

# MOTIVATING REML VIA PREDICTION-ERROR COVARIANCES IN EM UPDATES FOR LINEAR MIXED MODELS

ANDREW T. KARL  
KARL STATISTICAL SERVICES LLC  
AURORA, CO 80016, USA  
AKARL@ASU.EDU

**ABSTRACT.** We present a computational motivation for restricted maximum likelihood (REML) estimation in linear mixed models using an expectation–maximization (EM) algorithm. At each iteration, maximum likelihood (ML) and REML solve the same mixed-model equations for the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) of the fixed effects and the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP) of the random effects. They differ only in the trace adjustments used in the variance-component updates: ML uses conditional covariances of the random effects given the data, whereas REML uses prediction-error covariances from Henderson’s C-matrix, reflecting uncertainty from estimating the fixed effects. Short R code makes this switch explicit, exposes the key matrices for classroom inspection, and reproduces `lme4` ML and REML fits.

*Key words:* Henderson’s equations; expectation–maximization algorithm; restricted maximum likelihood; variance-component estimation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Restricted maximum likelihood (REML) estimation is often taught through likelihood algebra, error contrasts, and projection matrices (see, e.g., Patterson and Thompson, 1971; Stroup et al., 2018). These derivations are indispensable, but they can leave students unsure what changes computationally relative to maximum likelihood (ML) estimation (besides seeing a change in the log-likelihood function).

Rather than re-deriving REML, this note presents the iterative ML and REML updates within an expectation–maximization (EM) algorithm. The computational distinction is confined to the trace terms used to update the variance components in the M step: ML uses covariance calculations conditional on the fixed effects, whereas REML uses prediction-error covariances that reflect uncertainty from estimating the fixed effects. The goal is to give students an intuition for the REML estimator that will motivate them to understand its derivation.

We work with the linear mixed model

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{G}), \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}),$$

where  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the response vector,  $\mathbf{X}$  is a full-rank fixed-effect model matrix ( $n \times p$ ), and  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a random-effect model matrix ( $n \times q$ ). We assume  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  are independent and that  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are positive definite.

Section 2 summarizes canonical references and the sources of the specific ML and REML update rules used here. Section 3 introduces Henderson’s mixed-model equations and highlights the two covariance matrices that drive the ML–REML difference. Section 4 then presents the EM-type variance-component updates side by side and isolates the role of the trace adjustments. Appendix A records the ML and REML log-likelihoods for reference. Appendix B provides short R code that fits Model (1) using the EM iteration in Algorithm 1 (under simplifying assumptions on  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  in Section 4) and exposes the key matrices appearing in the update formulas, and Appendix C validates the numerical results against `lme4`.

## 2. RELATED WORK

Canonical treatments of REML estimation of linear mixed models include Patterson and Thompson (1971); Harville (1974); Searle et al. (1992); Stroup et al. (2018) provides a modern exposition and notation closely aligned with ours. The EM framework dates to Dempster et al. (1977); early EM algorithms for mixed models include Laird and Ware (1982); Laird et al. (1987) (see McLachlan and Krishnan, 2008 for a general overview of EM methods). Because Algorithm 1 updates  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  by its generalized least squares estimator at each iteration (via Henderson’s equations), the overall procedure is more precisely an expectation/conditional maximization (ECM) variant of EM (Meng and Rubin, 1993).

The specific EM variance-component updates used in Section 4 are sourced as follows: the ML update forms follow Karl (2012); Karl et al. (2013, 2014), while the REML trace corrections follow Diffey et al. (2017), who develop REML EM and PX–EM algorithms using Henderson’s equations (Henderson et al., 1959) and a conditional REML derivation (Verbyla, 1990). Although Newton–Raphson-type methods are often faster in routine mixed-model fitting (see, e.g., Lindstrom and Bates, 1988) and preferred in many popular software routines, EM is useful here because of the form taken by the variance-component updates.

## 3. HENDERSON'S EQUATIONS AND COVARIANCE MATRICES

Appendix A gives the ML and REML log-likelihoods for reference. Here we begin with Henderson's mixed-model equations, which highlight the model matrices students see in computation (Henderson et al., 1959; Searle et al., 1992; McCulloch et al., 2008; Diffey et al., 2017; Stroup et al., 2018).

