

# Module 11: Lesson 2 Lab

Callum Arnold

7/19/2021

## Contents

Background	1
Exercise 1	1
Exercise 2	2
Full conditional density of $\alpha$ . . . . .	2
Full conditional density of $\beta$ . . . . .	2
Exercise 3	3
Exercise 4	3
Exercise 5	3
Exercise 6* [Optional]	3

## Background

Suppose that we have data on incubation periods  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . We assume that the data are *independent* draws from a Gamma distribution with shape  $\alpha$  and rate  $\beta$ , i.e.

$$y_i \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta) \quad \text{i.i.d., } i = 1, \dots, n$$

where the Gamma distribution has probability density function:

$$f(x|\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta x), \quad \alpha > 0, \beta > 0.$$

The goal is to make (sampling-based) Bayesian inference for the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

## Exercise 1

Assume that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are *a priori* independent and assign Gamma distributions with parameters  $\lambda\alpha$  and  $\nu\alpha$ , and  $\lambda\beta$  and  $\nu\beta$ , respectively. Write down (i.e. express in mathematical terms) the posterior density of interest, i.e.

$$\pi(\alpha, \beta|y) \propto \pi(y|\alpha, \beta)\pi(\alpha)\pi(\beta)$$

where  $\pi(y|\alpha, \beta)$  denotes the likelihood function.

$$\begin{aligned}
y_i &\sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta) \\
f(x|\alpha, \beta) &= \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta x) \\
\alpha &\sim \Gamma(\lambda_\alpha, \nu_\alpha) \\
\beta &\sim \Gamma(\lambda_\beta, \nu_\beta)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\alpha, \beta|y) &\propto \pi(y|\alpha, \beta)\pi(\alpha)\pi(\beta) \\
\pi(y|\alpha, \beta) &= \frac{\beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k y_k^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \sum y_k)}{\{\Gamma(\alpha)\}^n} \\
\pi(\alpha, \beta|y) &\propto \frac{\beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k y_k^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \sum y_k)}{\{\Gamma(\alpha)\}^n} \times \pi(\alpha)\pi(\beta) \\
&\propto \frac{\beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k y_k^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \sum y_k)}{\{\Gamma(\alpha)\}^n} \times \left( \frac{\nu_\alpha^{\lambda_\alpha}}{\Gamma(\lambda_\alpha)} \alpha^{\lambda_\alpha-1} \exp(-\nu_\alpha \alpha) \right) \times \left( \frac{\nu_\beta^{\lambda_\beta}}{\Gamma(\lambda_\beta)} \beta^{\lambda_\beta-1} \exp(-\nu_\beta \beta) \right) \\
&\propto \left( \frac{\beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k y_k^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \sum y_k)}{\{\Gamma(\alpha)\}^n} \right) \times (\alpha^{\lambda_\alpha-1} \exp(-\nu_\alpha \alpha)) \times (\beta^{\lambda_\beta-1} \exp(-\nu_\beta \beta))
\end{aligned}$$

## Exercise 2

Having obtained the joint posterior density in Exercise 1, first derive the densities of the posterior distribution of the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  up to proportionality, i.e.  $\pi(\alpha|y)$  and  $\pi(\beta|y)$ .

Is any of these densities of a known form (i.e. the density of a standard/well-known distribution, e.g. Gamma, Normal etc)?

### Full conditional density of $\alpha$

$$\pi(\alpha|\beta, y) \propto \left( \frac{\beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k y_k^{\alpha-1}}{\{\Gamma(\alpha)\}^n} \right) \times (\alpha^{\lambda_\alpha-1} \exp(-\nu_\alpha \alpha))$$

This doesn't look like a standard well-known distribution, so we'll need to use M-H algorithm

### Full conditional density of $\beta$

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\alpha, \beta|y) &\propto \left( \beta^{n\alpha} \prod_k \exp(-\beta y_k) \right) \times (\beta^{\lambda_\beta-1} \exp(-\nu_\beta \beta)) \\
&\propto \left( \beta^{n\alpha} \exp\left(-\beta \sum_{k=1}^n y_k\right) \right) \times (\beta^{\lambda_\beta-1} \exp(-\nu_\beta \beta)) \\
&\propto \beta^{n\alpha+\lambda_\beta-1} \exp\left[\beta \left(\sum_{k=1}^n y_k + \nu_\beta\right)\right] \\
\beta|\alpha, y &\sim \Gamma\left(n\alpha + \lambda_\beta, \sum_{k=1}^n y_k + \nu_\beta\right)
\end{aligned}$$

We can see that this looks like a Gamma distribution with the associated shape parameters, therefore, for  $\beta$  we can sample directly from its conditional distribution.

## Exercise 3

Write a R function to implement an MCMC algorithm (from scratch!) which samples from the joint posterior distribution  $\pi(\alpha, \beta|y)$ .

First, think about what the input (i.e. arguments) the function should have, e.g. a vector corresponding to data  $\mathbf{y}$ , hyper-parameter values  $\lambda\alpha$ , etc. Then also think about what the output should be; surely the function should output the posterior samples of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Anything else?

To get you started, a pseudo-code of this MCMC algorithm is given below:

1. Choose initial values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ;
2. Update  $\alpha$  by sampling from  $\pi(\alpha|\beta, y)$  using a Gaussian random-walk;
3. Update  $\beta$  by sampling from  $\pi(\beta|\alpha, y)$  directly.
4. Go to Step (b)

Look at the trace plots and convince yourself that the chain has reached stationarity and is mixing well.

## Exercise 4

Test your algorithm is producing sensible results.

One way to do this is to first simulate a dataset from a Gamma distribution with some specific values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , eg. `y <- rgamma(100, 4, 2)` will simulate a vector of 100 draws from a  $\text{Ga}(4, 2)$ .

Then use your MCMC algorithm (in Exercise 3) to sample from the joint posterior distribution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  assuming vague priors, e.g.  $\lambda\alpha = \lambda\beta = 1$  and  $\nu\alpha = \nu\beta = 10 - 3$ .

In principle, your marginal posterior distributions ( $\pi(\alpha|y)$  and  $\pi(\beta|y)$ ) should be centered around the values you have chosen to simulate the data from (e.g. 4 and 2 in this case).

## Exercise 5

If you have convinced yourself that your MCMC algorithm is doing what is supposed to be doing, then use it to fit the model to the *Campylobacter* data (24 observations in total) from Evans et al. 1996) by `y <- c(rep(2, 2), rep(3, 6), rep(4, 11), rep(5, 3), rep(7, 7))`

Does the model offer a good fit? How would you go assessing that?

## Exercise 6\* [Optional]

Now that you have got a working algorithm, can you improve its mixing?

One way to do this is to update both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  at the same time (in a block). This can be done, for example, and as discussed in the lecture, by proposing values drawn from some (bivariate distribution) with density  $q(\alpha, \beta)$  and accept/reject according to the Metropolis-Hastings ratio. There are many choices here, but not all of them will lead to an efficient sampler.

Here are a few choices to try:

- Gaussian random-walk in a block, i.e. propose values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  drawn from a bivariate Normal distribution with mean the current values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  and some  $(2 \times 2)$  variance-covariance matrix, and then accept/reject using the Metropolis-Hastings ratio.

- Gaussian approximation to the posterior distribution  $\pi(\alpha, \beta|y)$ . (Hint: use the command `optim` to find the values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  that maximise the posterior density).