

# Posterior distribution

Jan van Waaij

April 27, 2021

## 1 Distribution of the posterior of a finite basis expansion with Gaussian coefficients

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $X^T = (X_t : t \in [0, T])$  be an observation of*

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t,$$

*where  $b$  is equipped with the prior distribution defined by*

$$b = \sum_{j=1}^k \theta_j \phi_j,$$

*where  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k\}$  is a linearly independent basis, and  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)^t$  has multivariate normal distribution  $N(\mu, \Sigma)$ , with mean vector  $\mu$  and positive definite matrix  $\Sigma$ , and  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is a measurable function. Then the posterior distribution of  $\theta$  given  $X^T$  is  $N(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma})$ , where*

$$\hat{\mu} = (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1}(m + \Sigma^{-1}\mu), \quad \hat{\Sigma} = (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1}$$

*and the vector  $m = (m_1, \dots, m_k)^t$  is defined by*

$$m_l = \int_0^T \frac{\phi_l(X_t)}{\sigma(X_t)^2} dX_t, \quad l = 1, \dots, k,$$

*and the symmetric  $k \times k$ -matrix  $S$  is given by*

$$S_{l,l'} = \int_0^T \frac{\phi_l(X_t)\phi_{l'}(X_t)}{\sigma^2(X_t)} dt, \quad l, l' = 1, \dots, k, \quad (1)$$

*provided  $S + \Sigma^{-1}$  is invertible. Moreover, the marginal likelihood is given by*

$$\int p(X^T | \theta) p(\theta) d\theta = |\Sigma^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}|^{1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu} e^{\frac{1}{2}\hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}}.$$

*Proof.* Almost surely we have by Girsanov's theorem (e.g. Steele, 2001, chapter 13 or Chung and Williams, 1990 reprint 2014, section 9.4)

$$p(X^T | \theta) = \exp \left( \int_0^T \frac{b(X_t)}{\sigma(X_t)^2} dX_t - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left( \frac{b(X_t)}{\sigma(X_t)} \right)^2 dt \right), \quad (2)$$

with respect to the Wiener measure. So

$$\log p(X^T | b) = \theta^t m - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t S \theta \quad (3)$$

and the log of the distribution of  $\theta$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\log p(\theta) &= -\frac{k}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1} (\theta - \mu) \\ &= C_1 - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t \Sigma^{-1} \theta + \theta^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$C_1 = -\frac{k}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} \mu^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\log[p(X^T | \theta)p(\theta)] &= C_1 + \theta^t m - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t S \theta - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t \Sigma^{-1} \theta + \theta^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu \\ &= C_1 + \theta^t (m + \Sigma^{-1} \mu) - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t (S + \Sigma^{-1}) \theta \\ &= C_1 + \theta^t (S + \Sigma^{-1}) \left( (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} (m + \Sigma^{-1} \mu) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t (S + \Sigma^{-1}) \theta.\end{aligned}$$

By the Bayes formula, the posterior density of  $\theta$  is proportional to  $p(X^T | \theta)p(\theta)$ . It follows that  $\theta | X^T$  is normally distributed with mean

$$\hat{\mu} := (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} (m + \Sigma^{-1} \mu).$$

and covariance matrix

$$\hat{\Sigma} := (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1},$$

provided  $S + \Sigma^{-1}$  is invertible. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}& \int p(X^T | \theta) p(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \int e^{C_1} e^{\theta^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \theta^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \theta} d\theta \\ &= (2\pi)^{k/2} |\hat{\Sigma}|^{1/2} e^{\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}} e^{C_1} \\ &\quad \times \int (2\pi)^{-k/2} |\hat{\Sigma}|^{-1/2} e^{\theta^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \theta^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \theta} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}} d\theta \\ &= (2\pi)^{k/2} |\hat{\Sigma}|^{1/2} e^{\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}} e^{C_1} \\ &= |\Sigma^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}|^{1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \mu^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu} e^{\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu}},\end{aligned}$$

using that the integrand in the third last line is the density of a multivariate normal distribution and therefore integrates to one.  $\square$

