# Stat-Computing-2 Assignment-5

### Anjan Ghosh, MS1803

Here we will consider a hierarchical Bayes approach for normal mixture model.

#### **Data Generation**

200 observations are simulated from the mixture distribution:

$$f = 0.35N(10, 5^2) + 0.65N(25, 5^2)$$

This is done in two steps.

- First, a bernoulli observation is drawn  $\sim Ber(p=0.35)$ .
- If the simulated value is less than 0.35, we draw one sample from  $N(10, 5^2)$  distribution, else from  $N(25, 5^2)$  distribution.

We denote this data as  $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{200})$ .

#### Derivation of the MCMC

We use the simulated dataset and estimate the underlying model parameters using a hierarchical Bayes algorithm. We assume that data comes from the model of the form:

$$f = pN(\mu_0, \sigma^2) + (1 - p)N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$$

This implies that with probabilty p, the data is coming from  $N(\mu_0, \sigma^2)$  distribution and from  $N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$  with probability 1 - p.

The hierarchical structure that we develop is:

$$p \sim Uniform(0,1),$$

$$K_{i}|p \sim Bernoulli(p), i = 1, 2, ..., 200$$

$$y_{i}|K_{i} = k \sim N(\mu_{k+1 \mod 2}, \sigma^{2}), k = 0, 1$$

$$\mu_{k} \sim N(0, 100), k = 0, 1$$

$$\sigma^{2} \sim Inverse \ Gamma(0.01, 0.01)$$

This fits the undertaken mixture model since, when  $K_i = 1$  with probability p, we take sample from  $N(\mu_0, \sigma^2)$  and when  $K_i = 0$  with probability 1 - p, we take sample from  $N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$ , for a certain i.

This helps in writing the joint likelihood and derive the posteriors from there.

Let 
$$K = \sum_{i=1}^{200} K_i$$
.

$$\pi(y, K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200}, p, \mu_0, \mu_1, \sigma^2) \propto \prod_{i=1}^{200} f(y_i | K_i, \mu_0, \mu_1, \sigma^2) \pi(K_i | p) \pi(p) \pi(p) \pi(\mu_0) \pi(\mu_1) \pi(\sigma^2)$$

$$\propto p^K (1 - p)^{200 - K} \prod_{i: K_i = 1} f(y_i | \mu_0, \sigma^2) \prod_{i: K_i = 0} f(y_i | \mu_1, \sigma^2) \times 1 \times \pi(\mu_0) \pi(\mu_1) \pi(\sigma^2)$$

$$\therefore \pi(p | K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200}) \propto p^K (1 - p)^{200 - K}$$

$$\sigma^2 \propto (\sigma^2)^{0.01 + 100 + 1} \exp{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}} (0.01 + \frac{1}{2} (\sum_{i: K_i = 0} (y_i - \mu_0)^2 + \sum_{i: K_i = 0} (y_i - \mu_1)^2))$$

Therefore it can be said that,

$$\begin{aligned} p|K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200} &\sim Beta(K+1, 200-K+1) \\ \sigma^2|y, K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200}, \mu_0, \mu_1 &\sim Inverse \ Gamma(0.01+100, 0.01+\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{i:K_i=1}(y_i-\mu_0)^2 + \sum_{i:K_i=0}(y_i-\mu_1)^2)) \\ \mu_0|y, K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200}, \sigma^2 &\sim N(\frac{\sum_{i:K_i=1}^{i:K_i=1}y_i}{\frac{K}{\sigma^2}+\frac{1}{10^2}}, \frac{1}{\frac{K}{\sigma^2}+\frac{1}{10^2}}) \\ \mu_1|y, K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{200}, \sigma^2 &\sim N(\frac{\sum_{i:K_i=0}^{i:K_i=0}y_i}{\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}+\frac{1}{10^2}}, \frac{1}{\frac{200-K}{\sigma^2}+\frac{1}{10^2}}) \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$K_{i}|y_{i}, p, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2} \sim \frac{f(y_{i}, K_{i}|p, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}{f(y_{i}|p, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}, i = 1, 2, \dots, 200 independently$$

$$= \frac{f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})\pi(K_{i}|p)}{f(y_{i}|p, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}$$

$$= \frac{p^{K_{i}}(1-p)^{1-K_{i}} \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}{p \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{0}, \sigma^{2}) + (1-p) \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}$$

$$\therefore K_{i}|y_{i}, p, \mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2} \sim Bernoulli(\frac{p \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{0}, \sigma^{2})}{p \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{0}, \sigma^{2}) + (1-p) \times f(y_{i}|K_{i}, \mu_{1}, \sigma^{2})}), i = 1, 2, \dots, 200 independently.$$

