

Quick and Simple Kernel Differential Equation Regression Estimators for Data with Sparse Design

Chunlei Ge^a and W. John Braun^b

^aUBC Okanagan; ^bUBC Okanagan

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled June 18, 2024

ABSTRACT

Local polynomial regression of order at least one often performs poorly in regions of sparse data. Local constant regression is exceptional in this regard, though it is the least accurate method in general, especially at the boundaries of the data. Incorporating information from differential equations which may approximately or exactly hold is one way of extending the sparse design capacity of local constant regression while reducing bias and variance. A nonparametric regression method that exploits first order differential equations is introduced in this paper and applied to noisy mouse tumour growth data. Asymptotic biases and variances of kernel estimators using Taylor polynomials with different degrees are discussed. Model comparison is performed for different estimators through simulation studies under various scenarios which simulate exponential-type growth.

KEYWORDS

Nonparametric regression; local polynomial regression; kernel estimator; sparse design; boundary effect; bias reduction; variance reduction; differential equations

1. Introduction

Modelling data where there are relationships between outcome variables and possible explanatory variables remains an active area of research. Generalized linear models as a group of typically parametric regression models are popular when they can clearly explain and interpret how predictors influence the outcome. Compared with nonparametric regression, parametric regressions are more interpretable but less flexible and accurate due to constraints that they impose on the shape of the functional relationships between the response and explanatory variables. These need to be predetermined. In practical problems, scatterplots, which are not appropriately fit by straight lines and other parametric curves, can be analyzed by nonparametric methods, a proposed approach which adapts to the functional relationship and highlights unexpected features of the data.

Local polynomial regression, a nonparametric technique for smoothing scatter plots and modelling functions, was introduced by [6] and by [11]. Typically, these regression models can reduce the noise or variability in the data by averaging values within a certain range. The tools used in the fitted model are weighted polynomials inside the local neighborhood with the bandwidth of h , which is a smoothing parameter. The

books by [1] and [5] provide several methods of bandwidth selection. The ability of capturing local nuances in data confers some valuable advantages on local polynomial regression models such as adaptive smoothing, local interpretability, and no need for explicit function specification. However, the dependence of local neighborhoods can lead to the difficulties in regions of sparse data. The information from differential equations can be a great assistance for local polynomial regression models.

The approach discussed in this paper is one specific form of differential equation assisted local polynomial regression. With the assistance of differential equations, local polynomial regression can capture more complex patterns in the data, for example, data with a sparse design. The improved model can incorporate with different kinds of differential equations including linear and nonlinear forms. In this paper, we will introduce a relatively simple model, a differential equation assisted local exponential growth model.

1.1. Kernel Differential Equation Regression Model

We consider kernel regression models with the assistance of first order differential equations.

Given n independent observations on an explanatory variable x and a response variable y , we consider models of the form

$$y_i = g(x_i) + \varepsilon_i \text{ where } g'(x) = F(x, g(x)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

for some Lipschitz continuous function F and uncorrelated mean-zero errors ε_i . We assume that the design points have been randomly sampled from an interval $[a, b]$ according to a probability density function f , or they have been selected according to a fixed sampling design in that interval.

1.2. Differential Equation Assisted Local Exponential Growth Model

We start a regression analysis using the above model with a specific form, $F(x, g(x)) = \lambda g(x)$. Then the model will be an exponential growth model

$$y_i = g(x_i) + \varepsilon_i \text{ where } g'(x) = \lambda g(x), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \tag{1}$$

We will call it local exponential growth model in this paper, or in short, local growth model. An application example will be performed in the next section. The data we used is mouse tumor growth data with sparse design.

1.3. An Application Example of Sparse Tumor Growth Data

At various points in this paper, we will consider the following example which concerns a set of control data for a chemotherapy trial in an animal experiment. Tumour volume measurements were taken in a single mouse. The full set of observations is below. Times are in days, and volumes are in cubic centimetres.

We artificially remove some of the data to illustrate performance of various local polynomial models on sparse data. The resulting data set is as follows and is plotted

	time	volume
1	21	0.05
2	25	0.09
3	28	0.22
4	31	0.32
5	33	0.61
6	35	0.70
7	38	0.90
8	40	1.29
9	42	1.77
10	45	3.32

Table 1. The full set of observations in mouse tumor volume data

as the filled circles in Figure 1. The removed data are denoted by open circles in that figure.

	time	volume
1	21	0.05
2	25	0.09
3	28	0.22
4	42	1.77
5	45	3.32

Table 2. The mouse tumor volume data in sparse design after removing 5 observations.

Local constant regression can sometimes handle this kind of data sparseness, but not accurately, especially near boundaries. Higher order local polynomial methods fail. In particular, we fit local constant, local linear and local quadratic models to the second data set using a gaussian kernel with bandwidth $h = 3.5$ in each case. As can be seen in the first three plots, each method has deficiencies, caused by the gap in the data set. Either spurious bumps are introduced (as in the local linear and quadratic cases) or gross inaccuracy results (in the local constant case).

