

Bayesian data analysis – reading instructions 7

Aki Vehtari

Chapter 7

Outline of the chapter 7

- 7.1 Measures of predictive accuracy
- 7.2 Information criteria and cross-validation
- 7.3 Model comparison based on predictive performance
- 7.4 Model comparison using Bayes factors
- 7.5 Continuous model expansion / sensitivity analysis
- 7.5 Example (may be skipped)

See also updated information on computation of cross-validation and comparison to WAIC

- Basics of cross-validation tutorial at StanCon 2018 Helsinki <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hpr8pxqkCH8>
- Model selection tutorial at StanCon 2018 Asilomar <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FUROJM3u5HQ>
- Aki Vehtari, Andrew Gelman and Jonah Gabry (2016). Efficient implementation of leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC for evaluating fitted Bayesian models. In *Statistics and Computing*, 27(5):1413-1432, doi:10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4. arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.04544. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.04544>

Find all the terms and symbols listed below. When reading the chapter, write down questions related to things unclear for you or things you think might be unclear for others.

- predictive accuracy/fit/error
- external validation
- cross-validation
- information criteria
- overfitting
- measures of predictive accuracy
- point prediction
- scoring function
- mean squared error
- probabilistic prediction
- scoring rule
- logarithmic score
- log-predictive density
- out-of-sample predictive fit
- elpd, elppd, lppd
- deviance
- within-sample predictive accuracy

- adjusted within-sample predictive accuracy
- AIC, DIC (less important)
- WAIC (important)
- effective number of parameters
- singular model
- BIC (less important)
- leave-one-out cross-validation
- evaluating predictive error comparisons
- bias induced by model selection
- Bayes factors
- continuous model expansion
- sensitivity analysis

Additional reading

See more theoretical details in

- Aki Vehtari and Janne Ojanen (2012). A survey of Bayesian predictive methods for model assessment, selection and comparison. In *Statistics Surveys*, 6:142-228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-SS102>

See more experimental comparisons in

- Juho Piironen and Aki Vehtari (2017). Comparison of Bayesian predictive methods for model selection. *Statistics and Computing*, 27(3):711-735. doi:10.1007/s11222-016-9649-y. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11222-016-9649-y>

Posterior probability of the model vs. predictive performance

Gelman: "To take a historical example, I don't find it useful, from a statistical perspective, to say that in 1850, say, our posterior probability that Newton's laws were true was 99%, then in 1900 it was 50%, then by 1920, it was 0.01% or whatever. I'd rather say that Newton's laws were a good fit to the available data and prior information back in 1850, but then as more data and a clearer understanding became available, people focused on areas of lack of fit in order to improve the model."