**3.1. Mixed-model equations.** For given covariance matrices  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ , define the  $(p+q) \times (p+q)$  matrix

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{X} & \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Z} \\ \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{X} & \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{G}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{\beta\beta} & \mathbf{M}_{\beta\eta} \\ \mathbf{M}_{\eta\beta} & \mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta} \end{bmatrix},$$

and its inverse (which exists under our regularity assumptions)

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{\beta\beta} & \mathbf{C}_{\beta\eta} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\eta\beta} & \mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Solving Henderson's equations gives

$$(4) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{C} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix},$$

yielding the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE)  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP)  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ . When estimated variance components are plugged in, these are often called an empirical BLUE (EBLUE) and an empirical BLUP (EBLUP).

**3.2. Conditional and prediction-error covariances.** In this section and Section 4, conditional moments are evaluated under Model (1) with  $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{R})$  fixed at their current working values in the EM cycle; iteration indices are suppressed. We write  $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$  when the dependence on  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is relevant. Under the Gaussian mixed model,  $\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{G}^{-1})^{-1}$  does not depend on  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ; throughout we therefore write this matrix as  $\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})$  (and similarly  $\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})$ ).

Two covariance matrices drive the ML-REML comparison below.

**(i) Prediction-error covariance from  $\mathbf{C}$ .** For a given  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  is the mean squared error (MSE) matrix of the BLUE/BLUP; under the Gaussian model it is the joint (sampling) covariance matrix of the BLUE and the BLUP prediction error:

$$(5) \quad \text{Var} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{C},$$

so  $\mathbf{C}_{\beta\beta} = \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta} = \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta})$ . In each EM iteration,  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}$  is evaluated at the current working values of  $(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{R})$ , and at convergence we use  $\mathbf{C}$  evaluated at the final estimated covariance matrices as an estimated MSE (prediction-error) matrix.

Similarly, with conditional residuals

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{Z}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}},$$

the residual prediction error  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  satisfies

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\mathbf{X} \ \mathbf{Z}] \mathbf{C} [\mathbf{X} \ \mathbf{Z}]'.$$

(ii) **Conditional covariance of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  given  $\mathbf{y}$ .** Under Model (1),

$$\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1} = (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{G}^{-1})^{-1},$$

This conditional covariance depends only on  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\mathbf{G}$ , and  $\mathbf{R}$ , whereas  $\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta} = \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta})$  also reflects the additional variability induced by estimating  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  (through the full inverse  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ ).  $\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta}$  is the inverse Schur complement of the fixed-effect block  $\mathbf{M}_{\beta\beta}$ :

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta} = (\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta} - \mathbf{M}_{\eta\beta}\mathbf{M}_{\beta\beta}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_{\beta\eta})^{-1}.$$

Identity (6) makes explicit how the fixed-effect matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  enters the prediction-error covariance through the cross-blocks of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

With these two variance sources in hand, we can now write the ML and REML EM updates side by side.

#### 4. EM UPDATES: ML vs. REML

The EM updates in this section follow Karl (2012); Karl et al. (2013, 2014) and Diffey et al. (2017); derivations are omitted to keep the focus on the update rules. Starting from initial  $(\tau^2, \sigma^2)$ , we alternate E and M steps until the relative change in the variance components is below a tolerance. For readability we suppress iteration indices, so the hats in (7)–(10) denote the updated values computed from the current estimates.

**4.1. E step.** Given current variance components  $(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{R})$ , the E step uses the conditional distribution of the random effects,  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}$ , which is multivariate normal under Model (1). Its conditional mean is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

and its conditional covariance is

$$\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}.$$

In the R implementation in Appendix B, we obtain  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and the corresponding BLUP  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$  simultaneously by solving Henderson's mixed-model equations (4). In this sense Algorithm 1 is an EM-type iteration with a conditional maximization step for  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  (Meng and Rubin, 1993). The E step calculations are the same for ML and REML; the criteria differ only in the M step for the variance components.