Our objective is to exploit the low variance and data sparseness-handling properties of local constant regression while achieving accuracy of higher order local polynomial methods. To do this, we will use additional information (or beliefs) about the regression function. Specifically, we suppose that the regression function is the solution of a differential equation. For example, a simplistic model for tumour volume is the exponential growth model:

$$g' = \lambda g,$$

for some positive constant λ . The explicit solution to this differential equation is

$$g(x) = g(0)e^{\lambda x}.$$

This model could be fit directly to the data, upon estimating λ by applying least-squares estimation to the loglinear version of the model.

Alternatively, we can obtain a local solution of the differential equation by constructing a Taylor expansion of $g(x_i)$ about an evaluation point x_0 , adapting the approach




Figure 1. Mouse tumour growth data with some artificially missing observations (shown as open circles). Left panel: local constant model; centre left panel: local linear model; centre right panel: local quadratic model; right panel: local growth model. All models are fit to the observed data (filled circles) using a gaussian kernel with bandwidth $h = 3.5$.

described in detail by [1]. The first order approximation is

$$g(x_i) = g(x_0) + (x_i - x_0)g'(x_0) + O((x_i - x_0)^2). \quad (2)$$

Substituting the information from the differential equation,

$$g'(x_0) = \lambda g(x_0),$$

we have

$$g(x_i) = g(x_0) + (x_i - x_0)\lambda g(x_0) + O((x_i - x_0)^2).$$

There is only one local parameter to estimate: $g(x_0)$. This can be estimated from

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x_0)(1 + (x_i - x_0)\lambda))^2 K_h(x_i - x_0)$$

where K_h is a symmetric probability density function (the kernel) having scale h (the bandwidth).

The plot in the right panel of Figure 1 shows the result of this approach for a grid of evaluation points x_0 in the interval $[21, 45]$, with bandwidth simply chosen as one-half of the median of the successive differences in the sorted covariate values.

The result is not perfect, since there is a small spurious bump in the curve in the region of the deleted data points. However, in comparison with the other curves in the figure, it appears that the differential equation has provided useful information. In a later section of this paper, we return to this example with a somewhat more rigorous analysis.

An important reference in the area of estimation of differential equation parameters and fitting differential equations to data is [7]. The approach taken there is based on splines and requires extensive tuning. [4] have proposed a different kernel-based differential equation estimation approach based on a measurement error model which is similar yet distinct from the method proposed in the present paper. Their paper contains a large number of references to the literature on the fitting of ordinary differential equations to data.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we outline our proposed method. The next section contains the theoretical demonstration, for the local exponential growth model, that the bias is reduced compared with local constant regression while the variance is not greatly increased. Section 4 features a simulation study showing how the method is competitive with standard local polynomial approaches. We also

compare the method with a nonlinear least-squares estimation to the solution of a differential equation. Comparisons are made both when the solution corresponds to the correct model and when truth departs from the differential equation solution. We also study the effectiveness of our approach for a sparse design by simulation. The next section treats the mouse tumour growth data in detail by modifying the exponential growth model. The paper concludes with a short discussion in Section 6.

2. Proposed Method

Our general approach is to adapt local polynomial regression as described by [1]. For a given evaluation point x_0 , a differential equation-assisted local polynomial regression estimator of $g(x_0)$ can be obtained by minimizing the local least-squares objective function

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g^*(x_i))^2 K_h(x_i - x_0).$$

Expanding $g(x_i)$ in Taylor series up to degree k about x_0 gives

$$g(x_i) \doteq g(x_0) + (x_i - x_0)g'(x_0) + \cdots + \frac{(x_i - x_0)^k}{k!}g^{(k)}(x_0).$$

We therefore define

$$g_k^*(x_i) = g(x_0) + (x_i - x_0)g'(x_0) + \cdots + \frac{(x_i - x_0)^k}{k!}g^{(k)}(x_0).$$

Using the differential equation information, we observe that

$$g'(x_0) = F(x_0, g)$$

and

$$g''(x_0) = F_1(x_0, g) + F_2(x_0, g)g'(x_0) = F_1(x_0, g) + F_2(x_0, g)F(x_0, g),$$

where F_j denotes the partial derivative of F with respect to its j argument. Additional derivatives can be computed, using symbolic algebra software if necessary.

Although there may be unknown global parameters governing the differential equation, there is only one local parameter to estimate: $g(x_0)$.

3. Theoretical Properties

3.1. The Proposed DE-Assisted Estimators

We suppose the data follow the exponential growth model

$$y_i = g(x_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad x_i \in [a, b], \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

where

$$g' = \lambda g$$

and where we assume λ is a known parameter. We further assume conditions on the design density, kernel, and bandwidth as in **(author?)** [1].

