# Bayesian Case Studies Practical 1 Model choice. Monte Carlo methods.

Robin Ryder

2018 - 2019

Aim: Monte Carlo methods. Application to model choice and model averaging.

**Reference:** Bayesian Essentials with R (Marin & Robert), chapter 2.

In this practical, we shall analyse data on activity of French members of Parliament ( *députés*). The data come from www.nosdeputes.fr and represent activity between January 2018 and January 2019. Download the data from http://bit.ly/MASH-BCS, then read them in R:

- > deputes=read.csv2('/path/to/deputes.csv')
- > attach(deputes)

Initially, we shall focus on the column questions\_orales, which represents the number of oral questions  $Y_i$  asked by each MP. We would like to test whether it depends on a binary variable  $Z_i$ . For  $Z_i$ , you can use the gender of the MP (column sexe).

1. Explore briefly the data (number of individuals, size of groups 1 and 2, histograms...). Choose a parametric family  $(\mathbb{P}_{\lambda})$  which seems suitable for these data.

We shall study the two following models, where  $\pi$  is a prior distribution:

$$egin{array}{c|cccc} \mathcal{M}_1 & & \mathcal{M}_2 \\ Y_i & \sim_{i.i.d} & \mathbb{P}_{\lambda} \\ \lambda & \sim & \pi \end{array} & egin{array}{c|cccc} \mathcal{M}_2 & & & \\ Y_i | Z_i = j & \sim_{i.i.d} & \mathbb{P}_{\lambda_j} \\ \lambda_1 & \sim & \pi \\ \lambda_2 & \sim & \pi \end{array}$$

- 2. Find a conjugate prior for the chosen family of distributions. Is this family of priors flexible enough? If not, which prior would you choose?
- 3. Find Jeffrey's prior for this model. What is the associated posterior?
- 4. Decide what your prior distribution will be.
- 5. Plot the prior of the parameters, and the posterior for the parameters of each model. Repeat with different values of the prior hyperparameters.
- 6. Give a 95% credibility interval for the parameters in each model.

7. In model 2, let  $r_{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}$ . Give a Monte Carlo estimate of the prior and posterior expectation and variance of  $r_{\lambda}$ .

We would now like to compute the Bayes factor

$$B_{21} = \frac{m_2(\boldsymbol{y})}{m_1(\boldsymbol{y})}$$
 where  $m_k(\boldsymbol{y}) = \int_{\Theta_k} L_k(\theta_k|\boldsymbol{y}) \pi_k(\theta_k) d\theta$ 

We propose several Monte Carlo methods to calculate the Bayes factor; we would like to compare the methods. For each method, write a script to visualize the convergence of the method.

## 8. Method 1: vanilla Monte Carlo

Give an approximation of  $B_{21}$  based on an M-sample of parameters simulated from the prior distribution.

### 9. Method 2: Importance sampling

Compute the posterior mean and variance of the parameters for each model. Deduce a reasonable instrumental distribution g to perform importance sampling. Give an approximation of  $B_{21}$  in this case.

Try again, using a different instrumental distribution. What do you observe?

# 10. Method 3: Harmonic mean (optional)

Calculate the theoretical value of

$$E_{\pi_1} \left[ \frac{1}{L(\theta_1|y)} \middle| y \right]$$

and deduce an approximation of  $B_{21}$  based on an M-sample of parameters simulated from the posterior distribution.

### 11. Method 4: explicit computation

Give the explicit expression of  $B_{21}$ , and write an R script to evaluate it.

- 12. Compare the 4 methods and select the best one.
- 13. Now that you have chosen your method, compute the Bayes factor and conclude on which model is the best.
- 14. Suppose that our prior probability for each model is 0.5. What is the posterior probability of each model?
- 15. We wish to predict the number of questions that will be asked by a new female individual. Draw a posterior sample from the corresponding  $\lambda$  parameter in each of the following cases:
  - a) We choose model  $\mathcal{M}_1$ .
  - b) We choose model  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .
  - c) We take a mixture of the two models, with weights equal to the posterior probabilities.

Give the posterior mean and variance. Comment.

16. Perform model choice for other columns: for  $Y_i$ , you might look at any of the quantitative variables. For  $Z_i$ , you could also use groupe\_sigle, which gives political affiliation, or nb\_mandats, which gives the number of other elective offices held. In those cases,  $Z_i$  can take more than 2 values.