**4.2. M step: variance components.** To obtain closed form variance component updates and avoid extraneous notation, we specialize in this subsection to the common case  $\mathbf{G} = \tau^2\mathbf{I}_q$  and  $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n$ . Corresponding updates for block-diagonal structures, with an analogous interpretation, are given by Karl et al. (2013) and Diffey et al. (2017).

**Random-effect variance.** For  $\mathbf{G} = \tau^2\mathbf{I}_q$ , the EM updates are

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{ML}}^2 &= \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{REML}}^2 &= \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \text{tr}\{\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta}\} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta})\}. \end{aligned}$$

For ML, the update follows from the conditional second moment under the Gaussian model,

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}\boldsymbol{\eta}' \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}' + \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}),$$

so that  $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})\}$ . For REML, the variance adjustment uses the BLUP prediction-error covariance  $\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta} = \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta})$ . This differs from the ML adjustment  $(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1} = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})$  because it also reflects uncertainty from estimating  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ; see the Schur-complement identity (6).

**Residual variance.** For  $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$ , the EM updates are

$$\begin{aligned} (9) \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\text{ML}}^2 &= \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\eta} \mid \mathbf{y})\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (10) \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\text{REML}}^2 &= \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}\{[\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]'\} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}/n$  is the average squared conditional residual, and the trace term is a variance adjustment. Thus, as in (7)–(8), ML and REML share the same average squared term and differ only in whether the variance adjustment is conditional (ML) or prediction-error-based (REML).

Algorithm 1 provides a concise summary of the EM algorithm for this model, with the REML/ML choice contained in Step 4.

**Algorithm 1 (EM iteration for the simple LMM; ML vs. REML differs only in trace terms).**

- (1) Initialize  $(\tau^2, \sigma^2)$ .
- (2) For current  $(\tau^2, \sigma^2)$ , set  $\mathbf{G} = \tau^2 \mathbf{I}_q$ ,  $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$  and form  $\mathbf{G}^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$ . Build  $\mathbf{M}$  in (2) and compute  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ . Also compute  $(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}$ .
- (3) Solve Henderson's equations (4) to obtain  $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$  and set  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{Z}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ .
- (4) Define the trace-adjustment matrices  $\mathbf{T}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\sigma$ . *ML*: set  $\mathbf{T}_\tau = (\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\sigma = \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'$ . *REML*: set  $\mathbf{T}_\tau = \mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta}$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\sigma = [\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]'$ .
- (5) Update

$$\sigma^2 \leftarrow \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}} + \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_\sigma)}{n}, \quad \tau^2 \leftarrow \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_\tau)}{q}.$$

- (6) Repeat Steps 2–5 until the relative change in  $(\tau^2, \sigma^2)$  is below a tolerance.

Connection to the linear-model REML estimator. Setting  $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{0}$  reduces the mixed model to  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ ; in this ordinary least squares case, we would not run EM, and we make the substitution only to show that the REML update (10) reproduces the familiar REML estimator (for students skeptical of the  $\frac{1}{n}$  factor). Then the trace term in (10) becomes  $\text{tr}\{\sigma^2 \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\} = \sigma^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_X) = \sigma^2 p$ , where  $\mathbf{P}_X = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'$  is the usual hat matrix, and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  (hence  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ ) is invariant to  $\sigma^2$ . Thus (10) yields

$$\sigma_{t+1}^2 = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{n} + \frac{p}{n} \sigma_t^2.$$

Since  $p < n$ , the iteration converges to the fixed point  $\sigma_\infty^2 = \hat{\mathbf{r}}'\hat{\mathbf{r}}/(n - p)$ .

TABLE 1. Trace terms in the EM variance-component updates under ML and REML, where  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}$

Update	ML trace adjustment uses	REML trace adjustment uses
$\tau^2$ in (7)–(8)	$\text{tr}\{(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\}/q$	$\text{tr}\{\mathbf{C}_{\eta\eta}\}/q$
$\sigma^2$ in (9)–(10)	$\text{tr}\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{M}_{\eta\eta})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\}/n$	$\text{tr}\{[\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}]'\}/n$

## 5. CLOSING REMARKS

The boxed updates (7)–(10) and Table 1 summarize the computational distinction in this EM presentation. At a fixed set of variance components, ML and REML solve the same mixed-model equations for  $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$ ; the difference is confined to which covariance matrix supplies the variance-adjustment (trace) terms in the variance-component updates.