Applying the first-degree Taylor expansion only:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x_i))^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\ & \doteq \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x) - g'(x)(x_i - x))^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x) - \lambda g(x)(x_i - x))^2 K_h(x_i - x) \end{aligned}$$

leads to the DE-Assisted first-degree estimator

$$\widehat{g}_1(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i (1 + (x_i - x)\lambda) K_h(x_i - x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 + (x_i - x)\lambda)^2 K_h(x_i - x)}.$$

where the subscript 1 indicates applying the first-degree Taylor expansion. We call it the local DE1-1 estimator, which is obtained with the known information of first order differential equation.

Similarly, we consider the second-degree estimator. Applying the second-degree Taylor expansion for $g(x_i)$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x_i))^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\ & \doteq \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x) - g'(x)(x_i - x) - \frac{1}{2}g''(x)(x_i - x)^2)^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(x) - \lambda g(x)(x_i - x) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 g(x)(x_i - x)^2)^2 K_h(x_i - x) \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the DE-Assisted second-degree estimator

$$\widehat{g}_2(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i (1 + (x_i - x)\lambda + \frac{1}{2}(x_i - x)^2 \lambda^2) K_h(x_i - x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 + (x_i - x)\lambda^2)^2 K_h(x_i - x)}.$$

where the subscript 2 indicates applying the second-order Taylor expansion. We call it the local DE1-2 estimator.

Generally, we can find the general form of k^{th} -degree Estimator by applying the k^{th} -degree Taylor expansion we mentioned in section 2

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}_k(x) &= \arg \min_i \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ y_i - \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p g^{(p)}(x) \right\}^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\
&= \arg \min_i \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ y_i - \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p g(x) \right\}^2 K_h(x_i - x) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \{ y_i \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \} K_h(x_i - x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h(x_i - x)} \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

where $g^{(p)}(x) = \lambda^p g(x)$, $p = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

We call it the local DE1-k estimator, where 1 indicates first-order differential equation and k indicates k^{th} -degree Taylor expansion.

In the next two sections, we will compute the conditional asymptotic biases and variances of $\hat{g}_k(x)$.

When we perform the conditional asymptotic analysis of the k^{th} degree estimators, we make the following assumptions for our model (1)

- $g(x)$, the mean function, has a bounded and continuous $k + 1^{th}$ derivative in a neighborhood of x .
- $f(x)$, the design density, is twice continuously differentiable and positive.
- $K(\cdot)$, the kernel function, is a symmetric and bounded PDF with finite sixth moment and is supported on a compact interval, say $[a, b]$.
-

$$R(K) = \int K^2(w) dw < \infty$$

for the kernel function $K(\cdot)$.

We will discuss the asymptotic conditional bias and variance of the DE-assisted estimators in the interior of $[a, b]$.

3.2. The Asymptotic Conditional Bias

We compute the asymptotic conditional bias of the k^{th} -degree estimator $\hat{g}_k(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Bias}(\widehat{g}_k(x)|x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \mathbb{E}[\widehat{g}_k(x)|x_1, \dots, x_n] - g(x) \\
&\approx \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \lambda^{k+1} g(x) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x)^{k+1} \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \right\} K_h(x_i - x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \right\}^2 K_h(x_i - x)} \\
&\approx \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \lambda^{k+1} g(x) \frac{\int_a^b (z - x)^{k+1} \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \right\} f(z) K_h(z - x) dz}{\int_a^b \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \right\}^2 f(z) K_h(z - x) dz}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We consider the fractional part of the above expression. Let $\frac{z-x}{h} = w$, then the numerator

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b (z - x)^{k+1} \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \right\} f(z) K_h(z - x) dz \\
&= \int (hw)^{k+1} \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (hw)^p \lambda^p \right\} f(x + hw) K(w) dw \\
&= \int (hw)^{k+1} \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (hw)^p \lambda^p \right\} (f(x) + hw f'(x)) K(w) dw \\
&= \int \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} h^{p+k+1} w^{p+k+1} \lambda^p f(x) + \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} h^{p+k+2} w^{p+k+2} \lambda^p f'(x) \right\} K(w) dw
\end{aligned}$$

and the denominator

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \right\}^2 f(z) K_h(z - x) dz \\
&= \int \left\{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (hw)^p \lambda^p \right\}^2 f(x + hw) K(w) dw \\
&\approx f(x)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when k is an odd number, the asymptotic conditional bias of $\widehat{g}_k(x)$ is

$$\text{Bias}(\widehat{g}_k(x)|x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \lambda^{k+1} g(x) h^{k+1} \mu_{k+1} + o_p(h^{k+1}) \tag{5}$$

where $\mu_{k+1} = \int w^{k+1} K(w) dw < \infty$.
and when k is an even number,

$$\text{Bias}(\widehat{g}_k(x)|x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \lambda^{k+1} g(x) h^{k+2} \mu_{k+2} (\lambda + \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)}) + o_p(h^{k+2}) \quad (6)$$

where $\mu_{k+2} = \int w^{k+2} K(w) dw < \infty$.

