

Discovering Interactions Using Covariate Informed Random Partition Models

Garritt L. Page
Department of Statistics
Brigham Young University
page@stat.byu.edu

Fernando A. Quintana
Departamento de Estadística
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
quintana@mat.puc.cl

Gary L. Rosner
Department of Biostatistics
John Hopkins University
grosner1@jhmi.edu

December 5, 2022

Abstract

Combination chemotherapy treatment regimens created for patients diagnosed with childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia have had great success in improving cure rates. Unfortunately, patients prescribed these types of treatment regimens have displayed susceptibility to the onset of osteonecrosis. Some have suggested that this is due to pharmacokinetic interaction between two agents in the treatment regimen (asparaginase and dexamethasone) and other physiological variables. Determining which physiological variables to consider when searching for interactions in scenarios like these, minus *a priori* guidance, has proved to be a challenging problem, particularly if interactions influence the response distribution in ways beyond shifts in expectation or dispersion only. In this paper we propose an exploratory technique that is able to discover associations between covariates and responses in a very general way. The procedure connects covariates to responses very flexibly through dependent random partition prior distributions, and then employs machine learning techniques to highlight potential associations found in each cluster. We provide a simulation study to show utility and apply the method

to data produced from a study dedicated to learning which physiological predictors influence severity of osteonecrosis multiplicatively.

Key Words: multiplicative associations, dependent random partition models, nonparametric Bayes, exploratory data analysis

1 Introduction

In studies that collect covariate measurements on subjects/experimental units in addition to a response, determining which covariates influence the response and in what way are of principal interest. This seemingly benign statistical problem has been seriously considered for many years with methods ranging from exploratory techniques to model based procedures. Perhaps the reason why research dedicated to this problem persists is that in practice building a statistical model is as much an art as a science. This is a consequence of important or “significant” associations depending completely on the factors included in the model. Therefore, knowing which effects to include in a model is crucial, but this information is rarely known *a priori*. Since this information is rarely known, an approach that is commonly used in practice proposes fitting a saturated model (a model containing all possible covariates or predictors) and then employing some type of multiplicity test correction, model selection criteria, shrinkage method, or stochastic search to locate “significant” factors (see, e.g. George and McCulloch 1997; Scott and Berger 2010; Tibshirani 1996; Ishwaran and Rao 2005; Smith and Kohn 1996; Chung and Dunson 2009; Mitra et al. 2017). These methods have been shown to work well in many instances. However, when multiplicative effects and/or nonlinear associations are present and are of interest, a fairly common scenario (see, e.g. Hu et al. 2009; Lim and Hastie 2015), the process of identifying associations becomes much more problematic as the saturated model can quickly become unwieldy. This happens to be the case in the study that we consider that examines which factors affect the severity of osteonecrosis in children treated for acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL).

Interest lies in learning how time-varying physiological and other baseline covariates such as gender, triglycerides, and body mass index (BMI) influence disease severity in an additive or multiplicative fashion. Employing the saturated model approach here with all possible two-way and/or three-way interactions becomes computationally expensive and inferentially difficult, so knowing which covariates to consider is important.

Adding to the complexity of the scenario just described, methods used to identify associations (either additive or multiplicative) are geared towards discovering covariates that only influence the mean of the response distribution. It is completely plausible that covariates also influence the variance or even the shape of the response distribution, and most methods are not equipped to detect these types of associations. Regression methods that allow covariates to influence the entire response (or error) distribution have been developed and are commonly known as density regression (see Dunson et al. 2007; Fan et al. 1996). There has been work in density regression that simultaneously carries out variable selection (Tokdar et al. 2010; Shen and Ghosal 2016), but they require that all effects of interest be included in a model. Though it may be possible to extend work done in density regression to incorporate multiplicative effects, *a priori* information would be necessary to guide which of these effects to consider. In light of this, an exploratory procedure that is able to discover possible associations in a general way, prior to model fitting, would be appealing.

There has been some work dedicated to explicitly identifying interactions (not just variable selection). Sorokina et al. (2009, 2008) define interactions based on additive regression functions and discover them using comparisons of additive groves, but their method depends on a preprocessing feature selection step (i.e., knowing what predictors to consider). Loh (2002) propose a method based on treed regression (Alexander and Grimshaw 1996) that allows detection of simple two-way interactions by partitioning trees based on predictor values. Hu et al. 2009 use Bayes factors to compare massive loglinear models with the goal of finding interactions. Once again these methods require including all interactions (or knowing

the subset to consider) and are based on a specific data model.

There is also a growing literature dedicated to subgroup analysis, i.e., the study of heterogeneous treatment effects among subgroups of a study population. Subgroups are typically identified or defined based on specific values in the covariate space. Since subpopulation treatment effects are of principal interest, focus is placed on studying the interaction between a covariate and a treatment (see e.g., Simon 2002; Berger et al. 2014; Varadhan and Wang 2014; Schnell et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2017; Su et al. 2018). Our approach is more general in nature, but can be used as an exploratory tool to help discover which covariates interact with the treatment and provide guidance by spotting subpopulations of potential interest.

Perhaps the work that most closely aligns with ours in terms of detecting interactions in a general way is Reich et al. (2012) and Du and Linero (2018). Recently, Du and Linero (2018) developed a method based on Bayesian decision tree ensembles which incorporates an additive component, something we are not limited to. Reich et al. (2012) develop a statistical emulator and devise a procedure that allows them to learn how the inputs of a stochastic computer model influence the output (which is a distribution). However, these methods are developed for a specific purpose while what we propose is much more general and can be employed with any data model, making the procedure essentially “model free”. That is, the exploratory procedure we propose discovers associations where anything is fair game in the sense that associations could be additive and/or multiplicative and could influence any aspect of the response density (i.e., mean, spread, shape, etc.) regardless of the data model that will eventually be employed. Our goal is ambitious and admittedly being able to discover all possible interactions in the general way we are proposing is presumably not possible. Thus, we do not claim that the exploratory approach detailed in the sequel discovers all “significant” interactions, rather it provides guidance to practitioners by highlighting possible interactions with very little overhead. As an aside, in subsequent sections we use the term “interaction” to denote something more general than what is referred to in a linear model

setting. Here, an interaction exists if the response distribution is in some way influenced by specific combinations of covariate values. This general conception includes the special case where all the influence is carried by only one of the covariates. Our general recommendation is then to carefully assess any influences that may be detected using the proposed procedure to gain insight on the source(s) of the detected difference(s). This highlights the exploratory nature of our proposal.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In the next section we detail the data collected from the study that motivated this work. Section 3 provides some background on dependent random partition distributions and association rules. Section 4 details the exploratory procedure we develop and includes a small simulation study. In Section 5 we apply the procedure to the osteonecrosis data and Section 6 contains a brief discussion.

