# Supplement:

## Explore Conditional Dependencies in Item Response Tree Data

#### 1 Four Models

Here I provide the specific formulation of the four models utilized for the verbal aggression data. I assume the three-category item response data have been expanded to two sets of sub-responses based on a linear tree with two sub-trees (two nodes and two branches).

Denote  $Y_{p,i}=m$  as the raw response (m=0,1,2) from person p  $(p=1,\ldots,N)$  to item i  $(i=1,\ldots,I)$ . m=0 indicates 'No', m=1 indicates 'Perhaps', and m=2 indicates 'Yes' in the verbal aggression data example. Let  $Y_{p,i,k}^*$  denote person p's sub-response to item i in Node k following the mapping matrix given below:

$$egin{array}{c|cccc} Y_{p,i} & Y_{p,i,1}^* & Y_{p,i,2}^* \\ \hline 0 & 0 & - \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

The conditional probabilities of  $Y_{p,i,k}^*=1$  is formulated in the four models (M1, M2, and M3, and M4) as follows:

M1: IRTree model with one latent trait (sequential IRT model)

logit 
$$\left(\Pr\left(Y_{p,i,k}^* = 1 | \theta_p, \alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k}\right)\right) = \alpha_{i,k}\theta_p + \beta_{i,k}, \quad \theta_p \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1),$$
 (1)

where  $\alpha_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  are the item slope and intercept for item i in node k, and  $\theta_p \in \mathbb{R}$  is the latent trait for person p.

• M2: IRTree model with two node-specific latent traits

logit 
$$\left(\Pr\left(Y_{p,i,k}^* = 1 | \theta_{p,k}, \alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k}\right)\right) = \alpha_{i,k}\theta_{p,k} + \beta_{i,k}, \quad (\theta_{p,1}, \theta_{p,2})' \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\theta}),$$
 (2)

where  $\alpha_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  are the item slope and intercept for item i in node k, and  $\theta_{p,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the latent trait for person p in node k.  $\Sigma_{\theta}$  is a two-by-two covariance matrix.

• M3: LSIRM with one latent trait

logit 
$$\left(\Pr\left(Y_{p,i,k}^* = 1 | \theta_p, \alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k}, \mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i\right)\right) = \alpha_{i,k}\theta_p + \beta_{i,k} - \gamma d(\mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i), \quad \theta_p \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1),$$
 (3)

where where  $\alpha_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  are the item slope and intercept for item i in node k, and  $\theta_p \in \mathbb{R}$  is the latent trait for person p. In addition,  $\gamma > 0$  is the weight of the distance term and  $d(\mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i) = ||\mathbf{a}_p - \mathbf{b}_i||_2$  is a two-dimensional Euclidean distance, and  $\mathbf{a}_p \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are the latent positions of person p and item i in the two-dimensional space.

• M4: LSIRM with two node-specific latent traits

logit 
$$\left(\Pr\left(Y_{p,i,k}^* = 1 | \theta_{p,k}, \alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k}, \mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i\right)\right) = \alpha_{i,k}\theta_{p,k} + \beta_{i,k} - \gamma d(\mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i), \quad (\theta_{p,1}, \theta_{p,2})' \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\theta}),$$
(4)

where  $\alpha_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  are the item slope and intercept for item i in node k, and  $\theta_p \in \mathbb{R}$  is the latent trait for person p.  $\Sigma_{\theta}$  is a two-by-two covariance matrix. In addition,  $\gamma > 0$  is the weight of the distance term and  $d(\mathbf{a}_p, \mathbf{b}_i) = ||\mathbf{a}_p - \mathbf{b}_i||_2$  is a two-dimensional Euclidean distance, and  $\mathbf{a}_p \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are the latent positions of person p and item i in the two-dimensional space.

#### 2 Estimation

A fully Bayesian approach is applied to estimate the four models based on the following priors:  $\alpha_{i,k} \sim \mathsf{N}(0,3^2), \ k=1,2, \quad \beta_{i,k} \sim \mathsf{N}(0,3^2), \ k=1,2, \quad \theta_{p,k} \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1), \ k=1,2, \quad c_\theta \sim \mathsf{N}(0,3^2), \\ \gamma \sim \mathsf{Half} \ \mathsf{N}(0,1), \quad a_{p,d} \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1), \ d=1,2, \quad b_{i,d} \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1), \ d=1,2. \quad \mathsf{Here} \ c_\theta \ \mathsf{is} \ \mathsf{the} \ \mathsf{Cholesky} \\ \mathsf{element}, \ \mathsf{such} \ \mathsf{that} \ \Sigma_\theta = L \cdot L', \ \mathsf{where} \ L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c_\theta & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \ \mathsf{The} \ \mathsf{diagonal} \ \mathsf{elements} \ \mathsf{of} \ L \ \mathsf{are} \ \mathsf{set} \ \mathsf{to} \ 1 \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{the} \\ \mathsf{identifiability} \ \mathsf{of} \ \mathsf{the} \ \mathsf{covariance} \ \mathsf{matrix}. \ \mathsf{In} \ \mathsf{this} \ \mathsf{case}, \ \mathsf{the} \ \mathsf{correlation} \ \mathsf{is} \ \rho_\theta = c_\theta/\sqrt{1+c_\theta^2}. \ \mathsf{The} \ \mathsf{estimation} \\ \mathsf{is} \ \mathsf{implemented} \ \mathsf{by} \ \mathsf{using} \ \mathsf{NIMBLE} \ \mathsf{(de} \ \mathsf{Valpine} \ \mathsf{et} \ \mathsf{al.}, \ 2017). \ \mathsf{In} \ \mathsf{all} \ \mathsf{analyses}, \ \mathsf{the} \ \mathsf{number} \ \mathsf{of} \ \mathsf{iterations} \\ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{burn-in} \ \mathsf{are} \ \mathsf{set} \ \mathsf{to} \ \mathsf{15,000} \ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{5,000}, \ \mathsf{respectively}. \ \mathsf{All} \ \mathsf{analyses} \ \mathsf{show} \ \mathsf{reasonable} \ \mathsf{convergence}.$ 

### References

de Valpine, P., Turek, D., Paciorek, C., Anderson-Bergman, C., Temple Lang, D., and Bodik, R. (2017). Programming with models: writing statistical algorithms for general model structures with NIMBLE. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26:403–413.