3.3. The Asymptotic Conditional Variance

The asymptotic conditional variance of the k^{th} -degree estimator (DE1- k estimator) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\widehat{g}_k(x)|x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(y_i|x_1, \dots, x_n) \{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h^2(x_i - x)}{\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h(x_i - x) \}^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma^2 \{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h^2(x_i - x)}{\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \sum_{p=0}^k \frac{1}{p!} (x_i - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h(x_i - x) \}^2} \\ &\approx \frac{1 \int_a^b \sigma^2 \{ 1 + \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h^2(z - x) f(z) dz}{n \{ \int_a^b \{ 1 + \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} (z - x)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K_h(z - x) f(z) dz \}^2} \\ &= \frac{1 \int \sigma^2 \{ 1 + \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} (hw)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K^2(w) f(x + hw) dw}{nh \{ \int \{ 1 + \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} (hw)^p \lambda^p \}^2 K(w) f(x + hw) dw \}^2} \\ &\approx \frac{\sigma^2 R(K)}{f(x)} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{nh}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\frac{z-x}{h} = w$.

The ratio of these expressions is independent of σ^2 . Further direct analysis of the ratio is difficult, but simulation provides some insight.

For a small study, we assume $\lambda = 1$ and we take a sample of size 10 with a random uniform sampling design. We then calculate the ratio of the variances at each design point using a gaussian kernel.

We find that the average of the ratio values is 0.998 and the range of values is (0.893, 1.096). These results are typical. Thus, we conclude that the variance behaviour of the first order approximation to the exponential growth model is quite similar to that of local constant regression.

4. Simulation Study

We now study the method numerically by simulating 100 sets of data (with sample sizes 25 and 10) under three scenarios:

- Scenario 1: $g(x) = e^x$ (pure exponential growth)
- Scenario 2: $g(x) = e^{x-0.025x^2}$ (damped exponential growth)
- Scenario 3: $g(x) = e^{x-0.1x^2}$ (heavily damped exponential growth)

In each case, noise with standard deviation 0.1 has been added.

For each simulated dataset, we apply the following estimators: NW (local constant), LL (local linear), LQ (local quadratic), LC (local cubic), DE1-1 (first-degree

DE-Assisted exponential growth approximation), DE1-2 (second-degree DE-Assisted exponential growth approximation), DE1-3 (third-degree DE-Assisted exponential growth approximation), DE1-4 (fourth-degree DE-Assisted exponential growth approximation), DE1-5 (fifth-degree DE-Assisted exponential growth approximation), and NLS (the exponential growth model fit by nonlinear least-squares). Bandwidths are selected by leave-one-out cross-validation.

Our basis for comparing the methods is the median absolute deviation (MAD) which is calculated by taking the absolute value of the difference between the fitted values and the corresponding true model values and finding the median. That is,

$$\text{MAD} = \text{median}(|y_i - \hat{y}_i|)$$

We then report the average of the MADs for the set of 100 simulated datasets. We also display the distribution of MAD values in boxplots for each method.

In our local exponential growth model, the governing differential equation is assumed to be $g' = \lambda g$ in each case. Thus, the second and third scenarios represent model misspecification scenarios.

To specify the issue of model misspecification, we consider two different model misspecification scenarios with different levels of misspecification. That is, Scenario 3 is misspecified more seriously than Scenario 2. We want to see the estimation behavior of DE-assisted estimators in different situations.

4.1. Numerical Properties of Estimators Under Uniform Sampling Design

In our first set of simulations, we consider a random uniformly distributed design for the covariate on the interval $[0, 1]$.

Boxplots are displayed in Figure 2 which shows the distributions (on the log scale) of the Means of Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) for the different estimation methods, NW (local constant), LL (local linear), LQ (local quadratic), LC (local cubic), DE1-1 (first-degree DE-Assisted regression), DE1-2 (second-degree DE-Assisted regression), and DE1-5 (fifth-degree DE-Assisted regression), applied to simulated data under the three scenarios with a uniform design. Table 3 contains the average MAD (Median Absolute Deviation) for each method for the four different scenarios and for the two sample sizes. Table 4 provides the corresponding standard error estimates.

	Scen. 1 (25)	Scen. 2 (25)	Scen. 3 (25)	Scen. 1 (10)	Scen. 2 (10)	Scen. 3 (10)
NW	53.27	52.97	69.22	77.14	71.70	84.64
LL	26.19	25.92	24.86	37.88	37.22	41.06
LQ	24.32	24.29	23.20	38.59	39.08	41.44
LC	29.52	28.83	26.81	43.00	47.43	49.18
DE1-1	24.62	24.39	24.25	35.28	33.97	35.90
DE1-2	15.63	15.78	27.12	23.50	24.79	34.97
DE1-3	14.58	15.68	38.58	21.99	24.60	40.18
DE1-4	14.46	16.69	40.51	21.94	24.99	41.14
DE1-5	14.45	16.86	40.84	21.94	25.01	41.30
NLS	14.41	17.53	47.25	21.54	24.56	49.39

Table 3. Means of Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) multiplied by 1000 based on 100 simulation runs for the three scenarios under the uniform sampling design. Sample sizes are specified in the brackets.