2 Osteonecrosis Study

The study that motivated developing the exploratory procedure detailed in this paper was designed to learn more about factors affecting risk for osteonecrosis in children suffering from acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL). With combination chemotherapeutic regimens, five-year survival is around 85% overall for childhood ALL, with some subgroups' rates well above 90% (American Cancer Society 2018). These regimens include the drug asparaginase and the steroid dexamethasone. Some have suggested that there is a pharmacokinetic interaction between these two agents, leading to greater inter-patient variability and severe adverse events (Kawedia et al. 2011). The principal aim of the motivating study was to learn about relationships between physiological characteristics and treatment characteristics and how these relationships influence susceptibility to osteonecrosis as a result of therapy. The analysis considers a number of physiological covariates measured on each patient, including low-density lipoprotein (LDL), high-density lipoprotein (HDL) levels, body mass

index (BMI), and others. In addition to these covariates, the data include plasma levels of dexamethasone, cortisol, and asparaginase at various times during each patient’s course of treatment (baseline, week 7, week 8) to explore how the pharmacokinetics (PK) of these substances influenced the risk and severity of osteonecrosis and whether other factors interact with the drugs’ PK. Finally, demographic variables include age at diagnosis, gender, and race. In total 23 predictors were considered with numerical summaries provided in Tables 1 and 2. Out of the 400 patients in the study, we have complete data vectors for 234, and we focus on these.

Table 1 displays the gender-by-race distribution with each gender being equally represented. A third binary covariate (called `LowRisk`) which indicates the prognosis of the patient’s leukemia (low or high risk of relapse) is also included. This variable should be highly influential because exact treatment regimens are based on patients’ risk factors relating to prognosis of their leukemia. Of the 234 subjects, 109 were in the low risk group while 125 were in the high risk. From Table 2 it is clear that a few continuous covariates are highly right skewed. Empirical correlations between time varying covariates suggest that temporal dependence is present. This dependence can be accommodated in our approach and is formally considered in the model developed by Barcella et al. (2018). We briefly comment that week 12 measurements were also collected, but very irregularly. This resulted in many incomplete covariate vectors, and for this reason we only consider measurements taken up to week 8.

The response measured in this study reflects the severity of osteonecrosis ranging on an ordinal scale from 0 for none up to 4 for high grade. Table 3 contains the number of patients by grade of osteonecrosis. We expect, but do not force, the covariates’ influences on osteonecrosis grade to be multiplicative, but it is not clear which covariates to pair together when exploring multiplicative effects. This is something we hope to discover.

Table 1: Number of patients in each gender by race category.

Gender	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other	White
Female	1	21	8	7	96
Male	2	19	8	3	69

Table 2: Five number summary of the continuous covariates.

Covariate	Min.	Q1	Q2	Mean	Q3	Max.
AgeAtDiagnosis	1.02	3.20	5.23	6.77	9.68	18.84
DexCIWk07	1.99	9.03	14.69	21.83	25.03	458.07
DexCIWk08	1.62	8.09	11.67	14.07	16.62	61.71
CortisolBaseline	0.25	4.07	5.67	7.46	8.22	59.41
CortisolWk07	0.11	4.93	7.12	9.00	10.34	55.16
CortisolWk08	0.00	0.32	0.58	1.11	1.01	30.27
HDLBaseline	11.30	39.05	48.60	56.28	59.25	271.00
HDLWk07	10.70	41.92	52.50	59.10	67.20	198.00
HDLWk08	1.90	29.45	44.00	50.31	61.50	238.00
LDLBaseline	13.00	62.00	82.00	83.95	104.75	195.00
LDLWk07	15.00	57.25	80.00	82.04	100.38	218.00
LDLWk08	5.00	50.25	68.00	73.44	91.50	179.00
TriglyceridesBaseline	20.00	58.62	87.50	104.60	124.75	472.00
TriglyceridesWk07	20.00	55.02	74.50	114.79	132.50	885.00
TriglyceridesWk08	15.90	75.25	122.50	220.75	286.00	1029.50
AlbuminBaseline	3.30	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.40	5.10
AlbuminWk07	2.10	3.20	3.90	3.75	4.30	4.80
AlbuminWk08	2.20	3.10	3.60	3.56	4.00	4.80
BMIBaseline	12.19	15.68	16.77	18.05	19.23	38.48
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC	0.42	1.07	3.54	14.20	24.83	93.85

Table 3: Grade of osteonecrosis and the number of patients diagnosed for each one.

Osteonecrosis Grade	0	1	2	3	4
Number of Subjects	73	115	27	17	2

3 Background and Preliminaries

The exploratory procedure we develop consists of three stages. In this section we briefly introduce each one and provide notation and background information necessary to make ideas concrete. The first step consists of connecting covariates to the response by way of a covariate informed partitioning of the response variable. A nice feature of the procedure is that any statistical model that produces (explicitly or implicitly) a covariate dependent partition may be employed. This includes the dependent Dirichlet process mixture (DDPM) model of MacEachern (2000) and its variants (e.g., De Iorio et al. 2004). The second step is to use the partition to identify potentially interesting interactions. This is done using a machine learning technique called association rules (Han et al. 2012, Chapter 6). The third step is to verify interactions which is done using posterior predictive densities. We now provide more pertinent background information.

