	σ_1	0.0606	0.0069	0.910	σ_1	0.0602	0.0068	0.904
	σ_2	0.2027	0.0235	0.916	σ_2	0.2012	0.0239	0.890
	σ_3	0.3029	0.0362	0.898	σ_3	0.3010	0.0355	0.888
					ρ_{12}	0.4523	0.0637	0.909
					ρ_{13}	0.3701	0.0688	0.903
				ρ_{23}	0.1995	0.0783	0.897	

The proposed model in (3) and the following independent proper prior distributions (5) were considered: $\beta_{0j} \sim N(0, 1000)$, $\beta_{lj} \sim N(0, 1000)$, $\sigma_j^2 \sim IG(0.1, 100)$, where $l = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$. For proposed regression model with correlated errors (9), we considered the same independent proper prior distributions for β_{0j} , β_{lj} and σ_j^2 , for $l = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$. It was simulated 100.000 Gibbs samples using the rjags package ([16]) interacting with R software ([17]), in which the first 10.000 simulated samples were discarded to eliminate the effects of the initial values and we considered every 20th sample among the 90.000 Gibbs samples. The convergence was verified through Gelman-Rubin diagnostic. It shows values very close to 1 indicating convergence of the simulation algorithm.

According to Carlin and Louis ([8]), the most basic tool for investigating model uncertainty is the *sensitivity analysis*, that is, making reasonable modifications to the assumption, recomputing the posterior quantities of interest and seeing if they have changed in a way that has practical impact on interpretations.

Table 2: Simulation Data. Bayesian Criteria.

Sample Size	Model	Bayesian criteria		
		EAIC	EBIC	DIC
$n = 70$	Uncorrelated errors	215.11	242.09	203.78
	Correlated errors	-187.65	-160.67	-196.45
$n = 100$	Uncorrelated errors	301.02	332.28	289.49
	Correlated errors	-278.12	-246.85	-286.98
$n = 150$	Uncorrelated errors	444.69	480.82	432.99
	Correlated errors	-428.94	-392.82	-437.86

Thus, we checked the sensitivity analysis for different choices of prior parameters (β_{0j} , β_{lj} and σ_j^2 , for $l = 1, 2, 3, 4$) by changing only on parameter at a time and keeping all other parameters constant to their default values. We observe that posterior summaries of the parameters do not present considerable difference and not affect the results.

Table 3 shows the posterior summaries for the parameters of the model (3) assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors based on these 4.500 final simulated Gibbs samples.

Note that, the estimated posterior means and standard deviations present similarity values for the both models (uncorrelated and correlated errors).

Table 3 shows the posterior summaries for the parameters of the model (3) assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors based on these 9.000 final simulated Gibbs samples. The convergence was verified through Gelman-Rubin diagnostic. It showed values very close to 1 indicating convergence of the simulation algorithm. Note that there is significant difference regarding to the proportions attack, block and serve points indicating by the estimated β_{11} , β_{31} , β_{42} and β_{43} for both models (uncorrelated and correlated errors), i.e., the player who scored in the game belongs to the winning team, percentage of excellent reception of the winning team and percentage of excellent defense of the loser team help it in these skills. Moreover, the estimated posterior means and standard deviations present similarity values for the both models (uncorrelated and correlated errors). We also observe that more parameters were significant in the correlated model than uncorrelated model, i.e., β_{12} , β_{13} , β_{21} , β_{22} , β_{32} and β_{41} .

Table 4 presents the Bayesian model selection criteria expected Akaike information criterion (*EAIC*), expected Bayesian information criterion (*EBIC*), deviance information criterion (*DIC*) and summary statistics of the CPO's ($LPML = \sum_{i=1}^n \log(\widehat{CPO})$). These results are suggesting that fitted regression model assuming correlated errors is the best choice (lower values EAIC, EBIC and DIC).

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we present a Bayesian analysis for compositional regression model considering ALR transformation and assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors. The inferencial procedure for the parameters

Table 3: Summary of the posterior distributions for the models parameters assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors.

