

# DISCOVERING INTERACTIONS USING COVARIATE INFORMED RANDOM PARTITION MODELS

BY GARRITT L. PAGE <sup>\*,†</sup>, FERNANDO A. QUINTANA <sup>‡,§</sup> AND GARY L. ROSNER <sup>¶</sup>

*Brigham Young University* <sup>\*</sup> and *BCAM - Basque Center for Applied Mathematics* <sup>†</sup> and *Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile* <sup>‡</sup> and *Millennium Nucleus Center for the Discovery of Structures in Complex Data* <sup>§</sup> and *John Hopkins University* <sup>¶</sup>

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 general way. The procedure connects covariates to responses flexibly through dependent random partition 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.

**1. Introduction.** In studies that collect covariate measurements on subjects/experimental units in addition to a response, it is of principal interest to determine which covariates influence the response and in what way. This seemingly benign statistical problem has been seriously considered for many years with methods ranging from exploratory techniques to more 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,

---

*Keywords and phrases:* multiplicative associations, dependent random partition models, nonparametric Bayes, exploratory data analysis

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 criterion, shrinkage method, or stochastic search to locate “significant” factors (see, e.g., Tibshirani, 1996; Smith and Kohn, 1996; George and McCulloch, 1997; Ishwaran and Rao, 2005; Chung and Dunson, 2009; Scott and Berger, 2010; Mitra, Müller and Ji, 2017). These methods have been shown to work well in many instances (Barrera-Gómez et al. 2017). However, when multiplicative effects and/or nonlinear associations are present and are of interest, a fairly common scenario (see, e.g. Hu, Joshi and Johnson, 2009; Lim and Hastie, 2015a), 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 under consideration, where we examine 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 interactions 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 Fan, Yao and Tong, 1996; Dunson, Pillai and Park, 2007). There has been work in density regression that simultaneously carries out variable selection (Tokdar, Zhu and Ghosh 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 is a growing literature dedicated to methods developed with the

main purpose of explicitly identifying interactions without restricting themselves to variable selection. [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). [Bien, Taylor and Tibshirani \(2013\)](#) use the Lasso, and [Lim and Hastie \(2015b\)](#) the group Lasso to detect interactions from hierarchically coherent models (i.e., two-way interactions are present only if both main effects are present). [Kapelner and Bleich 2016](#) employ Bayesian additive regression trees (BART) to identify interactions while [Du and Linero \(2018\)](#) develop methods based on Bayesian decision tree ensembles that incorporate an additive component. XGBoost ([Chen and Guestrin, 2016](#)) is a scalable machine learning system for tree boosting, that has also been employed to discover interactions. In more recent work [Ferrari and Dunson \(2019\)](#) use a factor model to induce models that include interactions and [Agrawal et al. \(2019\)](#) search for interactions in high dimensions.

The methods just cited are developed for specific scenarios while what we propose is more general and can be employed with any data model, making the procedure essentially “model free.” This is important for our application as the response is ordinal, rendering many of the works just cited unavailable. Thus, 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.

We finish our literature review noting that there is a growing literature dedicated to so-called 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, Wang and Shen 2014](#); [Varadhan and Wang 2014](#); [Schnell et al. 2016](#); [Liu et al. 2017](#); [Su et al. 2018](#); [Henderson et al. 2020](#)). 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.

As a point of terminology, in what follows 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. Thus, we recommend carefully investigating the “interactions” detected by our method to gain insight into how they (and the covariates they contain) influence the response distribution. This highlights the exploratory nature of our proposal.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we detail the data collected from the study that motivated this work. Section 3 provides an overview of our approach with some background on dependent random partition distributions and association rules. Section 4 provides more details of our approach and Section 5 describes two simulation studies. In Section 6 we apply the procedure to the osteonecrosis data and Section 7 contains a brief discussion.

**2. Osteonecrosis Study.** The study we consider 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. Table 2 provides a numerical summary of continuous covariates. Notice that a few of them are highly right skewed. Empirical correlations between time varying covariates suggest that temporal dependence is also 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

**3. Background and Preliminaries.** The exploratory procedure we develop consists of three stages. In this section we introduce each one and then provide notation and background information necessary to make ideas concrete.

The first step consists of connecting covariates to the response by way of a dependent random partition model. These types of models create partitions of the data taking into account homogeneity among covariates, and in particular, some of these models, such as the PPMx by [Müller, Quintana and Rosner \(2011\)](#), aim specifically at constructing priors for which two individuals with similar covariate values are more likely to cocluster. The resulting partition is, *a posteriori*, weighted by the corresponding cluster sizes, the likelihood component and the similarity of covariates that belong to a clus-

TABLE 2  
*Numerical summary of the nineteen continuous covariates measured on each subject in the osteonecrosis study.*

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

ter. This feature has proven to be quite useful in capturing many types of nonlinearities present in the data, including combined changes in shape, location and scale of the predictive distribution as the predictors change. Since these types of models are closely related to discrete random probability models of the type used in Bayesian nonparametrics, which are well known for their flexibility (see, e.g. Müller et al., 2015), in theory any statistical model that produces (explicitly or implicitly) a covariate dependent partition may be employed. This includes the dependent Dirichlet process mixture (DDP) model of MacEachern (2000) and its variants (e.g., ANOVA DDP of De Iorio et al. 2004). As explained below, we adopt here the PPMx model.

In the second step the estimated partition from step 1 is used to identify potentially interesting interactions. One possible way of employing the partition 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 the response (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. An unsupervised learning technique developed to carry out this type of search establishes so called association rules (Han, Kamber and Pei, 2012, Chapter 6). There is precedence to using association rules as a tool to identify interactions (see Heba et al. 2014), but we use them to rank potential interactions based on their “importance.” Ranking interactions based on their “importance” is, implicitly, something all procedures described in Section 1 do. Many of the procedures, however, provide very little guidance or criteria on how to determine which interactions are simply noise. This motivates the inclusion of a third step to our exploratory approach.

In the third step of our procedure we verify that a detected interaction indeed affects the response distribution. This is done by comparing posterior predictive densities that are based on specific values from covariates that were identified by an association rule. If the posterior predictive densities do not change as a function of the covariates found in the association rule, then their association with the response is weak at best. (As a side note, Gabry et al. (2019) advocate using a posterior predictive distribution as an exploratory or confirmatory tool.) We now provide more pertinent background information for dependent random partition models and association rules.

**3.1. Dependent Random Partition Models.** We begin by introducing some 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, both continuous and qualitative, 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.

We now introduce notation associated with the model that will be employed to connect  $\mathbf{X}$  to  $\mathbf{Y}$  through  $\rho_m$ . A dependent random partition prior distribution is assigned to  $\rho_m$ . This prior distribution parametrized by  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ , will be denoted using  $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ . Once a prior for  $\rho_m$  is specified, we will make use of  $f(\mathbf{Y} \mid \rho) = \prod_{j=1}^{k_m} f_j(\mathbf{Y}_j^*)$  as a data model where  $f_j(\mathbf{Y}_j^*) = \int \prod_{i \in S_j} f_j(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*) dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*)$ ,  $f_j(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^*)$  denotes the likelihood for  $\mathbf{Y}_j^*$ , 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  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s_i}^*$ . Alternatively, the data model can be written hierarchically using the cluster labels  $s_1, \dots, s_m$  in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}^*, s_i &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} f_{s_i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s_i}^*), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\
 \boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell^* &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} G_0, \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, k_m, \\
 \rho_m \mid \mathbf{X} &\sim RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.1}$$

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  $\rho_m$  (denoted by  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ ) which will facilitate our interaction search. There are a number of computational techniques that have been developed to fit model (3.1). 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 (3.1), since it is a general algorithm that can be used in a variety of settings.

As already discussed, there are many possibilities for  $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ . In what follows we employ the covariate dependent random partition model (PPMx)



described in Müller, Quintana and Rosner (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 chance that 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. Here,  $q(\cdot | \cdot)$  denotes an auxiliary probability model (likelihood and prior) that has no effect in the data model and is used only to introduce the desired effect in the similarity function. When multiple covariates of different types are available Müller, Quintana and Rosner (2011) suggest using the following multiplicative form

$$(3.2) \quad g(\mathbf{X}_j^* | \boldsymbol{\eta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^p g(\mathbf{X}_{j\ell}^* | \boldsymbol{\eta}).$$

**3.2. Association Rules.** Association rules are used to 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. 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 the importance of  $\{A\} \Rightarrow \{B\}$ . The first, called *support*, is the proportion of patients whose covariate vector contains both  $A$  and  $B$ . The second criterion, called *confidence*, is the fraction of patients that display  $B$  among those that display  $A$ . Our criteria to determine which covariate pairs to consider when looking for interactions will be those with large support and confidence. For a more detailed overview of association rules we refer interested readers to Hastie, Tibshirani and Friedman (2009, chapter 14) or Han, Kamber and Pei (2012, chapter 6).