3.1 Dependent Random Partition Models

First we introduce some general notation. Let $i = 1, \dots, m$ index the m experimental units in a designed experiment or m subjects in an observational study. Further, let $\rho_m = \{S_1, \dots, S_{k_m}\}$ denote a partitioning (or clustering) of the m units into k_m subsets such that $i \in S_j$ implies that unit i belongs to cluster j . A common alternative notation that specifies a partitioning of the m units into k_m clusters is to introduce m cluster labels s_1, \dots, s_m such that $s_i = j$ implies $i \in S_j$. We will use Y_i to denote the i th subject's response variable with $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ denoting an m dimensional response vector and $\mathbf{Y}_j^* = \{Y_i : i \in S_j\}$ the j th cluster's response vector. Similarly, let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ denote a covariate vector and $\mathbf{X}_j^* = \{X_i : i \in S_j\}$ a partitioned covariate vector. When p covariates are measured on each individual, then $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})$ will denote the i th individual's p -dimensional covariate vector and with a slight abuse of notation set $\mathbf{X}_j^* = (\mathbf{X}_{j1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{jp}^*)$

where $\mathbf{X}_{jh}^* = \{X_{ih} : i \in S_j\}$ for $h = 1, \dots, p$. Thus depending on context, \mathbf{X}_j^* could possibly be a super vector of stacked patients' covariate vectors. Lastly, if there are qualitative and continuous covariates, without loss of generality we sort \mathbf{X}_i so that the p_q qualitative covariates appear first and the p_c continuous covariates appear last. This results in $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip_q}, X_{i,p_q+1}, \dots, X_{i,p_q+p_c})$ and $\mathbf{X}_j^* = (\mathbf{X}_{j1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{jp_q}^*, \mathbf{X}_{j,p_q+1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{j,p_q+p_c}^*)$.

We now introduce notation associated with the basic model. A dependent random partition prior distribution is assigned to ρ_m . This prior distribution parametrized by $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, will be denoted using $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. Once a prior for ρ_m is specified, we will make use of $f(\mathbf{Y}|\rho) = \prod_{j=1}^{k_n} f_j(\mathbf{Y}_j^*)$ as a data model where $f_j(\mathbf{Y}_j^*) = \int \prod_{i \in S_j} f_j(Y_i|\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*) dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*)$, $f(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*)$ denotes the likelihood for \mathbf{Y} , and G_0 a prior for cluster specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*$. Note that unit-specific parameters can be connected to their cluster-specific counterpart via $\theta_i = \theta_{s_i}^*$. Alternatively, the data model can be written hierarchically using the cluster labels s_1, \dots, s_n in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*, s_i &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} f(\theta_{s_i}^*), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\
 \theta_\ell^* &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} G_0, \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, k_m, \\
 \rho_m | \mathbf{X} &\sim RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Notice that covariates do not appear in the data model so that neither pre-specified associations nor their forms are required. As a result, \mathbf{Y} is only connected to \mathbf{X} through the posterior distribution of ρ_m (denoted by $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$) which will facilitate our interaction search. There are a number of computational techniques that have been developed to fit this model. Most are some variant of MCMC that depends on the exact specification of $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. We opt to employ algorithm 8 of Neal (2000) when fitting model (1), since it is a general algorithm that can be used in a variety settings.

As mentioned there are many possibilities for $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. In what follows we employ the

covariate dependent random partition model (PPMx) described in Müller et al. (2011) (and further explored in Page and Quintana 2018) because of its flexibility in being able to easily incorporate all types of covariates. The exact form of $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ when adopting the PPMx is

$$RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \propto \prod_{j=1}^{k_m} c(S_j)g(\mathbf{X}_j^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}),$$

where $c(S)$ is a set function that measures the chances elements in S co-cluster *a priori*, and $g(\mathbf{X}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \int \prod_{i \in S_j} q(\mathbf{X}_i|\boldsymbol{\xi}^*)q(\boldsymbol{\xi}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta})d\boldsymbol{\xi}^*$ is a similarity function that produces higher values for \mathbf{X}^* 's that contain covariate values that are more similar. When multiple covariates of different types are available Müller et al. (2011) suggest using the following multiplicative form

$$g(\mathbf{X}_j^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{p_q} g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) \prod_{\ell=p_q+1}^{p_q+p_c} g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}). \quad (2)$$

3.2 Association Rules

One possible approach of employing $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ to pinpoint potential interactions is to identify covariates that seem to influence cluster formation. This would imply that an association exists among the influential covariates, and since $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ connects \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , there is also a potential association between the influential covariates and \mathbf{Y} (a necessity for an interaction to exist). Identifying influential covariates can be done by determining which covariates have the same (or similar) values for many individuals in a cluster. Performing this type of exhaustive search, which can be viewed as cluster “mode finding” or “bump hunting”, quickly becomes computationally prohibitive as the number of covariates grow. An unsupervised learning technique that has been developed to avoid the heavy computational cost, performs a greedy type search (rather than exhaustive) and establishes so called association

rules.

Association rules discover patterns or relations among a large collection of variables. They are typically denoted using $\{A\} \Rightarrow \{B\}$ where A and B define a subset of the covariate space that does not share any variables. One can interpret this association rule as “If A happens, then B happens”. Connecting the idea to the osteonecrosis study, a possible association rule is $\{A = \text{AgeAtDiagnosis} \in [3, 5)\} \Rightarrow \{B = \text{DexCIWk07} \in [9, 12)\}$ which would indicate that if *AgeAtDiagnosis* is between 3 and 5, then *DexCIWk07* is between 9 and 12.

There are two criteria to evaluate an association rule’s import. The first, called support, is the proportion of patients whose covariate vector contains both A and B . Thus, the support of the osteonecrosis example association rule is the proportion of subjects whose $\text{AgeAtDiagnosis} \in [3, 5)$ and $\text{DexCIWk07} \in [9, 12)$. Notice the natural connection between support and joint probability. The second criterion, called confidence, is the fraction of patients that display B among those that display A . Thus, the confidence of the osteonecrosis example association rule is the fraction of patients for which $\text{DexCIWk07} \in [9, 12)$ among those whose $\text{AgeAtDiagnosis} \in [3, 5)$. Notice the connection that confidence has with conditional probability. Association rules with large support and confidence are considered interesting and will be our criteria to determine which covariate pairs to consider when looking for interactions. For a more detailed overview of association rules we refer interested readers to Hastie et al. (2009, chapter 14) or Han et al. (2012, chapter 6).