Figure 2. MAD (Median Absolute Deviation) distributions (on the log scale) for the estimation methods applied to simulated data under the three scenarios in uniform design. Sample size = 25. Note: $\text{MAD} = \text{median}(|y_i - \hat{y}_i|)$.

	Scen. 1 (25)	Scen. 2 (25)	Scen. 3 (25)	Scen. 1 (10)	Scen. 2 (10)	Scen. 3 (10)
NW	3.01	2.69	3.50	3.42	2.99	5.07
LL	1.19	1.40	1.36	2.18	2.22	2.27
LQ	1.11	1.38	1.24	2.19	2.13	2.43
LC	1.26	1.54	1.27	2.35	2.49	2.46
DE1-1	1.23	1.45	1.39	2.28	1.93	1.99
DE1-2	0.94	1.17	1.16	1.78	1.86	2.18
DE1-3	0.96	1.03	1.30	1.87	1.84	2.23
DE1-4	0.95	1.06	1.32	1.86	1.84	2.26
DE1-5	0.95	1.05	1.33	1.86	1.84	2.27
NLS	0.95	0.99	1.29	1.82	1.82	2.18

Table 4. Standard errors of mean for Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) multiplied by 1000 based on 100 simulation runs for the three scenarios under the uniform sampling design. Sample sizes are specified in the brackets.

What we see under the first scenario with a sample of size 25 is that the solution of the differential equation is the most accurate estimator, followed by the fifth order DE approximation. The accuracy of the methods decreases as the order decreases. The completely nonparametric methods are not competitive with the DE-assisted methods in this case.

When there has been some model misspecification as in Scenario 2, the solution of the DE is no longer the best estimator. However, the approximate methods still work fairly well. The nonparametric methods remain uncompetitive.

In the third scenario, none of the methods are very accurate, but the first order DE-assisted method performs substantially better than any of the methods.

The results are almost qualitatively the same when the sample size is smaller. The only difference is that the exponential growth model remains somewhat more competitive under Scenario 2.

According to the results of boxplots and tables of the local growth model, we find




Figure 3. MAD (Median Absolute Deviation) distributions (on the log scale) for the estimation methods applied to simulated data under the three scenarios in sparse design. Sample size = 25. Note: MAD = median($|y_i - \hat{y}_i|$).

that, when the model is correct (Scenario 1), the highest-degree estimator (DE1-5) has the lowest bias. But when the model is misspecified (such as Scenario 2, 3), the higher-degree estimators (DE1-3, DE1-4, and DE1-5) have higher biases than the lower-degree estimator (DE1-1 and DE1-2). For the model selection, a higher-degree DE-Assisted regression is preferable. However, when the model is wrong, the higher-degree estimator will have greater bias. A first-degree or second-degree estimator will be a better choice.

4.2. Numerical Properties of Estimators Under Sparse Design

In our second set of simulations, we consider a random beta distributed design for the covariate on the interval $[0, 1]$. Shape parameters for the beta distribution were taken to be 1.0 and 0.5. This induces sparsity near the origin.

Boxplots of the MAD distributions for the various methods applied to the sparse designs are displayed in Figure 3. Tables 5 and 6 provide analogous information to that of Tables 3 and 4.

The results are similar to those reported for the uniform design. The completely nonparametric methods are not competitive with the DE-assisted methods, even under model misspecification.

5. Comparison of Estimates

We will compare our DE-assisted estimators with the traditional local polynomial regression estimators and (author?) [3]’s double-smoothing estimator.

In this section, we will compare the asymptotic properties for different estimates both for correct model and misspecified model.

When the DE-Assisted local exponential growth model (1) we use is correct, which

	Scen. 1 (25)	Scen. 2 (25)	Scen. 3 (25)	Scen. 1 (10)	Scen. 2 (10)	Scen. 3 (10)
NW	72.17	71.83	115.81	101.71	85.90	110.39
LL	32.28	28.84	28.25	47.91	39.11	40.66
LQ	27.90	27.92	25.59	47.92	42.20	46.23
LC	31.87	32.07	29.84	58.45	55.30	53.53
DE1-1	28.72	25.13	23.41	43.27	34.24	33.95
DE1-2	16.62	17.20	41.93	26.07	24.52	46.52
DE1-3	14.50	18.40	57.69	23.79	24.94	54.60
DE1-4	14.20	20.12	60.54	23.61	25.76	56.05
DE1-5	14.19	20.40	60.99	23.61	25.87	56.24
NLS	13.97	21.74	67.59	21.39	24.89	64.62

Table 5. Means of Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) multiplied by 1000 based on 100 simulation runs under the three sparse design scenarios. Sample sizes are specified in the brackets.

