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#### Abstract

We consider a variable selection problem for functional linear models where both multiple predictors and a response are functions. Especially we assume that variables are given as functions of time and then construct the historical functional linear model which takes the relationship of dependences of predictors and a response into consideration. Unknown parameters included in the model are estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood method with the $L_{1}$ penalty. We can simultaneously estimate and select variables given as functions using the $L_{1}$ type penalty. A regularization parameter involved in the regularization method is decided by a model selection criterion. The effectiveness of the proposed method is investigated by simulation studies and real data analysis.
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## 1 Introduction

Functional data analysis (FDA) has received considerable attentions in several fields such as meteorology, ergonomics and medicine, and there still are so many studies in both theoretical and applicative aspects (see, e.g. Ramsay and Silverman, 2005; Horváth and Kokoszka, 2012). The basic concept behind FDA is to represent repeated measurement data for individual as smooth functions and then treat them as if they themselves were the observed data. In this paper we consider a variable selection problem for functional data in the regression model.

There have been many works for functional regression models where predictors are functions while a response(s) is a scalar. The functional linear model was extended to several frameworks such as the generalized linear model (James, 2002; Müller and Stadtmüller, 2005), the additive model (Müller and Yao, 2008) and the adaptive model (James and Silverman, 2005). Furthermore, theoretical evaluations for the functional linear model were developed by Cai and Hall (2006); Hall and Horowitz (2007); Cai and Yuan (2012).

On the other hand, when both predictors and a response are given as functions there are two conceivable cases. One is that arguments of both the predictors and the response are the same (denoted by $X(t)$ and $Y(t)$ respectively) and the other vice versa ( $X(s)$ and $Y(t)$ ). For the former case the varying coefficient model (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1993; Hoover et al., 1998) can be applied for the modeling of the relationship. On the other hand, the latter can consider the case where certain interval of the domain of the
functional predictor affect the response and it is more natural than the former case. Therefore we consider the latter case throughout this paper. Ramsay and Dalzell (1991) first constructed the functional linear model for a functional predictor and a response as follows. Let $x_{i}(s)$ and $y_{i}(t)$ be respectively a predictor and a response given as functions with $s \in[0, S]$ and $t \in[0, T]$ for $i$-th subject. Then the functional linear model for $x_{i}(s)$ and $y_{i}(t)$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}(t)=\alpha(t)+\int_{0}^{T} x_{i}(s) \beta(s, t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha(t)$ is an intercept function, $\beta(s, t)$ is a coefficient function and $\varepsilon_{i}(t)$ are an error functions. Matsui et al. (2009) proposed estimating the model by the maximum penalized likelihood method and also derived a model selection criterion for evaluating the estimated model, and Yao et al. (2005) obtained a consistent estimates for the model as the theoretical development.

When $s$ and $t$ in the model (1) represent times, the response depends on future information of the predictor, which leads to paradoxical and inappropriate results, except that they have a periodicity. In order to solve this problem Malfait and Ramsay (2003) took the relationship of dependences of $x(s)$ and $y(t)$ into consideration and proposed a historical functional linear model (HFLM) as a special case of (1), and they also investigated how to estimate it. Furthermore, Harezlak et al. (2007) estimated the HFLM by the penalized least squares method with the $L_{2}$ or the $L_{1}$ penalty. Şentürk and Müller $(2008,2010)$ also discussed the similar situations for the frameworks of varying-coefficient models.

While these studies treat functional linear model with one predictor, in other word, the functional simple regression models, we consider the variable selection problem for multiple functional predictors in the multiple functional regression model, with the help of the sparse regularization. Sparse regularization is one of the most useful tools for variable selection problems and has come to be used in various situations. It can simultaneously estimate parameters and select variables by imposing $L_{1}$ type penalties. There have been proposed several $L_{1}$ type penalties (Tibshirani, 1996; Fan and Li, 2001; Zou and Hastie, 2005; Zhang, 2010). Matsui and Konishi (2011) proposed selecting functional predictors using the sparse regularization in the functional linear model with a scalar response.

We propose a method for the strategy for the problem of variable selection for the functional linear model with functional predictors and a functional response. Functional data and coefficients are represented by basis expansions. Since it is difficult to analytically evaluate functions in the model, an approximate calculation is introduced. Then parameters included in the model are estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood method via the sparse regularization. In order to choose the degrees of regularization we apply a model selection criterion derived for evaluating the functional linear model. Monte Carlo simulations are conducted to see the effectiveness of the proposed modeling strategy. Then we apply the proposed method to the analysis of typhoon data, trying to select functional variables which have effects on the path of typhoons.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces a HFLM that models the relationship between multiple predictors and a response both of which are given by functions of time. Section 3 provides how to estimate and evaluate the model. Numerical examples
are investigated in Section 4 and real data analysis is described in Section 5. Finally we summarize the main results in Section 6.