The typical notation used for association rules highlights the fact that they are by nature directional. However, our only purpose in using association rules is to identify pairs of covariates that are associated with each other and possibly influence the distribution of  $Y$  in a non-additive way. Because of this, 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 as the direction of the association is immaterial for our purposes.

**4. Interaction Discovery Procedure.** In this section we provide more details of our three-step interaction discovery procedure, after which we provide two simulation studies. In what follows we will refer to the three-step procedure as the Random partition, Association rule, Interaction Discovery procedure (or the RAID procedure).

A natural way of employing  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$  in the second stage of the exploratory procedure is to produce a point estimate of  $\rho_m$  using methods found in [Dahl \(2020\)](#) (or some other alternative) and then apply association rules to each of the resulting  $\mathbf{X}_j^*$ s. However, as noted by [Wade and Ghahramani \(2018\)](#), there might be substantial variability associated with the partition point estimate. Therefore, we instead apply association rules to the resulting  $\mathbf{X}_j^*$ s for each (or a subset) of the MCMC draws collected. This approach provides a means of propagating uncertainty associated with  $\rho_m$  through the exploratory procedure. 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. (We explore this in the simulation study of Section 5.2.) We briefly note that applying association rules to each of the  $\mathbf{X}_j^*$ s is crucial to finding interactions as they are connected to  $\mathbf{Y}$  through  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ . Applying association rules directly to  $\mathbf{X}$  would make interaction detection impossible as there is no connection to  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

As stated previously, the third step consists of using posterior predictive densities to confirm interactions. To make this step concrete, consider an example with three binary covariates. Let  $p_{ijk}(Y_0 \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$  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  $X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_2$ . 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)

$$(4.1) \quad H_0 : p_{00k}(Y_0 \mid \mathbf{Y}) = p_{01k}(Y_0 \mid \mathbf{Y}) = p_{10k}(Y_0 \mid \mathbf{Y}) = p_{11k}(Y_0 \mid \mathbf{Y}).$$

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/or  $X_2$ , and the specific way in which this occurs can be later explored separately. A similar approach would be employed if association rules highlighted any of the other possible two-way interactions (i.e.,  $X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_3$ ,  $X_2 \Leftrightarrow X_3$ ). We also consider the possibility of a three-way interaction in Section 6.

There are a number of procedures that might be selected to test the hypothesis found in (4.1). 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 (4.1) is completely valid. Just as with Chen and Hanson’s (2014) method, most methods employed to test (4.1) will produce a “ $p$ -value.” We use the “ $p$ -values” as a validation tool and thus, there is no guarantee that Type 1 error rates are preserved. That said, the simulation in the Section 5.2 suggests that error rates are not far from the size of the test.

**5. Simulation Studies.** In this section we detail two simulation studies carried out to explore the RAID procedure’s ability to detecting interactions. The first is based on a toy example that is included to provide insight into each of the three steps of our approach. The second is a more realistic setting that is based on the covariate structure found in the osteonecrosis data set. In both simulation studies a continuous response variable is used even though the response in the osteonecrosis study is ordinal. This was done so that we could compare our approach to other procedures found in the literature. As far as we are aware, no other procedure is able to accommodate an ordinal response. This highlights the “model-free” property of our approach.

In order to connect  $\mathbf{Y}$  to  $\mathbf{X}$  through  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ , we fit the following particular case of model (3.1) to each generated synthetic data set in both simulation studies

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.1) \quad & Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*, s_i \stackrel{ind}{\sim} N(\mu_{s_i}^*, \sigma_{s_i}^*), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\
 & (\mu_\ell^*, \sigma_\ell^*) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) \times Unif(0, A), \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, k_m, \\
 & \rho_m \mid \mathbf{X} \sim RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta}),
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mu_0 \sim N(0, 10^2)$ ,  $\sigma_0 \sim Unif(0, 10)$ , and  $A = 1$ . For the  $RPM_X(\boldsymbol{\eta})$  we used the PPMx with cohesion  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  connecting the partition model to that induced by a Dirichlet process (DP) mixture and the “rich get richer” property (i.e., a model that favors a small number of large clusters).  $M$  has connections with the DP dispersion parameter and we used  $M = 1$ . For the similarity we employed the auxiliary similarity function (see Müller, Quintana and Rosner 2011; Page and Quintana 2018). As a result, for qualitative variables,  $q(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{\xi}^*)$  and  $q(\boldsymbol{\xi}^* \mid \boldsymbol{\eta})$  correspond to multinomial and Dirichlet density functions, respectively and for continuous variables they take on a Gaussian and Gaussian-Inverse-Gamma density functions. Thus, for qualitative covariates  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  is a vector of Dirichlet shape parameters that we set to 0.1 and for continuous covariates,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  corresponds to the  $m_0 =$  center,  $k_0 =$  scale,  $\nu_0 =$  shape, and  $\kappa_0 =$  rate parameters of Gaussian-Inverse-Gamma distribution. After standardizing continuous covariates, we

employed  $m_0 = 0$ ,  $k_0 = 0.5$ ,  $\nu_0 = 1$ ,  $\kappa_0 = 2$ . In this model, the prior parameters that seem to have the most influence over  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$  are  $A$  and  $k_0$ . These parameters determine how much weight is placed on  $\mathbf{Y}$  or  $\mathbf{X}$  when forming clusters. We explore sensitivity to the specification of these prior parameters in Section 6.1.

5.1. *Simulation Study: Toy Example.* In this simulation, data sets consisting of three binary covariates are generated (i.e.,  $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ). The response distribution  $f(Y \mid X_1, X_2, X_3)$  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 from the table 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  $f_0(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$ . From Table 4 note that  $f_0(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$  corresponds to a standard normal regardless of the values of  $\mathbf{X}$ . For  $f_1(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$  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  $f_2(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$ , the mean and shape remain the same, but the variance changes depending on the values of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . Lastly, for  $f_3(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$  the mean and variance do not change but the values  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  influence the shape. The scenario under  $f_1(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$  follows the traditional 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.

TABLE 4

List 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 ( $a = 10$ ), scale ( $b = 1$ ), and skew ( $c = 20$ ) parameters. For the two-component mixture we set  $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ ,  $s_1^2 = s_2^2 = 1/16$ , and  $m_1 = -m_2 = \sqrt{15}/4$ .

$X_1$	$X_2$	$X_3$	$f_0(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$	$f_1(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$	$f_2(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$	$f_3(Y \mid \mathbf{X})$
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 and fit model (5.1). At each MCMC iterate of  $\rho_m$ , 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 considered association rules from clusters that contained at least 10 subjects/experimental units. After association rules were gathered using a lower bound support of 0.25 and confidence of 0.5, we identified the covariate tandem that had the highest total support and confidence. If this resulted in a tie, then both covariate tandems were considered. Then for each association rule, the Pólya tree-based testing procedure of Chen and Hanson (2014) was used to test the hypothesis in (4.1). The  $X$  variable absent from the association rule was fixed to its 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.

Lastly, since the number of posterior predictive draws collected to test (4.1) can be selected somewhat arbitrarily, the adage “statistical vs practical significance” is important here as it would be undesirable to reject (4.1) for differences among predictive densities that are inconsequential. Thus, when carrying out the test of Chen and Hanson (2014), we considered  $N \in \{50, 100, 250\}$  posterior predictive draws.

TABLE 5  
*p*-values averaged over 1000 synthetic datasets from testing hypothesis (4.1) 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

In the online supplementary material, we provide a more detailed description of the simulation study results for each of the 24 possible association rules, but here we focus on results for testing (4.1); which are found in Table 5. Each column of the table contains the  $p$ -values produced by the Chen and Hanson (2014) Pólya tree method averaged across the 1000 data sets. The Monte Carlo errors associated with entries found in Table 5 are all small with the largest being 0.01. From Table 5 it seems that for this data generating mechanism, it is sufficient to only consider 50 posterior predictive draws when testing the hypothesis for all three interaction types.

