

Gaussian Process Boosting

Fabio Sigrist*

Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts

March 13, 2022

Abstract

In this article, we propose a novel way to combine boosting with Gaussian process and mixed effects models. This allows for relaxing (i) the linearity assumption for the mean function in Gaussian process and mixed effects models in a flexible non-parametric way and (ii) the independence assumption made in most boosting algorithms. The former is advantageous for predictive accuracy and for avoiding model misspecifications. The latter is important for more efficient learning of the mean function and for obtaining probabilistic predictions. In addition, we present an extension that scales to large data using a Vecchia approximation for the Gaussian process model relying on novel results for covariance parameter inference. We obtain increased predictive performance compared to existing approaches using several simulated datasets and in house price and online transaction applications.

1 Introduction

In this article, we propose a novel way to combine boosting with Gaussian process and mixed effects models. Boosting [Freund and Schapire, 1996, Breiman, 1998, Friedman et al., 2000, Mason et al., 2000, Friedman, 2001, Bühlmann and Hothorn, 2007] is a machine learning technique that achieves superior predictive performance for a large variety of datasets [Chen and Guestrin, 2016, Nielsen, 2016]. Apart from this, the wide adoption of tree-boosting in applied machine learning and data science is due to several advantages: boosting with trees as base learners can automatically account for complex non-linearities, discontinuities, and high-order interactions, it is robust to outliers in and multicollinearity among predictor variables, it is scale-invariant to monotone transformations of the predictor variables, it can handle missing values in predictor variables automatically by losing almost no information [Elith et al., 2008], and boosting can perform variable selection. Gaussian processes [Williams and Rasmussen, 2006], on the other hand, are flexible non-parametric function models that achieve state-of-the-art predictive accuracy and allow for making probabilistic predictions [Gneiting et al., 2007]. Gaussian process and mixed effects models are used, for instance, for non-parametric regression, modeling of time series [Shumway and Stoffer, 2017], spatial [Banerjee et al., 2014], spatio-temporal [Cressie and Wikle, 2015], panel or longitudinal, and hierarchically clustered or grouped

*Email: fabio.sigrist@hslu.ch. Address: Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Suurstoffi 1, 6343 Rotkreuz, Switzerland.

data [Pinheiro and Bates, 2006], emulation of large computer experiments [Kennedy and O’Hagan, 2001], optimization of expensive black-box functions [Jones et al., 1998], and parameter tuning in machine learning models [Snoek et al., 2012].

In both Gaussian process and mixed effects models, the first moment is often assumed to consist of a linear function. Residual structured variation is then modeled using a Gaussian process or random effects model. However, this linearity assumption is often unrealistic and higher predictive accuracy can be obtained by relaxing this assumption; see e.g. Sections 4 and 5. Further, if the mean function of a Gaussian process model is misspecified, spurious second-order non-stationarity occurs as the covariance function of such a misspecified model equals the true covariance function plus the squared bias of the mean function [Schmidt and Guttorp, 2020, Fuglstad et al., 2015]. It is thus important to first correctly model the mean function before accounting for potential residual second-order non-stationarity.

On the other hand, in many state-of-the-art supervised machine learning algorithms, in particular in boosting, it is assumed that a flexible and potentially complex function relates a set of predictor variables to a response variable. Conditional on the predictor variables, the response variable is assumed to be independent across observations. This means that all residual correlation, i.e. correlation that is not accounted for by the regression function, is ignored. As we show in our experiments in Sections 4 and 5, modeling such correlation allows not only for better learning of the regression function, but it is also important for prediction, in particular for probabilistic prediction and for predicting averages or sums over space (block kriging), time, and groups or clusters. Examples of the latter include the prediction of global average temperatures, total rainfall in a catchment area, or the average price of products offered by multiple sellers [Sela and Simonoff, 2012].

In summary, both the linearity assumption in Gaussian process models and the independence assumption in boosting are often questionable. The goal of this article is to relax these restrictive assumptions by combining boosting with Gaussian process and mixed effects models. Specifically, we propose to model the mean function using an ensemble of base learners, such as regression trees [Breiman et al., 1984], learned in a stage-wise manner using boosting, and the second-order structure is modeled using a Gaussian process or mixed effects model. In doing so, the parameters of the covariance function are estimated jointly with the mean function; see Section 2 for more details.

1.1 Relation to existing work

We adopt the terminology used in the mixed effects models literature [Laird et al., 1982, Pinheiro and Bates, 2006] in this article; see Section 2.1 for more information. The majority of the existing Gaussian process and mixed effects models assume that the mean function is a linear regression function. Very little research has been done on combining modern supervised machine learning techniques, such as (tree-)boosting or random forests, with mixed effects models and, in particular, Gaussian processes. In the following, we give a brief review of existing literature for mixed effects models where a non-linear mean function is estimated in a flexible, non-parametric way focusing on approaches that do not make prior assumptions on the structure of the functional form of the mean function.

To relax the linearity assumption in mixed effects models, Tutz and Reithinger [2007] and Groll and Tutz [2012] propose to use generalized additive models [Hastie and Tibshirani, 1986, Wood, 2017]. However, the structure of the mean function has to be determined

a priori by specifying, for instance, main and second-order interaction effects. In general, it is thus likely that his results in model misspecification. For the special case of grouped random effects models for clustered or longitudinal data, several non-parametric, machine learning-based approaches have been proposed. This includes Hajjem et al. [2011], Sela and Simonoff [2012], and Fu and Simonoff [2015] which use regression trees for the mean function, and Hajjem et al. [2014] which use random forests to model the mean function. Both Hajjem et al. [2011] and Hajjem et al. [2014] propose an approach that is inspired by an expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm [Dempster et al., 1977] for mixed effects models [Laird et al., 1982]. Further, Sela and Simonoff [2012] and Fu and Simonoff [2015] use an iterative algorithm that alternates between, first, learning the partition of the tree using a tree algorithm and, second, estimating the coefficients of the trees and the covariance parameters using standard linear mixed effects model methodology. What these methods have in common is that they iteratively (i) learn of the mean function using a machine learning technique, (ii) calculate predictions of random effects, and (iii) estimate covariance parameters. This can make these approaches computationally demanding, in particular when the mean function consists of a relatively complex model such as a random forest which needs to be repeatedly estimated. In addition, they are heuristically motivated approaches and there exist no guarantees that the algorithms converge. In particular, despite the suggestions of their names, the algorithms in Sela and Simonoff [2012], Fu and Simonoff [2015], Hajjem et al. [2011, 2014] do not correspond to correctly specified EM algorithms for mixed effects models [Laird et al., 1982] as they do not contain a proper E-step, and it is thus unclear whether and to which values these algorithms converge.¹ Further, Pande et al. [2017] propose a tree-boosting approach for a certain class of a mixed effects model for longitudinal data. They focus on modeling complex interactions between time and features. However, their approach differs from ours in several directions. First, they only consider a special case of mixed effects models for longitudinal data. I.e., they do not cover other forms of Gaussian process or mixed effects models for, e.g., spatial or spatio-temporal data or clustered data with complex clustering such as crossed or nested random effects. Further, they (re-)estimate the covariance parameters in every boosting iteration using the `nlme` R package, and their `boostmtree` algorithm uses a special form of in-sample cross-validation to avoid overfitting. Finally, they do not allow for predictor variables that vary within subjects.

In practice, a straightforward alternative to using Gaussian process or mixed effects models with a non-parametric mean function consists of using any statistical or machine learning approach, such as boosting or random forest, and simply include the locations²

¹The E-step in an EM algorithm for mixed effect models works by, first, finding a maximizer for the mean function of the multivariate normal likelihood at the current covariance parameters, conditional on this obtaining predictions for the random effects, and then using these two quantities to calculate the expectation of the full data log-likelihood; see e.g. Laird et al. [1982]. However, Hajjem et al. [2011] and Hajjem et al. [2014] do not find an optimizer of the mean function as maximizer of the multivariate normal likelihood for fixed covariance parameters. Rather, they, first, use an independent normal likelihood obtained after subtracting predicted values of the random effects from the response variable to estimate the mean function, second, obtain predictions for the random effects, third, find estimates of the covariance parameters (M-step), and iterate over these three steps. Further, Sela and Simonoff [2012] and Fu and Simonoff [2015] iterate between, first, estimating the structure of a tree using an independent normal likelihood obtained after subtracting predicted values of the random effects from the response and, second, jointly estimating the leaf values and covariance parameters using a classical linear mixed effects model. This is not an EM algorithm as it does not involve an E-step that calculates an expectation of a log-likelihood.

²We follow the spatial statistics terminology and use the term “locations”. In machine learning, the

which define the Gaussian process as continuous variables or the grouping variables in the case of grouped random effects as categorical variables in the set of predictor variables for the mean function. For linear models, this is equivalent to using fixed effects instead of random effects. However, this approach has several drawbacks. First, when modeling spatial data, it is often required that the spatial effect is continuous over space, but tree-boosting and random forest create a discontinuous function. A way to avoid this problem in boosting is to use base learners that are continuous in the locations. This is the approach proposed in Hothorn et al. [2010] where splines are used to model spatial effects and ridge regression is used to model grouped effects. However, boosting approaches that model spatial or grouped effects using base learners have the drawback that they assume a deterministic relationship, irrespective of the base learners used, and that the residual error term is the only source of variation. On the other hand, Gaussian process and mixed effects models rely on a probabilistic model for the spatial and grouped effects and can thus provide probabilistic predictions accounting for uncertainty in prediction. This is particularly important if multivariate predictions, e.g. for predicting areal sums or averages, should be made for samples where the Gaussian process has not been observed and only other independent realizations of Gaussian processes, for e.g. past time points, have been observed. An example of this is the post-processing of model output of deterministic meteorological or climate models. Such post-processing models are estimated by relating observed data to model output data, and it is important to account for residual spatial dependence. However, often there is no observed data in the prediction step, i.e. the post-processing step. In this case, a boosting approach where spatial effects are modeled using base learners performs badly as no realization of the corresponding effects has been observed and correlation among predictions cannot be accounted for; see Section 4. Further, in the case of linear models, coefficient estimates are less efficient when using fixed effects instead of random effects. It is thus likely that the mean function is also less efficiently estimated in such a fixed effects boosting approach. Our simulated experiments in Section 4 support this hypothesis. Furthermore, when using fixed effects to model grouped effects, one cannot include predictor variables that are constant within groups due to non-identifiability. Finally, a spline-based approach has the disadvantage that it suffers from the so-called curse of dimensionality when the dimension of the “locations” that define the Gaussian process becomes large; see the beginning of Section 1 for examples where this occurs.

2 A non-linear, non-parametric mixed effects model

2.1 Model assumptions

We follow the terminology used in the mixed effects models literature [Laird et al., 1982, Pinheiro and Bates, 2006] to include both grouped or clustered random effects and Gaussian processes in our approach. Specifically, we assume a mixed effects model of the form

$$y = F(X) + Zb + \epsilon, \quad b \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \quad \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_n), \quad (1)$$

where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response variable, $F(X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the so-called fixed effects, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the random effects with covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an independent error term also called “nugget” effect in spatial

locations are usually called “features”; see Section 2.3.2 for more details.

statistics. Further, $F(X)$ is the row-wise evaluation of a function $F : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $F(X) = (F(X_1), \dots, F(X_n))^T$, where $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the vector of predictor variables for observation i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. The matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are the so-called fixed and random effects design matrices. In addition, n denotes the number of data points, m denotes the dimension of the random effects b , and p denotes the number of predictor variables in X .

The random effects vector b is either a finite-dimensional version of a Gaussian process and/or it contains grouped random effects.³ So-called grouped random effects occur in cases where there is one or several hierarchically nested or crossed grouping of the data, and the grouped random effects account for correlation due to this grouping. The matrix Z of the random effects is often simply an incidence matrix with entries in $\{0, 1\}$ such as for grouped random effects or Gaussian processes with multiple observations at the same location, but it can also contain covariate data, e.g. in the case of random coefficient models, which may or may not be a subset of the covariates in X . In Section 2.3, we outline several examples and special cases of models for Zb that are included in the specification in Equation (1). In our proposed approach, we assume that F is a function in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ given by $\langle F, G \rangle = E_{X_1} (F(X_1)G(X_1))$. For estimation, additional implicit or explicit assumptions need to be made on the properties of the function F , e.g. its regularity. In our case, we adopt a boosting approach and assume that F lies in the linear span of a set of base learners; see Section 3 for more details. Note that if $F(X) = X^T \beta$, where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of coefficients, the model in Equation (1) is called a linear mixed effects model.

The covariates X_i and Z_i are assumed to be independent and identically distributed, where the distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to either the Lebesgue measure, a counting measure, a mixture of both, or a product measure of the former measures to include both continuous, categorical, and mixed-type covariates. However, in the mixed effects model literature and also in this article, all results are conditional on X and Z , i.e. we assume that X and Z are observed and fixed, and the only sources of randomness are the random effects b and the error term ϵ . Further, the covariance matrix Σ is usually assumed to be parametrized by a relatively low number of parameters. For notational simplicity, we do not explicitly indicate the dependence on these parameters in Σ . We also point out that, conditional on $F(X)$ and Z , dependence among the response variable y can arise either due to the matrix Z being non-diagonal or due to the covariance matrix Σ of the random effects being non-diagonal.