## 2 Functional linear model with functional predictors and a response

Suppose we have $n$ sets of $p$ functional predictors and a functional response $\left\{\left(x_{i j}(s)\right.\right.$, $\left.\left.y_{i}(t)\right) ; s, t \in[0, T], i=1, \ldots, n, j=1, \ldots, p\right\}$. In order to model the relationship between predictors and a response, we consider the following historical functional linear model (HFLM, Malfait and Ramsay, 2003; Ramsay and Silverman, 2005):

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}(t)=\alpha(t)+\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} x_{i j}(s) \beta_{j}(s, t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha(t)$ is an intercept function, $\beta_{j}(s, t)$ are bivariate coefficient functions which impose varying weights on $x_{i m}(s)$ at $s \in\left[s_{j}(t), t\right]$ rather than $s \in[0, T], s_{j}(t)=\max \left\{0, t-\delta_{j}\right\}$ with a lag parameter $\delta_{j}>0$ which decide how long the time is included in the model, and $\varepsilon_{i}(t)$ are error functions. There are several relationships between other models for longitudinal data analysis. If intervals of the integration with respect to $s$ are shrunk to $s_{j}(t)=t$, that is, the arguments of the predictors and the response are the same, the HFLM corresponds to a varying-coefficient model of Hastie and Tibshirani (1993); Hoover et al. (1998):

$$
y_{i}(t)=\alpha(t)+\sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{i j}(t) \beta_{j}(t)+\varepsilon_{i}(t)
$$

On the other hand, if $\left[s_{j}(t), t\right]$ are discretized to be $t_{l}, l=1, \ldots, R_{j}$ so that $t_{l}=t$ and $t_{l-\left(R_{j}-1\right)}=s_{j}(t)$ for fixed $t$. then it correspond to a generalized varying-coefficient model by Şentürk and Müller (2008) with multiple predictors:

$$
y_{i}\left(t_{l}\right)=\alpha\left(t_{l}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{r=1}^{R_{j}} x_{i j}\left(t_{l-(r-1)}\right) \beta_{j r}\left(t_{l}\right)+\varepsilon_{i}\left(t_{l}\right) .
$$

Now we return to the HFLM (2). From the normal equation the intercept function is given by

$$
\alpha(t)=\bar{y}(t)-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} \bar{x}_{m}(s) \beta_{j}(s, t) d s+\bar{\varepsilon}(t)
$$

with $\bar{x}(s)=\sum_{i} x_{i}(s) / n, \bar{y}(t)=\sum_{i} y_{i}(t) / n$ and $\bar{\varepsilon}(t)=\sum_{i} \varepsilon_{i}(t) / n$. Therefore the HFLM (2) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}^{c}(t)=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_{s_{0}(t)}^{t} x_{i j}^{c}(s) \beta_{j}(s, t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}^{c}(t) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{i}^{c}(s)=x_{i}(s)-\bar{x}(s), y_{i}^{c}(t)=y_{i}(t)-\bar{y}(t)$ and $\varepsilon_{i}^{c}(t)=\varepsilon_{i}(t)-\bar{\varepsilon}(t)$. For simplicity we drop the suffix $c$ for the rest of this paper.

Suppose that the coefficient functions $\beta_{j}(s, t)$ are approximated by basis expansions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\beta}_{j}(s, t)=\sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} b_{j k} \phi_{j k}(s, t), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $b_{j k}$ are unknown parameters and $\beta_{j}(s, t)$ are basis functions. Typical bases include radial basis functions or thin-plate splines. Defining the residual $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{(j)}(s, t)=\beta_{j}(s, t)$ $\tilde{\beta}_{j}(s, t)$, the HFLM (2) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{i}(t) & =\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} x_{i m}(s)\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} b_{j k} \phi_{j k}(s, t)+\tilde{\varepsilon}_{(j)}(s, t)\right\} d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t) \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} b_{j k} \int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} x_{i j}(s) \phi_{j k}(s, t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t) \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} b_{j k} \psi_{i j k}(t)+\varepsilon_{i}(t),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\psi_{i j k}(t)=\int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} x_{i j}(s) \phi_{j k}(s, t) d s
$$

