

- what is conjugate prior.
- change of variable - { why not uniform
- Jeffreys prior : $\det(I(\theta))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$
what it connects to data
- Non-informative
- Expert prior
- KL distance
- Reference Prior.

- Direct integration
- with (hyper) prior
- why? Integration is hard.
- Bayesian Regression
- Bayesian variable selection

- ch 4.
- Laplace approximation
 - Independent MC methods

Bayesian testing

$H_0: \theta$ belongs to some interval.

$$\theta \in \Theta_0$$

$$\pi(\theta_0|x) = \int_{\Theta_0} \pi(\theta|x)$$

• Bayes Factor

$$\frac{\pi(\theta_0|x)}{\pi(\theta_1|x)} = \frac{\pi(\theta_0)}{\pi(\theta_1)} \times \text{labels of the (hyper)priors.}$$

"Posterior" odds \times "prior odds"

• A subset of Lebesgue measure zero.

eg. $\Theta_0 = \{ \mu = \mu_0 \}$ zero measure

$$\Rightarrow \pi(d\theta) = p_0 \pi_0(d\theta) + (1-p_0) \pi_1(d\theta)$$

π_0 : dist. concentrated on Θ_0

p_0 : prior prob.

p-values: Frequent: evidence against null hypothesis

$$\pi(\theta_0|x) = \frac{f(x|\theta_0)}{f(x|\theta_0) + \int \pi_i}$$

$$\Theta_0 = \{ \theta_0 \}$$

$$\approx \frac{f(x|\theta_0)}{f(x|\theta_0) + \sup_{\theta \notin \Theta_0} f(x|\theta)}$$

1 - Bayesian confidence set with level $(1-\alpha)$

$(1-\alpha)$ credible set.

$$P(\theta \in C_x | X=x) = \pi(C_x | x) \geq 1-\alpha$$

HPO, the one minimizing the volume \uparrow depends on x

$$L_k = \{ \theta, \pi(\theta|x) \geq k \} \quad k = \sup \{ k; \pi(L_k) \geq 1-\alpha \}$$

why.

△

Bayesian asymptotics

Fisher Information

$$\hat{\theta}_n \text{ MLE} \sim N(\theta_0, \frac{1}{I_n})$$

Bayesian $\theta|x_n \sim N(\hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} I^{-1})$
influence of prior vanish.

Bayes Formula 1.1

i countable set

$$P(A_i|B) = \frac{P(B|A_i)P(A_i)}{\sum_k P(B|A_k)P(A_k)}$$

$$P(A_i) > 0$$

$$P(B) > 0$$

continuous case.

$$f_{xy}(x|y) = \frac{f_{xy}(x,y)}{f_y(y)} =$$

$$f_y(x) = \frac{f_{xy}(y)}{f_{xy}} = \frac{f(x|y)f_y}{f_{xy}} = \frac{f_{xy}}{f_{xy}}$$

Frequentist: Relatively frequency of A_i among those happening with B

Bayesian: describing the uncertainty after we saw the data.

How to choose a prior?

1. cannot depend on data.
- 2.

prior and posterior predictive distributions.

$f_{xy} = \int f_{xy}(\theta) \pi(\theta) d\theta$ is called marginal density.

prior predictor density

After x observed:

Could observe distribution of Y from the same model

Posterior predictive distribution:

$$f_y(x) = \int f_y(x, \theta | x) d\theta$$

$$= \int f_y(x, \theta) \pi(\theta | x) d\theta \quad \mathbb{R} \quad Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X | \theta$$

$$= \int f_y(\theta) \pi(\theta | x) d\theta$$

Example with observation $[N]$

$$\text{exp} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum x_i - \mu \right)^2 - \frac{n\mu^2}{1+n\mu^2} (\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right)$$

frequent risk
fresh
weighted

Point Estimation

Summarize Bayes dist. in a number.