2.2 Likelihood and loss function

In the following, we derive the likelihood and the loss function that we then optimize. These are standard results but we briefly review them here, in particular to establish the notation used in this article. The density of the response y in Equation (1) is given by

$$p(y|F, \theta) = \int p(y|b, F, \theta) p(b|\theta) db, \quad (2)$$

³Note that we assume the random effects follow a normal distribution, but moderate violations of this assumption have been shown to have only a small effect on prediction accuracy in the context of generalized linear mixed models [McCulloch and Neuhaus, 2011].

where

$$p(b|\theta) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}b^T\Sigma^{-1}b\right)|\Sigma|^{-1/2}(2\pi)^{-m/2},$$

$$p(y|b, F, \theta) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y - F(X) - Zb)^T(y - F(X) - Zb)\right)(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2},$$

where we abbreviate $F = F(X)$ and $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ denotes the covariance parameters, i.e. the error variance σ^2 and parameters that parametrize Σ . To distinguish a function from its evaluation, we use the symbols “ $F(\cdot)$ ” to denote a function and “ F ” for the function evaluated at X in the following. It follows readily that the marginal distribution of y is given by

$$y \sim \mathcal{N}(F(X), \Psi), \quad \Psi = Z\Sigma Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n.$$

Factoring out the error variance σ^2 by setting

$$\Sigma^\dagger = \Sigma/\sigma^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^\dagger = Z\Sigma^\dagger Z^T + I_n$$

gives the equivalent form

$$y \sim \mathcal{N}(F(X), \sigma^2 \Psi^\dagger). \quad (3)$$

As this leads to a closed form expression for the estimated σ^2 (see Section 3 below), we use this reparametrization in the following and denote its parameters by θ . We thus obtain the following explicit expression for the likelihood $p(y|F, \theta)$:

$$p(y|F, \theta) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y - F)^T \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F)\right) \det(\Psi^\dagger)^{-1/2} (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2},$$

and the corresponding negative log-likelihood modulo a constant is given by

$$L(y, F, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y - F)^T \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F) + \frac{1}{2} \log \det(\Psi^\dagger) + \frac{n}{2} \log(\sigma^2). \quad (4)$$

We refer to $L(y, F, \theta)$ as loss function in the following. Estimation, or learning, is done by minimizing this. Specifically, our goal is to find the following joint minimizer

$$(\hat{F}(\cdot), \hat{\theta}) = \underset{(F(\cdot), \theta) \in (\mathcal{H}, \Theta)}{\operatorname{argmin}} L(y, F, \theta) \Big|_{F=F(X)}, \quad (5)$$

where we recall that $F(\cdot)$ is a function in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is a vector that contains all variance and covariance parameters specifying the distributions of b and ϵ .

2.3 Examples and special cases of random effects model

We distinguish between the following broad classes of random effects models: (i) models where the random effects b are defined by some form of hierarchical grouping denoted as grouped random effects models in this article, (ii) Gaussian process models where the random effects are finite-dimensional versions of Gaussian processes, and (iii) combinations of these two types of random effects. Grouped random effects models can range from simple single-level effects models to crossed and nested random effects models. Depending on the discipline, such models are also denoted as longitudinal, panel data, repeated measurement models.

2.3.1 Grouped random effects model

In a single-level grouped random effects model, it is assumed that there is a hierarchical grouping of several independent units with multiple observations which are dependent within units. Specifically, assume that there is a categorical variable that splits the data into m groups. Then there is a random effect $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, for every group j , and the random effects b are assumed to be independent with $\Sigma = \sigma_1^2 I_m$. We thus have

$$\Psi = \sigma_1^2 Z Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n,$$

where the matrix Z is an incidence matrix $Z \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$ that relates group-level random effects to observations.

Such a single-level model can be easily extended to allow for multiple random effects which can be nested or crossed and also consist of random coefficients, i.e. random slopes. In the latter case, Z is no longer a binary incidence matrix but it contains covariate data.

2.3.2 Gaussian process model

In a Gaussian process model, one assumes that the random effects $b = (b(s_1), \dots, b(s_m))^T$ are a finite-dimensional version of a Gaussian process $b(s)$ with a parametric covariance function

$$\text{Cov}(b(s), b(s')) = c(s, s'), \quad s, s' \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

observed at locations s_1, \dots, s_m . Note that we use the terminology “locations” since Gaussian processes are widely used in spatial statistics, but the locations can in general also consist of covariates or features that do not necessarily correspond to locations in a physical space.⁴ The matrix Z can be either a binary incidence matrix to model multiple observations at the same locations and/or it can contain covariate data for random coefficient Gaussian processes, also called spatially varying coefficient models [Gelfand et al., 2003].

Often, the covariance function is assumed to be second-order stationary, mean-square continuous, and parametrized of the form

$$c(s, s') = \sigma_1^2 r(\|s - s'\|/\rho),$$

where r is an isotropic autocorrelation function with $r(0) = 1$, $\sigma_1^2 = \text{Var}(b(s))$, and ρ is a so-called range parameter that determines how fast the autocorrelation decays with distance. Examples of autocorrelation functions include the exponential function $r(\|s - s'\|/\rho) = \exp(-\|s - s'\|/\rho)$ and the Gaussian function $r(\|s - s'\|/\rho) = \exp(-(\|s - s'\|/\rho)^2)$. The extension to more general covariance functions and also to multivariate Gaussian processes is straightforward and our methodology presented in Section 3 does not rely on e.g. stationarity assumptions. For a Gaussian process, we obtain the following covariance matrix

$$\Psi = \sigma_1^2 Z \Sigma Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n,$$

where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ has entries

$$(\Sigma)_{jk} = \sigma_1^2 r(d_{jk}/\rho)$$

and $d_{jk} = \|s_j - s_k\|$, $j, k = 1, \dots, m$.

⁴In machine learning, covariance functions are often also denoted as “kernel functions” and the covariance parameters θ are referred to as “hyper parameters”.

2.3.3 Joint grouped random effects and Gaussian process models

Grouped random effects and Gaussian processes can also be combined. An example where such models are used is so-called repeated measures data. For instance, one can assume that within groups, there is temporal and/or spatial dependence modeled by a Gaussian process, a simple example of the former being an autoregressive process of order one. In a single-level grouped random effect model, this means that every group j contains a Gaussian process and the different Gaussian processes are independent among each other. Alternatively, one can assume that there is one single global Gaussian process in combination with grouped random effects, i.e. the same Gaussian process is related to all observations and it accounts, for instance, for spatial correlation among all observations.

3 Combining Gaussian process and mixed effects models with boosting

Recall that the goal is to find the minimizer $(\hat{F}(\cdot), \hat{\theta})$ in Equation (5) with the loss function given in Equation (4). In contrast to the case of finite-dimensional optimization, it is not straightforward how to perform such an optimization task without making additional assumptions on $F(\cdot)$ or \mathcal{H} . We propose to perform this minimization using an approach denoted as boosting. In the following, we present boosting and then introduce the GPBoost algorithm.

3.1 Boosting with the multivariate Gaussian loss

In general, boosting finds a minimizer of the empirical risk functional $R(F(\cdot)) = \sum_{i'=1}^{n'} L(y_{i'}, F(x_{i'}))$, where $L(y, F(x))$ is an appropriately chosen loss function. This minimizer is found in the span $\Omega_{\mathcal{S}} = \text{span}(\mathcal{S})$ of a set \mathcal{S} of so-called base learners $f_j(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Classes of base learners can consist of, e.g., linear functions [Bühlmann et al., 2006], smoothing splines [Bühlmann and Yu, 2003], wavelets [Saberian et al., 2011], reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) regression functions [Sigrist, 2019], and regression trees [Breiman et al., 1984], with the latter being the most popular choice in particular in applied machine learning due to the advantages listed in Section 1.

For a given loss function and class of base learners, boosting finds a minimizer in a stagewise way by sequentially adding an update $f_m(\cdot)$ to the current estimate $F_{m-1}(\cdot)$:

$$F_m(\cdot) = F_{m-1}(\cdot) + f_m(\cdot), \quad f_m \in \mathcal{S}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M, \quad (6)$$

and $f_m(\cdot)$ is chosen in a way such that its addition results in the minimization of the risk. This minimization can usually not be done analytically and, consequently, an approximation is used. In most boosting algorithms, such an approximation is obtained using either a penalized functional first-order or a functional second-order Taylor expansion of the risk around the current estimate $F_{m-1}(\cdot)$. This then corresponds to functional gradient descent and functional Newton steps; see e.g. Sigrist [2018] for more information. It is also possible to combine gradient and Newton steps as proposed in Friedman [2001] by first learning part of the parameters of the base learner using a gradient step and the remaining part using a Newton update.

In the following, we show how boosting works in our case when the variance and covariance parameters θ are known and fixed. In contrast to existing boosting algorithms,

all observations are dependent in general, i.e., we have only one independent multivariate sample. Note that the empirical risk functional is given by

$$R(F(\cdot), \theta) = L(y, F, \theta) \Big|_{F=F(X)}.$$

For θ fixed and the loss in Equation (4), gradient boosting finds $f_m(\cdot)$ as

$$f_m(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F_{m-1}) - f \right\|^2, \quad (7)$$

where $f = (f(X_1), \dots, f(X_n))^T$. I.e., this is the least squares approximation to the negative gradient of the loss at the current estimate F_{m-1} :

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial F} L(y, F, \theta) \Big|_{F=F_{m-1}} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F_{m-1}).$$

In Newton boosting, $f_m(\cdot)$ is found as the minimizer of a functional second-order Taylor approximation of the empirical risk around $F_{m-1}(\cdot)$. In our case, this corresponds to

$$f_m(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}} (y - F_{m-1} - f)^T \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F_{m-1} - f). \quad (8)$$

As mentioned, there also exists a hybrid gradient-Newton boosting version which learns part of the parameters of the base learner $f_m(\cdot)$ using a gradient step and the remaining part using a Newton step; see e.g. Sigrist [2018]. In the following, we assume that the base learners can be written in the form

$$f(\cdot) = h(\cdot; \alpha)^T \gamma, \quad h(\cdot; \alpha), \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^K, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^Q,$$

where α and γ denote the parameters of the base learners and $h(\cdot; \alpha) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$. For instance, this is the case for regression trees where α indicates the splitting variables and the split locations, γ contains the terminal node values, and $h(\cdot; \alpha)$ is a function that maps the covariate to terminal tree nodes. In this case, hybrid gradient-Newton boosting first learns α_m using a gradient boosting step as in Equation (7), and then γ_m is learned using a Newton boosting step as in Equation (8). For the latter, an explicit generalized least squares solution is obtained as

$$\gamma_m = \left(h_{\alpha_m}^T \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}} h_{\alpha_m} \right)^{-1} h_{\alpha_m}^T \Psi^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F_{m-1}),$$

where $h_{\alpha_m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ is the matrix with entries $(h_{\alpha_m})_{ik} = h(X_i; \alpha_m)_k$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

We note that in Newton boosting as well as hybrid gradient-Newton boosting, the norm of $f_m(\cdot)$, i.e. the step-length, does not depend on the scaling of the loss function, in particular not on σ^2 . Since gradients are scale-dependent, this does not hold true for gradient boosting.

It has been empirically observed that damping the update in (6) results in increased predictive accuracy [Friedman, 2001]. This means that the update in (6) is damped by a factor ν :

$$F_m(\cdot) = F_{m-1}(\cdot) + \nu f_m(\cdot), \quad \nu > 0, \quad (9)$$

where ν is called the shrinkage parameter or learning rate.

As in finite dimensional optimization, functional gradient descent can also be accelerated using momentum. For instance, Biau et al. [2019] and Lu et al. [2019] propose to use Nesterov acceleration [Nesterov, 2004] for gradient boosting.

3.2 Gaussian process boosting

In linear mixed effects models, i.e. if $F(x) = x^T \beta$, $L(y, F, \theta)$ is usually optimized by first profiling out the fixed effect part and then optimizing over θ using, e.g., a quasi-Newton method. In our case, this is not an option since there is no explicit solution for $F(\cdot)$ conditional on θ . This means that the optimization has to be done over $F(\cdot)$ and θ jointly. A straightforward approach would consist of iteratively first doing one approximate functional descent step for $F(\cdot)$ using a boosting update and then performing one gradient or (quasi-)Newton descent step for θ . Despite being attractive from a computational point of view, this has the following drawback. For finite samples, boosting tends to overfit and early stopping has to be applied to prevent this, in particular for regression tasks. However, there is no guarantee that θ has converged to a minimum when early stopping is applied after a certain number of iterations. A possible solution to avoid this problem consists of doing coordinate descent in both directions $F(\cdot)$ and θ , i.e. iteratively doing full optimization in both directions. However, this has the drawback that it is computationally expensive as both $F(\cdot)$ and the covariance parameters θ need to be repeatedly learned. Also note that restricted maximum likelihood (REML) estimation is often used for linear mixed effects models since otherwise covariance parameter estimates are biased. This is, however, not possible in our case for similar reasons. We conjecture that early stopping has a similar effect as it prevents overfitting.

Our proposed solution is to combine functional gradient or Newton steps in $F(\cdot)$ with coordinate descent steps in θ . We thus avoid the above-mentioned overfitting problem while being computationally more effective compared to coordinate descent in both directions. Algorithm 1 summarizes our proposed approach.

Concerning the coordinate descent step for obtaining $\theta_m = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L(y, F_{m-1}, \theta)$, we note that there is an explicit solution for the error variance parameter:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} (y - F_{m-1})^T \Psi^{\dagger -1} (y - F_{m-1}).$$

We thus alternate between finding the explicit minimum for σ^2 and finding a minimizer of the remaining parameters. The latter is done using a first- or second-order method for convex optimization, which is initialized with the parameter vector θ_{m-1} of the previous iteration. In doing so, we avoid the full re-estimation of the random effect models covariance parameters. Further, for Gaussian processes, we have found in our simulated and real-world experiments that the computational time to find minimizers can be reduced considerably when using Nesterov accelerated gradient descent [Nesterov, 2004] compared to non-accelerated methods that are usually used for this task such as gradient descent, (quasi-) Newton methods, or Fisher scoring (results not tabulated). We thus use Nesterov accelerated gradient descent in all our simulated and real-world experiments in Sections 4 and 5. Note that the gradient of $L(y, F, \theta)$ with respect to a parameter θ_k , $k = 2, \dots, q$, is given by⁵

$$\frac{\partial L(y, F, \theta)}{\partial \theta_k} = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (y - F)^T \Psi^{\dagger -1} \frac{\partial \Psi^{\dagger}}{\partial \theta_k} \Psi^{\dagger -1} (y - F) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Psi^{\dagger -1} \frac{\partial \Psi^{\dagger}}{\partial \theta_k} \right), \quad (10)$$

⁵We apologize for the notational inconsistency of using θ_m to denote the vector of parameters in iteration m and θ_k to denote the parameter with index k in the vector θ . The distinction between these two cases can be inferred from the context, and in particular from the subscript letter.