4 Interaction Discovering Procedure

Fishing for interactions or effects in a vast covariate space is much like fishing on a vast, unknown lake. Being successful in either is essentially hopeless without some guidance on where to focus efforts. The exploratory approach we develop can be thought of as employing a guide to identify areas in the covariate space that increase chances of successfully identifying

additive and multiplicative effects (much like a fishing guide can identify locations in a vast lake where fish are present). As mentioned, the procedure consists of three stages. The first connects covariates to the response using $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ which is constructed by way of model (1). Second, association rules are employed to explore the cluster specific covariate structure identifying potential covariate associations that potentially influence the response distribution. Third, posterior predictive distributions are employed to confirm that effects identified indeed influence the response distribution. (As a side note, Gabry et al. (2019) advocate using a posterior predictive distribution as an exploratory or confirmatory tool.) We provide more details to each step, followed by an illustrative simulation study. In what follows we will refer to the three step procedure as the PPMx, Association rule, Interaction Discovery procedure (or the PAID procedure).

A natural way of employing $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ in the first stage of the exploratory procedure is to produce a point estimate of ρ_m using MCMC iterates and the least squares method developed by Dahl (2006) (or some other alternative). However, as noted by Wade and Ghahramani (2018), there might be substantial variability associated with the partition point estimate. Therefore, we apply association rules to each of the draws collected from $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ via the MCMC algorithm employed to fit model (1). This approach provides a means of propagating uncertainty associated with ρ_m through the exploratory procedure. For each draw from $\pi(\rho_m|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ we use association rules to identify covariates that are associated by selecting those that correspond to the highest total for support and confidence. Since the interactions identified will be based on specific clusters they are local in the same way that treatment effects are local in subset analysis. That is, the interaction may not remain consistent across the entire population. Lastly, posterior predictive distributions of outcomes based on values of covariates identified by association rules are used to confirm the presence of associations. To make the third stage of the procedure concrete, consider an example with three binary covariates. Let $f_{ijk}(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ denote the posterior predictive density for

$X_1 = i$, $X_2 = j$, and $X_3 = k$ with $i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}$ and assume that within a cluster, the association rule with highest total support and confidence is $\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$. To verify that there does indeed exist what we call an interaction between (X_1, X_2) , we test the following hypothesis (after fixing $X_3 = k$ to its empirical median)

$$H_0 : f_{00k}(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}) = f_{01k}(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}) = f_{10k}(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}) = f_{11k}(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}). \quad (3)$$

If the hypothesis is rejected, then we conclude that X_1 and X_2 interact. That is, the predictive distribution of Y is in some way influenced by X_1 and X_2 , and the specific way in which this occurs can be later explored separately. There are a number of procedures that might be selected to test the hypothesis found in (3). The Pólya tree procedure outlined in Chen and Hanson (2014) is quite flexible and powerful, and thus we opt to use it in what follows. However, any other procedure that is able to formally test the hypothesis in (3) is completely valid.

We briefly draw attention to a small notational change moving forward. The notation typically used with association rules highlights the fact that they are by nature directional. However, the direction of the association rule is immaterial in the procedure we develop. Notice that testing (3) for association rule $\{X_1 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 1\}$ would produce the same conclusions as testing (3) for $\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$ (or any other association rule that contains X_1 and X_2). Our purpose in using association rules is to simply identify a pair of covariates that are associated with each other and possibly influence the distribution of Y in a non-additive way. Therefore, we will use $X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_2$ to denote that at least one association rule contained the pair X_1, X_2 in some fashion.

4.1 Simulation Study

To illustrate the procedure just described, we consider a simulation study that demonstrates how association rules and posterior predictive distributions can identify valid interactions even when they influence the response distribution in ways other than through its expectation. Data sets consisting of three binary covariates are generated (i.e., $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$). The response distribution $f(Y|X_1, X_2, X_3)$ is made to explicitly depend on $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ in the three ways that are listed in Table 4. Each row of the table represents a possible covariate combination and the columns correspond to a particular response distribution. Note first that only X_1 and X_2 influence the distribution of Y and they do so multiplicatively (i.e., they interact in the linear model sense). As a control, we consider the case where the distribution of Y does not depend on \mathbf{X} in any way, which is denoted by $f_0(Y|\mathbf{X})$. From Table 4 note that $f_0(Y|\mathbf{X})$ corresponds to a standard normal regardless of the values of \mathbf{X} . For $f_1(Y|\mathbf{X})$ the variance and shape remain the same regardless of the value of \mathbf{X} , but the mean changes based on the values of X_1 and X_2 . For $f_2(Y|\mathbf{X})$, the mean and shape remain the same, but the variance changes depending on the values of \mathbf{X} . Lastly, for $f_3(Y|\mathbf{X})$ the mean and variance do not change but \mathbf{X} influences shape. The scenario under $f_1(Y|\mathbf{X})$ follows the classical definition of an interaction and thus can be detected using any number of procedures. The other two scenarios would not be detected even if an interaction between X_1 and X_2 is explicitly included in a linear model. As competitors, we consider a linear model and the spike and slab approach of Ishwaran and Rao (2005) that includes all main effects and two-way interactions. The spike and slab procedure is carried out using the `spikeslab` package (Ishwaran et al. 2013) found in R (R Core Team 2017). We note that by fixing X_3 , we are implicitly assuming that there is no three-way interaction. Although we focus on identifying two-way interactions, straightforward extensions to association rules and (3) would permit detecting three-way interactions using the same approach something we explore in Section 5.

Table 4: Description of distributions used in the simulation study. Here $N(a, b)$ denotes a normal distribution with mean a and standard deviation b , $SN(a, b, c)$ denotes a skew-normal distribution with location (a), scale (b), and skew (c) parameters with $a = 10$, $b = 1$, and $c = 20$ used in the simulation. For the two component mixture, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$, $s_1^2 = s_2^2 = 1/16$, and $m_1 = -m_2 = \sqrt{15}/4$ were employed.