From Table 5 it also seems that under  $f_0$  the average  $p$ -value is large




FIG 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.

in all cases, indicating that the posterior predictive densities in (4.1) are essentially the same regardless of the number of posterior predictive draws and association rule. This was expected. Similarly,  $X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_3$  under  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$ , and  $f_3$  and  $X_2 \Leftrightarrow X_3$  under  $f_3$  produced large  $p$ -values, which was also expected. 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. However, notice that under  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  the association rule that includes  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  also produced small  $p$ -values for (4.1). This was unexpected. Since  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  do not interact, fixing  $X_1$  makes it so that (4.1) amounts to testing for the “marginal effect” of  $X_2$ . Thus, small  $p$ -values associated with hypothesis (4.1) 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 (4.1) should be carefully examined. Here, we carried out the later by providing the posterior predictive densities in Figure 1. Estimated densities in the figure correspond to the first synthetic data set generated based on  $f_1$ . The first row of the figure corresponds to densities 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  $Y$ .

Next we compared the performance of our method to five alternative approaches that detect interactions. To this end, to each generated data set, we applied the following procedures:

1. linear model with all main effects and two-way interactions;
2. spike & slab model of Ishwaran and Rao (2005) with all main effects and two-way interactions;
3. the hierarchical group-Lasso (hgLASSO) procedure in Lim and Hastie (2015a);
4. the BART procedure detailed in Kapelner and Bleich (2016);
5. procedure based on XGBoost (Karbowiak and Biecek 2019).

Each of the listed methods were fit in R using the following: `lm` function for

linear model, the `spikeslab` package (Ishwaran, Rao and Kogalur 2013) for spike & slab, the `glinternet` package (Lim and Hastie 2019) for hgLASSO, the `bartMachine` package (Kapelner and Bleich 2016) for BART, and the `xgboost` package (Chen et al. 2019) coupled with the `EIX` package (Karbowiak and Biecek 2019) for XGBoost. To apply the procedures just listed, some-type of user input was required to confirm that an interaction was detected. For the sake of conciseness, we provide specific details of how procedures were implemented in the online supplementary material.

To study the impact that the RPM prior might have on results, we also used the RAID procedure coupled with the induced random partition distribution from the ANOVA DDP. The particular ANOVA DDP we employed is that for which the atoms were made to depend on group membership (as defined by the three categorical covariates), but weights did not. Lastly, we checked the sensitivity of results to posterior convergence by identifying interactions based on an MCMC chain that was run for only 500 iterations

The values listed in Table 6 are the proportion of data sets for which the interaction between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  was correctly identified. The Monte Carlo standard errors associated with proportions in Table 6 were all very small with 0.09 (associated with “RAID with ANOVA DDP,  $N = 100$ ”) being the largest. Notice that when no interaction was present all procedures performed similarly except for XGBoost and RAID with ANOVA DDP. These two procedures seemed to be more liberal in their interaction detection. When the interaction was based on the expectation of the response distribution (column  $f_1$ ), all procedures detected the interaction except for XGBoost. However, if the interaction was based on the variance or shape of the response distribution, the RAID procedure with PPMx was the only one that consistently detected it. Lastly, the RAID procedure still performed surprisingly well, even when the number of collected MCMC iterates was small.

*5.2. Simulation Study: Osteonecrosis Study Covariate Structure.* We now describe a simulation study where the number of covariates in each synthetic data set is similar to that found in the osteonecrosis study. More specifically, each synthetic data set contained 21 covariates, 19 of which were continuous and 2 binary. The binary covariate values were generated using a Bernoulli distribution with probability of success equal to 0.5. The continuous covariates were generated using a continuous uniform distribution with support  $(-1, 1)$ . We created interactions that impact the mean, spread, and shape of the response distribution in two ways. The first employed the setup established in Table 4, except that instead of one noise covariate that was



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	0.04	1.00	0.05	0.06
Spike & Slab	0.08	1.00	0.05	0.09
hgLASSO	0.09	1.00	0.12	0.10
BART	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.00
XGBoost	0.27	0.54	0.37	0.40
RAID with ANOVA DDP, $N = 50$	0.19	1.00	1.00	0.23
RAID with ANOVA DDP, $N = 100$	0.44	1.00	1.00	0.47
RAID with ANOVA DDP, $N = 250$	0.61	1.00	1.00	0.87
RAID with PPMx, $N = 50$	0.06	1.00	1.00	0.96
RAID with PPMx, $N = 100$	0.04	1.00	1.00	1.00
RAID with PPMx, $N = 250$	0.08	1.00	1.00	1.00
Results with only 500 MCMC iterates				
RAID with PPMx, $N = 50$	0.10	1.00	1.00	0.23
RAID with PPMx, $N = 100$	0.28	1.00	1.00	0.73
RAID with PPMx, $N = 250$	0.13	1.00	1.00	1.00

categorical, there are 19 continuous noise covariates.

The second method of generating data sets was based on interactions that depend on continuous covariates. This was done by using the following data generating mechanisms to generate response values

- $Y \sim N(5X_1X_2, \sigma)$  (interaction affecting mean);
- $Y \sim N(0, \exp\{5X_1X_2\}\sigma)$  (interaction affecting spread);
- $Y \sim \pi(X_1, X_2)N(0, \sigma) + (1 - \pi(X_1, X_2)) [0.5N(-0.5, \sigma) + 0.5N(0.5, \sigma)]$  where  $\pi(X_1, X_2) = 1/(1 + \exp\{200X_1X_2\})$  (interaction affecting shape).

For this setting  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  were continuous covariates generated using a uniform distribution with support  $(-1, 1)$ . Similar to what was done before, 19 “noise” covariates were also included, 17 of which were continuous (coming from a uniform distribution with support  $(-1, 1)$ ) and two binary (coming from a Bernoulli distribution with probability of success equal to 0.5).

We explored how the ratio of signal to noise affected the ability to detect interactions by considering  $\sigma \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0\}$ . Finally, we also considered the case when only 60% and 25% of observations exhibited the interaction. This was done by using a  $N(0, 1)$  distribution to generate response values for 40% (or 75%) of the units.

To each synthetic data set, the RAID PPMx procedure was fit along with the six competitors introduced in the previous section. For each procedure

we recorded if the interaction was detected (True Positive) and also enumerated the number of falsely detected interactions (False Positives). We briefly note that since association rules require discrete variables, before employing association rules for each cluster, the continuous covariates were dichotomized such that an equal number of observations belonged to each interval.

Here we only describe results for the case when the interaction was present in 100% of the population and include results when the interaction was present in only 60% or 25% of the population in the online supplementary material (see figures S.1-S.4). Trends were similar in all scenarios, except that it became more challenging to detect interactions as the percent of population that exhibits interaction decreased with the RAID method being the least impacted when the interaction only applies to a subset of the population.

In Figure 2, notice that except for XGBoost all methods did reasonably well in recovering the interaction that affects the mean between two categorical covariates, with the RAID and LM methods decaying more when the signal-to-noise ratio decreased. When interactions based on continuous covariates affected mean, the RAID method did the worst (only detecting the interaction in about 50% of the synthetic datasets). However, when interactions affected spread or shape, the RAID procedure is the only method that was able to detect the interaction with any type of regularity. The BART method won when interaction between continuous covariates affected the spread and the XGBoost method tended to perform the worst.

Figure 3 displays the false positives. It seems that the spike & slab and RAID procedures tended to produce the most amount of false positives, while the LASSO and BART method did reasonably well in avoiding this. Upon further investigation, many of the false positives detected by the RAID procedure included one of  $X_1$  or  $X_2$  (covariates that participated in the interaction). In fact, if interactions that included either  $X_1$  or  $X_2$  were not classified as false positives, then the number of false positives detected by the RAID procedure, averaged over all data generating scenarios, was only 1.01. Thus, as discussed in the previous section, the RAID procedure detects any combination of covariates that affect the response distribution in some way.

**6. 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, Müller and Quintana](#)




FIG 2. Results from the second simulation study: percentage of synthetic datasets for which the interaction was detected. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.




FIG 3. Results from the second simulation study: average number of falsely detected interactions. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.