Note that we rewrote $\sum_{j} \int x_{i j}(s) \tilde{\varepsilon}_{(j)}(t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t)$ as $\varepsilon_{i}(t)$. Using notations $\boldsymbol{y}(t)=\left(y_{1}(t)\right.$, $\left.\ldots, y_{n}(t)\right)^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t)=\left(\varepsilon_{1}(t), \ldots, \varepsilon_{n}(t)\right)^{\prime}, \Psi_{j}(t)=\left(\psi_{i j k}(t)\right)_{i k}, \Psi(t)=\left(\Psi_{1}(t), \ldots, \Psi_{p}(t)\right), \boldsymbol{b}=$ $\left(\boldsymbol{b}_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_{p}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$, and $\boldsymbol{b}_{j}=\left(b_{j 1}, \ldots, b_{j K_{j}}\right)^{\prime}$ the model (3) has the form of

$$
\begin{align*}
\boldsymbol{y}(t) & =\sum_{j=1}^{p} \Psi_{j}(t) \boldsymbol{b}_{j}+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) \\
& =\Psi(t) \boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

which is similar to the standard linear model with a design matrix $\Psi(t)$, a response vector $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ and a coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{b}$, except that some of vectors are functions of $t$.

## 3 Estimation and evaluation

We consider estimating the functional linear model described in the previous section. As the standard and natural approach for this problem, Ramsay and Silverman (2005), Chapter 16 used the integrated sum of squared error as the criterion to be minimized as the standard and natural approach for this problem, that is, they considered minimizing

$$
\operatorname{LMSSE}(\boldsymbol{b})=\int_{0}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{i}^{2}(t) d t=\int_{0}^{T}\{\boldsymbol{y}(t)-\Psi(t) \boldsymbol{b}\}^{\prime}\{\boldsymbol{y}(t)-\Psi(t) \boldsymbol{b}\} d t
$$

However, it is difficult to directly obtain estimates of $\boldsymbol{b}$ in (5) by two reasons. First, it is difficult to calculate $\psi_{i j k}$ analytically because of the complexity of the integral. Second, the least squares method sometimes gives unstable or degenerate estimates. In order to solve these problems, we respectively apply the Finite Elements Method (FEM) that approximate the integration numerically and the regularization method, especially the sparse regularization to select functional variables.

### 3.1 Finite element method

In order to calculate $\psi_{i j k}$ numerically we here apply the finite element method (FEM) to estimate the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{b}$. Malfait and Ramsay (2003) used the FEM for the HFLM and described the details of it.

Consider a two dimensional coordinate of $s, t$ which include the domain of integration in (2) (Figure 1 left). First we divide the intervals $[0, T]$ for $s$ and $t$ directions into $N$ intervals, each of which have equal length of $\mu$, and then construct triangular elements by further dividing each square grid into two triangles (Figure 1 right). The lag parameter $\delta_{j}$ can be approximated by $M_{j} \mu\left(0 \leq M_{j} \leq N\right)$ for each $j$. When $M_{j}=N$ the shape of the domain becomes a triangle, $0<M_{j}<N$ corresponds to a trapezoid, and when $M_{j}=0$ the domain is only $s=t$ and it corresponds to the varying-coefficient model. As a result, there are $M_{j}\left(2 N-M_{j}\right)$ triangular elements and $\left(M_{j}+1\right)\left(N+1-M_{j} / 2\right)$ nodes on the domain of $\beta_{j}(s, t)$. Each node is assigned by one basis function which has the shape of a hexagonal pyramid and has the value of 1 at the node and 0 at the adjacent nodes. Figure 2 shows a contour plot of an example of the basis function. These bases correspond to $\phi_{j k}(t)\left(j=1, \ldots, p, k=1, \ldots,\left(M_{j}+1\right)\left(N+1-M_{j} / 2\right)\left(=K_{j}\right)\right)$ of (4). We used Matlab functions which connect nodes with indices, available from the website of Ramsay and Silverman (2002).

We consequently discretize the time point $t$ into finite time points $Q$. Malfait and Ramsay (2003) says that the number of $Q=4 N$ gives sufficiently accuracy for the approximation. Using this discretization, $y_{i}(t), \psi_{i j k}(t)$ and $\varepsilon_{i}(t)$ are respectively expressed as vectors $\boldsymbol{y}_{i}=\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i Q}\right)^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i j k}=\left(\psi_{i 1 j k}, \ldots, \psi_{i Q j k}\right)^{\prime}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i}=\left(\varepsilon_{i 1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{i Q}\right)^{\prime}$. Then $\boldsymbol{y}(t), \Psi(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t)$ are respectively represented as vector or matrix forms

$$
\boldsymbol{y}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{y}_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\boldsymbol{y}_{n}
\end{array}\right), \Psi=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\boldsymbol{\psi}_{111} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\psi}_{11 K_{1}} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\psi}_{1 p 1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\psi}_{1 p K_{p}} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\boldsymbol{\psi}_{n 11} & \cdots & \psi_{n 1 K_{1}} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\psi}_{n p 1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\psi}_{n p K_{p}}
\end{array}\right) \text { and } \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and finally we have a form of linear model