Loss function $L: \Theta \rightarrow [0, \infty]$

Find the minimizer of risk

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_T p(T(x), \pi) = \mathbb{E}[L(T(x), \theta | x)]$$

$$= \int_{\Theta} L(T(x), \theta) \pi(\theta | x) d\theta$$

to $T(x)$

T_1, T_2 are good for a particular estimator

but not all $R(T_1, \theta) < R(T_2, \theta)$ but $R(T_1, \theta) > R(T_2, \theta)$

to look for estimator which minimizes the max risk $\sup_{\theta} R(T, \theta)$

$$R(T, w) = \int_{\Theta} R(T, \theta) w(\theta) d\theta$$

If $\int w(\theta) d\theta = 1$ w as prior for θ .

$$T(x) = \arg \min_T p(T(x), w) = \arg \min_T \mathbb{E}[L(T, \theta) | x]$$

is well defined for $f(x) = \int f(x, \theta) w(\theta) d\theta$

then my minim T' is almost surely T

Admissible

No other estimator is better

$$R(T', \theta) \leq R(T, \theta)$$

Bayes estimator are often biased.

I_{θ}

I_r

2.1 conjugate prior

Def $P_z = \{ \pi_i(\theta), i \in \mathbb{Z} \}$ of prior densities is called conjugate

if $\forall x \in P_z, \pi(\theta|x) \in P_z$

Example: Normal - Normal
Gamma -> Gamma.

choosing a prior's hyperparameters is even harder than choosing parameters itself. Similar in the case of Normal mean, it tells how much we want to rely on the $\pi(\xi)$

2.2 Non-informative Priors

Problems with const. uniform/flat prior.

- must be finite which is often not the case
- under c.o.v. the density is NOT invariant.

Def $\eta = g(\theta)$ be the new parameter

$$\lambda(\eta) := \pi(g^{-1}(\eta)) |\det Dg^{-1}(\eta)| \quad \text{then } g \text{ is NOT linear, } \lambda(\eta) \text{ is NOT const.}$$

Improper priors: a measure that is NOT a probability measure.

If $\pi(\theta) f(x|\theta)$ has FINITE mass, then inference can be made easily as before. and this is NOT a easy task to check

Jeffrey's Prior $\pi(\theta) \propto \det(I(\theta))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

eg. $X \sim N(\theta, 1) \quad I(\theta) = 1 \quad \text{improper on } \mathbb{R}.$
 $X \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2) \quad I(\theta) = 1/\sigma^2 \quad \sim \frac{1}{\sigma}$

Reasoning behind Jeffrey's priors:

since $I(\theta)^{-1}$ is asymptotic variance of MLE, thus it is a indicator of How much info. from data about θ .

It's also invariant under change of variables so. Good!

eg. $\eta = g(\theta) \quad I_\eta(\eta) = |Dg^{-1}(\eta)|^T I_\theta(g^{-1}(\eta)) |Dg^{-1}(\eta)|$

$$\Rightarrow \pi_\eta(\eta) \propto \det I_\eta(\eta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = |\det Dg^{-1}| \det I_\theta(g^{-1}(\eta))$$

same results with. c.o.v. formula.

Reference Priors

If X (data) has the largest impact then the impact of the prior is minimal.

KL distance $KL(f, g) = \int f(x) \log \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} dx$

Idea is to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} I(x, \theta) &= \int_x f(x) \int_\theta \pi(\theta|x) \log \frac{\pi(\theta|x)}{\pi(\theta)} d\theta dx \\ &= \int_\theta \pi(\theta) \int_x f(x|\theta) \log \frac{\pi(\theta) f(x|\theta)}{\pi(\theta) f(x)} d\theta dx \\ &= \int_\theta \pi(\theta) \int_x f(x|\theta) \log \pi(\theta|x) dx d\theta - \int_\theta \pi(\theta) \log \pi(\theta) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

is also unfeasible to find the maxime value.