Algorithm 1: GPBoost: Gaussian Process Boosting

input : Initial value $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, learning rate $\nu > 0$, number of boosting iterations $M \in \mathbb{N}$, **BoostType** $\in \{\text{"gradient"}, \text{"newton"}, \text{"hybrid"}\}$, **NesterovAccel** $\in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$, and if **NesterovAccel**==True momentum sequence $\mu_m \in (0, 1]$

output: Mean function $\hat{F}(\cdot) = F_M(\cdot)$ and covariance parameters $\hat{\theta} = \theta_M$

- 1: Initialize $F_0(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{c \in \mathbb{R}} L(y, c \cdot 1, \theta_0)$
- 2: **for** $m = 1$ **to** M **do**
- 3: Find $\theta_m = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L(y, F_{m-1}, \theta)$ using a (accelerated) first- or second-order method for convex optimization initialized with θ_{m-1}
- 4: **if** **BoostType**=="gradient" **then**
- 5: Find $f_m(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sigma_m^2} \Psi_m^\dagger^{-1} (F_{m-1} - y) - f \right\|^2$
- 6: **else if** **BoostType**=="newton" **then**
- 7: Find $f_m(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}} (y - F_{m-1} - f)^T \Psi_m^\dagger^{-1} (y - F_{m-1} - f)$
- 8: **else if** **BoostType**=="hybrid" **then**
- 9: Find $\alpha_m = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha: f(\cdot) = h(\cdot; \alpha)^T \gamma \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sigma_m^2} \Psi_m^\dagger^{-1} (F_{m-1} - y) - f \right\|^2$
- 10: Calculate $\gamma_m = \left(h_{\alpha_m}^T \Psi_m^\dagger^{-1} h_{\alpha_m} \right)^{-1} h_{\alpha_m}^T \Psi_m^\dagger^{-1} (y - F_{m-1})$
- 11: Set $f_m(\cdot) = h(\cdot; \alpha_m)^T \gamma_m$
- 12: **end if**
- 13: Update $F_m(\cdot) = F_{m-1}(\cdot) + \nu f_m(\cdot)$
- 14: **if** **NesterovAccel**==True **then**
- 15: Update $F_m(\cdot) = F_m(\cdot) + \mu_m (F_m(\cdot) - F_{m-1}(\cdot))$
- 16: **end if**
- 17: **end for**

see e.g. Williams and Rasmussen [2006], and we calculate the trace as $\operatorname{tr} \left(\Psi^\dagger^{-1} \frac{\partial \Psi^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} \right) = \sum_{i,j} \left(\Psi^\dagger^{-1} \right)_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial \Psi^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} \right)_{ij}$.

Further, for the minimization step of the covariance parameters, we reparametrize all parameters in θ with positivity constraints excluding σ^2 , such as marginal variance and range parameters, on the log-scale $\log(\theta_k)$ in order to constrain them to positive values during the numerical optimization.

If $R(F(\cdot), \theta) = L(y, F, \theta) \Big|_{F=F(X)}$ is convex in $F(\cdot)$ and θ and Θ is a convex set, then

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{(F(\cdot), \theta) \in (\Omega_{\mathcal{S}}, \Theta)} L(y, F, \theta) \Big|_{F=F(X)} \quad (11)$$

is a convex optimization problem and GPBoost Algorithm 1 without Nesterov acceleration converges to the minimizer of Equation (11). Thus, if the base learners span the entire space $\mathcal{H} = \Omega_{\mathcal{S}}$, then the GPBoost algorithm will find the minimizer given in Equation (5).

3.3 Out-of-sample learning for covariance parameters

It has recently been observed that state-of-the-art machine learning techniques such as neural networks, kernel machines, or boosting achieve a zero training loss while at the

same time having excellent generalization properties [Zhang et al., 2017, Wyner et al., 2017, Belkin et al., 2018]. While most of these results have been found for classifiers, it is likely that similar effects as reported in Wyner et al. [2017] are also present in regression applications. In line with this, we find in our simulated experiments in Section 4 that estimates of the error variance σ^2 are often too small. We do not observe similar problems for other covariance parameters such as variances and ranges of Gaussian processes, though. A way to circumvent this problem is to estimate the covariance parameters using out-of-sample data, i.e. using a validation data set or by doing cross-validation. To avoid that the mean function and/or the covariance parameters θ are only learned on part of the data, we propose the two-step approach presented in the GPBoostOOS Algorithm 2. In brief, the GPBoostOOS algorithm first runs the GPBoost algorithm and obtains predictions for the mean function on validation data. The covariance parameters are then estimated on the validation using the predicted mean function. Finally, the GPBoost algorithm is run a second time without estimating any covariance parameters, though. Note that when k -fold cross-validation is used, both the mean function and the covariance parameter are learned using the full data.

Algorithm 2: GPBoostOOS: Gaussian Process Boosting with Out-Of-Sample covariance parameter estimation

input : Initial value $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, learning rate $\nu > 0$, number of boosting iterations $M \in \mathbb{N}$, BoostType $\in \{\text{"gradient"}, \text{"newton"}, \text{"hybrid"}\}$, NesterovAccel $\in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$, and if NesterovAccel==True momentum sequence $\mu_m \in (0, 1]$

output: Mean function $\hat{F}(\cdot)$ and covariance parameters $\hat{\theta}$

- 1: Partition the data into training and validation sets, e.g. using k -fold cross-validation
- 2: Run the GPBoost algorithm on the training data and generate predictions for the mean function on the validation data \hat{F}_{val}
- 3: Find $\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L(y_{val}, \hat{F}_{val}, \theta)$ using the validation data with response y_{val}
- 4: Run the GPBoost algorithm on the full data while holding the covariance parameters θ fixed at $\hat{\theta}$, i.e. skipping line 3, to obtain $\hat{F}(\cdot)$

3.4 Efficient learning for large data

Concerning learning of trees, several approaches exist for scaling the computations to large data [Chen and Guestrin, 2016, Ke et al., 2017, Prokhorenkova et al., 2018]. In this article, we use the approach presented in Ke et al. [2017]. Further, if the random effects b consists of only grouped random effects, Ψ^\dagger is sparse and computations can be done efficiently using sparse matrix calculations. If, however, b contains a Gaussian process with a non-sparse covariance matrix, both the computational cost and the required memory do not scale well in the number of observed locations. In this case, one has to rely on some approximation to make calculations feasible. We choose to use a Vecchia approximation [Vecchia, 1988, Datta et al., 2016, Katzfuss and Guinness, 2017, Finley et al., 2019], also denoted as nearest-neighbor Gaussian process (NNGP) model by Datta et al. [2016], as it has several advantages over other Gaussian process approximations for large data; see e.g. Guinness [2018]. Roughly speaking, the idea of the Vecchia approximation is to approximate a Cholesky factor of the precision matrix using a sparse matrix and thus also obtain a sparse

approximate precision matrix. In the following, we briefly review how this is obtained in our case and then show how gradients of the negative log-likelihood given in Equation (10) can be calculated efficiently. To the best of our knowledge, the latter result is novel.

3.4.1 Vecchia approximation for the response variable y

Vecchia approximations are a special form of composite likelihood methods [Varin et al., 2011]. Specifically, the likelihood $p(y|F, \theta)$ is approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} p(y|F, \theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | (y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}), F, \theta) \\ &\approx \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | y_{N(i)}, F, \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $y_{N(i)}$ are subsets of the conditioning sets (y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}) and $N(i)$ denote the corresponding subsets of indices. As is commonly done, we choose $N(i)$ as the indices of the m nearest neighbors of s_i among s_1, \dots, s_{i-1} if $i > m + 1$ and, in the case $i \leq m + 1$, $N(i)$ equals $(1, \dots, i - 1)$.

By standard arguments for conditional Gaussian distributions, we have

$$p(y_i | y_{N(i)}, F, \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y_i | F_i + A_i (y_{N(i)} - F_{N(i)}), D_i),$$

where $\mathcal{N}(x | \mu, \Xi)$ denotes the normal density with mean vector μ and covariance matrix Ξ evaluated at x , and $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |N(i)|}$ and $D_i \in \mathbb{R}$, where $|N(i)|$ denotes the size of the set $N(i)$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= (Z \Sigma Z^T)_{i, N(i)} \left((Z \Sigma Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n)_{N(i)} \right)^{-1} \\ D_i &= (Z \Sigma Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n)_{i, i} - A_i (Z \Sigma Z^T)_{N(i), i} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\Sigma = (c(s_l, s_k))_{l, k}$, $1 \leq l, k \leq n$ is the covariance matrix of b , $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ the covariance function, $M_{i, N(i)}$ denotes the sub-matrix of M consisting of row i and columns $N(i)$, and $M_{N(i)}$ denotes the sub-matrix of a matrix M consisting of rows $N(i)$ and columns $N(i)$. Note that if Z is a diagonal matrix, we have

$$(Z \Sigma Z^T)_{N(i)} = Z_{N(i)} \Sigma_{N(i)} Z_{N(i)} = \Sigma_{N(i)} \odot (zz^T)_{N(i)},$$

where z is the diagonal of Z , i.e., the covariate data, and \odot denotes the Hadamard product. The use of this relationship can lead to a reduction in computation cost, in particular for random coefficient models; see Dambon et al. [2020].

We further denote by B the lower triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal, off-diagonal entries

$$(B)_{i, N(i)} = -A_i, \quad (14)$$

and 0's otherwise, and by D a diagonal matrix with D_i on the diagonal. We then obtain the following approximate distribution

$$y \stackrel{approx}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(F(X), \tilde{\Psi}), \quad \tilde{\Psi} = B^{-1} D B^{-T}, \quad (15)$$

and the corresponding precision matrix is given by

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{-1} = B^T D^{-1} B, \quad (16)$$

where the Cholesky factor B and also $\tilde{\Psi}^{-1}$ are sparse. Dividing by σ^2 and using the notation of (3), we have

$$\tilde{\Psi}^\dagger = B^{-1} D^\dagger B^{-T} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}} = B^T D^{\dagger^{-1}} B,$$

where $D^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} D$.

3.4.2 Efficient calculation of the gradient for the Vecchia approximation

In the following, we show how the gradient of the approximate log-likelihood can be calculated efficiently. The error variance σ^2 is not included in the results since its gradient is trivial and often not needed because an optimum can be found analytically. To the best of our knowledge, the following result is novel. Guinness [2019] also shows how to compute the gradient and Fisher information for the Vecchia approximation. However, his calculation and derivation are different.

Proposition 3.1. *The gradient of the negative log-likelihood for the Vecchia approximation given in Equation (15) can be calculated as*

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{L}(y, F, \theta)}{\partial \theta_k} = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(2u_k^T u + u^T \frac{\partial D^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} u \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{D_i^\dagger} \frac{\partial D_i^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k}, \quad 1 < k \leq q,$$

where $\tilde{L}(y, F, \theta)$ denotes the approximate negative log-likelihood and

$$u = D^{\dagger^{-1}} B(y - F) \quad \text{and} \quad u_k = \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k}(y - F), \quad (17)$$

and $\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k}$ and $\frac{\partial D^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k}$ are lower triangular and diagonal matrices, respectively, with non-zero entries given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} \right)_{i, N(i)} &= - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \theta_k} \\ &= - \left(Z \frac{\partial \Sigma^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} Z^T \right)_{i, N(i)} \left(\left(Z \Sigma^\dagger Z^T + I_n \right)_{N(i)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \left(Z \Sigma^\dagger Z^T \right)_{i, N(i)} \left(\left(Z \Sigma^\dagger Z^T + I_n \right)_{N(i)} \right)^{-1} \left(Z \frac{\partial \Sigma^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} Z^T \right)_{N(i)} \left(\left(Z \Sigma^\dagger Z^T + I_n \right)_{N(i)} \right)^{-1}, \\ \frac{\partial D_i^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} &= \left(Z \frac{\partial \Sigma^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} Z^T \right)_{i, i} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \theta_k} \left(Z^T \Sigma^\dagger Z \right)_{N(i), i} - A_i \left(Z^T \frac{\partial \Sigma^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} Z \right)_{N(i), i}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c^\dagger(s_l, s_k) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} c(s_l, s_k)$.

A proof can be found in Appendix A.

3.4.3 Vecchia approximation for the latent process b

Alternatively, one can apply a Vecchia approximation to the latent process b instead of the observed response process. This is what Finley et al. [2019] denote as collapsed nearest neighbor Gaussian process (NNGP) model. In doing so, one obtains an approximate precision matrix

$$\tilde{\Sigma}^\dagger^{-1} = B^T D^\dagger^{-1} B,$$

where B and D^\dagger are defined analogously as above excluding the error variance term, though. The approximate covariance matrix for the response variable is then given by

$$\tilde{\Psi}^\dagger = Z \tilde{\Sigma}^\dagger Z^T + I_n.$$

In this case, gradients of the log-likelihood need to be calculated using the standard formula in Equation (10). Computational costs for calculating the log-likelihood and its gradients can be reduced by using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula for the inverse of the covariance matrix

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}} = \left(Z \tilde{\Sigma}^\dagger Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n \right)^{-1} = \sigma^{-2} I_n - \sigma^{-2} Z (\sigma^2 \tilde{\Sigma}^\dagger^{-1} + Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T.$$

Further, the derivatives of the covariance matrix are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} &= Z \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \left(B^{-1} D^\dagger B^{-T} \right) Z^T \\ &= -Z B^{-1} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D^\dagger B^{-T} Z^T - Z B^{-1} D^\dagger B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} Z^T + Z B^{-1} \frac{\partial D^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} Z^T \end{aligned}$$

In comparison to the Vecchia approximation for the observed process, evaluations of both the likelihood and also gradients are more expensive.