X_1	X_2	X_3	$f_0(Y \mathbf{X})$	$f_1(Y \mathbf{X})$	$f_2(Y \mathbf{X})$	$f_3(Y \mathbf{X})$
1	1	1	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$
1	1	0	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$
1	0	1	$N(0, 1)$	$N(2, 1)$	$N(0, 3)$	$SN(a, b, c)$
1	0	0	$N(0, 1)$	$N(2, 1)$	$N(0, 3)$	$SN(a, b, c)$
0	1	1	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$
0	1	0	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$	$N(0, 1)$
0	0	1	$N(0, 1)$	$N(4, 1)$	$N(0, 6)$	$\sum_{j=1}^2 p_j N(m_j, s_j^2)$
0	0	0	$N(0, 1)$	$N(4, 1)$	$N(0, 6)$	$\sum_{j=1}^2 p_j N(m_j, s_j^2)$

For each scenario we generated 1000 data sets each with 500 observations. To each, model (1) was fit with $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ being the PPMx. The cohesion used is $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$ with $M = 1$ connecting the partition model to that induced by a Dirichlet process mixture and retaining the “rich get richer” property. We employ the auxiliary similarity function (see Müller et al. 2011; Page and Quintana 2018). As a result, for qualitative variables $q(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\xi}^*)$ and $q(\boldsymbol{\xi}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta})$ correspond to multinomial and Dirichlet density functions, respectively and for continuous variables they take on a Gaussian and Gaussian-Inverse-Gamma density functions.

Once model (1) is fit, at each MCMC iterate of ρ_m , cluster-specific association rules were gathered using the `apriori` function found in the `arules` package (Hahsler et al. 2015) of the statistical software R (R Core Team 2017). This function is based on the *apriori* algorithm of Agrawal et al. 1996. We consider association rules from clusters that contain at least 10 subjects/experimental units. After association rules are gathered, we identify the covariate tandem that has the highest total support and confidence. If this results in a tie, then both

covariate tandems are considered. For each association rule considered, we employ the Pólya tree-based testing procedure of Chen and Hanson (2014) to test the hypothesis in (3). The variable absent from the association rule is fixed at the empirical median value. The p -values from this testing procedure are derived from permutation tests and values in Table 5 are based on 500 permutations.

In the online supplementary material, we provide a more detailed description of the simulation study for each of the 24 possible association rules, but here we focus on results for testing (3) which are found in Table 5. Each column of the table contains the p -values produced by the Chen and Hanson (2014)’s Pólya tree method averaged across the 1000 data sets.

Since the number of posterior predictive draws collected to carry out the test can be selected somewhat arbitrarily, the adage “statistical vs practical significance” is important here as it would be undesirable to reject (3) for differences that are inconsequential. Therefore, we considered a differing number of posterior predictive draws when carrying out the test ($N \in \{50, 100, 250\}$). It seems that for this data generating mechanism, it was sufficient to only consider 50 posterior predictive draws when testing the hypothesis for $f_1(Y|\mathbf{X})$ and $f_2(Y|\mathbf{X})$, while 100 draws were sufficient for $f_3(Y|\mathbf{X})$.

Table 5: p -values resulting from carrying out the hypothesis test (3) using the Pólya tree method of Chen and Hanson (2014).

arules	$N = 50$				$N = 100$				$N = 250$			
	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3
$X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_2$	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00
$X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_3$	0.47	0.54	0.50	0.48	0.51	0.38	0.50	0.45	0.44	0.37	0.43	0.41
$X_2 \Leftrightarrow X_3$	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.14

Under f_0 the averaged p -value is large in all cases indicating that the posterior predictive densities in (3) are essentially the same regardless of the number of posterior predictive draws and association rule. This was expected as \mathbf{X} in no way influences Y under f_0 . Similarly,




Figure 1: Posterior predictive densities for the six combinations of X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 based on a synthetic data set used in the simulation study.

$X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_3$ under f_1 , f_2 , and f_3 and $X_2 \Leftrightarrow X_3$ under f_3 produced large p -values which was to be expected as X_3 does not influence Y . Since there is an interaction between X_1 and X_2 , the small p -values associated with $X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_2$ under f_1 , f_2 , and f_3 were expected. That said, notice that under f_1 and f_2 the association rule that includes X_2 and X_3 also produced small p -values for (3). This was unexpected as an interaction between X_2 and X_3 does not exist. Note that since X_2 and X_3 do not interact, fixing X_1 makes it so that (3) is testing for the “marginal effect” of X_2 . As a result small p -values associated with hypothesis (3) can indicate an interaction or a marginal effect. To correctly determine which, further testing can be carried out, or the posterior predictive densities being compared in (3) should be carefully examined. Here, we carry out the later by providing posterior predictive densities in Figure 1 which displays densities estimated using the first fake data set generated in the simulation study under f_1 . The first row of the figure corresponds to densities in (3) when X_3 is fixed, the second row when X_2 is fixed, and the third when X_1 is fixed. Notice that the densities in the first row are noticeably different and clearly depend on the levels of X_1 and X_2 (i.e., there is an interaction between X_1 and X_2). Close inspection of rows 2 and 3 of the figure shows that differences seen in the posterior predictive densities are not due to X_3 at all, but entirely to X_1 for the second row and X_2 for the third. Thus, graphs like Figure 1 are able to help determine if interactions correspond to “main effects” or “interaction effects” as they are typically defined in a linear model setting. Ultimately, the take home message of Table 5 and Figure 1 is that the exploratory procedure is able to identify that X_1 and X_2 interact regardless of the influence that they have on the distribution of Y .

Table 6 compares the performance of detecting the interaction between X_1 and X_2 using a linear model and spike and slab procedure to that which we proposed. The table displays the proportion of data sets for which the interaction between X_1 and X_2 was correctly identified. Notice that when no interaction is present all procedures perform similarly. Additionally, when the interaction is based on the expectation of the response distribution (f_1), all pro-

cedures are able to detect the interaction regularly. However, if the interaction is based on the variance or shape of the response distribution, the PAID procedure is the only one that is able to detect it.