How to solve

$$I_\infty(x, \theta) = \lim_n I(x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta) \quad \text{still infinite}$$

Approximating.

we again have Jeffrey's prior in the limit

hyperparameters that $\pi(\theta)$ depends on also has a prior distribution.

$$\pi(\xi) \pi(\theta|\xi) f(x|\theta)$$

The primary interest is posterior $\pi(\theta|x)$

Way 1. $\pi(\theta) = \int \pi(\theta|\xi) \pi(\xi) d\xi$

Way 2 $\pi(\theta|x) = \int \pi(\theta, \xi|x) d\xi = \int \pi(\theta|x, \xi) \pi(\xi|x) d\xi$

There leaves $\pi(\theta|x, \xi)$ and $f(x|\xi) / \pi(\xi|x)$ to determine

$$\pi(\xi|x) = \frac{\pi(\theta, \xi|x)}{\pi(\theta|x, \xi)} \quad \text{or} \quad \int \pi(\theta, \xi|x) d\theta$$

conjugate priors have explicit expression for $\pi(\theta|x, \xi)$ also $f(x|\xi)$

1. Normal means

Setting $f(x|\theta) \sim N(\theta, 1)$

prior: $\pi(\theta|\mu, \tau^2) \sim N(\mu, \tau^2)$ with μ fixed

$\tau^2 \sim \text{Gamma}(\gamma, \lambda)$

The posterior $\pi(\theta|\mu, \tau^2, x) \sim N(\frac{\mu + n\tau^2\bar{x}}{1+n\tau^2}, \frac{\tau^2}{1+n\tau^2})$

Using way 1 Direct integration

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta) &\propto \int (\tau^2)^{-\gamma} \exp\left\{-\tau^2 \frac{(\theta-\mu)^2}{2}\right\} (\tau^2)^{\gamma-1} \exp(-\lambda\tau^2) d\tau^2 \\ &= \int u^{r-1/2} \exp\left(-(\lambda + \frac{(\theta-\mu)^2}{2})u\right) du \\ &\propto \frac{1}{(\lambda + \frac{(\theta-\mu)^2}{2})^{r+1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

scaled and shifted

$\tau^2 \sim \text{dist. w.r. 2 r d.o.f.}$

$\pi(\theta|x) \propto \pi(\theta) f(x|\theta)$ does NOT belong to standard family but we know sth about the posterior mode. is closed to \bar{x} if prior and data are in conflict.

Using Way 2

$\pi(\theta|\tau^2, x)$ is already known

$f(x|\tau^2)$ is also kind of known by marginally

$$f(x|\tau^2) \propto (1+n\tau^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2(1+n\tau^2)} (\bar{x}-\mu)^2\right\}$$

\Rightarrow marginal posterior of τ^2 has little mass for small values. \Rightarrow It favors large values of τ^2 prior and data are in conflict

Empirical Bayes for Normal means.

$$\hat{\xi}(x) = \arg\max_{\xi} f(x|\xi)$$

For $f(x|\tau^2) \Rightarrow \hat{\tau}^2 = \max(0, (\bar{x}-\mu)^2 - \frac{1}{n})$

Means: we choose a wider prior when \bar{x} and μ are in conflict.

$$E[\theta|x, \hat{\tau}^2] = \begin{cases} \mu & \text{if } \bar{x} + \frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}^2} \mu - \bar{x} > 0 \\ \bar{x} + \frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}^2} \mu - \bar{x} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

converges to μ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

\Rightarrow EB methods tends to underestimate uncertainty

2. Hierarchical Poisson Model

likelihood $f(x|\theta_j)$ - Poisson

$$\frac{e^{-\theta_j} \theta_j^{x_j}}{x_j!}$$

Prior Gamma $\theta_j \sim \text{Gamma}(\gamma, \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^\gamma}{\Gamma(\gamma)} \theta_j^{\gamma-1} \exp(-\lambda\theta_j)$

hyperprior $\pi(\gamma, \lambda)$

Way 1 $\pi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J) = \int \frac{\lambda^\gamma}{\Gamma(\gamma)^J} \prod \theta_j^{\gamma-1} \exp(-\lambda \sum \theta_j) \pi(\gamma, \lambda) d\gamma d\lambda$
This is NOT a standard distribution.