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{y}=\Psi \boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 3.2 Penalized likelihood method via the sparse regularization

We here assume that error vectors $\varepsilon_{i}$ are identically and independently normally distributed with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and variance covariance matrix $\Sigma_{0}$ and that $\Sigma_{0}$ has an autocorrelation since $\varepsilon_{i 1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{i Q}$ are discretized realization at continuous time points. That



Figure 1: Illustration of the region of integral of the HFLM (left) and its triangulation (right).


Figure 2: An example of basis functions.
is, we assume that $\Sigma_{0}$ has the form of

$$
\Sigma_{0}=\frac{\sigma^{2}}{1-\rho^{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & \rho & \cdots & \rho^{Q-1}  \tag{7}\\
\rho & 1 & \cdots & \rho^{Q-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\rho^{Q-1} & \rho^{Q-2} & \cdots & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $\sigma^{2}$ and $\rho \in[-1,1]$ are variance and correlation parameters respectively. Here we referred to Fahrmeir et al. (2013) pp. 192 about the autocorrelation. Then the variance covariance matrix $\Sigma$ of $\varepsilon$ is $\Sigma=I_{n} \otimes \Sigma_{0}$, and hence we have a probability density function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})=\frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{n Q / 2} \log |\Sigma|} \exp \left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \boldsymbol{b})^{\prime} \Sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \boldsymbol{b})\right\} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}=\left(\boldsymbol{b}^{\prime}, \sigma^{2}, \rho\right)^{\prime}$, and then the log-likelihood function is given by

$$
\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})=-\frac{n Q}{2} \log (2 \pi)-\frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma|^{1 / 2}-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \boldsymbol{b})^{\prime} \Sigma(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \boldsymbol{b}) .
$$



Figure 3: Directions for penalizations about $D_{j}^{(H)}$ (left), $D_{j}^{(V)}$ (center) and $D_{j}^{(P)}$ (right).

We estimate parameters $\boldsymbol{b}, \sigma^{2}$ and $\rho$ by maximizing the following penalized likelihood function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ell_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})-n Q \sum_{j=1}^{p} P_{\lambda}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{\lambda}(\cdot)$ is a penalty function, $\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}=\sqrt{\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{\prime} \Omega_{j} \boldsymbol{b}_{j}}$ and $\Omega_{j}$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. Harezlak et al. (2007) has penalized for the fluctuation of the coefficient function in the direction parallel to $s$-axis (horizontal), $t$-axis (vertical) and $s=t$ (parallel), each of which corresponds to penalizing for neighboring basis functions for fixed $t, s$ and $s-t$ (Figure 3). We use a first difference for the neighboring bases, constructing penalty matrices for horizontal, vertical and parallel direction for $j$-th variable, denoted by $D_{j}^{(H)}$, $D_{j}^{(V)}$ and $D_{j}^{(P)}$. For example, the elements of $D_{j}^{(H)}$ are given by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\left(D_{j}^{(H)}\right)_{l m}=1  \tag{10}\\
\left(D_{j}^{(H)}\right)_{l m^{\prime}}=-1 \\
\left(D_{j}^{(H)}\right)_{l m^{\prime \prime}}=0
\end{array}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
s_{m}-s_{m^{\prime}}=1 \\
\text { if } & t_{m}-t_{m^{\prime}}=0 \\
m^{\prime \prime} \neq m, m^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)\right.
$$