As a classroom entry point, a teacher can implement the ML updates and then swap in the REML trace corrections to see what changes (inside a single iteration, recalling that the algorithm must run to convergence). Readers who want to see why these are the appropriate adjustments—and how they arise from the REML criterion—should consult standard derivations of REML and EM updates; see Karl et al. (2013); Diffey et al. (2017); Stroup et al. (2018) and the references therein.

Although we specialized to  $\mathbf{G} = \tau^2 \mathbf{I}_q$  and  $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$  to keep the variance-component M step algebra simple, the underlying distinction persists for more general covariance structures: ML-type EM updates use conditional second moments (and hence conditional covariances) of the random effects given the observed data (e.g., Karl et al., 2014), whereas REML-type EM updates replace these with prediction-error covariances that account for estimating the fixed effects (e.g., Diffey et al., 2017).

For further reading and additional code, see the internal functions of the `JM`, `mvglmmRank`, `RealVAMS`, and `GPvam` packages (Rizopoulos et al., 2009; Karl et al., 2014; Karl and Broatch, 2023; Karl et al., 2024b,a; Broatch et al., 2018) for EM-type implementations in more complex models, including richer structures for  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  (in the presence of missing data) and multiple non-normal responses.

## DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No new data were generated for this note. The R code to reproduce the numerical results (including Table 2) is provided as supplementary material with the submission.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author used ChatGPT (GPT-5.2 Pro) to assist with proofreading and rewording. It was also used to help with LaTeX formatting and to structure and comment the R code. All AI-suggested changes were reviewed and verified by the author, who remains responsible for the content.

## APPENDIX A. LOG-LIKELIHOOD FUNCTIONS

Under Model (1) we have

$$\mathbf{y} \sim N(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad \mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathbf{Z}' + \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  collects the variance component parameters indexing  $\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . The ML log-likelihood is

$$\ell_{\text{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log |\mathbf{V}| + (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})' \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) + n \log(2\pi) \right\},$$

and the REML log-likelihood (Patterson and Thompson, 1971; Harville, 1974; Verbyla, 1990; Searle et al., 1992; Stroup et al., 2018) is

$$\ell_{\text{REML}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log |\mathbf{V}| + \log |\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{X}| + \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} + (n-p) \log(2\pi) \right\},$$

with

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{V}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}^{-1}.$$

## APPENDIX B. EM CODE FOR TEACHING

The function `em_lmm()` below fits the linear mixed model with  $\mathbf{G} = \tau^2 \mathbf{I}_q$  and  $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$ . It is adapted from the `N_mov` function in the CRAN package `mvglmmRank` (Karl and Broatch, 2023), but is written to make the matrices in the update formulas explicit by forming  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}$  at each iteration.