3.5 Fisher information for covariance parameters

For the mixed effects model in Equation (1), the Fisher information matrix I for the covariance parameters θ has entries

$$(I)_{kl} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\Psi^{-1} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \theta_k} \Psi^{-1} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \theta_l} \right), \quad 1 \leq k, l \leq q.$$

The Fisher information can be used for finding a maximum of the approximate likelihood using the Fisher scoring algorithm. Further, for the linear case, asymptotic theory [Stein, 1999] suggests that if the smallest eigenvalue of I tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we can expect that

$$I(\hat{\theta})^{1/2} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I),$$

where θ_0 denotes the population parameter and $I(\hat{\theta})^{1/2}$ is some matrix square root. Based on this, one can construct approximate confidence sets or intervals for θ .

3.5.1 Fisher information for the Vecchia approximation

In the following, we show how the Fisher information for the Vecchia approximation in (15) can be calculated efficiently. To the best of our knowledge, this result is novel.

Proposition 3.2. *The Fisher information for the Vecchia approximation matrix in (15) has entries*

$$(I)_{kl} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} \right)_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D \right)_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i^{-2} \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \theta_k} \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \theta_l}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq q, \quad (18)$$

where, for $1 < k \leq q$,

$$\frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \theta_k} = \sigma^2 \frac{\partial D_i^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k}$$

and $\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k}$ and $\frac{\partial D_i^\dagger}{\partial \theta_k}$ are defined in Proposition 3.1, and for the error variance ($k = 1$), these derivatives are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial B}{\partial \sigma^2} \right)_{i,N(i)} &= - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \sigma^2} \\ &= (Z \Sigma Z^T)_{i,N(i)} \left((Z \Sigma Z^T + \sigma^2 I_n)_{N(i)} \right)^{-2}, \\ \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \sigma^2} &= 1 - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \sigma^2} (Z^T \Sigma Z)_{N(i),i}. \end{aligned}$$

A proof can be found in Appendix A. Concerning approximate standard errors, we note that since the Vecchia approximation results in a misspecified model, the Fisher information matrix needs to be replaced by the Godambe information matrix [Godambe, 1960] $G = H I^{-1} H$, where H is the negative expected Hessian of the log-likelihood, to obtain an approximate covariance matrix for $\hat{\theta}$ and corresponding confidence sets.

3.6 Prediction

Let $y_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$ denote samples for which predictions should be made. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ y_p \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} F(X) \\ F(X_p) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} Z_o \\ Z_p \end{pmatrix} b^* + \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon \\ \epsilon_p \end{pmatrix}, \\ &\sim \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} F(X) \\ F(X_p) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n & Z_o \Sigma Z_p^T \\ Z_p \Sigma^* Z_o^T & Z_p \Sigma^* Z_p^T + \sigma^2 I_{n_p} \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where b^* denotes the vector of all random effects at observation and prediction locations, $\Sigma^* = \text{Cov}(b^*)$, the matrices Z_o and Z_p relate b^* to the observed and predicted variables y and y_p , and X_p is the covariate matrix for the predictions. From this it follows that the conditional distribution $y_p|y$ is given by

$$y_p|y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_p, \Xi_p),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= F(X_p) + Z_p \Sigma^* Z_o^T (Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} (y - F(X)) \\ \Xi_p &= Z_p \Sigma^* Z_p + \sigma^2 I_{n_p} - Z_p \Sigma^* Z_o^T (Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} Z_o \Sigma^* Z_p^T. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Depending on the application, i.e. if $n \gg m$, the above quantities can be more efficiently calculated using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$(Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} = \sigma^{-2} I_n - \sigma^{-2} Z_o (\sigma^2 \Sigma^{*-1} + Z_o^T Z_o)^{-1} Z_o^T.$$

Alternatively, one can also calculate the quantities in Equation (19) using

$$Z_p \Sigma^* Z_o^T (Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} = Z_p (\sigma^2 \Sigma^{*-1} + Z_o^T Z_o)^{-1} Z_o^T.$$

This follows by applying the push-through identity

$$\Sigma^* Z_o^T (Z_o \Sigma^* Z_o^T + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} = (\Sigma^* Z_o^T Z_o + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} \Sigma^* Z_o^T$$

and the fact that

$$(\Sigma^* Z_o^T Z_o + \sigma^2 I_n)^{-1} = (\sigma^2 \Sigma^{*-1} + Z_o^T Z_o)^{-1} \Sigma^{*-1}.$$

Further, if predictions are to be made for the latent $F(X_p) + Z_p b^*$ instead of the observable variable y_p , the error variance term $\sigma^2 I_{n_p}$ is dropped from the covariance matrix in (19).

3.6.1 Prediction using the Vecchia approximation

Similarly as for parameter estimation, Vecchia approximations can also be used for making predictions. Specifically, predictions can be obtained by applying a Vecchia approximation to the joint response vector at observed and prediction locations. When doing so, one has to choose an ordering among the joint set of observed and predicted locations. We assume that either the observed or the predicted locations appear first in the ordering of the response variable. The former has the advantage that the nearest neighbors found for estimation can be reused and that the predictive distributions have the simple form given in Equation (20). On the other hand, if prediction locations appear first in the ordering, the approximations of predictive distributions are generally more accurate. See Katzfuss et al. [2018] for a comparison of different approaches for making predictions with Vecchia approximations.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that prediction are made at n_p locations $s_{p,1}, \dots, s_{p,n_p}$ with covariate data X_p . When applying the Vecchia approximation in Equation (15) to the response vector $(y, y_p)^T$ with the observed response y appearing first in the ordering, the conditional distribution $y_p|y$ is given by*

$$y_p|y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_p, \Xi_p),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= F(X_p) - B_p^{-1} B_{po} (y - F(X)) \\ \Xi_p &= B_p^{-1} D_p B_p^{-T}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

and $B_{po} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n}$, $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n_p}$, $D_p^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n_p}$ are the following submatrices of the Vecchia approximated precision matrix $\tilde{Cov}((y, y_p)^T)^{-1}$:

$$\tilde{Cov}((y, y_p)^T)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ B_{po} & B_p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} D^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & D_p^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ B_{po} & B_p \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

and B and D are defined in Equations (13) and (14).

A proof can be found in Appendix A. Note that D_p is a diagonal matrix, B_p is a lower triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal and non-zero off-diagonal entries corresponding to the nearest neighbors of the prediction locations among the prediction locations themselves $s_{p,1}, \dots, s_{p,n_p}$, and B_{po} has non-zero entries corresponding to the nearest neighbors of the prediction locations among the observed locations s_1, \dots, s_n .

If only univariate predictive distributions are of interest, computational costs can be additionally reduced when restricting that one conditions on observed locations only in Equation (12). The latter means that for every prediction location $s_{p,i}$, one conditions only on observed data $y_{N(i)}$ where $N(i)$ denotes the set of nearest neighbors for location $s_{p,i}$. In this case, B_p is an identity matrix and the predictive covariance matrix Ξ_p is a diagonal matrix. The latter can be a drawback if multivariate predictive distributions are of interest.

Proposition 3.4. *Assume that prediction are made at n_p locations $s_{p,1}, \dots, s_{p,n_p}$ with covariate data X_p . When applying the Vecchia approximation in Equation (15) to the response vector $(y_p, y)^T$ with the predicted response y_p appearing first in the ordering, the conditional distribution $y_p|y$ is given by*

$$y_p|y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_p, \Xi_p),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= F(X_p) - (B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_p + B_{op}^T D_o^{-1} B_{op})^{-1} B_{op}^T D_o^{-1} B_o (y - F(X)) \\ \Xi_p &= (B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_p + B_{op}^T D_o^{-1} B_{op})^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $B_o, D_o \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_{op} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_p}$, $B_p, D_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n_p}$, $D_p^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n_p}$ are the following submatrices of the Vecchia approximated precision matrix $\tilde{Cov}((y_p, y)^T)^{-1}$:

$$\tilde{Cov}((y_p, y)^T)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} B_p & 0 \\ B_{op} & B_o \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} D_p^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & D_o^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_p & 0 \\ B_{op} & B_o \end{pmatrix}.$$

A proof can be found in Appendix A.

3.7 Software implementation

The GPBoost algorithm is implemented in the `gpboost` library written in C++ with a C application programming interface (API) and corresponding R and Python packages. See <https://github.com/fabsig/GPBoost> for more information. For linear algebra calculations, we rely on the `Eigen` library [Guennebaud et al., 2010]. Sparse matrix algebra is used, in particular for calculating Cholesky decompositions, whenever covariance matrices are sparse, e.g. in the case of grouped random effects. In addition, to speed up computations for solving sparse linear triangular equation systems where the right-hand side is also sparse, we use the function `cs_spsolve` from the `CSparse` library [Davis, 2005] where the non-zero entries of the solutions are determined using a depth-first search algorithm. Further, multi-processor parallelization is done using `OpenMP`. Finally, for the tree-boosting part, in particular the tree growing algorithm, we use the `LightGBM` library [Ke et al., 2017].

4 Simulated experiments

In the following, we use simulation to investigate the predictive accuracy as well as the properties of the covariances parameter and mean function estimates of the GPBoost algorithm.

4.1 Methods considered

We compare our proposed methodology with the following alternative approaches: linear mixed effects models, model-based boosting ('mboost') [Hothorn et al., 2010], mixed-effect random forest ('MERF') [Hajjem et al., 2014], RE-EM trees ('REEMtree') [Sela and Simonoff, 2012], and standard gradient boosting with a squared loss ('LSBoost'). In addition to the GPBoost algorithm, we also consider the GPBoostOOS algorithm where covariance parameters are estimated using 4-fold cross-validation. The MERF and REEMtree algorithms can only be used for the grouped random effects and not for the Gaussian process models. For all boosting algorithms, we use gradient boosting without Nesterov acceleration and trees as base learners, except for the grouped and spatial random effects in mboost. Unless otherwise stated, standard gradient boosting with a squared loss includes the locations of the Gaussian process and the categorical grouping variable for the grouped random effects as additional covariates for the mean function F . For the linear mixed effects models, the GPBoost algorithm, and the GPBoostOOS algorithm, covariance parameters θ are estimated using Nesterov accelerated gradient descent. Learning and prediction with the GPBoost and GPBoostOOS algorithms, the linear models, and boosting with a square loss is done using the GPBoost library. Concerning mboost, we use the `mboost` R package [Hofner et al., 2014], where spatial effects are modeled using bivariate P-spline base-learner (`bspatial` with `df=6`), grouped random effects are modeled using random effects base learners (`brandom` with `df=4`), and all other predictor variables are modeled using trees as base learners. For the MERF algorithm, we use the `merf` Python package, and for the REEMtree algorithm, we use the `REEMtree` R package. The number of iterations of the MERF algorithm is set to 100. Increasing this value does not change our findings (results not reported). However, we note that we often do not observe convergence of the MERF algorithm, no matter how long we let it run.⁶ This might be related to the fact that the MERF algorithm is not a properly defined EM algorithm; see Section 1.1. All calculations are done on a standard laptop with a 2.9 GHz quad-core processor and 16 GB of random-access memory (RAM).

4.2 Evaluation criteria

Concerning predictive accuracy, we measure both the accuracy of point predictions and probabilistic predictions. Probabilistic predictions are obtained for mixed effects models as outlined in Section 3.6. For the two approaches that do not rely on a probabilistic model for the random effects (mboost and LSBoost), we estimate the variance of the residuals on the training data and use this for obtaining an independent Gaussian predictive distribution. Further, we evaluate the accuracy of univariate point and probabilistic predictions in two different ways. First, by making predictions for the same realization of a Gaussian process or

⁶This is an observation that has also been made by the creator of the `MERF` package in a blog post; see <https://towardsdatascience.com/mixed-effects-random-forests-6ecbb85cb177> (retrieved on April 3, 2020).

grouped random effects as the ones in the training data and, second, by making predictions for random effects that are independent of the ones in the training data. In the first case, the test data contains random effects for groups that are already included in the training data, and for Gaussian processes, it contains dependent samples from the same Gaussian process realization at different locations s_p . In the second scenario, the test data consists of random effects for groups that have not been observed in the training data and of samples from an independent Gaussian process realization. We use these two different forms of prediction evaluations since in practice both types of predictions are required. Further, we also evaluate the predictive accuracy of multivariate predictions. Specifically, we generate multivariate predictions and calculate point and probabilistic predictions for their averages. In addition, we also predict $(1-\alpha)$ quantiles and $(1-\alpha)$ prediction intervals for the averages, where $\alpha = 0.05$. For grouped random effects, such multivariate average predictions are required, for instance, when predicting the average price of products offered by several sellers, where every product is offered by multiple sellers; see e.g. Sela and Simonoff [2012] and the application in Section 5. Further, in the case of Gaussian processes, such quantities are calculated, for instance, in meteorology for predicting the average, or equivalently the total, precipitation over a catchment area or in real estate for predicting the total value of a portfolio of objects. Note that if a multivariate predictive distribution is given by $y_p|y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_p, \Xi_p)$, then the predictive distribution of the average is obtained as

$$\bar{y}_p|y \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mu}_p, \mathbf{1}^T \Xi_p \mathbf{1}/n^2),$$

where \bar{y} denotes the equally weighted average $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$ for a vector y and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of ones $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. In addition, we also evaluate the accuracy to predict the mean function F and the random effects b . Concerning the latter, we measure the accuracy to predict random effects for existing groups and for Gaussian processes, we evaluate predictions for the same realizations of b at novel locations. Finally, we also consider the accuracy of the variance and covariance parameter estimates measured using the root mean square error (RMSE).