(2005). These types of models are clearly more complex than model (3.1), but they permit demonstrating the flexibility of the exploratory procedure. In fact, 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 the 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 22-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, Müller and Quintana (2005) is that the values selected for  $\gamma$  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  $\rho_m$  results in modeling the latent ordinal scores with a mixture (which is essentially the same data model arising from marginalizing the random measure in the approach by Bao and Hanson 2015), we conclude that the model we specify affords sufficient flexibility and, therefore, the  $\gamma$  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  $s_1, \dots, s_n$

$$\begin{aligned} (6.1) \quad & Z_i \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2*}, s_i \sim N(\mu_{s_i}^*, \sigma_{s_i}^{2*}), \\ & (\mu_j^*, \sigma_j^2) \sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) \times Unif(0, A), \\ & Pr(\rho \mid \mathbf{X}) \propto \prod_{j=1}^k c(S_j)g(\mathbf{X}_j^*), \end{aligned}$$

where  $c(S_j)$  and  $g(\mathbf{X}_j^*)$  are set to functions detailed in Section 3.1. Further, we assume  $\mu_0 \sim N(0, 10^2)$ ,  $\sigma_0 \sim Unif(0, 10)$ , 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 15. Afterwards, we identified association rules for each MCMC iterate of  $\rho_m$ . Covariate values for those variables not identified in the association rule are set to the overall median. Testing (4.1) 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 stress again that  $p$ -values are used only as a validation summary and no notion of Type I error is implied.) As in the simulation study, each continuous covariate was dichotomized such that an equal number of observations belonged to each interval when employing association rules. Also, we explored the impact that trichotomizing continuous covariates might have on the RAID 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 for interactions that appeared in at least 50% of the MCMC iterates 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 the result of testing (4.1). Details associated with the “Prior#” column are provided in Section 6.1. 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 LDLWk08. Figure 4 contains the posterior predictive densities corresponding to the first four association rules listed in Table 7 that do not contain LowRisk. Interestingly, note that the interaction between AlbuminWk07 and AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC influences the shape of the predictive densities verifying that there is indeed an interaction between them and the interaction seems to impact the shape of the response distribution (as evidenced by changes in shape of the predictive distributions).

TABLE 7

*Association rules from the osteonecrosis data with 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	Prior#
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.62	0.91	43.44	0.00	16
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.99	0.58	0.85	39.65	0.01	15
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.93	0.84	0.95	39.35	0.00	14
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.81	0.72	1.00	10.40	0.01	7
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.81	0.87	0.98	40.55	0.18	17
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.55	0.53	0.88	15.71	0.00	6
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.53	0.51	0.88	16.36	0.00	8
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk08	0.50	0.83	0.98	10.66	0.85	3

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 interactions displayed Figure 4 that contain DexCl. It appears that low level of DexCl results in higher risk of grade 2 or higher osteonecrosis, but the exact risk depends on the levels of the other covariates (AlbuminWk07 and HDLWk08). The combination of low DexClWk07 and high AlbuminWk07 results in the highest risk of osteonecrosis. This leads one to hypothesize that a three-way interaction between Albumin, HDL, and DexCl may be present. We explored this by testing a version of (4.1) 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.

The online supplementary material also provides details on how the RAID procedure can accommodate the temporal structure that exists among the covariates through the PPMx prior. This is done by considering a multivariate similarity. As is seen in the supplementary material, including temporal dependence in the partition prior affects partition configuration and as a result interactions that are identified by the RAID procedure.

TABLE 8  
*Posterior probabilities for each severity grade of osteonecrosis corresponding to two association rules found in Table 7*

Covariates	Osteonecrosis Grade				
	0	1	2	3	4
AlbuminWk07 - L, DexClWk07 - L	0.124	0.818	0.058	0.000	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - L, DexClWk07 - H	0.193	0.805	0.002	0.000	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - H, DexClWk07 - L	0.282	0.643	0.061	0.014	0.000
AlbuminWk07 - H, DexClWk07 - H	0.414	0.569	0.017	0.000	0.000
DexClWk08 - L, HDLWk08 - L	0.200	0.799	0.001	0.000	0.000
DexClWk08 - L, HDLWk08 - H	0.195	0.805	0.000	0.000	0.000
DexClWk08 - H, HDLWk08 - L	0.287	0.682	0.030	0.001	0.000
DexClWk08 - H, HDLWk08 - H	0.330	0.667	0.003	0.000	0.000

6.1. *Sensitivity to Prior Specification.* Even though we developed the RAID procedure to be as automatized as possible (after standardizing covariates and possibly the response), “tuning” parameters that may affect the list of possible interactions exist. Those that are most influential are




FIG 4. Posterior predictive densities for the latent variable  $z$  and used in hypothesis test (4.1) for the first four association rules in Table 7 that do not include LowRisk. The vertical lines correspond to  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$



prior parameter specifications that have direct impact on  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ . In Section 5 we mentioned that for model 5.1 these are  $A$  and  $k_0$ , as they regulate the influence that  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  have on cluster formation. Note that as  $A \rightarrow 0$ , clusters become more heterogeneous with respect to  $\mathbf{Y}$  while as  $k_0 \rightarrow 0$  clusters become more heterogeneous with respect to  $\mathbf{X}$ . To explore sensitivity to these three prior specifications, we ran the RAID procedure for the osteonecrosis data based on  $A \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$  and  $k_0 \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$ . Since the cohesion function also has an effect on  $\pi(\rho_m \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ , we ran the RAID procedure using  $c(S_j) = 1$  (a uniform type cohesion function) in addition to  $c(S_j) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$ . This resulted in 18 prior configurations and as a result 18 runs of the RAID procedure. On average it took 15 minutes to employ the RAID to the 18 prior configurations. We provide tables that list the potential interactions for each of the 18 runs in the online supplementary material. Here we briefly summarize the results.

Values in the column labeled “Prior#” in Table 7 are the number of prior configurations that detected the corresponding interaction. Counting up the total number of unique interactions detected across the 18 runs of the RAID procedure resulted in 23 unique interactions. Each of the interactions listed in Table 7 were among the unique 23. There was a general agreement in the interactions detected among the 18 runs with four of the interactions in Table 7 appearing in the majority of the prior configurations. Overall, it seems that results are fairly robust to prior specifications.

Lastly, as a type of follow-up analysis, using the `polr` function found in the MASS R-package (Venables and Ripley 2002), we fit an ordered logistic regression model that included all eight two-way interactions listed in Table 7 and their corresponding main effects along with the three-way interaction detailed in the online supplementary material. (We remark that fitting a saturated ordered logistic regression model with all two-way interactions for these data is not possible.) This model did provide some evidence to suggest that an interaction between DexCIWk08 and HDLWk08 along with AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC and HDLWk07 was present in addition to the three-way interaction, but failed to identify any of the other interactions. This suggests that the added flexibility of our exploratory approach may be useful to detect interactions that would not be possible under more restricted alternatives.

**7. 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 conceptualize an interaction as influencing any aspect 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 DexCI 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. Note, however, 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).

One limitation of the RAID procedure (which is more a MCMC limitation) is that computation associated with the PPMx does not tend to scale well as  $p$  and/or  $n$  grows. Future research will be dedicated to implementing methods in the RAID procedure that permits it to scale well.

Finally, we provide some general recommendations when employing the RAID procedure. For the first step we recommend using the PPMx as the RPM. To automate the prior specification of model 5.1, we suggest standardizing the response and covariates and setting  $A = 0.5$  and  $k_0 = 0.5$ . This essentially puts equal weight on  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  when forming clusters. Decisions associated with step two determine how big a “net” one wants to cast when searching for interactions with the understanding that a larger “net” could result in more false positives. Decreasing support and confidence will cast a larger “net” as will decreasing the number of MCMC iterates in which an association must appear. Informal explorations led us to set support to 0.25, confidence of 0.5, and that a particular association rule should appear in 50% of MCMC iterates before being formally considered. For step three we suggest using 100 posterior predictive draws when comparing predictive densities and a cut-off of 0.01 for “ $p$ -values” if the [Chen and Hanson \(2014\)](#) method is used. This is somewhat arbitrary but worked to identify interactions well in the simulations. Lastly, we recommend using posterior predictive densities to visualize the interactions. Doing so will highlight how the interaction is affecting the response distribution, be it a shift in expec-