Table 6: Percent of datasets in the simulation study for which the interaction between X_1 and X_2 was correctly identified

Procedure	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3
Linear Model	0.05	1.00	0.05	0.05
Spike and Slab	0.09	1.00	0.07	0.08
PAID with $N = 50$	0.05	1.00	1.00	0.91
PAID with $N = 100$	0.05	1.00	1.00	0.99
PAID with $N = 250$	0.07	1.00	1.00	1.00

5 Interactions in the Osteonecrosis Study

We now turn our attention to the osteonecrosis study. Since the response is an ordinal variable it is natural to consider latent variable ordinal data models as those described in Bao and Hanson (2015) and in Kottas et al. (2005). These types of models are clearly more complex than that in (1), but they permit demonstrating the flexibility of the exploratory procedure as any data model can be employed so long as the response is connected to the covariates through a dependent random partition model (or analogous predictor dependent clustering procedures).

For sake of completeness we detail the ordinal model in its entirety. Let $y_i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ be the ordinal response measured on the i th patient $i = 1, \dots, 234$. Further, let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i22})$ denote subject i 's 23-dimensional covariate vector. As is done in Bao and Hanson (2015), real-valued latent scores z_1, \dots, z_n are introduced such that for $-\infty = \gamma_0 <$

$$\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_4 < \gamma_5 = \infty$$

$$y_i = \ell \Leftrightarrow \gamma_\ell < z_i \leq \gamma_{\ell+1} \text{ for } \ell = 0, \dots, 4.$$

The appeal of employing the methods described in Bao and Hanson (2015) and Kottas et al. (2005) is that the values selected for γ are immaterial, so long as the model is flexible enough to assign sufficient probability mass to each $(\gamma_\ell, \gamma_{\ell+1}]$ interval. Since assigning a PPMx prior to ρ_m results in modeling the latent ordinal scores with a mixture (which is essentially the same data model specified by Bao and Hanson 2015), we conclude that the model we specify affords sufficient flexibility and, therefore, the γ 's can be selected arbitrarily. In light of this we set $\gamma_1 = 0, \gamma_2 = 1/3, \gamma_3 = 2/3, \gamma_4 = 3/3$. The remainder of the model is expressed hierarchically after introducing latent cluster labels s_1, \dots, s_n

$$\begin{aligned} z_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2*}, s_i &\sim N(\mu_{s_i}^*, \sigma_{s_i}^{2*}), \\ (\mu_j^*, \sigma_j^*) &\sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) \times Unif(0, A), \\ Pr(\rho | \mathbf{X}) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^k c(S_j) g(\mathbf{X}_j^*), \end{aligned}$$

where $c(S_j)$ and $g(\mathbf{X}_j^*)$ are set to functions detailed in Section 3.1. Further, we assume $\mu_0 \sim N(0, 10^2)$, $\sigma_0 \sim UN(0, 10)$, and set $A = 0.1$. This model was fit to the osteonecrosis data by collecting 1000 MCMC iterates after discarding the first 10,000 as burn-in and thinning by ten. Afterwards, the exploratory procedure of identifying association rules for each MCMC iterate of ρ_m was carried out. Since association rules require discrete variables, each of the continuous covariates were dichotomized such that an equal number of observations belonged to each interval. Covariate values for those variables not identified in the association rule are set to the overall median. Testing (3) was done by using Chen and Hanson (2014)'s method based on 500 permutations and 100 posterior predictive draws. This testing procedure was

replicated five times with a unique set of 100 random posterior predictive draws and the average p -value is reported. We briefly mention that in addition to dichotomizing continuous covariates, we explored the impact that trichotomizing continuous covariates might have on the PAID exploratory procedure. Results are provided in the online supplementary material.

Since the study was conducted specifically to explore if dexamethasone clearance (DexCl) and/or asparaginase (AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC) interact with other physiological measurements, we restrict attention to those association rules that contain at least one of these two covariates. Results are provided in Table 7. The column “ Pr ” corresponds to the percent of MCMC iterates that identified the particular association rule, “Supp.” is the support, “Conf.” the confidence, $|S|$ corresponds to average cluster size from which association rule was identified, and “ p -value” indicates result of testing (3). Notice that DexClWk07 interacts with LowRisk and AlbuminWk07 while DexClWk08 interacts with HDLWk08. On the other hand, Asparaginase seems to interact with AlbuminWk07, HDLWk07, and AgeAtDiagnosis. Figure 2 contains the posterior predictive densities corresponding to the first four association rules in Table 7 that do not contain LowRisk. Note how the interaction between AlbuminWk07 and AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC influences the shape of the predictive densities verifying that there is indeed an interaction between them.

Table 7: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data with univariate similarity functions and continuous covariates being dichotomized. Here only association rules that contain either DexClwk07, DexClwk08, or AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC are considered

Association Rule	Pr	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	p -value
DexClWk07 \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	1.00	0.62	0.91	70.14	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk07	0.97	0.86	0.97	46.91	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow HDLWk07	0.81	0.72	1.00	14.64	0.02
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	0.76	0.57	0.84	67.24	0.20
DexClWk07 \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk07	0.70	0.71	0.97	20.50	0.00
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow HDLWk08	0.55	0.51	0.88	32.47	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	0.53	0.87	0.98	46.35	0.24
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk08	0.48	0.83	0.98	13.06	0.85
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow AgeAtDiagnosis	0.46	0.53	0.85	30.65	0.00

Being able to interpret results at the latent level is not always straightforward. Thus it would be appealing to determine how interactions influence the risk of osteonecrosis. Table 8 contains predictive probabilities associated with each osteonecrosis grade for specific levels of covariates found in the bottom row of plots in Figure 2. It appears that low level of `DexC1` results in higher risk of osteonecrosis, but the exact risk depends on the levels of the other covariates (`AlbuminWk07` and `HDLWk08`). The combination of low `DexC1Wk07` and high `AlbuminWk07` results in the highest risk of osteonecrosis. This leads one to hypothesize that a three-way interaction between `Albumin`, `HDL`, and `DexC1` may be present. We explored this by testing a version of (3) that includes posterior predictive densities for all possible combinations of the three covariates (eight in total). Doing this resulted in rejecting the null (with a p -value of 0) that all densities are equal and hence we conclude that a three-way interaction exists. More details are provided in the online supplementary material.