All point predictions are evaluated using the RMSE and probabilistic predictions are evaluated using the continuous ranked probability score (CRPS) [Gneiting et al., 2007]. Further, quantile predictions are evaluated using the proper scoring rule [Gneiting et al., 2007]

$$S(y, \hat{y}) = (y - \hat{y})(\alpha - 1_{\{y \leq \hat{y}\}})$$

and prediction intervals are evaluated using the interval score [Gneiting et al., 2007]

$$S(y, l, u) = u - l + \frac{2}{\alpha}(l - y)1_{\{y < l\}} + \frac{2}{\alpha}(y - u)1_{\{y > u\}},$$

where l and u denote the lower and upper limits of a prediction interval. In contrast to simply considering the coverage frequency, the interval score also takes the width of a prediction interval into account.⁷

We note that for the boosting approaches which model the spatial or grouped random effect using base learners (LSBoost and mboost), no estimates for covariance parameters

⁷The coverage frequency can easily be gamed. For instance, by first sampling a Bernoulli variable with success probability α , and then returning as prediction interval either $(0, 0)$ or $(-\infty, \infty)$ depending on whether the Bernoulli variable equals one or zero. Despite being nonsensical, prediction intervals from this procedure have the correct coverage probability of $(1 - \alpha)$ assuming that the response variable is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

can be obtained. Further, the `mboost` package does not allow for obtaining predictions for (i) independent realizations of random effects and (ii) separate predictions for the mean function F excluding spatial or grouped effects. In the case of grouped random effects, we circumvent this by assigning the test data a certain group from the training data and then subtracting the value of the estimated random effect for this group from the obtained predictions. For least squares boosting, we obtain predictions for independent realizations of random effects and the mean function by assuming missing values in the grouping variable and the locations, which are then handled in the same way as in the LightGBM implementation [Ke et al., 2017].⁸

4.3 Simulation setting

For the random effects term Zb , we consider grouped random effects with a single level of grouping and a spatial Gaussian process model with an exponential covariance function $c(s, s') = \sigma_1^2 \exp(-\|s - s'\|/\rho)$, where the locations s are uniformly sampled in $[0, 1]^2$ and $\rho = 0.1$. The marginal variance in both models is set to $\sigma_1^2 = 1$ and the error variance equals $\sigma^2 = 1$ such that we have a signal-to-noise ratio of 1 between the random effect and the nugget effect. Concerning the mean function F , we consider the following different functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
F(X) &= C \cdot \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{X_2 X_3 - 1 - \frac{1}{X_2 X_4}}{X_1} \right), \quad X = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)^T, \quad (\text{'friedman3'}), \\
X_1 &\sim \text{Unif}(0, 100), X_2 \sim \text{Unif}(40\pi, 560\pi), X_3 \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1), X_4 \sim \text{Unif}(1, 11), \\
F(X) &= C \cdot (2X_1 + X_2^2 + 4 \cdot 1_{\{X_3 > 0\}} + 2 \log(|X_1|)X_3), \quad X = (X_1, \dots, X_9)^T, \quad (\text{'hajjem'}), \\
X &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_9), \\
F(X) &= C \cdot (1 + X_1 + X_2), \quad X = (X_1, X_2)^T, \quad (\text{'linear'}), \\
X_1, X_2 &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Unif}(0, 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

The function 'friedman3' was first used in Friedman [1991] and has since then often been used to compare non-parametric regression models, and the function 'hajjem' has been used in Hajjem et al. [2014] to compare non-parametric mixed effects models. We also include a linear function in order to investigate how our approach compares to a linear mixed effects model when the data generating process is linear. The constant C is chosen such that the variance of $F(X)$ equals 1, i.e. that $F(X)$ has the same signal strength as the random effect.

We simulate 100 times training data sets of size n and test data sets using the specification in Equation (1). Specifically, we use a sample size of $n = 5000$ for the grouped random effects with 100 different groups each containing 50 samples. For the Gaussian process model, we use a sample size of $n = 500$. The reason for using a smaller sample size is that this allows us to do all calculations exactly and avoid any approximation error due to a large data approximation. In Section 3, we show how learning can be done for large data,

⁸Whenever there is a missing value in a variable required when passing a node in a tree, the default direction is used. Since in our case, there is no missing data in the training data, this corresponds to the direction with the largest amount of training data.

and we use this in the application in Section 5. All models are trained on the training data and evaluated on the test data. Tuning parameters are chosen using cross-validation on the training data; see Section 4.4 below. As mentioned above in Section 4.2, in every simulation run, we generate two test data sets of size n , where the first one contains random effects of the same realization of a Gaussian process or grouped random effects as in the training data, and the second test data contains samples with random effects that are independent of the ones in the training data. Further, for the multivariate predictions, we simulate additional test data as follows. In every simulation iteration, we simulate 100 additional samples of size 20 for which we calculate point and distribution forecasts for the average, quantiles of the average, and prediction intervals for the average. The simulation of the samples for the average is done by sampling the random effects independently from the observed data. Further, we restrict the range of the covariates by cutting the support of every covariate X_j in (23) into ten intervals based on deciles, randomly selecting an interval in every inner simulation iteration, and sampling the covariate X_j only from this interval. The latter is used to mimic applications where covariates are not equally distributed over their entire support when predicting an average or a sum. Note that in all test sets considered here, the function F is evaluated for unobserved covariates X .

4.4 Choice of tuning parameters

For the boosting algorithms (GPBoost, LSBoost, mboost), tuning parameters are chosen using 4-fold cross-validation on the training data with the RMSE as criterion and ignoring the random effects for predictions for the GPBoost model.⁹ We consider the following grid of tuning parameters: the number of boosting iterations $M \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}$, the learning rate $\nu \in \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$, the maximal depth of the trees $\in \{1, 5, 10\}$, and the minimum number of samples per leaf $\in \{1, 5\}$. To reduce the computational effort, we simulate an additional training data and choose the learning rate, the tree depth, and the minimum number of samples on this data. In every simulation run, we then only choose the number of boosting iterations using 4-fold cross-validation on the training data with early stopping applied when the RMSE does not decrease for more than five iterations for the GPBoost and LSBoost algorithms. To investigate the impact of the choice of tuning parameters, we also consider the GPBoost algorithm where only the number of iterations is selected using cross-validation and the learning rate is held fixed at $\nu = 0.1$, the tree depth is set to 10, and the minimal number of samples per leaf is 5. We refer to this as 'GPBFixLR' in the results below. For random forests, the choice of the tuning parameters is less sensitive compared to boosting. Nonetheless, for MERF, we choose the number of trees $\in \{100, 300, 500\}$, the maximal depth of the trees $\in \{1, 5, 10\}$, and the proportion of variables considered for making splits $\in \{0.5, 0.75, 1\}$ by minimizing the generalized log-likelihood (GLL) criterion [Hajjem et al., 2014]. For the REEMtree algorithm, which relies on the `rpart` R package, trees are cost-complexity pruned and the amount of pruning is chosen using 10-fold cross-validation on the training data.

⁹Also including predictions of the random effect components gives very similar results but is computationally slightly more demanding (results not tabulated).

4.5 Results

For the 'friedman3' mean function, the results for the grouped random effects and the spatial Gaussian process models are reported in Tables 1 and 2. The results for the other mean functions are reported in Appendix B.1. We report average values of the predictive accuracy metrics as well as standard deviations over the simulation runs. Further, we also calculate p-values from paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. Specifically, for every evaluation criterion, we test the null hypothesis of equality between the GPBoost algorithm and every alternative approach using the paired samples from the different simulation runs.

	GPBoost	LinearME	LSBoost	mboost	MERF	REEMtree	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.045	1.215	1.059	1.134	1.045	1.1	1.055	1.046
(sd)	(0.01)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.011)
(p-val)		(5.6e-123)	(1.5e-60)	(1.6e-91)	(0.00053)	(5.4e-88)	(1.4e-53)	(1.7e-12)
RMSE_indep	1.426	1.548	1.433	1.428	1.428	1.465	1.433	1.428
(sd)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
(p-val)		(2.4e-111)	(5.8e-17)	(2.4e-09)	(0.0014)	(9e-84)	(1e-43)	(3e-12)
RMSE_avg	0.5645	0.7937	0.5838	0.5685	0.5678	1.085	0.5677	0.567
(sd)	(0.044)	(0.059)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.045)	(0.11)	(0.044)	(0.044)
(p-val)		(1.1e-65)	(1e-15)	(0.00091)	(0.009)	(2.6e-72)	(0.00064)	(0.00017)
CRPS_avg	0.3198	0.4567	0.383	0.359	0.3216	0.6245	0.3215	0.3213
(sd)	(0.025)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.033)	(0.026)	(0.066)	(0.026)	(0.026)
(p-val)		(3.6e-63)	(3.4e-57)	(2.1e-56)	(0.016)	(6.4e-71)	(0.0015)	(0.00011)
QL_avg	0.05802	0.08124	0.1121	0.1036	0.05765	0.1057	0.05835	0.05804
(sd)	(0.0065)	(0.012)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.0058)	(0.019)	(0.0064)	(0.0067)
(p-val)		(5.6e-38)	(9e-37)	(2.3e-40)	(0.15)	(5e-49)	(0.1)	(0.92)
IS_avg	2.671	4.728	8.184	6.238	2.68	9.488	2.682	2.679
(sd)	(0.33)	(0.84)	(1.3)	(1)	(0.34)	(2)	(0.32)	(0.33)
(p-val)		(7.9e-46)	(1.7e-71)	(3.9e-67)	(0.37)	(2.1e-56)	(0.27)	(0.21)
RMSE_F	0.2152	0.6452	0.2572	0.2267	0.2241	0.3985	0.2567	0.2222
(sd)	(0.02)	(0.014)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.02)	(0.019)
(p-val)		(7.2e-140)	(2.6e-26)	(1.8e-20)	(9.8e-06)	(2.1e-100)	(4.9e-62)	(5.8e-27)
RMSE_b	0.2315	0.2636		0.4924	0.2378	0.2411	0.2338	0.2319
(sd)	(0.017)	(0.016)		(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
(p-val)		(3.1e-64)		(3.6e-103)	(0.00016)	(6.6e-43)	(1.1e-16)	(0.038)
sigma2	0.1151	0.4069	0.2802	0.1369	0.04671	0.06467	0.055	0.1412
sigma2_b	0.1021	0.1022			0.1023	0.1008	0.1022	0.1021
time (s)	2.192	0.05069	0.4414	11.3	186.3	0.879	5.675	2.181

Table 1: Results for the grouped random effects model and mean function $F = \text{'friedman3'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

We start discussing the results for the grouped random effects reported in Table 1. First, we find that the GPBoost algorithm clearly outperforms a linear mixed effects model (LinearME), gradient boosting with a square loss (LSBoost) with the grouping variable included in the mean function, the mboost approach, as wells as the REEMtree algorithm

in all predictive accuracy metrics with all differences being highly significant. Further, we observe that the GPBoost algorithm generally has slightly higher accuracy than the MERF algorithm, and most of the differences are significant but relatively small. Specifically, for univariate predictions for samples of both observed and unobserved groups ('RMSE' and 'RMSE_indep'), GPBoost performs significantly better than MERF. For multivariate predictions, i.e. predictions of averages across several groups, we find that GPBoost is better in terms of RMSE ('RMSE_avg'), CRPS ('CRPS_avg') and the interval score ('IS_avg'), and MERF outperforms GPBoost in terms of the quantile loss ('QL_avg'). Further, GPBoost learns, or predicts, both the mean function F and the random effects b significantly better than all alternative techniques. Concerning parameter estimates, we observe no major differences among the method in the RMSE of the variance of the random effects ('sigma2.b'). For the error variance σ^2 , we observe large differences, though. In particular, the GPBoost algorithm has an RMSE that is smaller than the ones of a linear mixed effects model, least squares boosting, and mboost, but a larger RMSE than the ones of MERF and REEMtree. This is due to a downwards bias in the estimates produced by the GPBoost algorithm (results not tabulated). As discussed in Section 3.3, this finding is in line with the recent observation that state-of-the-art machine learning methods can interpolate the training data while at the same time having a low generalization error [Zhang et al., 2017, Wyner et al., 2017, Belkin et al., 2018]. When estimating the covariance parameters on out-of-sample data using cross-validation in the GPBoostOOS Algorithm 2, the RMSE of the error variance is of the same magnitude as the one of MERF and REEMtree. Note that the MERF algorithm also estimates covariance parameters using out-of-sample data. Finally, we also report the wall-clock time in seconds needed for training the different models. Here we observe a large difference between the GPBoost and the MERF algorithm, the second best competitor in terms of predictive accuracy, with the GPBoost algorithm running almost two orders of magnitude faster than the MERF algorithm. Further, mboost takes approximately five times as much time as the GPBoost algorithm. As expected, the linear mixed effects model, least squares gradient boosting, and the REEMtree algorithm run faster than the GPBoost algorithm.

Concerning the results for the 'hajjem' mean function reported in Table 5 in the appendix, we find qualitatively similar results as for the 'friedman3' mean function. Note that due to a smaller learning rate chosen using cross-validation for the GPBoost algorithm, more boosting iterations are done which translates into a larger computational time. However, when fixing the learning rate at $\nu = 0.1$ ('GPBFixLR'), the computational time is approximately equal as in the previous experiment with the predictive accuracy being only slightly lower. Finally, as expected, the linear mixed effects model performs best in the case where the mean function is linear; see Table 6 in the appendix. Interestingly, the differences to the GPBoost algorithm are of small, albeit significant, magnitude. Except for the linear model, the GPBoost algorithm outperforms all other approaches, and the differences between the GPBoost algorithm and the next best approach (MERF), are of similar magnitude as the one between GPBoost and the linear model.