Inputs are compatible model objects  $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$ . The commented lines above the function show how to extract these from an example `mvglmmRank` fit for modeling NFL scores with a multiple membership  $\mathbf{Z}$  structure (Harville, 1977); Appendix C shows the analogous extraction from an `lme4 lmer()` fit. (In sports-ranking applications such as `mvglmmRank`, the fixed-effect home-field advantage estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  can be biased under unbalanced or nonrandom schedules,  $\mathbf{Z}$ ; see Karl and Zimmerman (2021).) For clarity, the implementation uses dense matrix operations; large problems should use sparse linear algebra. To keep the listing short, we do not evaluate the (RE)ML log-likelihood inside `em_lmm()`; however, the supplemental validation script computes the final log-likelihood and matches `lme4`. Note that REML and ML log-likelihoods are defined on different likelihood scales (restricted vs. full) and should not be compared directly across likelihood types.

```

1 # Example: extract y, X, Z from an nfl2012 fit
2 # Uncomment these lines to load example data from mvglmmRank
3 # library(mvglmmRank)
4 # data(nfl2012)
5 # res <- mvglmmRank(nfl2012, method = "N.mov", verbose = FALSE, tol.n=1e-16)
6 # res$parameters #for comparison with em_lmm output
7 # Z   <- res$N.output$Z
8 # X   <- res$N.output$X
9 # y   <- res$N.output$Y
10
11 em_lmm <- function(y, X, Z, REML = FALSE,
12                      maxit = 100, tol = 1e-7,
13                      tau2_init = 1, sigma2_init = 1) {
14
15  # LMM: y = X beta + Z eta + eps; eta ~ N(0, tau^2 I), eps ~ N(0, sigma^2 I).
16  # REML toggles which covariance appears in the variance-component trace adjustments.
17
```

```

18  y  <- as.matrix(y)
19  X  <- as.matrix(X)
20  Z  <- as.matrix(Z)
21  XZ <- cbind(X, Z)
22
23  n <- nrow(X)
24  p <- ncol(X)
25  q <- ncol(Z)
26  if (nrow(Z) != n) stop("X and Z must have the same number of rows.")
27  if (qr(X)$rank < ncol(X)) stop("X must be full rank.")
28
29  # Initial values for variance components
30  tau2  <- tau2_init
31  sigma2 <- sigma2_init
32
33  # Initial values for beta and eta
34  beta <- matrix(0, p, 1)
35  eta  <- matrix(0, q, 1)
36
37  for (iter in 1:maxit) {
38
39  ## --- Henderson solve: compute BLUE/BLUP and needed covariance blocks ---
40  #  $G^{-1}$  and  $R^{-1}$ 
41  G_inv <- diag(1 / tau2, q)    #  $\tau^{-2} I_q$ 
42  R_inv <- diag(1 / sigma2, n)  #  $\sigma^{-2} I_n$ 
43
44  XtRinv <- t(X) %*% R_inv      #  $X' R^{-1}$ 
45  ZtRinv <- t(Z) %*% R_inv      #  $Z' R^{-1}$ 
46
47  # Blocks of M
48  M_betabeta <- XtRinv %*% X
49  M_betaeta  <- XtRinv %*% Z
50  M_etabeta  <- t(M_betaeta)
51  M_etaeta  <- ZtRinv %*% Z + G_inv  #  $Z' R^{-1} Z + G^{-1}$ 
52
53  M <- rbind(
54    cbind(M_betabeta, M_betaeta),
55    cbind(M_etabeta, M_etaeta)
56  )
57
58  # Right-hand side [ $X' R^{-1} y; Z' R^{-1} y$ ]
59  rhs <- rbind(
60    XtRinv %*% y,
61    ZtRinv %*% y
62  )
63
64  # Henderson's mixed model equations:
65  # [beta_hat; eta_hat] = C [X' R^{-1} y; Z' R^{-1} y],
66  # where C = M^{-1} is the "C-matrix"
67  C   <- chol2inv(chol(M))

```

```

68  sol <- C %*% rhs
69
70  beta <- sol[1:p, , drop = FALSE]
71  eta  <- sol[(p + 1):(p + q), , drop = FALSE]
72
73  #  $C_{\{\eta, \eta\}}$ : prediction-error covariance for  $\eta$ ,  $Var(\eta_{\text{hat}} - \eta)$ 
74  C_etaeta <- C[(p + 1):(p + q), (p + 1):(p + q), drop = FALSE]
75
76  #  $(M_{\{\eta, \eta\}})^{-1}$ : conditional covariance  $Var(\eta / y)$  at current  $(G, R)$ 
77  M_etaeta_inv <- chol2inv(chol(M_etaeta))
78
79  ## --- Residuals and trace-adjustment matrices (Algorithm 1) ---
80
81  # Conditional residuals
82  r_hat <- y - X %*% beta - Z %*% eta
83
84  if (!REML) {
85    # ML trace-adjustment matrices:
86    #  $T_{\tau} = Var(\eta / y) = (M_{\{\eta, \eta\}})^{-1}$ 
87    #  $T_{\sigma} = Var(Z \eta / y) = Z (M_{\{\eta, \eta\}})^{-1} Z'$ 
88    T_sigma <- Z %*% M_etaeta_inv %*% t(Z)
89    T_tau  <- M_etaeta_inv
90
91  } else {
92    # REML trace-adjustment matrices:
93    #  $T_{\tau} = Var(\eta_{\text{hat}} - \eta) = C_{\{\eta, \eta\}}$ 
94    #  $T_{\sigma} = Var(r_{\text{hat}} - \eta) = [X \ Z] C [X \ Z]'$ 
95    T_sigma <- XZ %*% C %*% t(XZ)
96    T_tau  <- C_etaeta
97  }
98
99  ## --- M step updates ( $\tau^2$  and  $\sigma^2$ ) ---
100
101 #  $\sigma^2$  update:
102 #  $\sigma_{\text{hat}}^2 = (r_{\text{hat}}'r_{\text{hat}})/n + tr(T_{\sigma})/n$ 
103 rss_r      <- as.numeric(t(r_hat) %*% r_hat)
104 trace_Tsigma <- sum(diag(T_sigma))
105 sigma2_new <- (rss_r + trace_Tsigma) / n
106
107 #  $\tau^2$  update:
108 #  $\tau_{\text{hat}}^2 = (\eta' \eta)/q + tr(T_{\tau})/q$ 
109 q_eta      <- as.numeric(t(eta) %*% eta)
110 trace_Ttau <- sum(diag(T_tau))
111 tau2_new   <- (q_eta + trace_Ttau) / q
112
113 ## --- Convergence check ---
114
115 delta <- max(
116   abs(sigma2_new - sigma2) / (sigma2 + 1e-8),
117   abs(tau2_new - tau2) / (tau2 + 1e-8)