Way 2 $\pi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_J | \gamma, \lambda, x) = \prod \pi(\theta_j | \gamma, \lambda, x_j)$
 $f(x, x_J | \gamma, \lambda) = \prod f(x_j | \gamma, \lambda)$

$$\pi(\theta_j | \gamma, \lambda, x_j) = \frac{(\lambda+1)^{\gamma+x_j}}{\Gamma(\gamma+x_j)} \theta_j^{\gamma+x_j-1} \exp(-(\lambda+1)\theta_j)$$

~~Gamma~~

$$\begin{aligned} \text{To solve } f(x_j | \gamma, \lambda) &= \int f(x_j | \theta_j) \pi(\theta_j | \gamma, \lambda, x_j) d\theta_j \\ &= \int \text{Pois}(\theta_j) \cdot \text{Gamma} d\theta_j \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\gamma+x_j)}{x_j! \Gamma(\gamma)} \frac{\lambda^\gamma}{(\lambda+1)^{\gamma+x_j}} \\ &= \binom{\gamma+x_j}{x_j} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1}\right)^\gamma \left(\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\right)^{x_j} \end{aligned}$$

Negative binom!

$$\pi(\theta_j | x_1, \dots, x_n) = \int \pi(\theta_j | \gamma, \lambda, x_j) \pi(\gamma, \lambda | x) d\gamma d\lambda$$

$$\propto \int \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma)} \prod f(x_j | \gamma, \lambda) \pi(\gamma, \lambda) d\gamma d\lambda$$

Cannot be integrated in close form

Empirical Bayes.

$f(x|\gamma, \lambda) \sim \text{negative binomial}$

$$\Rightarrow J \gamma \log\left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right) - \sum x_j \log(1+\lambda) + \sum \log(\gamma + x_j)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\hat{\gamma}}{\hat{\lambda}} = \bar{x}$$

Regression and model selection

$$y = \alpha + x_r \beta_r + \varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, b^2)$$

Assumption: x fixed & independent

$$\pi(\alpha, \beta_r, b^2) \propto \pi(b^2) \cdot \pi(\beta_r | b^2) \quad \text{since } \alpha \text{ is flat} \\ = b^{-2} \pi(\beta_r | b^2)$$

Popular choice of g -prior of Zellner

$$\pi(\beta_r | b^2) \propto N(0, g b^2 (X_r^T X_r)^{-1})$$

$$\text{Posterior: } \beta_r | b^2, y \sim N\left(\frac{g}{g+1} \hat{\beta}_r, \frac{g b^2}{g+1} (X_r^T X_r)^{-1}\right) \\ \alpha | b^2, y \sim N(\hat{\alpha}, \frac{b^2}{n})$$

$\hat{\beta}_r, \hat{\alpha}$ is the MLE.

$$\text{posterior mean } \frac{g}{g+1} \hat{\beta}_r + \frac{1}{g+1} \beta_r^0$$

a convex combination of prior mean and MLE
shrinkage towards zero

• $g \rightarrow \infty$ non-informative prior

$\beta(x, 0) \rightarrow 0$ in the limit we will
always choose empty model.

Reversible

x is k component.

we have to know $\pi_i = \pi(x_i | x_{-i})$

Every π_i needs to be known.

MH algorithm:

• Reversible distribution:

$$\int_A \pi(x) P(x, B) dx = \int_B \pi(x) P(x, A) dx$$

$$\text{ie } P[X^t \in A, X^{t+1} \in B] = P[X^{t+1} \in A, X^t \in B]$$

• π is also invariant

$$\pi(x) q(x, y) = \pi(y) q(y, x) \quad \forall x, y.$$

reversibly

MH assumption

• generate a chain which has reversible distribution

可以产生可逆的吗? No. Symmetry $= 1$

usually does NOT hold for x

Algorithm

1. Simulate x^0

2. For $t=1, \dots$

⊙ Generate $y^t \sim q(x^{t-1}, x)$ and U^t

$$\oplus x^t = \begin{cases} y^t & \text{if } U^t \leq a(x^{t-1}, y^t) \\ x^{t-1} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

How to solve the problem of reversibility

$$p(x, y) = q(x, y)$$

$$p(y, x) = \frac{\pi(x) q(x, y)}{\pi(y)}$$

p Arbitrary Transition Kernel.

$$\Rightarrow p(x, y) = \frac{\pi(y) q(y, x)}{\pi(x)}$$

$$p(y, x) = q(y, x)$$

prob \rightarrow

$$p(x, y) \leq q$$

$$p(y, x) \leq q$$

$$\forall x \neq y$$

$$a(x, y) = \min \left(1, \frac{\pi(y) q(y, x)}{\pi(x) q(x, y)} \right)$$

KWM

$$y^t \sim N(x^{t-1}, \Sigma)$$

Hamiltonian MC

• Drawbacks of Gibbs sampler / MH
step-wise is small.