## 2 The marginal maximum likelihood estimator

Suppose we have prior  $\theta \sim N(\mu, \Sigma_\lambda)$ , where  $\Sigma_\lambda = \lambda^2 \Sigma$ . Note that

$$\Sigma_\lambda \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} = \Sigma_\lambda (S + \Sigma^{-1}) = \Sigma_\lambda S + \mathbb{I}_k = \lambda^2 \Sigma S + \mathbb{I}_k$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}^t \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mu} = m^t (S + \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} m = m^t (S + \lambda^{-2} \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} m.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \int p(X^T | \theta) p(\theta) d\theta \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\lambda^2 \Sigma S + \mathbb{I}_k| - \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \mu^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu + \frac{1}{2} m^t (S + \lambda^{-2} \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} m. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

**Lemma 2.** Let  $X^T = (X_t : t \in [0, T])$  be an observation of

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t,$$

where  $b$  is equipped with the prior distribution defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 &\sim \text{Inverse Gamma}(A, B) = IG(A, B) \\ \theta | \lambda &\sim N(\mu, \lambda^2 \Sigma) \\ b | \theta &= \sum_{j=1}^k \theta_j \phi_j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k\}$  is a linearly independent basis. Then

$$\lambda^2 | \theta, X^T \sim IG\left(A + k/2, B + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1}(\theta - \mu)\right).$$

*Proof.* Recall eq. (3),  $\log p(X^T | b) = \theta^t m - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t S \theta$ . The logarithm of the distribution of  $\theta$  given  $\lambda$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is given by (proportionality w.r.t.  $\lambda$ ),

$$\log p(\theta | \lambda) = C_1 - k \log \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-2} (\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1} (\theta - \mu).$$

for some real constant  $C_1$ , depending on  $\theta$ , but not on  $\lambda$ .

In the following,  $\propto$  means equal up to a multiplicative constant depending on  $\theta$  and  $X^T$ , but not on  $\lambda$ . By the Bayes formula,

$$p(\lambda^2 | \theta, X^T) \propto p(X^T | \lambda^2, \theta) p(\lambda^2 | \theta)$$

and

$$p(\lambda^2 | \theta) \propto p(\theta | \lambda^2) p(\lambda^2)$$

so

$$p(\lambda^2 | \theta, X^T) \propto p(X^T | \lambda^2, \theta) p(\theta | \lambda^2) p(\lambda^2).$$

It follows that for some real constants  $C, \tilde{C}$  depending on  $\theta$  and  $X^T$ , but not on  $\lambda$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \log p(\lambda^2 | \theta, X^T) \\ &= C + \theta^t m - \frac{1}{2} \theta^t S \theta \\ & \quad - k \log \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-2} (\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1} (\theta - \mu) \\ & \quad - (A + 1) \log(\lambda^2) - \frac{B}{\lambda^2} \\ &= \tilde{C} - (A + k/2 + 1) \log(\lambda^2) - \frac{B + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1}(\theta - \mu)}{\lambda^2}; \end{aligned}$$

which is up to an additive constant the logarithm of the density of the inverse gamma distribution with shape parameter  $A + k/2$  and scale parameter  $B + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1}(\theta - \mu)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(X^T \mid j, \lambda^2) &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\lambda^2 \Sigma S + \mathbb{I}_k| \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \mu^t \Sigma^{-1} \mu + \frac{1}{2} m^t (S + \lambda^{-2} \Sigma^{-1})^{-1} m. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows from

$$p(X^T \mid j, \lambda^2) = \int p(X^T \mid j, \theta^j, \lambda^2) p(\theta^j \mid j, \lambda) d\theta^j$$

and eq. (4). □

### 3 Number of dependent Faber-Schauder functions with higher or equal index

The Faber-Schauder basis functions  $\psi_0, \psi_{j,k}$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x) &= \begin{cases} 1 - 2x & \text{when } x \in [0, 1/2), \\ 2x - 1 & \text{when } x \in [1/2, 1], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \Lambda(x) &= \begin{cases} 2x & \text{when } x \in [0, 1/2), \\ 2(1 - x) & \text{when } x \in [1/2, 1], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\psi_{j,k}(x) = \Lambda(2^j x - k + 1), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, k = 1, \dots, 2^j,$$

see **meulenschauerwaaij2017**. In this question we establish that the Girsanov matrix  $S$ , defined by eq. (1) with the Faber-Schauder matrix is sparse.