Model (3) assuming uncorrelated errors				Model (3) assuming correlated errors			
Parameter	Mean	Standard Deviation	Credibility Interval (90%)	Parameter	Mean	Standard Deviation	Credibility Interval (90%)
β_{01}	0.5570	0.1918	(0.2406; 0.8693)	β_{01}	0.5402	0.1340	(0.3172; 0.7575)
β_{02}	-1.9765	0.3457	(-2.5470; -1.4050)	β_{02}	-1.9646	0.2373	(-2.3511; -1.5750)
β_{03}	-0.9372	0.4806	(-1.7273; -0.1537)	β_{03}	-0.9369	0.3362	(-1.4786; -0.3802)
β_{11}	0.1729	0.0439	(0.0994; 0.2438)	β_{11}	0.1739	0.0302	(0.1248; 0.2243)
β_{12}	0.1434	0.0787	(0.0149; 0.2741)	β_{12}	0.1422	0.0539	(0.0544; 0.2308)
β_{13}	0.1896	0.1103	(0.0100; 0.3692)	β_{13}	0.1904	0.0763	(0.0640; 0.3157)
β_{21}	-0.0719	0.0418	(-0.1414; -0.0032)	β_{21}	-0.0710	0.0288	(-0.1187; -0.0243)
β_{22}	-0.1533	0.0748	(-0.2757; -0.0296)	β_{22}	-0.1540	0.0518	(-0.2393; -0.0682)
β_{23}	-0.0269	0.1034	(-0.1973; 0.1431)	β_{23}	-0.0266	0.0721	(-0.1451; 0.0903)
β_{31}	0.4273	0.1740	(0.1409; 0.7106)	β_{31}	0.4317	0.1235	(0.2305; 0.6345)
β_{32}	0.5267	0.3124	(0.0052; 1.0393)	β_{32}	0.5156	0.2156	(0.1631; 0.8730)
β_{33}	-0.2667	0.4356	(-0.9798; 0.4562)	β_{33}	-0.2705	0.3049	(-0.7736; 0.2224)
β_{41}	-0.5559	0.2818	(-1.0130; -0.0973)	β_{41}	-0.5284	0.1945	(-0.8450; -0.2098)
β_{42}	1.2419	0.5086	(0.4003; 2.0773)	β_{42}	1.2339	0.3470	(0.6665; 1.8018)
β_{43}	-1.9218	0.7063	(-3.0970; -0.7714)	β_{43}	-1.9212	0.4873	(-2.7199; -1.1283)
σ_1	0.0515	0.0067	(0.0415; 0.0635)	σ_1	0.0242	0.0022	(0.0209; 0.0280)
σ_2	0.1634	0.0213	(0.1317; 0.2011)	σ_2	0.0775	0.0070	(0.0667; 0.0895)
σ_3	0.3172	0.0411	(0.2560; 0.3897)	σ_3	0.1524	0.0137	(0.1310; 0.1763)
				ρ_{12}	0.1296	0.0399	(0.0632; 0.1946)
				ρ_{13}	0.0793	0.0396	(0.0137; 0.1443)
				ρ_{23}	0.0514	0.0397	(-0.0145; 0.1167)

Table 4: Bayesian Criteria for the models parameters assuming uncorrelated and correlated errors.

Model	Bayesian Criteria			
	EAIC	EBIC	DIC	LPML
Uncorrelated errors	329.924	363.959	325.284	152.962
Correlated errors	-599.408	-539.846	-619.624	-320.704

based on MCMC methods. We have illustrated the proposed methodology considering a real data set from percentages of winning volleyball team's points, in which it was considered multivariate data structure. A comparison study of models was carried out through model selection procedure based on a statistical criteria. Thus, the results indicate that the compositional regression model with correlated errors outperforms the model with uncorrelated errors, besides pointing out the advantage of considering the natural multivariate structure of the data.

References

- [1] ACHCAR, J. A.; OBAGE, S. C. Uma abordagem Bayesiana para dados composicionais considerando erros correlacionados. *Revista de Matemática e Estatística*, 23(2), 95-107, 2005.
- [2] AITCHISON, J. The statistical analysis of compositional data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 44(2), 139-177, 1982.
- [3] AITCHISON, J. *The statistical analysis of compositional data*. Chapman & Hall, 1986.