```

```

118      )
119
120      sigma2 <- sigma2_new
121      tau2   <- tau2_new
122
123      if (delta < tol) break
124  }
125
126  list(
127      beta   = drop(beta),
128      eta    = drop(eta),
129      tau2   = tau2,
130      sigma2 = sigma2,
131      G      = tau2 * diag(q),
132      R      = sigma2 * diag(n),
133      iter   = iter,
134      REML   = REML,
135
136      # --- objects for inspection (final iteration) ---
137      M      = M,
138      C      = C,
139      M_etaeta_inv = M_etaeta_inv,
140      C_etaeta   = C_etaeta,
141      r_hat     = drop(r_hat),
142      T_tau     = T_tau,
143      T_sigma   = T_sigma,
144      trace_Ttau = trace_Ttau,
145      trace_Tsigma = trace_Tsigma
146  )
147 }
148 # em_lmm(y, X, Z, REML = TRUE)

```

#### APPENDIX C. LME4 VALIDATION

To validate the EM algorithm implementation in Appendix B, we compared its output with estimates from lme4's `lmer()` (Bates et al., 2015) using a Gaussian one-way random-effects model with three fixed-effect coefficients (an intercept and two continuous covariates) and a single random-intercept variance component. For each fit we ran `em_lmm()` under both ML and REML and fit the corresponding model in `lmer()` with matching settings. Table 2 reports the true parameter values together with the EM and lme4 estimates of the fixed effects, variance components, and (RE)ML log-likelihoods; the EM implementation reproduces the `lmer()` results to the displayed precision.

A minimal example of extracting compatible  $(y, X, Z)$  from an lme4 fit is:

```

1 library(lme4)
2 fit <- lmer(y ~ x1 + x2 + (1 | grp), data = dat, REML = TRUE)
3 y <- getME(fit, "y")
4 X <- getME(fit, "X")
5 Z <- t(getME(fit, "Zt"))

```

TABLE 2. Comparison of `em_lmm` (Appendix B) and `lme4` estimates (ML vs. REML) for a one-way random-effects model. REML and ML log-likelihood values are on different likelihood scales and are shown only for within-method validation.

method	likelihood	$\beta_0$	$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	$\tau^2$	$\sigma^2$	logLik
Truth		2.0000	1.0000	-0.5000	1.0000	1.0000	—
<code>em_lmm</code>	REML	1.9684	1.3937	-0.6070	0.8616	0.6785	-40.61296
<code>lme4</code>	REML	1.9684	1.3937	-0.6070	0.8616	0.6785	-40.61296
<code>em_lmm</code>	ML	1.9673	1.3910	-0.6026	0.7169	0.6167	-39.02332
<code>lme4</code>	ML	1.9673	1.3910	-0.6026	0.7169	0.6167	-39.02332

## REFERENCES

D. Bates, M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using `lme4`. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48, 2015.

