Homework 9

PkGu

12/1/2021

P[263] 4.

(1). For model $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_n \sim B(n, p) \\ p \sim Beta(\alpha, \beta) \end{cases}$$

We have marginal likelihood (or model evidence) $\mathbf{x}|\alpha,\beta$

$$P_{\alpha,\beta}(t) = \binom{n}{t} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+t)\Gamma(n+\beta-t)}{\Gamma(n+\alpha+\beta)}$$

where $t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$. By definition,

$$-\frac{1}{2}BIC_{\alpha,\beta} = \log P_{\alpha,\beta}(t|\hat{p}) - \frac{1}{2}\log n$$
$$= t\log \hat{p} + (n-t)\log(1-\hat{p}) + \log\binom{n}{t} - \frac{1}{2}\log n$$

where $\hat{p} = \hat{p}_{MLE} = \frac{t}{n}$.

(2). $-\frac{1}{2}BIC$ are used to approximately compute $\log P_{\alpha,\beta}(t)$. Taking $\alpha=2,\beta=4$, we try to approximately compute the difference between them, which is defined by $\mathbb{E}[|\log P(t)-(-\frac{1}{2}BIC)|]$. For simplicity in computation, we use Stirling formula

$$\log(\Gamma(m)) = m \log m - m - \frac{1}{2} \log m + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) + o(1)$$

So

$$\begin{split} \log P(t) &= \log \Gamma(n+1) - \log \Gamma(t+1) - \log \Gamma(n-t+1) \\ &+ \log \Gamma(t+2) + \log \Gamma(n-t+4) - \log \Gamma(n+6) + \log(20) \\ &\approx n \log(n) - t \log(t) - (n-t) \log(n-t) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\log(n) - \log(t) - \log(n-t)) \\ &+ (t+2) \log(t+2) + (n-t+4) \log(n-t+4) - (n+6) \log(n+6) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\log(n+6) - \log(t+2) - \log(n-t+4)) \\ &+ \log(20) \\ &\approx \log(t) + 3 \log(n-t) - 5 \log(n) + \log(20) \end{split}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}BIC = t\log(t) + (n-t)\log(n-t) - n\log(n)$$

$$+\log\Gamma(n+1) - \log\Gamma(t+1) - \log\Gamma(n-t+1)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\log(n)$$

$$\approx -\frac{1}{2}\log(t) - \frac{1}{2}\log(n-t)$$

```
n <- 500
t <- numeric(n)
m <- 1000
err <- numeric(m)
rti <- numeric(m)
p <- rbeta(n,2,4)
for (i in 1:m){
    for (j in 1:n){
        t[j] <- rbinom(1,1,p[j])
    }
    tsum <- sum(t)
    err[i] <- abs((3/2)*log(tsum)+(7/2)*log(n-tsum)-5*log(n)+log(20))
}
print(mean(err))</pre>
```

[1] 0.0709796

The result shows that in this case the BIC has accuracy $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ where ϵ can take 10% when n > 100, 7% when n > 10000.

P[263] 5.

(1). The model evidences are respectively

$$f(\mathbf{x}|M_0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\mathbf{x}|\mu) f(\mu|M_0) d\mu$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\frac{1}{2\pi})^{\frac{31}{2}} e^{-\frac{30(\bar{x}-\mu)^2 + \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} e^{-\frac{(\mu-1)^2}{2}} d\mu$$

$$= (\frac{1}{2\pi})^{\frac{31}{2}} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{\mu^2 - 2\frac{30\bar{x} + 1}{31} + \frac{(30\bar{x}^2 + 1)}{31}}{2\bar{x}}} d\mu$$

$$= (\frac{1}{2\pi})^{\frac{31}{2}} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} e^{-\frac{31(\bar{x} - 1)^2}{60}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{((\mu - \frac{30\bar{x} + 1}{31})^2}{2\bar{x}}} d\mu$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-15} (31)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} e^{-\frac{31(\bar{x} - 1)^2}{60}}$$

$$f(\mathbf{x}|M_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\mathbf{x}|\mu) f(\mu|M_1) d\mu$$

$$= \int_{-1}^{1} (2\pi)^{-15} e^{-\frac{30(\bar{x}-\mu)^2 + \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} \frac{1}{2} d\mu$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-15} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} e^{-\frac{(\bar{x}-\mu)^2}{2 \cdot \frac{1}{30}}} d\mu$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-15} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{30}} \int_{-\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x}}^{\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x}} e^{-\frac{\nu^2}{2}} d\nu$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-15} e^{-\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{2}} (\frac{\pi}{60})^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Phi(\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x}) - \Phi(-\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x}))$$

So the Bayes factor is

$$BF_{01} = \left(\frac{60}{31\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{31(\bar{x}-1)^2}{60}} / \left(\Phi(\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x}) - \Phi(-\sqrt{30} - \sqrt{30}\bar{x})\right)$$

(2).

Importance sampling method: Since $f(\mathbf{x}|M_0) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu|M_0}[f(\mathbf{x}|\mu)])$, and

$$\pi(\mu|M_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(\mu-1)^2}{2}}$$
$$\pi(\mu|M_1) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{(-1,1)}$$
$$f(\mathbf{x}|\mu) \propto e^{15(\bar{x}-\mu)^2}$$

```
m < -10
n <- 1000
wght1 <- function(mu){</pre>
  if(mu>-1 & mu<1){
    w \leftarrow sqrt(2*pi)*exp((mu-1)^2/2)/2
    return(w)
  }
  else{
    return(0)
  }
}
for(i in 1:m){
  w1 <- numeric(n)
  xbar \leftarrow rnorm(1,1,1/30)
  mu0 < - rnorm (n, 1, 1)
  f0 \leftarrow exp(15*(xbar-mu0))
  exp0 <- mean(f0)</pre>
  for(j in 1:n){
    w1[j] <- wght1(mu0[j])
  wf1 \leftarrow exp(15*(xbar-mu0))*w1
```

```
exp1 <- mean(wf1)/mean(w1)
print(exp0/exp1)
}

## [1] 5380473
## [1] 24472022
## [1] 828273.2
## [1] 10980867
## [1] 76612.27
## [1] 2128224
## [1] 1589853
## [1] 12568.71
## [1] 15374.21
## [1] 36376123814</pre>
```

MCMC method: We use random walk Monte Carlo algorithm here... An example has shown in Homework 7. But I can't understand why should I arrange such a complicated approximate algorithm for sampling from these simple distributions (a normal distribution and a uniform one)...