- [4] AITCHISON, J.; SHEN, S. M. Logistic-normal distributions: Some properties and uses. *Biometrika*, 67(2), 261-272, 1980.
- [5] BOX, G. E. P.; COX, D. R. An analysis of transformations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 26(2), p. 211-252, 1964.
- [6] Brazilian Volleyball Confederation (CBV). *Data set of Men's Volleyball Super League*. Available at: <http://www.cbv.com.br/v1/superliga-1112/m-tabela.asp>. Accessed August 23, 2012.
- [7] CAMPOS, F. A. D.; STANGANÉLLI, L. C. R.; CAMPOS, L. C. B.; PASQUARELLI, B. N.; GÓMEZ, M. A. Performance indicators analysis at Brazilian and Italian women's volleyball leagues according to game location, game outcome, and set number. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 118(2), 347-361, 2014.
- [8] CARLIN, B. P.; LOUIS, T. A. *Bayesian Methods for Data Analysis*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Texts in Statistical Science, 3th. Edition, 2009.
- [9] International Volleyball Federation (FIVB). Available at: <http://www.fivb.org/en/volleyball/History.asp>. Accessed August 20, 2014.
- [10] GELFAND, A. E.; SMITH, A. F. M. Sampling based approaches to calculating marginal densities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85(410), 398-409, 1990.
- [11] IYENGAR, M.; DEY, D. K. *Bayesian analysis of compositional data*. Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-3120, 1996.
- [12] IYENGAR, M.; DEY, D. K. *Box-Cox transformations in Bayesian analysis of compositional data*. *Environmetrics*, 9(6), 657-671, 1998.
- [13] JOHNSON, R.; WICHERN, D. *Applied multivariate statistical analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- [14] LUNN, D.; SPIEGELHALTER, D.; THOMAS, A.; BEST, N. The BUGS project: Evolution, critique and future directions. *Statistics in Medicine*, 28(25), 3049-3067, 2009.
- [15] PLUMMER, M. JAGS: A program for analysis Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs sampling. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical Computing (DSC, 2003)*. Vol. 124. Technische Universit at Wien, 2003.
- [16] PLUMMER, M. rjags: Bayesian graphical models using MCMC. r package version 3-3, 2011.
- [17] R Development Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2011.

- [18] RAYENS, W. S.; SRINIVASAN, C. Box-Cox transformations in the analysis of compositional data. *Journal of Chemometrics*, 5(3), 227-239, 1991.
- [19] TJELMELAND, H.; LUND, K. V. Bayesian modelling of spatial compositional data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 30, 87-100, 2003.

Appendix

Table A. Matches of Brazilian Men's Volleyball Super League 2011/2012.