Jennifer Broatch, Jennifer Green, and Andrew Karl. RealVAMS: An R Package for Fitting a Multivariate Value-Added Model (VAM). *The R Journal*, 10(1):22–30, 2018. doi: 10.32614/RJ-2018-033. URL <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-033>.

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*, 39(1):1–38, 1977.

S. M. Diffey, A. B. Smith, A. H. Welsh, and B. R. Cullis. A new REML (parameter expanded) EM algorithm for linear mixed models. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 59(4):433–448, 2017.

David A. Harville. Bayesian inference for variance components using only error contrasts. *Biometrika*, 61(2):383–385, 1974.

David A. Harville. The use of linear-model methodology to rate high school or college football teams. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 72(358):278–289, 1977. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1977.10480991.

C. R. Henderson, O. Kempthorne, S. R. Searle, and C. M. von Krosigk. The estimation of environmental and genetic trends from records subject to culling. *Biometrics*, 15(2):192–218, 1959. doi: 10.2307/2527669.

Andrew Karl, Jennifer Broatch, and Jennifer Green. *RealVAMS: Multivariate VAM Fitting*, 2024a. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RealVAMS>. R package version 0.4-6.

Andrew Karl, Yan Yang, and Sharon L. Lohr. *GPvam: Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Multiple Membership Mixed Models Used in Value-Added Modeling*, 2024b. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=GPvam>. R package version 3.2-0.

Andrew T. Karl. The sensitivity of college football rankings to several modeling choices. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 8(3):1–44, 2012. doi: 10.1515/1559-0410.1471.

Andrew T. Karl and Jennifer Broatch. *mvglmmRank: Multivariate Generalized Linear Mixed Models for Ranking Sports Teams*, 2023. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mvglmmRank>. R package version 1.2-4.

Andrew T. Karl and Dale L. Zimmerman. A diagnostic for bias in linear mixed model estimators induced by dependence between the random effects and the corresponding model matrix. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 211:107–118, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.jspi.2020.06.004.

Andrew T. Karl, Yan Yang, and Sharon L. Lohr. Efficient maximum likelihood estimation of multiple membership linear mixed models, with an application to educational value-added assessments. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 59:13–27, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2012.10.004.

Andrew T. Karl, Yan Yang, and Sharon L. Lohr. Computation of maximum likelihood estimates for multiresponse generalized linear mixed models with non-nested, correlated random effects. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 73:146–162, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2013.11.019.

N. M. Laird and J. H. Ware. Random-effects models for longitudinal data. *Biometrics*, 38(4): 963–974, 1982.

N. M. Laird, N. Lange, and D. Stram. Maximum likelihood computations with repeated measures: application of the EM algorithm. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(397):97–105, 1987.

Michael J. Lindstrom and Douglas M. Bates. Newton–Raphson and EM algorithms for linear mixed-effects models for repeated-measures data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83 (404):1014–1022, 1988.

C. E. McCulloch, S. R. Searle, and J. M. Neuhaus. *Generalized, Linear, and Mixed Models*. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2nd edition, 2008.

Geoffrey J. McLachlan and Thriyambakam Krishnan. *The EM Algorithm and Extensions*. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2nd edition, 2008.

Xiao-Li Meng and Donald B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood estimation via the ECM algorithm: A general framework. *Biometrika*, 80(2):267–278, 1993. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2337198>.

H. D. Patterson and R. Thompson. Recovery of inter-block information when block sizes are unequal. *Biometrika*, 58(3):545–554, 1971.

Dimitris Rizopoulos, Geert Verbeke, and Emmanuel Lesaffre. Fully exponential laplace approximations for the joint modelling of survival and longitudinal data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 71(3):637–654, 2009. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00704.x.

S. R. Searle, G. Casella, and C. E. McCulloch. *Variance Components*. Wiley, New York, 1992.

Walter W. Stroup, George A. Milliken, Elizabeth A. Claassen, and Russell D. Wolfinger. *SAS for Mixed Models: Introduction and Basic Applications*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, 2018.

A. P. Verbyla. A conditional derivation of residual maximum likelihood. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 32(2):227–230, 1990.