	Scen. 1 (25)	Scen. 2 (25)	Scen. 3 (25)	Scen. 1 (10)	Scen. 2 (10)	Scen. 3 (10)
NW	3.26	4.61	6.29	5.10	4.75	6.92
LL	1.65	1.62	1.70	3.19	2.30	2.18
LQ	1.74	1.43	1.68	2.49	2.08	3.07
LC	1.65	1.39	1.53	3.16	6.11	3.24
DE1-1	1.50	1.52	1.40	2.57	2.09	1.95
DE1-2	1.10	1.02	1.30	1.75	1.54	2.31
DE1-3	0.91	1.07	1.32	1.73	1.60	2.24
DE1-4	0.90	1.12	1.36	1.74	1.63	2.25
DE1-5	0.90	1.12	1.37	1.74	1.62	2.25
NLS	0.93	1.09	1.23	1.70	1.61	2.12

Table 6. Standard errors of mean for Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) multiplied by 1000 based on 100 simulation runs under the three sparse design scenarios. Sample sizes are specified in the brackets.

means that the truth is $g(x) = e^{\lambda_1 x}$, and then $g^{(k)} = \lambda^k g(x)$, where $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Table 7 gives us a summarized table with comparing different estimators. The order follows the pattern from the largest to the smallest approximately.

The summary table of bias and variance shows that, for the DE-Assisted local growth model, the higher-degree estimator has a lower bias while the variance stays the same. So if the model is correct and we are not concerned about the computational load, we prefer a higher-degree estimator. However, if the model is misspecified, it will be a different story. The lower-degree estimator is better than higher-degree estimator. Sometimes when the model is badly misspecified, the first-degree estimator is probably the best choice. We will demonstrate this result in the simulation study.

According to the result of simulation study, we realize that, in a misspecified model, a higher-degree DE-Assisted estimator is not a better choice than a lower-degree one. When the model is badly misspecified, a first-degree estimator is competitive enough among the regression estimators. Therefore, we will compare DE1-1 estimate with local constant and local linear estimates for misspecified models as follows.

The model we use is the DE-Assisted local exponential growth model (1) with $g'(x) = \lambda_1 g(x)$.

The truth is the scenario, $g(x) = e^{\lambda_1 x - \lambda_2 x^2}$, where λ_1 and λ_2 are known and global parameters, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$. Therefore, the truth is,

$$g'(x) = (\lambda_1 - 2x\lambda_2)g(x),$$

Method	Asymptotic bias in interior	Asymptotic variance
NW	$\frac{1}{2}\{\lambda^2 g(x) + 2\lambda \frac{g(x)f'(x)}{f(x)}\}h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} v_0 + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
LL	$\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 g(x)h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} v_0 + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
DE1-1	$\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 g(x)h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} v_0 + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
DE1-2	$\frac{1}{6}\lambda^3 g(x)h^4\mu_4(\lambda + \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)})\mu_4 + o_p(h^4)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} v_0 + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
LQ	$\frac{1}{24} \frac{\mu_2\mu_6 - \mu_4^2}{\mu_2^2 - \mu_4} \{\lambda^4 g(x) + 4\lambda^3 \frac{g(x)f'(x)}{f(x)}\}h^4 + o_p(h^4)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} \frac{\mu_4^2 v_0 - 2\mu_2\mu_4 v_2 + \mu_2^2 v_4}{(\mu_2^2 - \mu_4)^2} + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
LC	$\frac{1}{24} \frac{\mu_2\mu_6 - \mu_4^2}{\mu_2^2 - \mu_4} \lambda^4 g(x)h^4 + o_p(h^4)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} \frac{\mu_4^2 v_0 - 2\mu_2\mu_4 v_2 + \mu_2^2 v_4}{(\mu_2^2 - \mu_4)^2} + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
DS	$h^4 B(x) + o_p(h^4)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} V + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$
DE1-3	$\frac{1}{24}\lambda^4 g(x)h^4\mu_4 + o_p(h^4)$	$\frac{1}{nh} \frac{\sigma^2}{f(x)} v_0 + o_p(\frac{1}{nh})$

Table 7. Summary of asymptotic conditional bias and variance for the NW (local constant) , LL (local linear) , LC (local cubic), DS (double smoothing), DE1-1 (first-degree DE-Assisted), DE1-2 (second-degree DE-Assisted), and DE1-3 (third-degree DE-Assisted) estimators for correct models.