We next discuss the results for the Gaussian process model reported in Table 2. Apart from a linear Gaussian process model, we consider two boosting approaches that model the spatial effect using base learners (LSBoost and mboost) as alternatives. We find that the GPBoost algorithm has significantly higher predictive accuracy compared to all alternative approaches in all metrics considered. The same holds also for the 'hajjem' mean function

	GPBoost	LinearGP	LSBoost	mboost	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.291	1.375	1.404	1.343	1.293	1.317
(sd)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.063)	(0.058)	(0.046)	(0.046)
(p-val)		(4.1e-49)	(9.9e-41)	(3.4e-28)	(0.04)	(2e-14)
CRPS	0.7291	0.7743	0.8255	0.7606	0.7297	0.7704
(sd)	(0.028)	(0.03)	(0.043)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.034)
(p-val)		(1.1e-47)	(7.1e-48)	(3.7e-29)	(0.42)	(2.4e-31)
RMSE_indep	1.51	1.578	1.621		1.51	1.524
(sd)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.2)		(0.084)	(0.084)
(p-val)		(5.3e-37)	(2.2e-08)		(0.74)	(4.5e-08)
CRPS_indep	0.8549	0.8909	0.9829		0.8538	0.8758
(sd)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.16)		(0.049)	(0.056)
(p-val)		(2.6e-34)	(1.3e-13)		(0.078)	(7.3e-22)
RMSE_avg	0.5998	0.7268	2.291		0.5928	0.6083
(sd)	(0.07)	(0.072)	(0.94)		(0.07)	(0.074)
(p-val)		(3e-40)	(7.9e-33)		(0.0017)	(0.075)
CRPS_avg	0.349	0.4315	2.041		0.3457	0.3642
(sd)	(0.051)	(0.054)	(0.94)		(0.049)	(0.055)
(p-val)		(5.5e-38)	(6.6e-33)		(0.017)	(2.8e-06)
QL_avg	0.07662	0.08915	1.674		0.07722	0.08575
(sd)	(0.034)	(0.041)	(0.95)		(0.033)	(0.043)
(p-val)		(9.7e-10)	(9.3e-31)		(0.24)	(8e-06)
IS_avg	4.313	5.967	71.7		3.989	5.155
(sd)	(1.2)	(1.6)	(37)		(1.1)	(1.6)
(p-val)		(5.6e-28)	(3.6e-33)		(3.1e-15)	(5.4e-13)
RMSE_F	0.5162	0.6877	0.7442		0.515	0.5627
(sd)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.29)		(0.069)	(0.067)
(p-val)		(1.2e-60)	(3e-12)		(0.64)	(6.1e-19)
RMSE_b	0.6981	0.7095			0.6973	0.7129
(sd)	(0.051)	(0.051)			(0.051)	(0.053)
(p-val)		(1.7e-08)			(0.34)	(3.6e-10)
sigma2	0.1392	0.3862	0.2796	0.3888	0.2447	0.6427
sigma2_b	0.2325	0.2514			0.2392	0.255
rho	0.06738	0.05813			0.075	0.05796
time (s)	50.97	1.432	0.1088	2.567	118.5	20.51

Table 2: Results for the Gaussian process model and mean function $F = \text{'friedman3'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

whose results are reported in Table 7 in the appendix. The linear model has again the highest predictive accuracy when the data generating process is linear; see Table 8 in the appendix. Despite the relatively small sample size of $n = 500$, the differences in predictive accuracy between the linear Gaussian process model and the GPBoost algorithm are relatively small but significant. In contrast to the larger sample size of the grouped random effects, the differences between the GPBoost and the GPBoostOOS algorithms in the accuracy of the error variance parameter σ^2 estimate are less pronounced. This is to be expected as the small sample size translates into high variance for the mean function

estimate and, consequently, the out-of-sample parameter estimate for σ^2 is also less efficient.

5 Real-world applications

In the following, we apply the GPBoost algorithm to two real-world data sets and compare its predictive accuracy to alternative existing techniques. We consider data sets for both grouped random effects and Gaussian process models.

5.1 Grouped random effects: transaction data

For grouped random effects, we consider data for third-party sellers on Amazon, where software titles are sold by multiple sellers and the goal is to predict the titles' prices. This data set has been previously studied by Sela and Simonoff [2012] in the context of non-parametric mixed effects models; see Ghose et al. [2005] for background on this data set and its first use. The data is an unbalanced panel consisting of 9484 transactions for 250 distinct software titles. I.e., the software titles constitute the grouping variable. The response variable is the relative price premium that a seller can command. This is calculated as the logarithm of the ratio of the price at which a good is sold over the price of all competing goods in the marketplace. Covariates include both the sellers reputation and characteristics of its competitors and the item. Specifically, we consider the following predictor variables: the proportion of positive, negative, and neutral comments a seller has received in the past (PLIFE, NGLIFE, NLIFE), the total number of comments received from buyers over the last 30 days, 90 days, and year (COUNTTH, COUNTNY, COUNTRYR), the item condition (SellerCond), the seller rating (SellerRating), the lifetime of the seller (SellerLife), the number of competitors (Competitors), the length of time that the seller has been in the marketplace (PostHours), the quality of competing goods in the marketplace (AvgCompCondition), the average reputation of the competitors (AvgCompRating), and the average prices of the competing goods (AvgCompPrice), and the average lifetime of the competitors (AvgCompLife).¹⁰

In the following, we compare the predictive accuracy using 4-fold cross-validation. Similarly as in the simulation study, we evaluate the predictive accuracy of univariate predictions (i) when doing cross-validation at the observation level and (ii) when doing cross-validation at the grouping level. In the former case, we randomly partition every group, i.e. all observations of every software title, into four equally sized sets to create four test and training data sets, where each test set contains approximately a quarter of the observations of every group and the remaining observations are in the training set. Groups with less than four observations are always assigned to the training data. Concerning predictions of observations from new groups, 4-fold cross-validation is done at the group level so that predictions are done for observations of groups that are not included in the training data. In addition, for the group level cross-validation, we also evaluate the accuracy for predicting averages obtained from multivariate probabilistic predictions. Specifically, from all groups in the test data, we iteratively choose four groups and partition the samples of every group equally to

¹⁰The data contains nine additional covariates with missing values: the proportion of positive, negative, and neutral comments a seller has received in the past 30 days, 90 days, and year. Since Sela and Simonoff [2012] finds that these variables are not important for predictive accuracy (they are never selected for making splits in the tree algorithm and linear models excluding these variables and including them by first imputing them have essentially the same predictive accuracy), we exclude them.

four smaller test sets. Thus, every such small test subset contains one-fourth of the data of the four groups, and there is thus dependence among the data in the test set since some observations belong to the same group. We then make multivariate predictions for these smaller test subsets and calculate predictive distributions for their averages. We compare the GPBoost algorithms to the same alternative methods as in the simulation study; see Section 4.1. We recall that for least squares gradient boosting (LSBoost), we include the grouping variables as an additional predictor variable for the mean function. Tuning parameters are chosen by doing additional 4-fold cross-validation on every of the four training data sets, and we use the same set of tuning parameters as in the simulation study; see Section 4.4. Further, we also consider the same evaluation criteria as in the simulation study. In particular, deterministic point predictions are evaluated using the RMSE, and probabilistic average predictions, which involve a prediction of the second-order structure, are evaluated using the CRPS, the quantile loss, and the interval score; see Section 4.2 for more details. Finally, we report p-values calculated using paired t-tests at the observation level accounting for the fact that evaluation criteria for the same observations are dependent. For the RMSE, we perform tests for the squared error.

	GPBoost	LinearME	LSBoost	mboost	MERF	REEMtree
RMSE	0.2034	0.3499	0.1941	0.2284	0.2035	0.248
(p-val)		(1.6e-105)	(0.024)	(6e-09)	(0.98)	(1.1e-15)
RMSE_indep	0.2649	0.3799	0.2643	0.2673	0.2669	0.2895
(p-val)		(6.3e-129)	(0.78)	(0.22)	(0.37)	(8.6e-19)
RMSE_avg	0.0848	0.135	0.1124	0.1045	0.09155	0.1039
(p-val)		(1.2e-09)	(7.2e-07)	(0.0074)	(0.12)	(0.0037)
CRPS_avg	0.04789	0.07411	0.06215	0.05586	0.05098	0.07175
(p-val)		(3.1e-16)	(5.1e-10)	(0.00048)	(0.19)	(6.6e-10)
QL_avg	0.0116	0.01361	0.01225	0.01301	0.01534	0.03006
(p-val)		(0.043)	(0.52)	(0.26)	(0.093)	(1.2e-08)
IS_avg	0.5103	0.6191	0.6031	0.5628	0.907	2.28
(p-val)		(0.0017)	(0.0012)	(0.18)	(0.00021)	(2e-22)

Table 3: Comparison of predictive accuracy for transaction data. The numbers in parentheses are p-values calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

The results are summarized in Table 3. Concerning point predictions for observations of already observed groups ('RMSE') and observations of unobserved groups ('RMSE_indep'), GPBoost, MERF, and LSBoost have almost the same predictive accuracy, with only LSBoost being marginally significantly better at the 5% level compared to GPBoost for the RMSE. The linear mixed effects model, mboost, and the REEMtree algorithm have significantly worse predictive accuracy than the GPBoost algorithm, except for mboost for group-level predictions ('RMSE_indep'). Concerning the prediction of averages calculated from multivariate predictions, we observe that the GPBoost algorithm outperforms all other methods with the majority of the differences being significant. In particular, GPBoost has considerably higher predictive accuracy than both a linear mixed effects model and gradient boosting with a square loss. Except for the interval score for the prediction interval, the differences between the MERF and GPBoost algorithms are relatively small.

5.2 Gaussian process model: housing data

We consider house price data for 25/357 single family homes sold in Lucas County, Ohio. The data has originally been provided by the Spatial Econometrics Toolbox for Matlab, it is available in the `spData` R package [Bivand et al., 2008], and it has been previously studied by LeSage and Pace [2004], Bivand [2011], Dubé and Legros [2013]. The response variable is the logarithmic selling price. Further, the data includes the following predictor variables: `age`, `stories` (factor with levels {one, bilevel, multlvl, one+half, two, two+half, three}), `TLA` (total living area), `wall` (factor with levels {stucdrv, ccbtile, metlwnyl, brick, stone, wood partbrk}), `beds` (number of bedrooms), `baths` (number of full baths), `halfbaths` (number of halfbaths), `frontage` (lot frontage), `depth`, `garage` (factor with levels {no garage, basement, attached, detached, carport}), `garagesqft`, `rooms` (number of rooms), `lotsize`, `sdate` (selling date, factor with levels {1993,1994,1995,1996,1997,1998}), as well as longitude-latitude coordinates for the location. For the Gaussian process model with a linear mean function, we follow Bivand et al. [2008] and also include the square and cube of age as predictor variables, and as in Dubé and Legros [2013], we logarithmize the total living area and the lot size.

As in the previous examples, we compare the predictive accuracy using 4-fold cross-validation. In addition to univariate point and probabilistic predictions, we also generate multivariate predictions for predicting the total value of multiple objects as explained in the following. For every test set, we randomly select 100 times disjoint sets of 20 observations which are close together in space. Specifically, we iteratively randomly select a location and then determine its 19 nearest neighbors to obtain a set of 20 observations and then continue in the same manner with the remaining locations. For these sets of 20 objects, we then calculate predictive distributions for their sums obtained from multivariate predictive distributions.¹¹ As in the simulation study, we consider the following alternative approaches: a linear Gaussian process, gradient boosting with a square loss, and gradient boosting with spline base-learner for spatial effects using the `mboost` R package. For gradient boosting with a square loss and also the GPBoost algorithm, we include the coordinates as predictor variables in the mean function F . For comparison, we also report the results when excluding the coordinates from the mean function. The number of boosting iterations $M \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}$ and the learning rate $\nu \in \{0.1, 0.01\}$ are chosen using additional 4-fold cross-validation on every of the four training data sets. For GPBoost and LSBoost, early stopping is applied if the mean square error does not decrease for more than five iterations. Since cross-validation over a large grid of tuning parameters is computationally expensive for the GPBoost and `mboost` algorithms, we use a maximal tree depth of 10 and a minimal number of samples per leaf of 5. For boosting with a square loss, we have also done the selection of the tuning parameters using the larger grid of tuning parameters given in Section 4.4, and for every fold, the optimal combination of tuning parameters is equal to the one obtained when restricting the selection to the smaller grid. Further, for the GPBoost algorithms, we also include predictions from the Gaussian process and not just the mean function when making predictions during cross-validation since, here, we are only interested in predictions for the same realization of a Gaussian process for which we have observations. However, the results change only marginally when ignoring the predictions

¹¹For simplicity, we predict the sum on the logarithmic scale. If the sum should be predicted on the original scale, simulation is required as the sum of dependent log-normal variables does not follow a standard distribution.

from the Gaussian process in the cross-validation; see below and Appendix B.2. For all Gaussian process-based models, we use the Vecchia approximation as outlined in Sections 3.4 and 3.6.1. Specifically, for training, we use the Vecchia approximation for the response variable with 50 nearest neighbors and a random ordering of the observations; see Section 3.4.1. For prediction, we use the result in Proposition 3.3 with the observed data ordered first conditioning on observed data only when calculating the Vecchia approximation and using 500 nearest neighbors. Further, for generating multivariate predictive distributions of dimension 20, we use the same Vecchia approximation conditioning on all data and not just the observed data, however. The latter is computationally more expensive but it allows for obtaining more accurate, non-diagonal predictive covariance matrices; see Section 3.6.1 for more information.

