

Lecture 23

- Metropolis-Hasting (E. Teller-1953)

given $X_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda = a + b + i)$ we need a way to sample
 $K(a|b, X_i) = "$ an "a" and a "b"
 $K(b|a, X_i) = "$ from conditionals to approx posterior.

- M-H Rejection Sampling

Main steps: draw a from $K(a|b, X_i)$; b from $K(b|a, X_i)$
 * steps are identical, can't sample directly so: SubSteps

sub step 1 | create : $q(a_{+1}, \phi)$ a transitional distribution
 \uparrow other hyperparameters

draw "a" from $q(a_{+1}, \phi)$

* substitute distribution, different from $P(a|b, X_i)$
 * now we must check if "a" is a good choice

sub step 2 | M-H ratio

$$r := \frac{P(a=a_+, b=b_{+1} | X)}{f_q(a_+ | a_{+1}, \phi)} \cdot \frac{P(a=a_{+1}, b=b_{+1} | X)}{f_q(a_{+1} | a_+, \phi)}$$

ratio of posterior to transition if a_+ is used

chance to go old \rightarrow new

posterior of new data

posterior of old data

chance to go new \rightarrow old

ratio of posterior to transition if reversed

"Metropolis" alg

sub step 3 | Accept/Reject proposed a_+

accept only if $r \geq 1$

* M-H has been proven to converge
 * M-H is most useful when sampling from a conditional kernel

we only \rightarrow if q is symmetric

* Note: Gibbs Sampler is special case of M-H

draw from $q(\theta_j, \delta) = P(\theta_j | \theta_{-j})$ • the conditional is the known transitional distribution not including j

$$\left\{ \frac{P(\theta_j = \theta_{j,+} | \theta_{-j})}{P(\theta_j = \theta_{j,-} | \theta_{-j})} \right\} = 1$$

$$r := \frac{P(\theta_j = \theta_{j,+} | \theta_{-j})}{P(\theta_j = \theta_{j,-} | \theta_{-j})} = 1$$

• for $q = N(\theta_{t+1}, I^2)$: $f_q(a_t | a_{t+1}, \phi) = f_q(a_{t+1} | a_t, \phi)$
the metropolis model/algorithm

• * so we use M-H (or Metropolis) when given a conditional kernel

Bayesian protocol:

① Collect data

② Pick \mathcal{L} : likelihood model

③ Pick $P(\theta)$: prior

These are ASSUMED

what if they are wrong?

④ Get posterior : use for inference

- compute

- Grid sample

- Gibbs sample

- M-H algorithm

* We model check $P(X|\theta)$ & $P(\theta)$ to ensure X makes sense

- Check #1 : passing Prior Predictive distribution check ?

$$P(X) = \int_{\Theta} P(X|\theta) P(\theta) d\theta$$

- does X make sense based on distribution $P(X)$
- X must fall in $P(X)$

- Check #2 : passing posterior replicate distribution check ?

$$P(X^*|X) = \int_{\Theta} P(X^*|\theta) P(\theta|X) d\theta$$

- can X come from $X^*|X$?
- does our model generate new X^* that resembles our actual data.