Note: In the DS estimator, $B(x) = (\mu_2^2 - \mu_4)/4[g''(x)f''(x)/f(x) + 2(g^{(3)}(x)f'(x)/f(x) + g^{(4)}(x))] = (\mu_2^2 - \mu_4)/4[\lambda^2 g(x)f''(x)/f(x) + 2(\lambda^3 g(x)f'(x)/f(x) + \lambda^4 g(x))]$. $V = \int \{(K * K)(v) - (K_1 * K_1)(v)/\mu_2\}^2 dv$, where $K_1(u) = uK(u)$. $f(x)$ is the design density which is the density of the covariate X , $\mu_k = \int w^k K(w)dw$ and $v_k = \int w^k K^2(w)dw$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The detail of the DS estimator, which used a double-smoothing technique, can be found in the paper (author?) [3].

and

$$g''(x) = ((\lambda_1 - 2x\lambda_2)^2 - 2x\lambda_2)g(x).$$

Using the previous technique we applied in Section 3.3, we obtain the asymptotic conditional biases of DE1-1, NW (local constant), and LL (local linear) estimators. Table 8 does not include the asymptotic conditional variances since they have no changes for misspecified models. We can find the DE1-1 estimator has the smallest bias among these three ones in Table 8.

Method	Asymptotic bias in interior
NW	$\frac{1}{2}((\lambda_1 - 2x\lambda_2)^2 - 2x\lambda_2)g(x)h^2\mu_2 + \frac{g'(x)f'(x)}{f(x)}h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$
LL	$\frac{1}{2}((\lambda_1 - 2x\lambda_2)^2 - 2x\lambda_2)g(x)h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$
DE1-1	$\frac{1}{2}((\lambda_1 - 2x\lambda_2)^2 - 2x\lambda_2)g(x)h^2\mu_2 - 2x\lambda_2 g(x)(\lambda_1 + \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)})h^2\mu_2 + o_p(h^2)$

Table 8. Summary of asymptotic conditional bias and variance for the NW (local constant), LL (local linear), and DE1-1 (first-degree DE-Assisted) estimators for misspecified models.

In the next section, we will extend local growth model and apply it to the mouse tumor volume data which we described in Section 1.

6. Local Sub-Exponential Growth Model and Application

6.1. Local Sub-Exponential Growth Model

The exponential model often leads to overestimates of growth at later times. Therefore, modifications such as the Gompertz model have been considered. Another possibility

is as follows. With $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, suppose

$$g' = \lambda g^\alpha \quad (8)$$

The explicit solution to this differential equation is

$$g(x) = \{(1 - \alpha)(\lambda x + g(0))\}^{1/(1-\alpha)}. \quad (9)$$

Alternatively, we can apply our proposed method to obtain a local solution of the differential equation by constructing the Taylor expansion about an evaluation point x_0 , and applying the differential equation:

$$g'(x_0) = \lambda(g(x_0))^\alpha$$

and the second derivative:

$$g''(x_0) = \alpha\lambda^2(g(x_0))^{2\alpha-1}.$$

Upon defining

$$g^*(x_i) = g(x_0) + (x_i - x_0)\lambda(g(x_0))^\alpha + \frac{(x_i - x_0)^2}{2}\alpha\lambda^2(g(x_0))^{2\alpha-1}$$

our DE-assisted local quadratic regression estimator at x_0 is obtained by minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g^*(x_i))^2 K_h(x_i - x_0)$$

with respect to the single parameter $g(x_0)$. The minimization is obtained by solving a weighted nonlinear least-squares problem which is easily solved iteratively, given an appropriate initial guess. One possibility is to simply use the local constant regression estimate as the starting value for the iteration.

6.2. Application to Sparse Tumor Growth Data

Since the growth is roughly approximated by an exponential model, it makes more sense to log transform the response variable and to make the assumption that the errors are additive on the log scale. Under a normal distribution assumption, this amounts to the assumption that, on the original scale, the errors are multiplicative and distributed according to a log-normal distribution.

After transformation, the differential equation model at (8) becomes

$$G'(x) = \lambda e^{(\alpha-1)G(x)} \quad (10)$$

where $G(x) = \log(g(x))$. The model on the data becomes

$$\log(y_i) = G(x_i) + \varepsilon_i \quad (11)$$

and first order and second order Taylor expansions about x_0 give

$$\log(y_i) \doteq G(x_0) + \lambda e^{(\alpha-1)G(x_0)}(x_i - x_0) + \varepsilon_i \quad (12)$$

and

$$\log(y_i) \doteq G(x_0) + \lambda e^{(\alpha-1)G(x_0)}(x_i - x_0) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\alpha - 1)e^{2(\alpha-1)G(x_0)}(x_i - x_0)^2 + \varepsilon_i \quad (13)$$

When implemented in the DE-assisted regression methodology, we refer to the models (12) and (13) as the first and second order local growth models, respectively.

Since we do not know the true model for this data set, we arbitrarily choose the local linear estimate for the full data set as the “truth”. The bandwidth is obtained using the `dpill` function [8] in the *KernSmooth* package [?] in R: $h = 2.38$. The standard deviation of the residuals is obtained as 0.089. The local linear fit $\widehat{G}_{\ell\ell}(x)$, together with the standard deviation become the basis of another simulation study whereby new observations are generated at the original design points x_i according to a normal distribution with mean $\widehat{G}_{\ell\ell}(x_i)$ ($i \in 1, 2, \dots, 10$) and the empirical standard deviation.