	GPBoost	LinearGP	LSBoost	mboost	GPBoost_excl_coord	LSBoost_excl_coord
RMSE	0.2508	0.3252	0.2457	0.2973	0.2726	0.3216
(p-val)		(0)	(6.6e-07)	(0)	(3.7e-80)	(0)
CRPS	0.1329	0.1661	0.1294	0.1563	0.1433	0.1688
(p-val)		(0)	(2.8e-12)	(0)	(4.4e-90)	(0)
RMSE_sum	1.299	1.991	1.482	2.854	1.737	3.697
(p-val)		(1.9e-07)	(8.1e-05)	(8.3e-12)	(3.3e-06)	(1.2e-13)
CRPS_sum	0.7115	1.019	0.8167	1.544	0.9088	2.034
(p-val)		(4.5e-11)	(8.4e-05)	(1.6e-20)	(7e-08)	(2.2e-25)
QL_sum	0.1663	0.2659	0.2294	0.5736	0.2509	0.8828
(p-val)		(1.1e-05)	(8.5e-05)	(8.1e-10)	(3.9e-05)	(8.9e-13)
IS_sum	8.1	13.09	11	28.25	12.41	42.37
(p-val)		(9.6e-05)	(0.00012)	(3e-12)	(7.6e-05)	(1.1e-15)

Table 4: Comparison of predictive accuracy for housing data. The numbers in parentheses are p-values calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. ‘QL’ and ‘IS’ denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

The results are reported in Table 4. Concerning univariate predictions (‘RMSE’ and ‘CRPS’), we find that the GPBoost algorithm clearly outperforms a linear Gaussian process model and also the mboost approach. Further, least squares boosting with the coordinates included in the mean function marginally outperforms the GPBoost algorithm by approximately 2.0% and 2.6% for the RMSE and the CRPS, respectively. Due to the large sample size, these differences are significant. Concerning the predictions of sums of several objects, we find that the GPBoost algorithm has considerably higher predictive accuracy compared to all alternative approaches. All differences in RMSE (‘RMSE_sum’), CRPS (‘CRPS_sum’), quantile loss (‘QL_sum’), and interval score (‘IS_sum’) are large and significant. Interestingly, when comparing Gaussian process boosting (GPBoost) and least squares boosting (LSBoost), we also observe a large difference of approximately 14.1% in predictive accuracy for point predictions (‘RMSE_sum’). Further, the comparison between Gaussian process boosting without interactions between locations and the covariates (‘GPBoost_excl_coord’) and the corresponding gradient boosting version with the square loss (‘LSBoost_excl_coord’) shows that there is important residual spatial variation when conditioning on the effect of the predictor variables. Finally, the GPBoost algorithms with the coordinates in the mean function (‘GPBoost’) performs significantly better compared

to when not including the coordinates in the mean function ('GPBoost_excl_coord'). This is an indication that there are interaction effects between the predictor variables and the spatial locations.

6 Conclusion

We have introduced a novel way for combining boosting with Gaussian process and mixed effects models and we have shown that this leads to improved predictive accuracy compared to existing state-of-the-art methods for a large set of simulated and real-world data. Further, in the case that the mean function is indeed linear, the loss in predictive accuracy is relatively small. We are currently investigating how our approach can be extended to non-Gaussian data distributions using, e.g., Laplace approximations. Further, future research is required for convergence results concerning both the optimization problem, which is solved by the GPBoost algorithm, and asymptotic properties of the estimators obtained from the GPBoost algorithm.

Acknowledgments

We thank Hansruedi Künsch for very helpful comments on a first version of this article. Further, we are grateful to Jeff Simonoff for providing the transaction data.

References

- S. Banerjee, B. P. Carlin, and A. E. Gelfand. *Hierarchical modeling and analysis for spatial data*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2014.
- M. Belkin, S. Ma, and S. Mandal. To understand deep learning we need to understand kernel learning. In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 541–549, 2018.
- G. Biau, B. Cadre, and L. Rouvière. Accelerated gradient boosting. *Machine Learning*, 108(6):971–992, 2019.
- R. Bivand. After 'raising the bar': Applied maximum likelihood estimation of families of models in spatial econometrics. *NHH Dept. of Economics Discussion Paper*, (22), 2011.
- R. S. Bivand, E. J. Pebesma, V. Gomez-Rubio, and E. J. Pebesma. *Applied spatial data analysis with R*, volume 747248717. Springer, 2008.
- L. Breiman. Arcing classifiers. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 801–824, 1998.
- L. Breiman, J. Friedman, C. J. Stone, and R. A. Olshen. *Classification and regression trees*. CRC press, 1984.
- P. Bühlmann and T. Hothorn. Boosting algorithms: Regularization, prediction and model fitting. *Statistical Science*, pages 477–505, 2007.

- P. Bühlmann and B. Yu. Boosting with the l_2 loss: regression and classification. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462):324–339, 2003.
- P. Bühlmann et al. Boosting for high-dimensional linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(2):559–583, 2006.
- T. Chen and C. Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 785–794. ACM, 2016.
- N. Cressie and C. K. Wikle. *Statistics for spatio-temporal data*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- J. A. Dambon, F. Sigrist, and R. Furrer. Maximum likelihood estimation of spatially varying coefficient models for large data with an application to real estate price prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08089*, 2020.
- A. Datta, S. Banerjee, A. O. Finley, and A. E. Gelfand. Hierarchical nearest-neighbor gaussian process models for large geostatistical datasets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):800–812, 2016.
- T. Davis. Csparse: a concise sparse matrix package, 2005. URL <http://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/sparse/CSparse>.
- A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–22, 1977.
- J. Dubé and D. Legros. Dealing with spatial data pooled over time in statistical models. *Letters in Spatial and Resource Sciences*, 6(1):1–18, 2013.
- J. Elith, J. R. Leathwick, and T. Hastie. A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(4):802–813, 2008.
- A. O. Finley, A. Datta, B. D. Cook, D. C. Morton, H. E. Andersen, and S. Banerjee. Efficient algorithms for bayesian nearest neighbor gaussian processes. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 28(2):401–414, 2019.
- Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire. Experiments with a new boosting algorithm. In *ICML*, volume 96, pages 148–156. Bari, Italy, 1996.
- J. Friedman, T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, et al. Additive logistic regression: a statistical view of boosting (with discussion and a rejoinder by the authors). *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(2):337–407, 2000.
- J. H. Friedman. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1–67, 1991.
- J. H. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1189–1232, 2001.
- W. Fu and J. S. Simonoff. Unbiased regression trees for longitudinal and clustered data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 88:53–74, 2015.

- G.-A. Fuglstad, D. Simpson, F. Lindgren, and H. Rue. Does non-stationary spatial data always require non-stationary random fields? *Spatial Statistics*, 14:505–531, 2015.
- A. E. Gelfand, H.-J. Kim, C. Sirmans, and S. Banerjee. Spatial modeling with spatially varying coefficient processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462):387–396, 2003.
- A. Ghose, P. G. Ipeirotis, and A. Sundararajan. The dimensions of reputation in electronic markets. *NYU Center for Digital Economy Research Working Paper No. CeDER-06-02*, 2005.
- T. Gneiting, F. Balabdaoui, and A. E. Raftery. Probabilistic forecasts, calibration and sharpness. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69(2):243–268, 2007.
- V. P. Godambe. An optimum property of regular maximum likelihood estimation. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 31(4):1208–1211, 1960.
- A. Groll and G. Tutz. Regularization for generalized additive mixed models by likelihood-based boosting. *Methods of Information in Medicine*, 51(02):168–177, 2012.
- G. Guennebaud, B. Jacob, et al. Eigen v3. <http://eigen.tuxfamily.org>, 2010.
- J. Guinness. Permutation and grouping methods for sharpening gaussian process approximations. *Technometrics*, 60(4):415–429, 2018.
- J. Guinness. Gaussian process learning via fisher scoring of vecchia’s approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08374*, 2019.
- A. Hajjem, F. Bellavance, and D. Larocque. Mixed effects regression trees for clustered data. *Statistics & probability letters*, 81(4):451–459, 2011.
- A. Hajjem, F. Bellavance, and D. Larocque. Mixed-effects random forest for clustered data. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 84(6):1313–1328, 2014.
- T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani. Generalized additive models. *Statistical Science*, 1(3):297–310, 1986.
- B. Hofner, A. Mayr, N. Robinzonov, and M. Schmid. Model-based boosting in R: A hands-on tutorial using the R package mboost. *Computational Statistics*, 29:3–35, 2014.
- T. Hothorn, P. Bühlmann, T. Kneib, M. Schmid, and B. Hofner. Model-based boosting 2.0. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Aug):2109–2113, 2010.
- D. R. Jones, M. Schonlau, and W. J. Welch. Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions. *Journal of Global optimization*, 13(4):455–492, 1998.
- M. Katzfuss and J. Guinness. A general framework for vecchia approximations of gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06302*, 2017.
- M. Katzfuss, J. Guinness, W. Gong, and D. Zilber. Vecchia approximations of gaussian-process predictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.03309*, 2018.

- G. Ke, Q. Meng, T. Finley, T. Wang, W. Chen, W. Ma, Q. Ye, and T.-Y. Liu. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3149–3157, 2017.
- M. C. Kennedy and A. O’Hagan. Bayesian calibration of computer models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 63(3):425–464, 2001.
- N. M. Laird, J. H. Ware, et al. Random-effects models for longitudinal data. *Biometrics*, 38(4):963–974, 1982.
- J. P. LeSage and R. K. Pace. Models for spatially dependent missing data. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 29(2):233–254, 2004.
- H. Lu, S. P. Karimireddy, N. Ponomareva, and V. Mirrokni. Accelerating gradient boosting machine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08708*, 2019.
- L. Mason, J. Baxter, P. L. Bartlett, and M. R. Frean. Boosting algorithms as gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 512–518, 2000.
- C. E. McCulloch and J. M. Neuhaus. Misspecifying the shape of a random effects distribution: why getting it wrong may not matter. *Statistical science*, pages 388–402, 2011.
- Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2004.
- D. Nielsen. Tree boosting with xgboost-why does xgboost win” every” machine learning competition? Master’s thesis, NTNU, 2016.
- A. Pande, L. Li, J. Rajeswaran, J. Ehrlinger, U. B. Kogalur, E. H. Blackstone, and H. Ishwaran. Boosted multivariate trees for longitudinal data. *Machine learning*, 106(2):277–305, 2017.
- J. Pinheiro and D. Bates. *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- L. Prokhorenkova, G. Gusev, A. Vorobev, A. V. Dorogush, and A. Gulin. Catboost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 6639–6649. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- H. Rue and L. Held. Discrete spatial variation. *Handbook of spatial statistics*, pages 171–200, 2010.
- M. J. Saberian, H. Masnadi-Shirazi, and N. Vasconcelos. Taylorboost: First and second-order boosting algorithms with explicit margin control. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2011 IEEE Conference on*, pages 2929–2934. IEEE, 2011.
- A. M. Schmidt and P. Guttorp. Flexible spatial covariance functions. *Spatial Statistics*, page 100416, 2020.
- R. J. Sela and J. S. Simonoff. Re-em trees: a data mining approach for longitudinal and clustered data. *Machine learning*, 86(2):169–207, 2012.

- R. H. Shumway and D. S. Stoffer. *Time series analysis and its applications: with R examples*. Springer, 2017.
- F. Sigrist. Gradient and newton boosting for classification and regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03064*, 2018.
- F. Sigrist. KTBoost: Combined Kernel and Tree Boosting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03999*, 2019.
- J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, and R. P. Adams. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2951–2959, 2012.
- M. L. Stein. *Interpolation of spatial data: some theory for kriging*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- G. Tutz and F. Reithinger. A boosting approach to flexible semiparametric mixed models. *Statistics in medicine*, 26(14):2872–2900, 2007.
- C. Varin, N. Reid, and D. Firth. An overview of composite likelihood methods. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 5–42, 2011.
- A. V. Vecchia. Estimation and model identification for continuous spatial processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 50(2):297–312, 1988.
- C. K. Williams and C. E. Rasmussen. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT Press Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- S. N. Wood. *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017.
- A. J. Wyner, M. Olson, J. Bleich, and D. Mease. Explaining the success of adaboost and random forests as interpolating classifiers. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(48):1–33, 2017.
- C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.

Appendices

A Proofs

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The negative log-likelihood of the Vecchia approximation in Equation (15) modulo a constant is given by

$$\tilde{L}(y, F, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y - F)^T \tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log D_i^{\dagger} + \frac{n}{2} \log(\sigma^2). \quad (24)$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{L}(y, F, \theta)}{\partial \theta_k} = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y - F)^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{D_i^{\dagger}} \frac{\partial D_i^{\dagger}}{\partial \theta_k}. \quad (25)$$

Further, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}} = \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{\dagger^{-1}} B + B^T D^{\dagger^{-1}} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} - B^T D^{\dagger^{-1}} \frac{\partial D^{\dagger}}{\partial \theta_k} D^{\dagger^{-1}} B.$$

We thus obtain the result in the proposition by noting that

$$(y - F)^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{\dagger^{-1}}(y - F) = 2u_k^T u + u^T \frac{\partial D^{\dagger}}{\partial \theta_k} u,$$

where u and u_k are given in Equation (17). □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We have

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_k} = -B^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D B^{-T} - B^{-1} D B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} + B^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T}.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_k} = -B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D B^{-T} - \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} + B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T}.$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_l} &= B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D B^{-T} + \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \\ &\quad - B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \\ &\quad + B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} + \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} \\ &\quad - B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} \\ &\quad - B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} - \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} \\ &\quad + B^T D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the cyclicity of the trace, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_l} \right) &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} \right) + \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} \right) + \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} \right) - \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-T} \right) \\
&\quad + \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k}$ is lower triangular with zeros on the diagonal, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_k} \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Psi}}{\partial \theta_l} \right) &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \right) + \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_k} B^{-1} D B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_l} \right) \\
&\quad + \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} \right) \\
&= 2 \text{tr} \left(B^{-T} \frac{\partial B^T}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta_l} B^{-1} D \right) + \text{tr} \left(D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_k} D^{-1} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_l} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and the statement in (18) follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We have

$$\begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ B_{po} & B_p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} D^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & D_p^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ B_{po} & B_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_o^T D_o^{-1} B_o + B_{po}^T D_p^{-1} B_{po} & B_{po}^T D_p^{-1} B_p \\ B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_{po} & B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_p \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since

$$(B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_p)^{-1} B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_{po} = B_p^{-1} B_{po},$$

the result follows from Theorem 12.2 in Rue and Held [2010]. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We have