Matches	% attack	% block	% serve	% errors	z_1	z_2	z_3	z_4
1	48.00	12.00	2.67	37.33	0	1	0.6591	0.3958
2	53.06	14.29	7.14	25.51	1	1	0.3467	0.4394
3	44.00	13.33	8.00	34.67	1	0	0.4500	0.3571
4	52.63	14.74	7.37	25.26	1	0	0.4605	0.6000
5	56.00	8.00	5.33	30.67	0	1	0.7708	0.5192
6	65.63	10.16	2.34	21.88	1	0	0.5247	0.4835
7	54.67	14.67	2.67	28.00	1	1	0.6735	0.4746
8	50.00	12.50	9.62	27.88	0	1	0.5000	0.5075
9	52.58	15.46	3.09	28.87	1	0	0.6452	0.5500
10	57.33	13.33	4.00	25.33	1	1	0.5926	0.5091
11	56.60	11.32	6.60	25.47	1	0	0.6447	0.4605
12	49.33	9.33	14.67	26.67	1	1	0.5555	0.4082
13	56.67	8.33	6.67	28.33	1	0	0.3936	0.4857
14	66.67	4.00	1.33	28.00	1	1	0.7924	0.4038
15	56.70	10.31	3.09	29.90	1	0	0.5867	0.4677
16	62.67	6.67	4.00	26.67	1	1	0.4561	0.3958
17	49.35	5.19	3.90	41.56	0	1	0.2453	0.4510
18	48.00	13.33	6.67	32.00	1	1	0.5000	0.4808
19	56.12	14.29	4.08	25.51	1	0	0.5507	0.4328
20	44.00	9.33	5.33	41.33	1	0	0.5641	0.5172
21	54.95	10.81	5.41	28.83	1	1	0.6173	0.2817
22	59.34	15.38	3.30	21.98	0	0	0.5952	0.5889
23	51.52	12.12	1.01	35.35	1	0	0.3194	0.5614
24	57.69	14.10	5.13	23.08	1	0	0.6250	0.5000
25	53.33	14.67	2.67	29.33	1	0	0.4800	0.7017
26	55.45	13.86	5.94	24.75	0	1	0.8133	0.4146
27	48.04	10.78	3.92	37.25	0	0	0.4722	0.5077
28	48.00	17.33	9.33	25.33	1	0	0.6792	0.3846
29	57.33	8.00	6.67	28.00	1	1	0.5217	0.4186
30	53.78	8.40	5.04	32.77	1	1	0.3736	0.5488
31	44.74	10.53	7.02	37.72	0	1	0.6265	0.4810
32	53.57	13.10	3.57	29.76	1	1	0.5538	0.5082
33	59.41	5.94	6.93	27.72	1	1	0.5556	0.5429
34	59.21	9.21	6.58	25.00	1	0	0.5185	0.4792
35	51.04	13.54	6.25	29.17	1	0	0.5410	0.5484
36	50.51	13.13	3.03	33.33	0	0	0.3472	0.5454
37	55.34	16.50	4.85	23.30	1	0	0.6420	0.5000
38	61.33	4.00	2.67	32.00	1	0	0.3542	0.4681
39	48.98	17.35	2.04	31.63	0	1	0.5758	0.4844
40	55.32	9.57	5.32	29.79	1	1	0.4306	0.4576
41	56.25	7.29	5.21	31.25	1	1	0.5454	0.4627
42	56.19	7.62	2.86	33.33	1	0	0.4096	0.5286
43	51.72	8.62	6.03	33.62	0	1	0.4762	0.4444
44	49.46	13.98	3.23	33.33	1	1	0.6618	0.5714
45	47.27	11.82	5.45	35.45	0	0	0.2250	0.5857
46	57.33	13.33	1.33	28.00	0	0	0.5800	0.4461
47	56.84	14.74	3.16	25.26	1	0	0.3947	0.6173
48	60.61	10.10	3.03	26.26	1	0	0.5479	0.4756
49	60.18	10.62	3.54	25.66	1	0	0.5312	0.5714
50	52.43	9.71	3.88	33.98	0	0	0.6265	0.5000
51	50.67	13.33	4.00	32.00	0	0	0.6000	0.5769
52	63.30	8.26	4.59	23.85	1	1	0.4831	0.5000
53	54.46	4.95	2.97	37.62	0	1	0.6493	0.5441
54	56.25	8.33	4.17	31.25	1	0	0.3485	0.5769
55	69.89	5.38	5.38	19.35	1	0	0.6479	0.4219
56	65.82	15.19	3.80	15.19	1	0	0.4062	0.2857
57	57.89	5.26	11.84	25.00	1	1	0.6415	0.3559
58	36.84	12.63	7.37	43.16	0	0	0.4286	0.6271
59	50.00	14.42	1.92	33.65	0	0	0.5672	0.5699
60	52.08	6.25	5.21	36.46	0	0	0.6000	0.4638
61	53.33	13.33	5.33	28.00	1	0	0.4706	0.4091
62	44.00	16.00	10.67	29.33	1	1	0.4750	0.5238
63	58.67	10.67	8.00	22.67	1	1	0.5102	0.4375
64	54.00	8.00	5.00	33.00	0	0	0.6765	0.4545