We train our competing models on the simulated datasets with observations 4 through 8 removed each time. The models under test are local constant, local linear, local quadratic, first order local growth, second order local growth, and the nonlinear least-squares estimate of the solution to the differential equation (10).

Estimation of α and λ is needed for the two local growth models. From (9), we can see that

$$G(x) \doteq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}(\log(1 - \alpha) + \log(\lambda) + \log(x))$$

since $g(0)$ is necessarily a very small value in this application. This means that the simple linear regression slope estimator for the model $\log(y)$ versus $\log(x)$ is an estimator for $1/(1 - \alpha)$. We use this to estimate α . Given this estimate, we then estimate λ by applying nonlinear least-squares to the model

$$y = \{(1 - \widehat{\alpha})(\lambda x)\}^{1/(1-\widehat{\alpha})}.$$

This is, once more, based on an approximation to the explicit DE solution given at (9).

The squared differences between $\widehat{G}(x_i)$ and $\widehat{G}_{\ell\ell}(x_i)$ are calculated for $i = 4, \dots, 8$ and averaged, for each of the six estimation methods. The averages of these average squared differences are listed in Table 9. The squared differences were calculated, both on the raw scale, and on the log scale. The smallest values in both cases are for the second order local growth model, with the first order local growth model close behind. The local linear model also enjoys fairly small average squared errors, but there is a slight bias in favour of local linear, since the underlying data follows a linear model. Local quadratic regression performs somewhat worse, and the nonlinear growth model has considerably larger errors than the lower order local approximations. This suggests that the suggested local growth model may not really be appropriate for the data. However, the overall message is that the DE model can guide the kernel regression methods to a satisfactory estimate.

	log scale	original scale
NW	0.48	0.44
LL	0.03	0.03
LQ	0.05	0.06
DE1-1	0.03	0.02
DE1-2	0.03	0.03
NLS	0.79	0.09

Table 9. Average squared error summaries for each of the modelling approaches, NW (local constant), LL (local linear), LQ (local quadratic), DE1-1 (first-degree DE-Assisted regression), DE1-2 (second-degree DE-Assisted regression), and NLS (nonlinear least square). Errors in the first column are based on differences between fitted and observed values on the log scale, and errors in the second column are based on differences between exponentiated fitted values and raw observed values.

7. Discussion

Differential equation information can be used to improve local polynomial regression estimates. The proposed method is simple and without requiring substantial amounts of parameter tuning. The solution of the DE is not needed, and the method is only slightly more complicated to implement than local constant regression. Thus, it is simple and the computation is fast.

The number of derivatives to evaluate will depend on how believable the DE is. If the DE is not very believable, use fewer terms and a smaller h . Weighted nonlinear least-squares may be needed to do the estimation, if the DE is not linear. Global parameters (e.g. λ, α in growth model) need to be estimated.

Bias can be reduced, relative to local constant regression, both in the interior and at the data boundaries. The method appears to be somewhat robust to model misspecification, and it seems to work particularly well, as compared with other methods, when the design is sparse.

Bias reduction can still be achieved even if the parameters are estimated. Bias order remains $O(h^2)$ as long as parameter estimates converge at rate $n^{1/2}$ (typical parametric rate) and even if parameter estimates converge at rate $n^{2/5}$ (the typical nonparametric rate).

We have focussed on a simple case, the exponential model, as a proof of concept. In the future, study of more complicated models will be of interest.

Acknowledgements

This research has been supported in part by a grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] Fan J, Gijbels I (1996). Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications, volume 66. CRC Press.
- [2] Hall, P., and Ma, Y. (2014). Quick and easy one-step parameter estimation in differential equations. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 76(4), 735-748.
- [3] He, H., and Huang, L. S. (2009). Double-smoothing for bias reduction in local linear regression. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 139(3), 1056-1072.
- [4] Liang, H., and Wu, H. (2008). Parameter estimation for differential equation models using a framework of measurement error in regression models. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 103(484), 1570-1583.

- [5] Loader, C. (2006). Local regression and likelihood. Springer Science and Business Media.
- [6] Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 9(1), 141-142.
- [7] Ramsay, J. O., Hooker, G., Campbell, D., and Cao, J. (2007). Parameter estimation for differential equations: a generalized smoothing approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 69(5), 741-796.
- [8] Ruppert, D., Sheather, S. J., and Wand, M. P. (1995). An effective bandwidth selector for local least squares regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(432), 1257-1270.
- [9] Wand, M., and Ripley, B. (2015). KernSmooth: Functions for kernel smoothing supporting Wand and Jones (1995). R package version 2.23-15. MR1319818.
- [10] Wang, H., and Cao, J. (2022). pCODE: Estimating Parameters of ODE Models. *R Journal*, 14(4).
- [11] Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, 359-372.