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_p & 0 \\ B_{op} & B_o \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} D_p^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & D_o^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_p & 0 \\ B_{op} & B_o \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_p^T D_p^{-1} B_p + B_{op}^T D_o^{-1} B_{op} & B_{op}^T D_o^{-1} B_o \\ B_o^T D_o^{-1} B_{op} & B_o^T D_o^{-1} B_o \end{pmatrix},$$

and the result follows from Theorem 12.2 in Rue and Held [2010]. \square

B Additional results

B.1 Simulated experiments: other mean functions

	GPBoost	LinearME	LSBoost	mboost	MERF	REEMtree	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.072	1.318	1.101	1.235	1.076	1.147	1.075	1.074
(sd)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.013)
(p-val)		(1.7e-126)	(4.7e-71)	(4.9e-107)	(2.1e-16)	(1.4e-88)	(6.8e-26)	(4.4e-13)
RMSE_indep	1.458	1.64	1.457	1.521	1.464	1.511	1.46	1.459
(sd)	(0.032)	(0.03)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)
(p-val)		(4.2e-119)	(0.74)	(3.8e-86)	(1.3e-14)	(1.1e-82)	(8.6e-14)	(5.3e-07)
RMSE_avg	0.5865	0.9102	0.5845	0.7013	0.5994	1.071	0.5852	0.5871
(sd)	(0.04)	(0.081)	(0.04)	(0.052)	(0.046)	(0.093)	(0.04)	(0.04)
(p-val)		(1e-72)	(0.4)	(3.4e-57)	(5.1e-09)	(1.3e-80)	(0.062)	(0.36)
CRPS_avg	0.3317	0.5311	0.3869	0.4484	0.3387	0.6444	0.3307	0.3319
(sd)	(0.024)	(0.054)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.027)	(0.066)	(0.024)	(0.024)
(p-val)		(3.2e-68)	(4.5e-49)	(1.1e-67)	(5.1e-08)	(3.3e-75)	(0.021)	(0.53)
QL_avg	0.06237	0.1227	0.1327	0.1438	0.06522	0.1706	0.06172	0.06233
(sd)	(0.0091)	(0.025)	(0.036)	(0.031)	(0.011)	(0.033)	(0.0082)	(0.009)
(p-val)		(1.3e-50)	(3.9e-38)	(8.3e-53)	(1.7e-11)	(4.6e-61)	(0.0069)	(0.81)
IS_avg	2.847	6.155	8.547	8.59	2.918	9.463	2.816	2.853
(sd)	(0.37)	(1.2)	(1.1)	(1.2)	(0.4)	(1.8)	(0.32)	(0.37)
(p-val)		(1.7e-55)	(1.2e-77)	(3.2e-75)	(6.8e-05)	(1.2e-63)	(0.0016)	(0.32)
RMSE_F	0.3191	0.8151	0.3146	0.5419	0.3448	0.5126	0.3301	0.3252
(sd)	(0.025)	(0.02)	(0.031)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.025)
(p-val)		(1.9e-136)	(0.047)	(7.1e-102)	(1.7e-18)	(9.1e-95)	(1.3e-29)	(8e-16)
RMSE_b	0.2351	0.2835		0.4903	0.2538	0.2504	0.237	0.2354
(sd)	(0.018)	(0.019)		(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)
(p-val)		(1.6e-74)		(5.9e-102)	(9.5e-12)	(7.3e-48)	(4.5e-14)	(0.01)
sigma2	0.168	0.6566	0.3497	0.3881	0.1085	0.1504	0.1184	0.1717
sigma2_b	0.1012	0.1037			0.1021	0.1006	0.1004	0.1013
time (s)	18.37	0.05976	1.039	16.18	262.8	1.373	43.05	2.29

Table 5: Results for the grouped random effects model and mean function $F = \text{'hajjem'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

	GPBoost	LinearME	LSBoost	mboost	MERF	REEMtree	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.027	1.022	1.028	1.12	1.032	1.063	1.027	1.038
(sd)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.015)	(0.01)	(0.011)	(0.01)	(0.011)
(p-val)		(4.4e-51)	(5.2e-15)	(1.7e-91)	(3.3e-43)	(9.8e-82)	(6.3e-05)	(2.8e-77)
RMSE_indep	1.419	1.416	1.42	1.424	1.423	1.445	1.419	1.427
(sd)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)
(p-val)		(2e-35)	(0.093)	(1.4e-37)	(5.5e-30)	(2.2e-74)	(0.15)	(4.8e-52)
RMSE_avg	0.5495	0.5463	0.5522	0.5615	0.5575	1.136	0.5486	0.5597
(sd)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.064)	(0.038)	(0.04)
(p-val)		(1.2e-07)	(8.6e-05)	(4.9e-26)	(4.1e-19)	(4.2e-100)	(0.00047)	(8.3e-25)
CRPS_avg	0.3114	0.3094	0.3532	0.3541	0.3158	0.7101	0.3108	0.3172
(sd)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.03)	(0.023)	(0.051)	(0.022)	(0.023)
(p-val)		(1.7e-08)	(2e-69)	(2.2e-64)	(4e-17)	(5.1e-94)	(2e-04)	(9e-23)
QL_avg	0.0564	0.05603	0.1079	0.1014	0.05749	0.1917	0.05623	0.05785
(sd)	(0.0062)	(0.0062)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.0062)	(0.033)	(0.006)	(0.0067)
(p-val)		(0.0038)	(6.7e-42)	(4.5e-42)	(3.7e-09)	(2.9e-66)	(0.003)	(2.9e-10)
IS_avg	2.555	2.55	6.481	6.061	2.603	10.63	2.552	2.621
(sd)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.95)	(0.91)	(0.24)	(1.5)	(0.23)	(0.25)
(p-val)		(0.3)	(3.4e-70)	(1.6e-67)	(7.7e-11)	(7.9e-78)	(0.2)	(1.5e-12)
RMSE_F	0.1139	0.05588	0.1236	0.1656	0.1522	0.2943	0.1167	0.1888
(sd)	(0.021)	(0.033)	(0.025)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.02)	(0.015)
(p-val)		(7.2e-59)	(1.7e-06)	(2.9e-71)	(1e-61)	(5e-98)	(1.3e-06)	(2.7e-88)
RMSE_b	0.2258	0.225		0.4852	0.227	0.2328	0.2259	0.228
(sd)	(0.013)	(0.013)		(0.021)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
(p-val)		(1.9e-10)		(7.5e-105)	(9.7e-06)	(4e-37)	(0.17)	(5.4e-17)
sigma2	0.02681	0.02098	0.06357	0.1455	0.02927	0.03597	0.02495	0.1007
sigma2_b	0.09712	0.0971			0.09741	0.0971	0.09705	0.09702
time (s)	5.616	0.0366	0.05108	9.248	104.6	0.5916	14.1	1.546

Table 6: Results for the grouped random effects model and mean function $F = \text{'linear'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

	GPBoost	LinearGP	LSBoost	mboost	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.408	1.487	1.514	1.536	1.414	1.408
(sd)	(0.061)	(0.064)	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.06)	(0.061)
(p-val)		(3.3e-42)	(4e-35)	(9.7e-53)	(0.12)	
CRPS	0.8221	0.8308	0.8994	0.8603	0.7935	0.8221
(sd)	(0.04)	(0.032)	(0.048)	(0.035)	(0.032)	(0.04)
(p-val)		(0.0018)	(9.7e-33)	(1.5e-22)	(1.4e-18)	
RMSE_indep	1.583	1.647	1.655		1.584	1.583
(sd)	(0.089)	(0.086)	(0.14)		(0.087)	(0.089)
(p-val)		(2.6e-29)	(2.2e-07)		(0.6)	
CRPS_indep	0.9064	0.9254	1.005		0.8923	0.9064
(sd)	(0.056)	(0.049)	(0.11)		(0.049)	(0.056)
(p-val)		(5.2e-11)	(8.9e-16)		(5.7e-15)	
RMSE_avg	0.7325	0.87	1.276		0.7158	0.7325
(sd)	(0.082)	(0.077)	(0.16)		(0.074)	(0.082)
(p-val)		(6.7e-42)	(8.1e-54)		(4.7e-05)	
CRPS_avg	0.4493	0.5295	0.9168		0.4242	0.4493
(sd)	(0.062)	(0.056)	(0.15)		(0.054)	(0.062)
(p-val)		(6.5e-35)	(7.6e-52)		(3.9e-13)	
QL_avg	0.1237	0.143	0.3746		0.1015	0.1237
(sd)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.1)		(0.034)	(0.048)
(p-val)		(1.3e-11)	(3.5e-47)		(2.5e-18)	
IS_avg	7.319	8.175	28.02		5.521	7.319
(sd)	(2.1)	(1.9)	(6.2)		(1.4)	(2.1)
(p-val)		(1.5e-10)	(4.3e-53)		(1.9e-31)	
RMSE_F	0.7333	0.8675	0.8702		0.7292	0.7333
(sd)	(0.08)	(0.071)	(0.19)		(0.072)	(0.08)
(p-val)		(5.8e-48)	(5.8e-10)		(0.27)	
RMSE_b	0.7325	0.7252			0.7421	0.7325
(sd)	(0.058)	(0.057)			(0.06)	(0.058)
(p-val)		(0.031)			(0.012)	
sigma2	0.6323	0.612	0.3685	1.085	0.5443	0.6323
sigma2_b	0.2631	0.2768			0.2533	0.2631
rho	0.04204	0.04414			0.04309	0.04204
time (s)	18.19	1.454	0.1119	3.217	81.71	16.52

Table 7: Results for the Gaussian process model and mean function $F = \text{'hajjem'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

	GPBoost	LinearGP	LSBoost	mboost	GPBOOS	GPBFixLR
RMSE	1.216	1.191	1.357	1.279	1.217	1.286
(sd)	(0.04)	(0.039)	(0.063)	(0.045)	(0.04)	(0.045)
(p-val)		(1.5e-34)	(5.7e-50)	(3.3e-44)	(0.21)	(2.8e-56)
CRPS	0.6869	0.6725	0.7667	0.7237	0.6869	0.739
(sd)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.029)
(p-val)		(1.6e-34)	(1.6e-49)	(9.8e-43)	(0.97)	(3.7e-61)
RMSE_indep	1.457	1.44	1.528		1.458	1.51
(sd)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.15)		(0.086)	(0.084)
(p-val)		(1.9e-21)	(1.1e-07)		(0.15)	(1.7e-49)
CRPS_indep	0.8247	0.8143	0.8739		0.8246	0.8621
(sd)	(0.051)	(0.05)	(0.1)		(0.05)	(0.053)
(p-val)		(4e-22)	(1.3e-07)		(0.74)	(1.3e-51)
RMSE_avg	0.477	0.4379	2.234		0.4679	0.5705
(sd)	(0.073)	(0.074)	(0.38)		(0.072)	(0.074)
(p-val)		(1.7e-21)	(5.3e-67)		(7.2e-07)	(3.3e-45)
CRPS_avg	0.2775	0.2528	1.826		0.2708	0.3424
(sd)	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.38)		(0.054)	(0.057)
(p-val)		(2.8e-20)	(1.9e-61)		(9.4e-08)	(7.5e-44)
QL_avg	0.05161	0.0457	1.455		0.04969	0.07263
(sd)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.36)		(0.012)	(0.028)
(p-val)		(1.9e-11)	(5.6e-62)		(2.5e-05)	(1.5e-20)
IS_avg	2.7	2.28	59.27		2.523	4.251
(sd)	(1.2)	(1.1)	(15)		(1.1)	(1.5)
(p-val)		(1.8e-18)	(6.8e-60)		(1.5e-12)	(1.1e-36)
RMSE_F	0.314	0.1969	0.4962		0.3173	0.5107
(sd)	(0.088)	(0.12)	(0.24)		(0.087)	(0.074)
(p-val)		(1.7e-33)	(1.5e-12)		(0.28)	(1.5e-71)
RMSE_b	0.6859	0.6793			0.6841	0.7072
(sd)	(0.053)	(0.053)			(0.052)	(0.056)
(p-val)		(0.00011)			(0.045)	(5.9e-25)
sigma2	0.1557	0.1178	0.6156	0.3714	0.1393	0.4493
sigma2_b	0.2101	0.2046			0.2095	0.2255
rho	0.02924	0.02974			0.02869	0.02981
time (s)	50.37	1.235	0.1042	2.074	122.3	19.29

Table 8: Results for the Gaussian process model and mean function $F = \text{'linear'}$. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations and p-values. P-values are calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'GPBOOS' refers to the GPBoostOOS algorithm and 'GPBFixLR' is the GPBoost algorithm with the learning rate held fixed at 0.1. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values (excluding 'GPBOOS' and 'GPBFixLR') are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.

B.2 Housing data

The following table reports the results for the Housing data application in Section 5.2 when only considering predictions from the mean function and ignoring Gaussian process predictions in the cross-validation for choosing tuning parameters of the GPBoost algorithm.

	GPBoost	LinearGP	LSBoost	mboost	GPBoost_excl_coord	LSBoost_excl_coord
RMSE	0.2492	0.3252	0.2457	0.2973	0.2741	0.3216
(p-val)		(0)	(0.00078)	(0)	(5.2e-73)	(0)
CRPS	0.1343	0.1661	0.1294	0.1563	0.1449	0.1688
(p-val)		(0)	(1.7e-19)	(0)	(8.1e-58)	(0)
RMSE_sum	1.213	1.991	1.482	2.854	1.729	3.697
(p-val)		(1.5e-07)	(1.1e-05)	(7.5e-12)	(5.7e-06)	(9.1e-14)
CRPS_sum	0.6811	1.019	0.8167	1.544	0.9154	2.034
(p-val)		(6.8e-12)	(6.1e-06)	(4.5e-21)	(7.2e-09)	(4.8e-26)
QL_sum	0.1824	0.2659	0.2294	0.5736	0.2753	0.8828
(p-val)		(0.00054)	(0.0055)	(6.8e-09)	(0.00023)	(3.7e-12)
IS_sum	9.749	13.09	11	28.25	14.13	42.37
(p-val)		(0.012)	(0.13)	(2.5e-10)	(0.00043)	(2.6e-14)

Table 9: Comparison of predictive accuracy for housing data. The numbers in parentheses are p-values calculated using paired t-tests comparing the GPBoost algorithm to the other approaches. 'QL' and 'IS' denote the quantile loss and interval score. The smallest values are in boldface. An empty value indicates that the required predictions cannot be calculated for the corresponding approach.