tation as in Figure 1 or a change in shape as in Figure 4. If it is determined that the interaction affects the expectation of the response distribution, then a follow-up analysis to quantify interaction effects can be carried out using generalized linear models. If the interaction affects the response distribution in some other way, then formal additional analysis is not available and quantifying the interaction effects will require other (perhaps ad-hoc) approaches similar to our approach with the osteonecrosis data set.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank all the reviewers for comments and suggestions that helped us to greatly improve this manuscript. We thank Drs. Yuhui Chen and Timothy Hanson for kindly sharing code that carries out the Pólya Tree permutation test. Garritt L. Page was partially supported by the Basque Government through the BERC 2018-2021 program, by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities through BCAM Severo Ochoa accreditation SEV-2017-0718. Fernando A. Quintana was supported by grant FONDECYT 1180034 and by Millennium Science Initiative of the Ministry of Economy, Development, and Tourism, grant “Millennium Nucleus Center for the Discovery of Structures in Complex Data”. 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* (U. M. Fayyad, G. Piatetsky-Shapiro, P. Smyth and R. Uthurusamy, eds.) 307–328. American Association for Artificial Intelligence, Menlo Park, CA, USA.
- AGRAWAL, R., TRIPPE, B., HUGGINS, J. and BRODERICK, T. (2019). The Kernel Interaction Trick: Fast Bayesian Discovery of Pairwise Interactions in High Dimensions. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning* (K. CHAUDHURI and R. SALAKHUTDINOV, eds.). *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* **97** 141–150. PMLR, Long Beach, California, USA.
- 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.
- BARRERA-GÓMEZ, J., AGIER, L., PORTENGEN, L., CHADEAU-HYAM, M., GIORGIS-ALLEMAND, L., SIROUX, V., ROBINSON, O., VLAANDEREN, J., GONZÁLEZ, J. R., NIEUWENHUIJSEN, M., VINEIS, P., VRIJHEID, M., VERMEULEN, R., SLAMA, R. and BASAGAÑA, X. (2017). A systematic comparison of statistical methods to detect interactions in exposome-health associations. *Environmental Health* **16** 74.
- BERGER, J. O., WANG, X. and SHEN, L. (2014). A Bayesian Approach to Subgroup Identification. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* **24** 110 - 129.
- BIEN, J., TAYLOR, J. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2013). A lasso for hierarchical interactions. *Ann. Statist.* **41** 1111–1141.
- CHEN, T. and GUESTRIN, C. (2016). XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery*

- and Data Mining. *KDD '16* 785–794. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- 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.
- CHEN, T., HE, T., BENESTY, M., KHOTILOVICH, V., TANG, Y., CHO, H., CHEN, K., MITCHELL, R., CANO, I., ZHOU, T., LI, M., XIE, J., LIN, M., GENG, Y. and LI, Y. (2019). xgboost: Extreme Gradient Boosting R package version 0.90.0.2.
- 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. (2020). salso: Sequentially-Allocated Latent Structure Optimization R package version 0.1.11.
- 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* **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.
- FERRARI, F. and DUNSON, D. B. (2019). Bayesian Factor Analysis for Inference on Interactions. arXiv:1904.11603v1.
- GABRY, J., SIMPSON, D., VEHTARI, A., BETANCOURT, M. and GELMAN, A. (2019). Visualization in Bayesian workflow. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A* **182** 389–402.
- 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*, 1 ed. Elsevier.
- HASTIE, T., TIBSHIRANI, R. and FRIEDMAN, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction*, 2 ed. Springer.
- HEBA, I., AMANY, A., AHMED, S. E. and AMR, S. (2014). Novel data-mining methodologies for detecting drug-drug interactions: A review of pharmacovigilance literature. In *Advances in Environmental Sciences, Development and Chemistry* (W. L. STAFF, ed.) 301–314. Wseas LLC.
- HENDERSON, N. C., LOUIS, T. A., ROSNER, G. L. and VARADHAN, R. (2020). Individualized treatment effects with censored data via fully nonparametric Bayesian accelerated failure time models. *Biostatistics* **21** 50–68.
- 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. and RAO, J. S. (2005). Spike and Slab Variable Selection: Frequentist and Bayesian Strategies. *The Annals of Statistics* **33** 730–773.
- ISHWARAN, H., RAO, J. S. and KOGALUR, U. B. (2013). spikeslab : Prediction and variable selection using spike and slab regression R package version 1.1.5.
- KAPELNER, A. and BLEICH, J. (2016). bartMachine: Machine Learning with Bayesian Additive Regression Trees. *Journal of Statistical Software* **70** 4.
- KARBOWIAK, E. and BIECEK, P. (2019). EIX: Explain Interactions in 'XGBoost' R pack-

age version 1.0.

- 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. (2015a). Learning Interactions via Hierarchical Group-Lasso Regularization. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **24** 627-654.
- LIM, M. and HASTIE, T. (2015b). Learning Interactions via Hierarchical Group-Lasso Regularization. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **24** 627-654.
- LIM, M. and HASTIE, T. (2019). glinternet: Learning Interactions via Hierarchical Group-Lasso Regularization R package version 1.0.10.
- 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.
- MACEachern, S. N. (2000). Dependent Dirichlet processes Technical Report, Ohio State University, Department of Statistics.
- MITRA, R., MÜLLER, 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.
- MÜLLER, P., QUINTANA, F. A., JARA, A. and HANSON, T. (2015). *Bayesian Nonparametric Data Analysis*, First ed. Springer, Switzerland.
- 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 Partition Models. *Statistics and Computing* **28** 1009-1031.
- REICH, B. J., KALENDRA, E., STORLIE, C. B., BONDELL, H. D. and FUENTES, M. (2012). Variable selection for high dimensional Bayesian density estimation: application to human exposure simulation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical 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 studying treatment-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.
- 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].
- SU, X., PEÑA, A. T., 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.
- R CORE TEAM (2017). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing R

Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

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.

VENABLES, W. N. and RIPLEY, B. D. (2002). *Modern Applied Statistics with S*, Fourth ed. Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0.

WADE, S. and GHAHRAMANI, Z. (2018). Bayesian Cluster Analysis: Point Estimation and Credible Balls. *Bayesian Analysis* **13** 559-626.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS,  
PROVO, UTAH  
DEPARTAMENTO DE ESTADÍSTICA,  
SANTIAGO, CHILE  
E-MAIL: [page@stat.byu.edu](mailto:page@stat.byu.edu)  
[quintana@mat.uc.cl](mailto:quintana@mat.uc.cl)

DEPARTMENT OF BIostatISTICS,  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND  
E-MAIL: [grosner1@jhmi.edu](mailto:grosner1@jhmi.edu)

# Supplementary Material: Discovering Interactions Using Covariate Informed Random Partition Models

Garritt L. Page  
Department of Statistics  
Brigham Young University  
Basque Center for Applied Mathematics  
page@stat.byu.edu

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

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

January 6, 2022

This document contains supplementary material to the paper “Discovering Interactions Using Covariate Informed Random Partition Models”. In Section 1 we provide more details associated with the simulation studies conducted in Sections ?? and ?? of the main article. Section 2 provides more results from the osteonecrosis study in Section ?? of the main article. These include results when continuous covariates are trichotomized, a three-way interaction between `AlbuminWk07`, `DexC1Wk07`, and `HDLWk08` is explored, a multivariate similarity to accommodate temporal dependence in covariates is employed, and all results from the sensitivity study.

## 1 Additional Details Associated with Simulation Studies

We first provide more insight from the simulation study in Section ?? and then from that of Section ??.

### 1.1 Details of Competitors Included in Both Simulation Studies

As mentioned in the main article, in a simulation study setting the decision of whether an interaction is present or not needs to be made automated. All procedures need some oversight as it is not always clear if the automated decision is correct or not. To this end we carefully detail the process used for each procedure.

- **Linear Model:** Using the `lm` function in R, we fit a saturated model with all main effects and two-way interactions. An interaction was deemed “detected” if the frequentist  $p$ -value was less than 0.01.
- **Spike & Slab:** Using the `spikeslab` package, similar to the linear model we fit a saturated model with all main effects and two-way interactions. All interaction effects that have a non-zero “gnet” value are considered to be “real” interactions. This follows the suggestion outlined in Ishwaran et al. (2010). The “gnet” value is defined as the model in a particular path solution that minimizes the AIC criterion. See Ishwaran et al. (2010) or Ishwaran and Rao (2005) for more details.
- **hgLASSO:** Using the `glinternet` package we fit a grouped LASSO procedure with the shrinkage parameter being estimated using 10-fold cross validation. More specifically, the `glinternet.cv` function was used, with the “lambda” argument set to 10. Then the “lambda” parameter that corresponded to cross-validation error estimate below the minimum plus one standard deviation was used. On occasion, this procedure produced an error (particularly in the case when no interactions were explicitly included in the data generating mechanism). When this occurred, we simply skipped the data iteration.
- **BART:** We used the `bartMachine` package to fit the BART model and then the function `interaction_investigator` identify potential interactions. Covariates are said to interact in a given tree “only if they appear together in a contiguous downward path from the root node to a terminal node”. Summing across trees and MCMC iterations produces a total number of interactions for each pair of variables. This value is used to rank the interactions on their “importance”. See Kapelner and Bleich (2016) for specific details. No direction is given in Kapelner and Bleich (2016) on a cut-off value that could be used to classify an interaction as “real” or not. Thus, we devised and used the following procedure. Interactions are ordered by their “total” and a cut-off is determined by a 50% decrease in the “total” value. All interactions above this threshold are considered “real”.
- **XGBoost:** We followed the vignette found in Ewelina Karbowiak (2020) to highlight potential interactions using XGBoost. However, just like the BART procedure, little guidance is given on when to classify potential interactions as noise. To this end, we employed the same strategy as in the case of the BART procedure. That is, we ordered interactions according to their “sumGain” and a cut-off is determined by a 50% decrease in the “sumGain” value. All interactions above this threshold are considered “real”. It was not uncommon for the `xgboost` function to produce an error in data generating scenarios that included interactions that did not depend on a shift of expectation. When this occurred we simply skipped the data iteration.