These gives the required posterior distributions. Following steps are followed in sequence for 20001 times. First 2000 samples are discarded as burn-in and remaining ones are thinned by saving every 10th iteration.

- 1.  $p, \mu_0, \mu_1, \sigma^2$  are initialised with the help of respective prior distributions.
- Inside a loop,
  - 2.  $K_i$ , i = 1, 2, ..., 200 are simulated independently from its posterior.
  - 3. p is simulated from its posterior.
  - 4.  $\sigma^2$  is simulated from its posterior.
  - 5.  $\mu_0, \mu_1$  are simulated from their posteriors.

#### R code

### DATA GENERATION n<-200

```
mu < -c(10,25)
sig < -c(5,5)
p < -c(.35,.65)
z<-sample(1:length(p),prob = p,replace = T,size = 200)</pre>
x<-rnorm(n,mu[z],sig[z])</pre>
### PRIOR INITIALISATIONS AND VECTOR/MATRIX INITIALISATIONS
p init<-runif(1)</pre>
mu_init<-rnorm(2,0,10)</pre>
sig_init<-sqrt(1/rgamma(1,0.01,0.01))
sig<-numeric(20001)</pre>
p<-numeric(20001)
mu<-matrix(,20001,2)</pre>
### ITERATIONS
for(i in 1:20001)
  K<-rbinom(n,1,p_init*dnorm(x,mu_init[1],sig_init)/</pre>
               (p_init*dnorm(x,mu_init[1],sig_init)+
                  (1-p_init)*dnorm(x,mu_init[2],sig_init)))
  p[i] < -rbeta(1, sum(K==1)+1, sum(K==0)+1)
  sig[i] < -sqrt(1/rgamma(1,0.01+n/2,0.01+(sum((x[K==1]-mu_init[1])^2)+
                                              sum((x[K==0]-mu_init[2])^2))/2))
  mu[i,1] < -rnorm(1,sum(K==1)*mean(x[K==1])*100/(100*sum(K==1)+sig[i]^2),
                  100*sig[i]^2/(100*sum(K==1)+sig[i]^2))
  mu[i,2] < -rnorm(1,sum(K==0)*mean(x[K==0])*100/(100*sum(K==0)+sig[i]^2),
                  100*sig[i]^2/(100*sum(K==0)+sig[i]^2))
  p_init<-p[i]
  sig_init<-sig[i]
  mu_init<-mu[i,]</pre>
}
### BURN-IN AND THINNING, ESTIMATES AND 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS
index<-seq(from=2001,to=20001,by=10)
mean(p[index])
apply(mu[index,], 2, mean)
mean(sig[index])
quantile(p[index], c(0.025, 0.5, 0.975))
apply(mu[index,],2,quantile,c(0.025,0.5,0.975))
quantile(sig[index],c(0.025,0.5,0.975))
```

#### Results

Table containing posterior estimates and 95% credible interval of the parameters

Parameter	Posterior Mean	Posterior Median	95% Credible Interval
$p$ $\mu_1$ $\mu_2$ $sigma$	0.3863311	0.3860024	(0.3076422, 0.4682178)
	10.9103679	10.9203482	(9.8611319, 12.0471979)
	25.3811611	25.3949254	(24.5405844, 26.1011435)
	4.8886941	4.8601455	(4.3251507, 5.6227762)

## Conclusion

- Final estimates are more or less close to the original values of parameters that were used in generating samples.
- Posterior medians are close to posterior means.
- 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of posterior distributions lie closely to each other for all the parameters except for p. Increase in sample size might have a positive effect on this.
- Estimates are comparable with that obtained through EM algorithm previously.