where $s_{m}$ and $t_{m}$ are respectively $s$ and $t$ coordinates of the $m$-th node, $m=1, \ldots, K_{j}$, $l=1, \ldots, L$ and $L$ is the number of combinations that the condition in (10) occurs. $D_{j}^{(V)}$ and $D_{j}^{(P)}$ are given in similar ways. Then the matrices $\Omega_{j}$ are given by $\Omega_{j}=$ $\gamma_{j}^{(H)}\left(D_{j}^{(H)}\right)^{\prime} D_{j}^{(H)}+\gamma_{j}^{(V)}\left(D_{j}^{(V)}\right)^{\prime} D_{j}^{(V)}+\gamma_{j}^{(P)}\left(D_{j}^{(P)}\right)^{\prime} D_{j}^{(P)}$ with tuning parameters $\gamma_{j}^{(H)}, \gamma_{j}^{(V)}$ and $\gamma_{j}^{(P)}$ that control degrees of regularizations for each direction. Although it can be considered that all of these tuning parameters are selected by model selection criteria such as AIC or BIC, the computational load can be very expensive. Alternatively we decide these values as the following rule, using the idea of Fan and Li (2004). First we obtain the maximum likelihood estimator of $\boldsymbol{b}$, denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(M L)}$, by maximizing (9) with $\lambda=0$, and then $\gamma_{j}^{(H)}$ is given as the standard deviation of $D_{j}^{(H)} \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_{j}^{(M L)} \cdot \gamma_{j}^{(V)}$ and $\gamma_{j}^{(P)}$ are obtained in same way, then the overall degrees of the regularization is controlled by $\lambda$, which is selected by model selection criteria.

For the penalty $P_{\lambda}(\cdot)$ we apply a smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty
by Fan and Li (2001) whose derivative is defined by

$$
P_{\lambda}^{\prime}(|\theta|)=\lambda\left\{I(|\theta| \leq \lambda)+\frac{(a \lambda-|\theta|)_{+}}{(a-1) \lambda} I(|\theta|>\lambda)\right\}
$$

for arbitrary $\theta$, where $\lambda$ is a regularization parameter and $a$ is a tuning parameter. Here we set $a=3.7$ since Fan and Li (2001) says that this value gives minimum Bayes rule.

Parameters are estimated via the local quadratic approximation which iteratively update parameters and has been applied for the lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) and the SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001). Denote an initial value of $\boldsymbol{b}$ in the update as $\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}$, then the Taylor expansion of $P_{\lambda}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}\right)$ around $\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}$ gives

$$
P_{\lambda}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}\right) \approx P_{\lambda}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \frac{P_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}\right)}{\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}\right\|_{\Omega_{j}}}\left\{\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{b}_{j}-\left(\boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}\right)^{\prime} \boldsymbol{b}_{j}^{(0)}\right\} .
$$

Using this approximation and assuming a fixed variance $\sigma^{2}$ the penalized log-likelihood function (9) can also be approximated by

$$
\ell_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{b}) \approx \ell\left(\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)+\frac{\partial \ell\left(\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{b}^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)^{\prime} \frac{\partial \ell\left(\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{b} \partial \boldsymbol{b}^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{b}^{(0)}\right)+\frac{n Q}{2} \boldsymbol{b}^{\prime} \Omega(\boldsymbol{b}) \boldsymbol{b},
$$

where $\Omega(\boldsymbol{b})=\operatorname{blockdiag}\left\{P_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{1}\right\|_{\Omega_{1}}\right) /\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{1}\right\| \Omega_{\Omega_{1}}, \ldots, P_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{p}\right\|_{\Omega_{p}}\right) /\left\|\boldsymbol{b}_{p}\right\|_{\Omega_{p}}\right\}$. Then if $k$-th updated values of $\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\Sigma$, respectively denoted by $\boldsymbol{b}^{(k)}$ and $\Sigma^{(k)}$, are obtained, the ( $k+1$ )-th updated value of $\boldsymbol{b}$ is given by

$$
\boldsymbol{b}^{(k+1)}=\left\{\Psi^{\prime}\left(\Sigma^{(k)}\right)^{-1} \Psi+n Q \Omega\left(\boldsymbol{b}^{(k)}\right)\right\}^{-1} \Psi^{\prime}\left(\Sigma^{(k)}\right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{y}
$$

and subsequently the correlation and variance parameter are respectively updated by

$$
\rho^{(k+1)}=\frac{s_{q 1}}{s_{q}}, \quad\left(\sigma^{2}\right)^{(k+1)}=\frac{1}{n Q}\left(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \boldsymbol{b}^{(k+1)}\right)^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(k+1)}\right),
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s_{q 1}=\frac{1}{n Q} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{q=2}^{Q}\left(y_{i q}-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} \psi_{i q j k} b_{j k}\right)\left(y_{i(q-1)}-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} \psi_{i(q-1) j k} b_{j k}\right), \\
& s_{q}=\frac{1}{n Q} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{q=1}^{Q}\left(y_{i q}-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{j}} \psi_{i q j k} b_{j k}\right)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The updated variance covariance matrix $\Sigma^{(k+1)}$ is obtained by substituting $\rho^{(k+1)}$ and $\left(\sigma^{2}\right)^{(k+1)}$ into (7). This update is continued until the convergence criterion is satisfied, then we obtain the estimated parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}, \hat{\sigma}^{2}$ and $\hat{\rho}$. Substituting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}=\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}^{\prime}, \hat{\sigma}^{2}, \hat{\rho}\right)^{\prime}$ into (8) we obtain a statistical model