## 1.2 Additional Details for the Simulation Study Based on a Toy Example

Since only a small number of two-way association rules in the simulation study exist, we are able to provide results for each one which facilitates illustrating each step of the exploratory approach. The association rules can be found in Table S.1 under the header “arules”. The column “ $Pr$ ” contains the percent of MCMC iterates (out of 1000) that identified the particular association rule averaged across the 1000 synthetic data sets. Notice that under  $f_0(Y|\mathbf{X})$  no association rule is favored over any other with regards to its chances of being selected. This is to be expected as  $\mathbf{X}$  in no way influences  $Y$ . Contrast that to when  $\mathbf{X}$  does influence  $Y$ , (i.e., under  $f_1(Y|\mathbf{X})$ ,  $f_2(Y|\mathbf{X})$ , and  $f_3(Y|\mathbf{X})$ ). In these cases, association rules that include both  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are much more highly favored in terms of the chances of being detected compared to those that in any way contain  $X_3$ . More concretely, the association rules that include  $X_1$  and  $X_3$  all have very low chances of being detected while those that include  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  have a higher chance but still much lower than those that include both  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  (approximately 30% compared to 80%).

Table S.1: Summary of characteristics for each association rule corresponding to simulation study results. See the text for an explanation.

arules	$f_0(Y \mathbf{X})$			$f_1(Y \mathbf{X})$			$f_2(Y \mathbf{X})$			$f_3(Y \mathbf{X})$		
	$Pr$	Size	#dat	$Pr$	Size	#dat	$Pr$	Size	#dat	$Pr$	Size	#dat
$\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$	0.11	36.71	100	0.07	56.31	100	0.90	30.51	100	0.87	60.86	100
$\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 1\}$	0.10	35.56	100	0.32	75.52	100	0.45	88.77	100	0.42	90.15	100
$\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 0\}$	0.08	48.65	100	0.02	19.82	99.4	0.03	17.02	99.9	0.02	20.57	99.2
$\{X_1 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 1\}$	0.07	44.70	100	0.02	19.46	99.2	0.03	17.13	99.9	0.02	20.79	99.8
$\{X_1 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$	0.11	36.96	100	0.07	55.79	100	0.53	32.23	100	0.37	35.22	100
$\{X_1 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 1\}$	0.11	35.52	100	0.33	77.38	100	0.20	78.94	100	0.26	69.67	100
$\{X_1 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 0\}$	0.06	46.41	100	0.02	19.85	99.1	0.05	19.58	100	0.08	27.48	100
$\{X_1 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 1\}$	0.07	45.47	100	0.02	19.96	98.6	0.05	19.67	100	0.09	27.53	100
<hr/>												
$\{X_2 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 0\}$	0.08	42.91	100	0.97	120.58	100	0.38	18.08	100	0.80	59.99	100
$\{X_2 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 1\}$	0.08	42.90	100	0.97	120.67	100	0.23	25.48	100	0.84	61.36	100
$\{X_2 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 0\}$	0.08	43.93	100	0.01	18.14	67.7	0.11	20.48	100	0.05	25.15	100
$\{X_2 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 1\}$	0.08	43.71	100	0.01	17.39	66.5	0.11	20.61	100	0.05	25.20	100
$\{X_2 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 0\}$	0.08	42.02	100	0.06	26.65	100	0.08	26.05	100	0.10	45.48	100
$\{X_2 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 1\}$	0.08	42.89	100	0.06	26.32	100	0.05	39.55	100	0.10	44.61	100
$\{X_2 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 0\}$	0.08	44.29	100	0.05	26.12	100	0.05	26.36	100	0.06	28.35	100
$\{X_2 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_3 = 1\}$	0.07	41.69	100	0.06	26.15	100	0.05	25.75	100	0.06	28.36	100
<hr/>												
$\{X_3 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 0\}$	0.07	53.10	99.8	0.01	16.57	95.5	0.02	16.71	99.4	0.01	18.46	95
$\{X_3 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 1\}$	0.06	51.65	99.7	0.01	17.21	95.5	0.04	26.42	99.9	0.09	39.57	100
$\{X_3 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$	0.05	63.40	98.2	0.00	10.98	31.6	0.35	31.30	100	0.06	38.14	99
$\{X_3 = 0\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 1\}$	0.05	62.93	99	0.27	102.76	100	0.24	104.69	99.9	0.22	96.82	100
$\{X_3 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 0\}$	0.05	50.60	99.9	0.01	16.38	95.2	0.02	16.77	99.5	0.01	18.76	95
$\{X_3 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_1 = 1\}$	0.07	52.88	100	0.01	16.48	93.6	0.04	26.20	99.9	0.09	39.42	100
$\{X_3 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 0\}$	0.05	63.96	99.1	0.00	11.53	27.9	0.34	31.06	100	0.06	37.46	98.9
$\{X_3 = 1\} \Rightarrow \{X_2 = 1\}$	0.05	59.35	99.6	0.26	100.68	100	0.24	103.72	100	0.25	100.64	100

It is interesting to point out that under  $f_3(Y|\mathbf{X})$  the procedure seems to be able to identify the correct association with more certainty compared to other scenarios (at least for this data generating scenario). These same trends are further corroborated by the “Size” column. Values in this column provide the cluster size from which each association rule was identified averaged over the 1000 MCMC iterates and 1000 synthetic datasets (recall each data set is comprised of 500 observations). Notice that when  $\mathbf{X}$  in no way influences the distribution of  $Y$ , then average cluster size is essentially uniform across all association rules. By way of contrast, cluster sizes on average are bigger for association rules that include both  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  compared to those that do not when  $\mathbf{X}$  influences the distribution of  $Y$ . The last column, “# dat” is the percent of synthetic datasets where the association rule was identified for at least one MCMC iterate. Overall the take home message of Table S.1 is that the procedure is able to identify the pair of covariates that influence the distribution of  $Y$  regardless of what feature of  $Y$ ’s distribution is being influenced.

### 1.3 Additional Details for Simulation Study Based the Osteonecrosis Data

In addition to generating data in which the interaction manifests itself in 100% of the population, we also considered the cases when only 60% and 25% of the population exhibited an interaction. This was done in the simulation study in Section ?? by randomly selecting 40% and 75% of the generated response values and replacing them with a random standard normal realization. Results when doing this are provided in Figures S.1 - S.4. As expected all procedures ability to detect interactions decays as the percent of the population that exhibit the interaction decreases. With only 60% of the population displaying the interaction it seems that the RAID procedure is the least impacted in that it is able to detect the interaction in all scenarios except when a two categorical covariates interact in such a way that the shape of the response distribution changes. The other methods do well when interaction impacts the mean of the response generally speaking. When only 25% of the population exhibit the interaction RAID does well in detecting interaction when categorical covariates impact mean of response, while BART and spike & slab detect it when continuous covariates impact mean of response. In the other scenarios with only 25% of population exhibiting interaction, none of the procedures do well. In terms of false positives, the RAID procedure and spike & slab seem to be more prone to them. But as mentioned, for RAID this is partly an artifact of the procedure finding “main” effects in addition to “interactions”.




Figure S.1: Results from the second simulation study when the interaction is exhibited in only 60% of the population. The percentage of synthetic datasets for which the interaction was detected is provided on the  $y$ -axis. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.




Figure S.2: Results from the second simulation study when the interaction is exhibited in only 60% of the population. The average number of falsely detected interactions is provided on the  $y$ -axis. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.