Matches	% attack	% block	% serve	% errors	z_1	z_2	z_3	z_4
65	53.27	9.35	5.61	31.78	1	1	0.4884	0.5067
66	51.09	6.52	4.35	38.04	1	1	0.5373	0.5775
67	55.26	6.58	6.58	31.58	1	1	0.6316	0.3889
68	55.10	12.24	3.06	29.59	1	0	0.6349	0.3333
69	64.94	6.49	5.19	23.38	0	1	0.6949	0.3906
70	57.33	10.67	10.67	21.33	1	1	0.5319	0.4286
71	56.70	12.37	7.22	23.71	1	0	0.7917	0.4412
72	44.74	9.21	7.89	38.16	0	0	0.3182	0.5849
73	62.50	13.54	4.17	19.79	1	1	0.4937	0.5352
74	56.52	5.22	6.09	32.17	1	1	0.4494	0.4937
75	53.19	14.89	4.26	27.66	1	0	0.5362	0.4237
76	57.33	9.33	6.67	26.67	1	1	0.6491	0.4118
77	50.67	18.67	2.67	28.00	1	1	0.4783	0.4706
78	53.95	10.53	6.58	28.95	1	0	0.5000	0.4898
79	44.00	16.00	2.67	37.33	1	1	0.5217	0.5208
80	48.00	5.33	6.67	40.00	0	1	0.5333	0.2222
81	56.00	8.00	2.67	33.33	1	0	0.7857	0.4048
82	57.84	11.76	2.94	27.45	0	0	0.6512	0.4931
83	47.25	12.09	4.40	36.26	1	1	0.5781	0.5443
84	59.81	11.21	3.74	25.23	1	0	0.3483	0.5000
85	53.06	11.22	5.10	30.61	0	1	0.4127	0.4091
86	54.55	7.27	4.55	33.64	1	0	0.3333	0.4789
87	59.18	6.12	3.06	31.63	1	1	0.4923	0.4203
88	46.88	13.54	3.13	36.46	0	1	0.6351	0.5600
89	57.50	11.67	1.67	29.17	0	0	0.6210	0.4713
90	48.00	20.00	8.00	24.00	1	0	0.2391	0.5532
91	54.00	13.00	2.00	31.00	0	1	0.6667	0.4068
92	54.67	6.67	8.00	30.67	1	1	0.5870	0.3696
93	56.12	7.14	3.06	33.67	1	1	0.5405	0.4930
94	56.00	8.00	8.00	28.00	0	1	0.6226	0.4528
95	50.67	13.33	6.67	29.33	1	0	0.5116	0.4615
96	52.00	12.00	1.33	34.67	1	1	0.4762	0.4210
97	58.06	10.75	2.15	29.03	1	0	0.4265	0.4776
98	45.33	6.67	2.67	45.33	0	0	0.5200	0.5102
99	51.90	15.19	2.53	30.38	1	0	0.5893	0.6461
100	52.78	15.74	1.85	29.63	0	1	0.4348	0.4857
101	54.29	9.52	7.62	28.57	1	0	0.3537	0.5422
102	50.67	14.67	5.33	29.33	1	0	0.4595	0.4324
103	48.00	20.00	2.67	29.33	1	1	0.6190	0.4348
104	62.03	6.33	2.53	29.11	1	1	0.7736	0.4490
105	40.00	12.00	9.33	38.67	0	0	0.6190	0.5526
106	59.09	8.18	4.55	28.18	1	1	0.5581	0.4634
107	49.33	9.33	8.00	33.33	1	1	0.6667	0.5263
108	58.25	6.80	3.88	31.07	0	0	0.5976	0.4225
109	60.78	9.80	6.86	22.55	0	0	0.6265	0.4651
110	55.77	13.46	1.92	28.85	0	0	0.3368	0.6234
111	56.00	8.00	4.00	32.00	0	0	0.3774	0.4286
112	55.88	10.78	5.88	27.45	1	0	0.5135	0.5555
113	64.13	5.43	7.61	22.83	1	0	0.6329	0.3973
114	46.67	8.00	9.33	36.00	1	1	0.3409	0.4722
115	56.14	8.77	4.39	30.70	0	1	0.5679	0.5185
116	49.00	9.00	6.00	36.00	0	1	0.5540	0.5614
117	54.67	10.67	5.33	29.33	1	1	0.5778	0.4348
118	48.65	18.02	4.50	28.83	0	1	0.6429	0.6364
119	64.22	7.34	1.83	26.61	1	1	0.5432	0.4255
120	56.58	7.89	11.84	23.68	0	1	0.5319	0.3725
121	56.38	14.89	5.32	23.40	1	0	0.4571	0.4286
122	48.45	15.46	5.15	30.93	1	0	0.5833	0.4918
123	52.83	6.60	6.60	33.96	1	0	0.2625	0.4927
124	60.00	5.33	9.33	25.33	1	0	0.5283	0.3750
125	59.63	9.17	1.83	29.36	1	1	0.5952	0.5484
126	54.67	10.67	1.33	33.33	0	1	0.5965	0.6349
127	54.67	6.67	6.67	32.00	1	0	0.3696	0.4103
128	46.91	6.17	4.94	41.98	0	1	0.6863	0.5366