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\boldsymbol{y}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})=\frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{n Q / 2} \log |\hat{\Sigma}|} \exp \left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \hat{\boldsymbol{b}})^{\prime} \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}-\Psi \hat{\boldsymbol{b}})\right\} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 3.3 Model selection criterion

Since the estimated model (11) strongly depends on the value of tuning parameters such as regularization parameter $\lambda$. Although the cross-validation is widely used for the selection of tuning parameters, Leng et al. (2006) showed that the criteria based on the minimum prediction error such as cross-validation or generalized cross-validation do not select models consistently. On the other hand, Wang et al. (2007) and Zhang et al. (2010) showed that the BIC type criterion with the effective degrees of freedom select the true model consistently for the SCAD regularization. We use a BIC type model selection criterion for evaluating the historical functional linear model (2) estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood method with the group SCAD regularization. The BIC is given by

$$
\mathrm{BIC}=-2 \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})+d f \log (n Q),
$$

where $d f$ is an effective degrees of freedom given by

$$
d f=\operatorname{tr}\left\{\Psi\left(\Psi^{\prime} \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \Psi+n Q \Omega(\hat{\boldsymbol{b}})\right)^{-1} \Psi^{\prime} \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\right\} .
$$

We select the regularization parameter $\lambda$ which minimizes the BIC and treat it as an optimal model.

## 4 Simulation

We conducted Monte Carlo simulations to show the effectiveness of the proposed method. We simulated functional predictors $X_{j}(s)(j=1, \ldots, 5)$ and a response $Y(t)$, where $j=1, \ldots, 5$ and $s, t \in[0,1]$, as the following rule on the model of the HFLM. First, we constructed functional predictors and coefficients by

$$
x_{i j}(s)=\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(u_{j k}+w_{i j k}\right) \xi_{j k}(s), \quad \beta_{j}(s, t)=\sum_{k=1}^{K^{2}} v_{j k} \zeta_{j k}(s, t)
$$

respectively, where $K=7$ and $\xi_{j k}(s)$ and $\zeta_{j k}(s, t)$ are respectively one and two dimensional basis functions, for which we used the radial basis functions of Kawano and Konishi (2007), and $u_{j k}, w_{i j k}$ in $x_{i j}(s)$ are respectively given as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{1 k}=0.1 k, \quad u_{2 k}=\sin k, \quad u_{3 k}=\cos k, \quad u_{4 k}=\exp (2 k / 7), \quad u_{5 k}=-k^{2}, \\
& \boldsymbol{w}_{i j} \sim N_{K}\left(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{w}\right), \quad \boldsymbol{w}_{i j}=\left(w_{i j 1}, \ldots, w_{i j K}\right)^{\prime}, \quad \Sigma_{w}=\left(\sigma_{w} \rho_{w}^{|k-l|}\right)_{k l}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\sigma_{w}=0.3$ and $\rho_{w}=0.5$. Moreover, $v_{j k}$ in $\beta_{j}(s, t)$ are set to be

$$
v_{1 k}=0.5^{(a-4)^{2}+(b-4)^{2}} / 10, \quad v_{2 k}=0.1 a, \quad v_{3 k}=-\sin \left((a-b)^{2}\right), \quad v_{4 k}=0, \quad v_{5 k}=0,
$$

where $a=1, \ldots, K$ and $b=1, \ldots, K$ correspond to $k=(a-1) K+b$. It means that $X_{4}$ and $X_{5}$ are unnecessary for the model. Furthermore, the error function in the HFLM was generated by the basis expansion with random coefficients:

$$
\varepsilon_{i}(t)=\sum_{k=1}^{K} e_{k} \xi_{k}(t), \quad e_{k} \sim N\left(0, \sigma_{e}^{2} R_{i}^{e 2}\right),
$$

where $\xi_{k}(t)$ are basis functions same as $\xi_{j k}(t), \sigma_{e}=0.1,0.3$ and $R_{i}^{e}=\operatorname{sd}\left(y_{i}(t)\right)$. Then the response is given by

$$
y_{i}(t)=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_{s_{j}(t)}^{t} x_{i j}(s) \beta_{j}(s, t) d s+\varepsilon_{i}(t)
$$

where we set the lag parameter $\delta_{j}$ included in $s_{j}(t)$ to be $\delta_{j}=0.5$ for all $j$. Since it is natural that the observed longitudinal data themselves have noises, we added noises to above predictors and responses as follows:

$$
x_{i j l}=x_{i j}\left(s_{l}\right)+\varepsilon_{i j l}^{(x)}, \quad y_{i l}=y_{i}\left(t_{l}\right)+\varepsilon_{i l}^{(y)},
$$

where $l=1, \ldots, 51$ and $\varepsilon_{i j l}^{(x)}$ and $\varepsilon_{i l}^{(y)}$ respectively follow $N\left(0, \sigma_{x}^{2} R_{i}^{x 2}\right)$ and $N\left(0, \sigma_{y}^{2} R_{i}^{y 2}\right)$ with $\sigma_{x}=\sigma_{y}=0.3, R_{i}^{x}=\operatorname{sd}\left(x_{i j}(s)\right), R_{i}^{y}=\operatorname{sd}\left(y_{i}(t)\right)$.

We treated $x_{i j l}$ and $y_{i l}$ as observed data, then converted them into functional data using $B$-spline basis. Numbers of basis are set to be 8 for each variable. Next we constructed a design matrix and a response vector in (6) using the FEM. There are several tuning parameters involved in the FEM, described in Section 3.1. We set parameters $N=13$ and $\mu=4$, and $M_{j}$ are set so that $\delta_{j}=0.25,0.50,0.75$ for all $j$ (true is 0.5 ). Then parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in the model is estimated by maximum likelihood method and the penalized likelihood method with the group SCAD regularization. We conducted this strategy for 100 repetitions and for all combinations of $n=50,100, \sigma_{e}=0.1,0.3$ and $\delta_{j}=0.25,0.50,0.75$, and then investigated average values of MSE $=\sum_{i}^{n} \sum_{j}^{51}\left\{y_{i}\left(t_{j}\right)-\hat{y}_{i}\left(t_{j}\right)\right\}^{2}$ with estimated response functions $\hat{y}_{i}(t)$, regularization parameter, and numbers of selected variables.

Table 1 shows the results of simulation study. It includes averaged MSEs for the maximum likelihood method (ML) and the group SCAD regularization (gSCAD), averaged value of selected regularization parameters $(\lambda)$ and ratios of variables selected for 100 repetitions. This table shows that the group SCAD regularization minimized MSEs for all cases. Among $\delta_{j}, \delta_{j}=0.25$ and $\delta_{j}=0.50$ minimized the MSE, although the true $\delta_{j}$ is 0.5 . For the accuracy of variable selection, all cases had tendencies to select correct variables.

## 5 Real data analysis

We applied the proposed method to the analysis of typhoon data. We investigated which sets of data about the typhoon have an influence on the path of them, using the functional linear model.

The data are available on the website "Digital Typhoon."" We picked up 88 typhoons which passed around Japan, i.e. passed between north latitude of 30 and 50 and between east longitude of 130 and 150) since 2001 to 2012 from the website. The data contains the position (latitude $Y_{1}$ and longitude $Y_{2}$ ), the center atmospheric pressure ( $X_{1}$ ), velocity of the wind around the center $\left(X_{2}\right)$ and radii of minor and major storm axes (winds higher than $25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, respectively $X_{3}$ and $X_{4}$ ) and gale axes (winds higher than $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, respectively $X_{5}$ and $X_{6}$ ) of typhoons. They are observed every six hours from the generation

[^0]Table 1: Results on 100 repetitions in simulation studies.

|  |  |  | MSE $(\mathrm{SD} \times 10)$ |  | $\lambda$ |  |  |  |  | Ratio of selection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $n$ | $\sigma_{e}$ | $\delta$ | ML | gSCAD | $\left(\times 10^{2}\right)$ | $X_{1}$ | $X_{2}$ | $X_{3}$ | $X_{4}$ | $X_{5}$ |  |  |  |
| 50 | 0.1 | 0.25 | $3.17(1.53)$ | $2.93(1.80)$ | 0.82 | 0.82 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.31 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.50 | $3.22(2.01)$ | $2.76(3.16)$ | 0.71 | 0.82 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.24 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.75 | $3.49(2.22)$ | $2.98(2.80)$ | 0.67 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.29 | 0.04 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.25 | $5.88(5.56)$ | $5.18(6.90)$ | 1.52 | 0.81 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.42 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.50 | $6.67(5.47)$ | $5.71(7.80)$ | 1.35 | 0.83 | 0.99 | 0.84 | 0.36 | 0.07 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.75 | $7.24(6.21)$ | $6.25(8.64)$ | 1.26 | 0.90 | 0.97 | 0.73 | 0.40 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
| 100 | 0.1 | 0.25 | $2.80(1.20)$ | $2.64(1.24)$ | 0.46 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.50 | $2.56(1.26)$ | $2.30(1.35)$ | 0.34 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.27 | 0.02 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.75 | $2.71(1.43)$ | $2.43(1.63)$ | 0.30 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.38 | 0.06 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.25 | $4.46(3.08)$ | $4.10(5.66)$ | 0.89 | 0.69 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.18 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.50 | $4.85(3.55)$ | $4.44(5.91)$ | 0.57 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.48 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.3 | 0.75 | $5.17(3.54)$ | $4.73(5.67)$ | 0.52 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.51 | 0.00 |  |  |  |