Figure S.3: Results from the second simulation study when the interaction is exhibited in only 25% of the population. The percentage of synthetic datasets for which the interaction was detected is provided in the  $y$ -axis. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.




Figure S.4: Results from the second simulation study when the interaction is exhibited in only 25% of the population. The average number of falsely detected interactions is provided on the  $y$ -axis. In each figure, the top row corresponds to an interaction that is based on categorical covariates and the bottom row to continuous covariates.

## 2 Further Analysis of the Osteonecrosis Study

### 2.1 Using Trichotomized Continuous Covariates in the Osteonecrosis Study

Since association rules can only realistically be applied to categorical variables, it would be natural to question if the discretization impacts how association rules highlight covariates that may be interacting. That is, does the discretization depth influence interaction discovery? Recall, in the main article, that each continuous covariate was dichotomized so that both levels (“Low”, “High”) contained 50% of the observations. It seems reasonable to believe that a finer discretization of the continuous covariates would discover more “local” multiplicative associations. To explore this, we ran the RAID procedure with trichotomized continuous covariates so that 1/3 of the observations belonged to each interval. With continuous covariates being binned into three groups, the hypothesis in (??) would become an equality of nine posterior predictive densities. As a result, we increased the number of posterior predictive draws to 300 when carrying out the Pólya tree test of Chen and Hanson (2014). The association rules that contain either **DexCl** or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are presented in Table S.2.

Table S.2: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data resulting from the ordinal data model fit with univariate similarity functions and continuous covariates being trichotomized (Low, Medium, High)

Association Rule	<i>Pr</i>	Supp.	Conf.	S	<i>p</i> -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.43	0.91	70.14	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.45	0.81	70.14	0.06
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.75	0.55	0.99	14.42	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.66	0.64	0.85	46.40	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.61	0.39	0.71	67.55	0.35
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.58	0.70	0.99	46.42	0.05
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.58	0.59	1.00	13.80	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk08	0.51	0.57	0.98	12.90	0.49

There are clear similarities between Tables ?? and S.2. In particular the first association rule in Table S.2 is also the first in Table ?. That said, there are differences and as a result, it appears that trichotomizing continuous covariates produces different potential interactions. For example, an interaction between **TriglyceridesWk08** and **DexClWk07** was detected when continuous covariates were trichotomized but was not identified in Table ?. In fact, **Triglycerides** do not appear in Table ?. Overall, it does seem that the manner in which continuous covariates are discretized does impact which interactions are highlighted. This of course is not unexpected.

## 2.2 Three-Way Interaction

The exact hypothesis that was considered when exploring the existence of a three-way interaction between `DexC1Wk07`, `HDLWk08`, and `AlbuminWk07` is (we use  $D$ ,  $H$ , and  $A$  as short hand for `DexC1Wk08`, `HDLWk08`, and `AlbuminWk08`, and  $\mathbf{X}$  denotes the other covariates fixed at their median value)

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = L, H = L, A = L, \mathbf{X}) &= f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = L, H = L, A = H, \mathbf{X}) = \\ &f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = L, H = H, A = L, \mathbf{X}) = f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = L, H = H, A = H, \mathbf{X}) = \\ &f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = H, H = L, A = L, \mathbf{X}) = f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = H, H = L, A = H, \mathbf{X}) = \\ &f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = H, H = H, A = L, \mathbf{X}) = f(Y_0|\mathbf{Y}, D = H, H = H, A = H, \mathbf{X}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.1})$$

We used the same testing procedure as before to test this hypothesis using 100 MCMC draws from each. This resulted in a  $p$ -value of 0 indicating that at least one of the densities is different from the others. To explore this a bit more, Figure S.5 displays the densities and Table S.3 the predicted osteonecrosis grade. Notice from the table that among all four configurations with High `HDLWk08`, the highest risk of grade 2 or higher osteonecrosis is when `AlbuminWk07` and `DexC1Wk07` are both Low. On the other hand, when `HDLWk08` is Low, having `AlbuminWk07` and `DexC1Wk07` both Low does not have the highest risk of grade 2 or higher osteonecrosis. Instead, the highest risk of grade 2 or higher osteonecrosis when `HDLWk08` is Low is when `AlbuminWk07` is Low but `DexC1Wk07` is High (0.064). Having both `AlbuminWk07` and `DexC1Wk07` Low is the second lowest risk (0.032). This is also verified by Figure S.5 where these three combinations display humps at latent value locations corresponding to the specific osteonecrosis grades.

Table S.3: Posterior probabilities corresponding to each severity grade of osteonecrosis for `AlbuminWk07`, `DexC1Wk07`, and `HDLWk08`

AlbuminWk07	DexC1Wk07	HDLWk08	Osteonecrosis Grade		
			0	1	$\geq 2$
Low	Low	Low	0.149	0.819	0.032
High	Low	Low	0.196	0.802	0.002
Low	High	Low	0.309	0.627	0.064
High	High	Low	0.428	0.560	0.012
Low	Low	High	0.114	0.749	0.137
High	Low	High	0.327	0.662	0.011
Low	High	High	0.341	0.593	0.066
High	High	High	0.441	0.535	0.024






Figure S.5: Posterior predictive densities for the latent variable  $z$  associated with the eight densities found (S.1). The vertical lines correspond to  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$

## 2.3 Multivariate Similarity Function

Table S.4: 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	<i>Pr</i>	Supp.	Conf.	<i>S</i>	<i>p</i> -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

In this section we show how the RAID procedure can accommodate the temporal structure that exists among the covariates through the PPMx prior. This is done by considering the following multivariate type similarity:

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

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 specifications 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 worse 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 S.4. All association rules that appear in Table S.4 also appear in Table ?? save those that involve `LDLBaseline`, which is not confirmed when paired with `DexClwk08`. Perhaps the biggest difference between Tables ?? and S.4 is that the association rule between `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` and `AlbuminWk07` is now not confirmed. Thus, the interaction between these two variables may be changing with specific values of the covariates that depend on

time. This illustrates that the exploratory approach depends on the specific model employed.

## 2.4 Sensitivity to Prior Specification

We provide tables containing the list of potential interactions for each of the 18 prior configurations outlined in Section ?? of the main document. Recall that for ordinal data model (??) used to fit the osteonecrosis data the priors whose sensitivity is being explored are  $A$ ,  $c(\cdot)$ , and  $g(\cdot)$ . In particular, for the similarity  $g(\cdot)$  and for continuous covariates we vary  $k_0$  in

$$g(\mathbf{X}_j^*|\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{p_c} \int \prod_{i \in S_j} N(\mathbf{X}_{i\ell}|m^*, s^{2*}) N(m^*|m_0, k_0 s^{2*}) IG(s^{2*}|\nu_0, \kappa_0) dm^* ds^{2*}$$

while fixing  $m_0 = 0$ ,  $\nu_0 = 1$ , and  $\kappa_0 = 2$ . The parameter values employed in the sensitivity analysis are  $A \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$ ,  $k_0 \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$  and  $c(\cdot) = 1$  or  $c(\cdot) = M \times (|\cdot| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$ . The list of interactions detected for each prior specification are provided in Tables S.5 - S.22. As expected there are differences among the 18 tables. Most notably, when  $k_0$  is large (i.e., 10), there are much less interactions detected. This is to be expected as the connection between  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  is weaker as the values of  $\mathbf{Y}$  are what is primarily driving cluster formation. It seems that results are quite robust to the specification of  $c(\cdot)$ .

Table S.5: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.95	0.69	1.00	8.09	0.18
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.90	0.70	1.00	8.00	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.70	0.81	0.99	11.13	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.69	0.70	1.00	11.86	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.66	0.97	0.99	18.56	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.66	0.98	1.00	19.32	0.38
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.65	0.77	0.99	13.38	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.62	0.77	0.98	11.73	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.59	0.75	0.98	11.24	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.55	1.00	1.00	19.00	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk08	0.51	0.61	1.00	7.25	0.00

Table S.6: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.97	0.69	1.00	7.96	0.12
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.92	0.69	1.00	7.89	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.83	0.81	1.00	10.89	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.64	0.98	1.00	19.12	0.01
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.63	0.98	1.00	19.56	0.37
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.62	0.72	1.00	11.63	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.61	0.77	0.99	10.56	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.60	0.75	0.99	12.80	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.52	0.76	0.99	10.31	0.00

Table S.7: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.95	0.61	0.95	25.73	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.93	0.84	1.00	27.34	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.92	0.61	0.91	21.96	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.84	0.80	0.93	25.48	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.84	0.71	0.98	21.33	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.80	0.71	0.99	21.45	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.77	0.69	0.92	15.53	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.68	0.91	0.99	19.21	0.00

## References

- 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.
- Ewelina Karbowiak (2020), “*EIX: Explain Interactions in XGBoost*,” <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/EIX/vignettes/EIX.html>[Accessed: 17 Feb. 2020].
- Ishwaran, H., Kogalur, U. B., and Rao, J. (2010), “spikeslab: Prediction and Variable Selection Using Spike and Slab Regression,” *The R journal*, 2, 68–73.
- Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005), “Spike and Slab Variable Selection: Frequentist and Bayesian Strategies,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 33, 730–773.