Table 8: Posterior probabilities corresponding to each severity grade of osteonecrosis associated with two association rules found in 7

Covariates	Osteonecrosis Grade				
	0	1	2	3	4
AlbuminWk07 - L, DexCIWk07 - L	0.145	0.810	0.045	0.000	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - L, DexCIWk07 - H	0.196	0.804	0.000	0.000	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - H, DexCIWk07 - L	0.303	0.627	0.055	0.015	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - H, DexCIWk07 - H	0.418	0.560	0.019	0.003	0.000
DexCIWk08 - L, HDLWk08 - L	0.197	0.803	0.000	0.000	0.000
DexCIWk08 - L, HDLWk08 - H	0.195	0.805	0.000	0.000	0.000
DexCIWk08 - H, HDLWk08 - L	0.276	0.695	0.028	0.001	0.000
DexCIWk08 - H, HDLWk08 - H	0.332	0.666	0.002	0.000	0.000

To finalize our search for interactions we show how the PAID procedure can accommodate the temporal structure that exists among the covariates through the PPMx prior. This is




Figure 2: Posterior predictive densities for the latent variable z and used in hypothesis test (3) for the first four association rules in Table 7 that do not include LowRisk. The vertical lines correspond to $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$

done by considering the following multivariate type similarity:

$$g(\mathbf{X}_j^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{p_q} g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) \prod_{\ell=p_q+1}^{p_q+p_c} g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) \prod_{\ell=p_q+p_c+1}^{p_q+p_c+p_t} g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}), \quad (4)$$

where p_t denotes the number of temporally measured variables, and individual covariate vectors are ordered such that qualitative variables appear first, categorical second, and time-dependent last. For temporal covariates $q(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\xi}^*)$ and $q(\boldsymbol{\xi}^*)$ correspond to a multivariate Gaussian density and a multivariate Gaussian-Inverse-Wishart density respectively, with dimensionality given by the number of measurements for that particular covariate. It seems plausible that this similarity construction will be able to more accurately measure the compactness of temporal variables as correlations will be included. Using the same MCMC specs as in the univariate similarity case, we fit the ordinal data model with a multivariate PPMx prior. The two model fits are fairly compatible although the multivariate similarity produces a slightly lower log pseudo marginal likelihood (LPML) (-275.74) relative to the univariate similarity (-255.25) indicating a slightly better model fit. In addition, the average number of clusters is 10.3 for the former and 11.2 for the later. Association rule results are provided in Table 9. All association rules that appear in Table 9 also appear in Table 7 save those that involve `LDLBaseline`, which is not “significant” when paired with `DexC1Wk08`. Overall, this analysis further reinforces the interaction between `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` and `AlbuminWk07`.

6 Conclusions

We have detailed an exploratory procedure that in a general way is able to identify interactions. The definition of interaction that we espouse is more general than that typically associated with linear models. Here we claim that an interaction can influence any aspect

Table 9: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model fit with multivariate similarity functions assigned to the temporally referenced covariates. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered

Association Rule	Pr	Supp.	Conf.	S	p -value
DexClWk07 \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	1.00	0.63	0.91	69.07	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk07	0.98	0.82	0.96	52.22	0.37
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	0.90	0.56	0.86	68.70	0.53
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow LDLBaseline	0.65	0.63	0.99	15.78	0.61
DexClWk07 \Leftrightarrow LDLBaseline	0.61	0.62	1.00	16.06	0.00
DexClWk07 \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk07	0.54	0.66	0.91	22.93	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC \Leftrightarrow LowRisk	0.51	0.82	0.96	52.03	0.12
DexClWk08 \Leftrightarrow AlbuminWk08	0.49	0.81	0.98	13.36	0.61

of the response distribution rather than focusing solely on the first moment. Further, the procedure is able to identify interactions without *a priori* information regarding which (multiplicative) effects to include in a data model. This was seen when applying the procedure to the osteonecrosis data set. In the application, relationships that were known to exist (e.g., Low `DexCl` and higher risk of osteonecrosis) were identified without considering them explicitly in the procedure. In addition, a three-way interaction, also not explicitly included in the data model, was highlighted (see supplementary material). This interaction was not previously known by the investigators, and its scientific relevance has yet to be determined.

We also demonstrated that the procedure can be easily employed regardless of the type of response being measured. Indeed, the procedure is essentially “data model free” as it can be employed regardless of the data model so long as some type of random partition model is employed. Lastly, we note that our exploratory procedure only identifies potential interactions. That is, it does not estimate their effect. If this is desired, then any number of statistical procedures that include the specific covariates identified by our procedure can be employed (i.e., some form of regression).

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Drs. Yuhui Chen and Timothy Hanson for kindly sharing code that carries out the Pólya Tree permutation test. Fernando A. Quintana

was supported by grant FONDECYT 1180034 and Iniciativa Científica Milenio - Minecon Núcleo Milenio MiDas. Gary L. Rosner was partially funded by grants GM092666 and P30CA006973

References

- Agrawal, R., Mannila, H., Srikant, R., Toivonen, H., and Verkamo, A. I. (1996), “Fast Discovery of Association Rules,” in *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, eds. Fayyad, U. M., Piatetsky-Shapiro, G., Smyth, P., and Uthurusamy, R., Menlo Park, CA, USA: American Association for Artificial Intelligence, pp. 307–328.
- Alexander, W. P. and Grimshaw, S. D. (1996), “Treed Regression,” *The Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 5, 156–157.
- American Cancer Society (2018), “Survival Rates for Childhood Leukemias,” <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/leukemia-in-children/detection-diagnosis-staging/survival-rates.html>[Accessed: 18 March 2018].
- Bao, J. and Hanson, T. E. (2015), “Bayesian Nonparametric Multivariate Ordinal Regression,” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 43, 337–357.
- Barcella, W., De Iorio, M., Favaro, S., and Rosner, G. L. (2018), “Dependent generalized Dirichlet process priors for the analysis of acute lymphoblastic leukemia,” *Biostatistics*, 19, 342–358.
- Berger, J. O., Wang, X., and Shen, L. (2014), “A Bayesian Approach to Subgroup Identification,” *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 24, 110 – 129.
- Chen, Y. and Hanson, T. E. (2014), “Bayesian nonparametric k -sample tests for censored and uncensored data,” *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 71, 335–346.
- Chung, Y. and Dunson, D. B. (2009), “Nonparametric Bayes conditional distribution modeling with variable selection,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1646–1660.
- Dahl, D. B. (2006), “Model-Based Clustering for Expression Data via a Dirichlet Process Mixture Model,” in *Bayesian Inference for Gene Expression and Proteomics*, eds. Vanucci, M., Do, K. A., and Müller, P., Cambridge University Press, pp. 201–218.
- De Iorio, M., Müller, P., Rosner, G. L., and MacEachern, S. N. (2004), “An ANOVA Model for Dependent Random Measures,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99, 205–215.