**Definition 4.** Let for each  $n$ ,  $M^n$  a  $n \times n$  matrix. The sequence  $(M^n)_{n \geq 1}$  is sparse when the number of nonzero entries of  $M^n$  divided by  $n^2$  converges to zero.

Informally this means that almost all entries of  $M^n$  are zero.

Note that  $S_{l,\nu} = 0$  when  $\text{SUPP}(\Psi_l) \cap \text{SUPP}(\Psi_\nu)$  has Lebesgue measure zero. **Hier verder!!!** Note that for level  $j \geq 1$ ,  $\psi_{j,k}$  and  $\psi_{j,l}$  are only dependent when  $k = l$  (obviously, then they are equal).

Note that  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_{0,1}$  are dependent, both of level 0.

When  $d \geq 1$ , then there are  $2^d$  Faber functions of level  $j + d$  that are dependent with  $\psi_{j,k}$ ,  $j \geq 0$ . These are

$$\psi_{j+d, (k-1)2^d+1}, \psi_{j+d, (k-1)2^d+2}, \dots, \psi_{j+d, k2^d}$$

Every Faber-Schauder function is obviously dependent with itself.

Indexing with  $i = 2^j + k$ , when  $\psi_{j,k}$  has index  $(j, k)$  (excluding  $i = 1$ ), we see that, when  $j \geq 0$ ,  $\psi_i$  is dependent with  $2^{j'-j}$ , functions  $\psi_{j',k'}$ ,  $i' = 2^{j'} + k' \geq i$  of level  $j' \geq j$  (including itself, when  $j' = j$ ).

So if  $J$  is the highest level,  $\psi_i$  is dependent with

$$\sum_{d=0}^{J-j} 2^d = 2^{J-j+1} - 1.$$

Faber-Schauder functions  $\psi_{i'}$  with index  $i' \geq i$ . Hence summing over all levels  $0, \dots, J$  and indices within a level, the number of combinations of functions  $(\psi_{j,k}, \psi_{j',k'}), 0 \leq j, j' \leq J$  and  $i = 2^j + k \leq 2^{j'} + k' = i'$  which are dependent is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^J \sum_{k=1}^{2^j} (2^{J-j+1} - 1) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^J (2^{J+1} - 2^j) \\ &= (J+1)2^{J+1} - (2^{J+1} - 1) \\ &= J2^{J+1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The Faber-Schauder function  $\psi_1$  is dependent with every Faber-Schauder function (including itself) up to and including level  $J$ , which counts for  $2^{J+1}$  Faber-Schauder functions with a higher index or equal index, up to level  $J$ .

In total we have

$$J2^{J+1} + 1 + 2^{J+1} = (J+1)2^{J+1} + 1.$$

Faber-Schauder functions up to level  $J$  dependent with a Faber-Schauder function with equal (itself) or higher index.

If we only consider dependent pairs  $(\psi_i, \psi_{i'})$  with  $i' > i$ , then we have

$$J2^{J+1} + 1$$

of such pairs (minus all  $2^{J+1}$  diagonal pairs  $(\psi_i, \psi_i)$ ).

Hence, by symmetry, there are in total  $J2^{J+1} + 1 + J2^{J+1} + 1 + 2^{J+1} = (2J+1)2^{J+1} + 2$  pairs  $(\psi_i, \psi_{i'})$  that are dependent.

**Lemma 5.** *The Girsanov covariantie matrix is sparse.*

*Proof.* At most  $(2J+1)2^{J+1} + 2$  entries of the  $2^{J+1} \times 2^{J+1}$ -matrix ( $2^{2J+2}$  entries) are nonzero. The fraction of nonzero elements is at most

$$\frac{(2J+1)2^{J+1} + 2}{2^{2J+2}} = (2J+1)2^{-J-1} + 2^{-2J-1},$$

which converges to zero. □

## References

- Chung, K.L. and R.J. Williams (1990 reprint 2014). *Introduction to Stochastic Integration*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Springer New York. ISBN: 978-1-4614-9587-1. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4614-9587-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9587-1).
- Steele, J.M. (2001). *Stochastic Calculus and Financial Applications*. Applications of mathematics : stochastic modelling and applied probability. Springer. ISBN: 9780387950167. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4684-9305-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-9305-4).