Research Group Presentation

Overview of Bayesian analysis

Motivating example: Likelihood

▶ Suppose X_1,\dots,X_n is an i.i.d. sample with $X_i\sim \mathrm{Exp}(\lambda).$ We would like to estimate $\lambda.$

Motivating example: Likelihood

- ▶ Suppose X_1,\dots,X_n is an i.i.d. sample with $X_i\sim \mathrm{Exp}(\lambda).$ We would like to estimate $\lambda.$
- Likelihood approach:

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} = \frac{n}{\sum_{i} x_{i}}$$

$$I(\lambda) = \lambda^{-2}$$

Motivating example: Likelihood

- Suppose X_1,\dots,X_n is an i.i.d. sample with $X_i\sim \operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)$. We would like to estimate λ .
- Likelihood approach:

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} = \frac{n}{\sum_{i} x_{i}}$$

$$I(\lambda) = \lambda^{-2}$$

If z.025 = qnorm(.975), then approximately and for large n, the interval

$$\left(\hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{MLE}} - \frac{z_{.025}\lambda_{\mathrm{MLE}}}{\sqrt{n}}, \hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{MLE}} - \frac{z_{.025}\lambda_{\mathrm{MLE}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

has 95% coverage, meaning if we repeat the experiment 100 times, the interval will contain the true value of λ in roughly 95 of them.

lacktriangle Think of λ as a quantity with its own distribution

- lacktriangle Think of λ as a quantity with its own distribution
- Prior distribution: $p(\lambda) = \text{Gamma}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta)$

- \blacktriangleright Think of λ as a quantity with its own distribution
- Prior distribution: $p(\lambda) = \text{Gamma}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta)$
- ▶ Bayes' theorem:

$$\pi(\lambda,\mathbf{x}) \propto L(\lambda) p(\lambda)$$

$$= \operatorname{Gamma}(\lambda, \alpha + n, \beta + n\bar{x})$$

- lacktriangle Think of λ as a quantity with its own distribution
- Prior distribution: $p(\lambda) = \text{Gamma}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta)$
- ▶ Bayes' theorem:

$$\pi(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \propto L(\lambda)p(\lambda)$$

$$= \operatorname{Gamma}(\lambda, \alpha + n, \beta + n\bar{x})$$

Based on this we can construct an interval I such that we can literally say " λ has a 95% chance of being in I"

Quantile regression

General Framework

▶ OLS regression: $E[Y|\mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$

General Framework

- ▶ OLS regression: $E[Y|\mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$
- $\blacktriangleright \ \, \text{Quantile regression:} \ \, q_p(Y|\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(p)$

General Framework

- ▶ OLS regression: $E[Y|\mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$
- $\qquad \qquad \textbf{Quantile regression:} \ \ q_p(Y|\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(p)$
- Frequentist approach:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}(p)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i} \rho_p(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

where
$$\rho_p(u) = u(p - \mathbf{1}_{\{u < 0\}})$$

▶ It can be shown that the previous minimization problem is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood associated to the distribution

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(u) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p(u))$$

▶ It can be shown that the previous minimization problem is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood associated to the distribution

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(u) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p(u))$$

▶ More generally, we can add a location and a scale parameter:

$$f_p^{\rm AL}(u|\mu,\sigma) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p((u-\mu)/\sigma))$$

this distribution is called *asymmetric Laplace* [Yu and Moyeed, 2001]

▶ It can be shown that the previous minimization problem is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood associated to the distribution

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(u) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p(u))$$

▶ More generally, we can add a location and a scale parameter:

$$f_p^{\rm AL}(u|\mu,\sigma) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p((u-\mu)/\sigma))$$

this distribution is called *asymmetric Laplace* [Yu and Moyeed, 2001]

▶ Prior: $p(\beta) \propto 1$ (improper)

▶ It can be shown that the previous minimization problem is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood associated to the distribution

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(u) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p(u))$$

More generally, we can add a location and a scale parameter:

$$f_p^{\rm AL}(u|\mu,\sigma) = p(1-p) \exp(-\rho_p((u-\mu)/\sigma))$$

this distribution is called *asymmetric Laplace* [Yu and Moyeed, 2001]

- ▶ Prior: $p(\beta) \propto 1$ (improper)
- ▶ Theorem: This leads to a proper posterior distribution

Problems: AL is very rigid

- Problems: AL is very rigid
 - Skewness is determined by p, in particular it is symmetric at p=.5

- Problems: AL is very rigid
 - Skewness is determined by p, in particular it is symmetric at $p=.5\,$
 - Mode is always at 0

- Problems: AL is very rigid
 - Skewness is determined by p, in particular it is symmetric at $p=.5\,$
 - ► Mode is always at 0
- Solution [Yan and Kottas, 2017]:

- Problems: AL is very rigid
 - Skewness is determined by p, in particular it is symmetric at p=.5
 - Mode is always at 0
- Solution [Yan and Kottas, 2017]:
 - ▶ We can write

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(y|\mu,\sigma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} N(y|\mu + \sigma A(p)z, \sigma^2 B(p)z) Exp(z|1) dz$$

- Problems: AL is very rigid
 - Skewness is determined by p, in particular it is symmetric at p=.5
 - ► Mode is always at 0
- Solution [Yan and Kottas, 2017]:
 - ▶ We can write

$$f_p^{\mathrm{AL}}(y|\mu,\sigma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} N(y|\mu + \sigma A(p)z, \sigma^2 B(p)z) Exp(z|1) dz$$

► So, let us add a parameter

$$f_p^{\rm GAL}(y|\mu,\sigma)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{D}} N(y|\mu + \sigma \alpha s + \sigma A(p)z, \sigma^2 B(p)z) Exp(z|1) N^+(s|0,1) dz ds$$

Parameter Estimation

Likelyhood above is very complicated, so sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters becomes an issue

- Likelyhood above is very complicated, so sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters becomes an issue
- Usually, we deal with this using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques

- Likelyhood above is very complicated, so sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters becomes an issue
- Usually, we deal with this using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques
- Coding MCMCs by hand is cumbersome. It can also lead to convergence issues

- Likelyhood above is very complicated, so sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters becomes an issue
- Usually, we deal with this using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques
- Coding MCMCs by hand is cumbersome. It can also lead to convergence issues
- Software packages like BUGS and JAGS can automatically code MCMCs based on model structure

- Likelyhood above is very complicated, so sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters becomes an issue
- Usually, we deal with this using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques
- Coding MCMCs by hand is cumbersome. It can also lead to convergence issues
- Software packages like BUGS and JAGS can automatically code MCMCs based on model structure
- ➤ Stan [Stan development team, 2012] improves on those packages by implementing HMC and NUTS

➤ Stan is low level: it's a programming language on it's own, built on top of C++

- ➤ Stan is low level: it's a programming language on it's own, built on top of C++
- ▶ BRMS [Buckner, 2017] is a high level interface for Stan on R

- ➤ Stan is low level: it's a programming language on it's own, built on top of C++
- ▶ BRMS [Buckner, 2017] is a high level interface for Stan on R
 - lt uses the same formula syntax as 1me4

- ➤ Stan is low level: it's a programming language on it's own, built on top of C++
- ▶ BRMS [Buckner, 2017] is a high level interface for Stan on R
 - lt uses the same formula syntax as 1me4
 - Under the hood, it automatically generates and compiles Stan code, which we can retrieve