Table S.8: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.96	0.81	0.94	25.28	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.94	0.63	0.94	19.45	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.93	0.85	0.99	27.52	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.80	0.72	0.96	21.65	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.79	0.67	0.92	15.96	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.77	0.62	0.94	25.83	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.68	0.70	0.99	22.25	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.63	0.59	0.90	23.54	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.58	0.90	0.99	19.28	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.56	0.76	0.97	13.05	0.00

Table S.9: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.60	0.89	63.87	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.64	0.94	67.96	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.98	0.58	0.83	49.19	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.97	0.75	0.96	17.44	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.95	0.53	1.00	10.73	0.01
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.89	0.58	0.87	61.00	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.74	0.57	0.82	48.42	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk08	0.55	0.70	0.89	16.16	0.00

Kapelner, A. and Bleich, J. (2016), “bartMachine: Machine Learning with Bayesian Additive Regression Trees,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 70, 4.

Table S.10: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 0.1$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.60	0.89	64.14	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.64	0.94	68.34	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.98	0.58	0.83	49.17	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.98	0.75	0.96	17.36	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.91	0.58	0.87	61.12	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.82	0.53	1.00	10.55	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.70	0.57	0.81	48.49	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk08	0.68	0.70	0.89	16.32	0.00

Table S.11: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.85	0.96	0.99	21.79	0.21
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.71	0.76	0.97	12.77	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.67	0.83	1.00	10.96	0.02
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.60	0.73	1.00	8.42	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.59	0.71	0.98	8.63	0.20
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.58	0.89	1.00	15.67	0.01
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.56	1.00	1.00	23.16	0.08
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.55	0.99	1.00	23.71	0.02
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.55	0.78	0.97	12.47	0.04
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.55	0.69	0.99	9.96	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.51	0.76	0.98	14.20	0.00

Table S.12: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.81	0.97	0.99	22.20	0.01
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.76	0.74	0.97	12.67	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.75	0.84	1.00	11.20	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.71	0.76	0.99	14.00	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.70	0.72	0.99	8.64	0.28
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.64	0.73	1.00	8.38	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.63	1.00	1.00	23.32	0.03
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.61	0.89	0.99	16.11	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.59	0.99	1.00	23.86	0.05
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.55	0.80	0.98	12.78	0.01
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.52	0.70	0.99	10.38	0.00

Table S.13: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either **DexClwk07**, **DexClwk08**, or **AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC** are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.96	0.58	0.90	27.27	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.91	0.70	0.93	17.23	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.88	0.85	0.99	11.82	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.85	0.57	0.88	27.20	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.82	0.74	0.98	20.20	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.79	0.90	0.98	29.20	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.75	0.62	0.92	20.11	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.68	0.71	1.00	19.87	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.59	0.71	0.96	18.14	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.57	0.84	0.96	25.95	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.57	0.66	0.98	16.07	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLBaseline	0.52	0.75	0.97	10.77	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.51	0.87	0.98	27.65	0.00

Table S.14: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.95	0.58	0.90	27.69	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.95	0.70	0.93	17.15	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.92	0.74	0.98	20.52	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.86	0.86	1.00	11.86	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.84	0.63	0.91	20.38	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.78	0.86	0.96	31.00	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.78	0.57	0.88	27.41	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.68	0.72	1.00	20.56	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.68	0.82	0.95	28.01	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.56	0.74	0.93	11.79	0.00

Table S.15: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.54	0.83	69.41	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.59	0.91	76.47	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.70	0.50	0.84	10.89	0.90
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.66	0.50	0.87	11.08	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.61	0.51	0.83	65.11	0.01

Table S.16: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 1$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.53	0.82	69.48	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.59	0.91	76.78	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.83	0.50	0.86	11.30	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.66	0.50	0.85	11.11	1.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.63	0.50	0.83	65.16	0.12
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk07	0.51	0.66	0.87	52.43	0.00



Table S.17: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.82	0.76	0.97	13.24	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.74	0.72	0.99	13.64	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.72	0.74	1.00	8.58	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.71	0.93	0.99	21.04	0.12
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.67	0.72	0.98	8.57	0.46
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.62	0.78	0.96	14.45	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.60	0.78	0.98	15.42	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.55	0.70	0.96	13.36	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.53	1.00	1.00	24.57	0.17
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk07	0.52	0.76	0.99	11.63	0.15
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.51	0.88	0.99	16.78	0.00

Table S.18: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 0.1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk08	0.78	0.70	0.98	14.17	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.77	0.77	0.97	12.96	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ HDLWk07	0.74	0.73	1.00	8.41	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.73	0.92	0.98	20.04	0.09
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ Race2	0.67	0.71	0.98	8.18	0.55
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.58	0.88	1.00	16.79	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.57	0.90	1.00	18.88	0.02
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AgeAtDiagnosis	0.54	0.78	0.96	14.52	0.02
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.54	0.71	0.95	14.15	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LDLWk08	0.53	0.78	0.98	15.09	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	0.52	0.69	0.99	12.58	0.00

Table S.19: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>Race2</code>	0.99	0.70	0.93	16.98	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LowRisk</code>	0.97	0.56	0.90	27.46	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LDLWk08</code>	0.88	0.75	0.98	20.91	0.00
<code>DexClWk08</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>HDLWk08</code>	0.85	0.55	0.87	27.46	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AgeAtDiagnosis</code>	0.83	0.86	1.00	12.11	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LowRisk</code>	0.78	0.86	0.96	32.12	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AlbuminWk07</code>	0.75	0.62	0.91	20.85	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LDLWk08</code>	0.71	0.72	0.99	20.23	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AlbuminWk07</code>	0.67	0.82	0.95	30.07	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>CortisolBaseline</code>	0.55	0.89	0.98	13.04	0.00

Table S.20: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClwk07`, `DexClwk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 1$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LowRisk</code>	0.97	0.57	0.89	27.87	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LDLWk08</code>	0.91	0.75	0.98	20.85	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>Race2</code>	0.91	0.70	0.93	17.23	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AgeAtDiagnosis</code>	0.90	0.85	1.00	11.81	0.00
<code>DexClWk08</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>HDLWk08</code>	0.85	0.56	0.87	27.54	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LowRisk</code>	0.81	0.82	0.95	28.72	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AlbuminWk07</code>	0.80	0.63	0.92	19.44	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>AlbuminWk07</code>	0.79	0.80	0.95	27.65	0.00
<code>AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>LDLWk08</code>	0.63	0.72	1.00	20.70	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>CortisolBaseline</code>	0.62	0.88	0.96	13.42	0.00
<code>DexClWk07</code> $\Leftrightarrow$ <code>HDLBaseline</code>	0.53	0.74	0.97	12.42	0.00

Table S.21: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClWk07`, `DexClWk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.54	0.83	69.71	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.59	0.91	76.79	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.81	0.50	0.87	11.25	0.00
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.66	0.51	0.83	65.47	0.03
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.66	0.51	0.85	11.15	0.96

Table S.22: Association rules from the Osteonecrosis data ordinal data model. Here only association rules that contain either `DexClWk07`, `DexClWk08`, or `AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC` are considered. Prior specification is  $A = 10$ ,  $k_0 = 10$ ,  $c(S) = M \times (|S| - 1)!$  with  $M = 1$

Association Rule	$Pr$	Supp.	Conf.	$ S $	$p$ -value
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ AlbuminWk07	1.00	0.53	0.82	70.08	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	1.00	0.59	0.91	77.47	0.00
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk08	0.81	0.50	0.87	11.07	0.00
DexClWk08 $\Leftrightarrow$ CortisolWk07	0.78	0.51	0.85	11.13	0.99
AsparaginaseAntibodyAUC $\Leftrightarrow$ LowRisk	0.64	0.50	0.83	65.78	0.03
DexClWk07 $\Leftrightarrow$ TriglyceridesWk07	0.57	0.66	0.87	52.25	0.00