

**Congratulations! You passed!**

Next Item



1. For Questions 1 through 3, consider the following model for data that take on values between 0 and 1:

1 / 1
points

$$\begin{aligned} x_i | \alpha, \beta &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \alpha &\sim \text{Gamma}(a, b), \\ \beta &\sim \text{Gamma}(r, s), \end{aligned}$$

where α and β are independent a priori. Which of the following gives the full conditional density for α up to proportionality?

- ☐ $p(\alpha | \beta, x) \propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} I_{(\alpha>0)}$
- ☐ $p(\alpha | \beta, x) \propto \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n}{\Gamma(\alpha)^n \Gamma(\beta)^n} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha-1} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (1-x_i) \right]^{\beta-1} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} \beta^{r-1} e^{-s\beta} I_{(0<\alpha<1)} I_{(0<\beta<1)}$
- ☐ $p(\alpha | \beta, x) \propto \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n}{\Gamma(\alpha)^n} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} I_{(0<\alpha<1)}$
- ☒ $p(\alpha | \beta, x) \propto \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n}{\Gamma(\alpha)^n} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha-1} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} I_{(\alpha>0)}$

Correct

When we treat the data and β as known constants, the full joint distribution of all quantities x, α , and β is proportional to this expression when viewed as a function of α .



2. Suppose we want posterior samples for α from the model in Question 1. What is our best option?

1 / 1
points

- ☐ The joint posterior for α and β is a common probability distribution which we can sample directly. Thus we can draw Monte Carlo samples for both parameters and keep the samples for α .
- ☒ The full conditional for α is not proportional to any common probability distribution, and the marginal posterior for β is not any easier, so we will have to resort to a Metropolis-Hastings sampler.

Correct

Another option is to approximate the posterior distribution for α by considering a set of discrete values such as 0.1, 0.2, ..., 0.9 etc. You could use a discrete uniform prior, or discrete prior probabilities proportional to the beta prior evaluated at these specific values. Either way, the full conditional distribution for α looks like the discrete version of Bayes' theorem, which is easy to compute.

- ☐ The full conditional for α is proportional to a common distribution which we can sample directly, so we can draw from that.
- ☐ The full conditional for α is not a proper distribution (it doesn't integrate to 1), so we cannot sample from it.



3. If we elect to use a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm to draw posterior samples for α , the Metropolis-Hastings candidate acceptance ratio is computed using the full conditional for α as

1 / 1
points

$$\frac{\Gamma(\alpha)^n \Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha^*} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha^*} q(\alpha^*|\alpha) I_{(\alpha^*>0)}}{\Gamma(\alpha^*)^n \Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} q(\alpha|\alpha^*) I_{(\alpha>0)}}$$

where α^* is a candidate value drawn from proposal distribution $q(\alpha^*|\alpha)$. Suppose that instead of the full conditional for α , we use the full joint posterior distribution of α and β and simply plug in the current (or known) value of β . What is the Metropolis-Hastings ratio in this case?

- ☐ $\frac{\alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha^*} q(\alpha^*|\alpha) I_{(\alpha^*>0)}}{\alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} q(\alpha|\alpha^*) I_{(\alpha>0)}}$
- ☒ $\frac{\Gamma(\alpha)^n \Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha^*} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha^*} q(\alpha^*|\alpha) I_{(\alpha^*>0)}}{\Gamma(\alpha^*)^n \Gamma(\alpha+\beta)^n \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha} \alpha^{a-1} e^{-b\alpha} q(\alpha|\alpha^*) I_{(\alpha>0)}}$

Correct

All of the terms involving only β are identical in the numerator and denominator, and thus cancel out. The acceptance ratio is the same whether we use the full joint posterior or the full conditional in a Gibbs sampler.



MCMC

Quiz, 5 questions



$$\frac{\Gamma(\alpha^* + \beta)^n \left[\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right]^{\alpha^* - 1} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (1 - x_i) \right]^{\beta - 1} \alpha^{*\alpha - 1} e^{-\ln \alpha^*} \beta^{\beta - 1} e^{-\beta \beta} q(\alpha | \alpha^*) I_{(0, \alpha^*)} I_{(\beta, \beta)}}{\Gamma(\alpha^*)^n \Gamma(\beta)^n q(\alpha^* | \alpha)}$$

5/5 points (100%)

1 / 1
points

4. For Questions 4 and 5, re-run the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm from Lesson 4 to draw posterior samples from the model for mean company personnel growth for six new companies: (-0.2, -1.5, -5.3, 0.3, -0.8, -2.2). Use the same prior as in the lesson.

Below are four possible values for the standard deviation of the normal proposal distribution in the algorithm. Which one yields the best sampling results?

☐ 0.5☒ 1.5**Correct**

The candidate acceptance rate for this proposal distribution is about 0.3 which yields good results.

☐ 3.0☐ 4.01 / 1
points

5. Report the posterior mean point estimate for μ , the mean growth, using these six data points. Round your answer to two decimal places.

Correct Response

The sample mean of the six points is -1.62. Clearly the prior has some influence on this estimate.