- Du, J. and Linero, A. R. (2018), “Interaction Detection with Bayesian Decision Tree Ensembles,” ArXiv:1809.08524.
- Dunson, D. B., Pillai, N., and Park, J.-H. (2007), “Bayesian density regression,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69, 163–183.
- Fan, J., Yao, Q., and Tong, H. (1996), “Estimation of conditional densities and sensitivity measures in nonlinear dynamical systems,” *Biometrika*, 83, 189–206.
- Gabry, J., Simpson, D., Vehtari, A., Betancourt, M., and Gelman, A. (2019), “Visualization in Bayesian workflow,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*, To appear.
- George, E. I. and McCulloch, R. E. (1997), “Approaches for Bayesian Variable Selection,” *Statistica Sinica*, 7, 339–374.
- Hahsler, M., Buchta, C., Gruen, B., and Hornik, K. (2015), *arules: Mining Association Rules and Frequent Itemsets*, r package version 1.3-1.
- Han, J., Kamber, M., and Pei, J. (2012), *Data Mining Concepts and Techniques*, Elsevier, 1st ed.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2009), *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction*, Springer, 2nd ed.
- Hu, J., Joshi, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2009), “Log-Linear Models for Gene Association,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 597–607.
- Ishwaran, H., Rao, J., and Kogalur, U. (2013), *spikeslab : Prediction and variable selection using spike and slab regression*, r package version 1.1.5.
- Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005), “Spike and Slab Variable Selection: Frequentist and Bayesian Strategies,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 33, 730–773.
- Kawedia, J. D., Kaste, S. C., Pei, D., Panetta, J. C., Cai, X., Cheng, C., Neale, G., Howard, S. C., Evans, W. E., Pui, C.-H., and Relling, M. V. (2011), “Pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, and pharmacogenetic determinants of osteonecrosis in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia,” *Blood*, 117, 2340–2347.
- Kottas, A., Müller, P., and Quintana, F. (2005), “Nonparametric Bayesian Modeling for Multivariate Ordinal Data,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 14, 610–625.
- Lim, M. and Hastie, T. (2015), “Learning Interactions via Hierarchical Group-Lasso Regularization,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 24, 627–654.
- Liu, J., Sivaganesan, S., Laud, P. W., and Müller, P. (2017), “A Bayesian subgroup analysis using collections of ANOVA models,” *Biometrical Journal*, 59, 746–766.

- Loh, W.-Y. (2002), “Regression Trees With Unbiased Variable Selection and Interaction Detection,” *Statistica Sinica*, 12, 361 – 386.
- MacEachern, S. N. (2000), “Dependent Dirichlet processes,” Tech. rep., Ohio State University, Department of Statistics.
- Mitra, R., Mueller, P., and Ji, Y. (2017), “Bayesian multiplicity control for multiple graphs,” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 45, 44–61.
- Müller, P., Quintana, F. A., and Rosner, G. L. (2011), “A Product Partition Model With Regression on Covariates,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20, 260–277.
- Neal, R. M. (2000), “Markov Chain Sampling Methods for Dirichlet Process Mixture Models,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9, 249–265.
- Page, G. L. and Quintana, F. A. (2018), “Calibrating Covariate Informed Product Parititon Models,” *Statistics and Computing*, 28, 1009–1031.
- R Core Team (2017), *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Reich, B. J., Kalendra, E., Storlie, C. B., Bondell, H. D., and Fuentes, M. (2012), “Variable selection for high dimensinoal Bayesian density estimation: application to human exposure simulation,” *Journa of the Royal Statistifal Society: Series C*, 61, 47–66.
- Schnell, P. M., Tang, Q., Offen, W. W., and Carlin, B. P. (2016), “A Bayesian Credible Subgroups Approach to Identifying Patient Subgroups with Positive Treatment Effects,” *Biometrics*, 72, 1026–1036.
- Scott, J. G. and Berger, J. O. (2010), “Bayes and empirical-Bayes multiplicity adjustment in the variable-selection problem,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 2587–2619.
- Shen, W. and Ghosal, S. (2016), “Adaptive Bayesian density regression for high-dimensional data,” *Bernoulli*, 22, 389–420.
- Simon, R. (2002), “Bayesian subset analysis: application to studyingtreatment-by-gender interactions,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 21, 2909–2916.
- Smith, M. and Kohn, R. (1996), “Nonparametric regression using Bayesian variable selection,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 75, 317–343.
- Sorokina, D., Caruana, R., Riedewald, M., and Fink, D. (2008), “Detecting Statistical Interactions with Additive Groves of Trees,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning*, New York, NY, USA: ACM, ICML ’08, pp. 1000–1007.

- Sorokina, D., Caruana, R., Riedewald, M., Hochachka, W., and Kelling, S. (2009), “Detecting and Interpreting Variable Interactions in Observational Ornithology Data,” in *2009 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*, pp. 64–69.
- Su, X., na, A. T. P., Liu, L., and Levine, R. A. (2018), “Random forests of interaction trees for estimating individualized treatment effects in randomized trials,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 37, 2547–2560.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), “Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 58, 267–288.
- Tokdar, S. T., Zhu, Y. M., and Ghosh, J. K. (2010), “Bayesian density regression with logistic Gaussian process and subspace projection,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 5, 319–344.
- Varadhan, R. and Wang, S.-J. (2014), “Standardization for subgroup analysis in randomized controlled trials,” *Journal of biopharmaceutical statistics*, 24, 154–167.
- Wade, S. and Ghahramani, Z. (2018), “Bayesian Cluster Analysis: Point Estimation and Credible Balls,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 13, 559–626.