Assume: we can evaluate the gradient efficiently

How: consider a new target $\tilde{\pi}$

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, u) \propto \pi(x) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} u^T M^{-1} u \right\} \quad M = \text{diag}(m_i)$$

u_i is called momentum variable.

Based on a deterministic, invertible map $G(x, u)$

The transformation $G(x, u)$ is given by ODE

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt^i} = \frac{\partial H(x, u)}{\partial u_i} = \frac{u_i}{m_i}$$

$$\frac{du_i}{dt^i} = \frac{\partial H(x, u)}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \log \pi(x)}{\partial x_i} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

Remarks of MCMC.

1. Biasness $E h_{N,r} \neq \int h(x) \pi(x) dx$

2. $\text{Var}(h_{N,r})$ is complicated as it includes the covariance term.

4 Bayesian Computation

1. Laplace Approximation

$$\int h(\theta) q(\theta) d\theta \quad \text{where } \begin{cases} q \text{ has 'max'} \\ h \text{ arbitrary smooth} \end{cases}$$

$$\log q(\theta) = \log q(\theta_0) - \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \theta_0)^T J (\theta - \theta_0)$$

$$\int h(\theta) q(\theta) d\theta \approx h(\theta_0) q(\theta_0) (\det J_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}} \quad q(\theta)$$

Bayes Theorem and BIC

$$B_{12} = \frac{f_c(M_1)}{f_c(M_2)} = \frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_n | M_1)}{\int \pi \prod f_c(\theta) d\theta_i}$$

$$\approx \pi(\theta_1) \prod f_c(x_i | \theta_1) (\det n I \theta_1)^{-\frac{n}{2}} n(\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \log f_c(x_1 | M_1) \approx \log \pi - \frac{p_1}{2} \log n + O(1)$$

BIC thus

2. Independent Monte Carlo Methods

on the basis of drawing independent U^t

Basic idea is that we can use quantile function and $(0,1)$ to generate RV following certain distribution $F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x, \dots\}$

But this is often intractable in high-dim setting.

Rejection sampling

- Simulate with a diff. dist γ (Proposal)
- Connect to target π

$$R(x) = \frac{\pi(x)}{M \gamma(x)} \leq 2 \quad \text{envelope}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proof: } P[X \in dx] &= P[Y \in dx | U \leq \frac{\pi(Y)}{M \gamma(Y)}] \\ &\propto P[Y \in dx] P[U \leq \frac{\pi(Y)}{M \gamma(Y)} | Y \in dx] \\ &= \frac{\pi(x)}{M \gamma(x)} \gamma(x) dx = \pi(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Require not know:

π up to a normalizing const.

Rejection is high unless γ is close to π however, it is hard to find a really close one

Importance Sampling

$$\text{Goal: } E_{\pi}(h(x)) = \int h(x) \pi(x)$$

Instead of rejection \Rightarrow weight them with an appropriate weighting function.

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N h(Y^t) w(Y^t) \quad \text{where } w(x) = \frac{\pi(x)}{\gamma(x)} \quad \text{No need to bound this}$$

These are methods to generate independent

MCMC generate

$$X^t = G(X^{t-1}, U^t) \quad U^t \text{ can be more in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$P(X^t \in A | \dots) = P[X^t \in A | X^{t-1}] = P[X^{t-1} \in A]$$

Determined by G

$$P(x, A) = P(G(x, U) \in A) = P[U \in \{u; G(x, u) \in A\}]$$

How to specify G ?

Some properties about $M(\cdot)$

Positivity: All state can be reached $\pi(U^t) > 0$

• Invariance / Stationary properties

$$\pi(A) = \int \pi(x) P(x, A) dx \quad \forall A$$