to the disappearance of the typhoons. We aligned the generation and disappearance time of all typhoons by scaling the time points at which the data were observed on $[0,1]$. Figure 4 shows some examples of typhoon data. Since the survival times differ for each typhoon numbers and positions of time points also differ, and therefore it is difficult to apply the traditional linear model directly. In this example we examined whether which kind of information of the typhoon affect the location of it. In order to do it we treated the positions as responses and other variables as predictors.

First of the analysis we converted the observed data into functions by the basis expansion, and then centered them. Then we constructed the HFLM (2) by treating the position of typhoons as the functional response and the remaining data as functional predictors. Since the model (2) contains only one response whereas there are two data sets of positions (latitude and longitude), we separately constructed the HFLM with each of the response. Unknown parameters included in the model is estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood method with the group SCAD regularization and a regularization parameter $\lambda$ involved in the penalized log-likelihood function was selected by BIC. We investigated which variables are selected and surface of the estimated coefficients.

Figures 5 to 10 show estimated coefficient functions for $Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.25,0.50,0.75$. From these figures we can find that some of coefficient surfaces are estimated to be zero functions, which lead to eliminations of corresponding variables from the model. When the response is latitude only one variable, the velocity of the wind $\left(X_{2}\right)$ is removed from the model for all cases of $\delta_{j}$. On the other hand when the response is longitude the pressure $\left(X_{1}\right)$, the velocity of the wind $\left(X_{2}\right)$ and the minor gale axis $\left(X_{6}\right)$, and in addition the major gale axis $\left(X_{5}\right)$ for cases $\delta_{j}=0.50$ and $\delta_{j}=0.75$ are removed from the model. Next we focus on features of coefficient surfaces of selected variables. For example, $\beta_{1}(s, t)$ in Figure 9 shows that there is a positive weight to the variable around $t=s$ direction, and this weight decreases for the $t=1-s$ direction with $s$ goes to 0 . It indicates that the last information of the predictor has positive weight to the response, whereas this influence gradually vanishes as it becomes a thing of the past. Same implications are


Figure 4: Examples of typhoon data. Bottom right 2 plots (north latitude and east longitude) are responses and remaining data are predictors.
obtained from other coefficient surfaces. Note that, however, for the $\delta_{j}=0.25$ case there are many fluctuations on the surfaces and therefore it is difficult to obtain insights from them than other cases of $\delta_{j}$.

## 6 Concluding remarks

We have proposed the method for variable selection of variable selection where predictors and a response are given as functions. Especially when they are functions of time we need to take account of the dependency between predictors and a response, and therefore we applied the historical functional linear model. Unknown parameters included in the historical functional linear model are estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood method with the group SCAD regularization, and a regularization parameter included in the model is selected by a BIC type model selection criterion. In addition to the estimation of parameters we can also select functional predictors in the regression model due to the property of the $L_{1}$ type regularization. Simulation and real data analysis revealed that the proposed method appropriately selected variables.

In this work we assumed that several tuning parameters except for the regularization parameter $\lambda$ are given. Especially for the lag parameter $\delta_{j}$, though, we think it is a crucial issue to select these values objectively, since it decides how long the time is included in the model. However, we cannot directly apply model selection criteria since the "sample size" in model (6) changes as the lag parameter $\delta_{j}$ changes. Therefore future works include the selection of them. Furthermore we can consider extending the HFLM to that with multiple response. Then we can treat two responses, such as the longitude and the latitude of typhoon data used in Section 5, together in one model to take the correlation among
responses into consideration.
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Figure 5: Coefficient functions for $Y_{1}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.25$.
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Figure 6: Coefficient functions for $Y_{2}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.25$.


Figure 7: Coefficient functions for $Y_{1}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.50$.


Figure 8: Coefficient functions for $Y_{2}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.50$.


Figure 9: Coefficient functions for $Y_{1}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.75$.


Figure 10: Coefficient functions for $Y_{2}$ and $\delta_{j}=0.75$.
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