

STAT 525 Lecture 17

October 26, 2017

1 Last time

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{y} &\sim N(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} &\sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta)\end{aligned}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta = 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{g-prior} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta = g\sigma^2 [\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}]^{-1} \\ \text{ridge} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta = \sigma_\beta^2 \mathbb{I} \end{cases}$$

Let $\tau = \sigma^{-2}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{y} &\sim N(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau^{-1} \mathbb{I}_n) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} &\sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta, \tau^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta) \\ \tau &\sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_\tau, \beta_\tau)\end{aligned}$$

Then the posterior would be

$$\begin{aligned}p(\tau \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &\propto p(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}) p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \\ &= p(\tau) p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \mid \tau) p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \\ &\propto \tau^{\alpha_\tau - 1} \exp(-\beta_\tau \tau) |2\pi\tau^{-1} \mathbb{I}_n|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tau \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2\right) \times \\ &\quad |2\pi\tau^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)^T [\tau^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta]^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)\right) \\ &\propto \tau^{\alpha_\tau + \frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2} - 1} \exp\left(-\tau \left[\beta_\tau + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)^T [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta]^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)\right]\right)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}_\tau &= \alpha_\tau + \frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2} \\ \tilde{\beta}_\tau &= \beta_\tau + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)^T [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta]^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta)\end{aligned}$$

Instead if we don't have τ in the prior on beta then

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}_\tau &= \alpha_\tau + \frac{n}{2} \\ \tilde{\beta}_\tau &= \beta_\tau + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2\end{aligned}$$

If we have the following g prior

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta &= \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta &= g\sigma^2 \left[\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \right]^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

After marginizing β out, we have

$$[\tau \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}] \sim \text{Gamma} \left(\alpha_\tau + \frac{n}{2}, \beta_\tau + SSR_g \right)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}SSR_g &= \mathbf{y}^T \left[\mathbb{I}_n - \frac{g}{g+1} \mathbf{X} \left(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{y} \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 - \frac{g}{g+1} \mathbf{y}^T \left[\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}_{\text{ols}} \right]\end{aligned}$$

2 Prediction

Given new $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ to predict $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ or $p(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \mid \mathbf{y})$

Sources of uncertainty

1. Model variability σ^2 (not accounted for by $\mathbf{X}\beta$)
2. Posterior uncertainty in $p(\beta, \sigma^2 \mid \mathbf{y})$ (due to finite sample size)

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \beta, \sigma^2] \sim N(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I})$$

where we simulate β , σ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$.

3 Bayesian Robustness

Instead of $\epsilon_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2)$ try $\epsilon_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} t_\nu(0, \sigma^2)$ where ν is the degree of freedom. Can be augmented as

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_i \mid \xi_i &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2 / \xi_i) \\ \xi_i &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma} \left(\frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{\nu}{2} \right)\end{aligned}$$

(Scaled Mixture of Gaussian)

1. (Asymmetric) Laplace
2. Skew normal
3. Discrete mixtures of Gaussian

4 Shrinkage and penalized regression

- Many predictors ($p \gg n$) but may be unrelated to \mathbf{y} .
- Including unnecessary predictors. Can cause poor performance.
- Nice to represent a small sets of predictors.

Key trade off for several methods

- Discrete (or two groups model)

$$p(\beta_j = 0) > 0$$

- Can select $\{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$
- Problem: computationally feasible for moderate p

- Continuous (One group)

- no true zero but small $|\beta_j| \approx 0$
- Scalable

Penalized Regression

Setting:

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}\beta) + \lambda P(\beta)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}\beta)$ is the loss function (corresponding to (-log) likelihood) and $P(\beta)$ is penalty (corresponding to (-log) prior). λ control the trade off (corresponding to prior precision)

$$\lambda \rightarrow 0 \mathcal{L} \text{ dominates}$$

$$\lambda \rightarrow \infty P \text{ dominates}$$

4.1 Lasso Regression

$$\hat{\beta}_L = \arg \min_{\beta} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}\beta) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|$$

1. unpenalized intercept ($\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ centered)
2. variable X should be on the same scale
3. penalized MLE (post mode) produces sparse solution.

4.2 Bayesian Lasso (Park & Casella 2008)

$$[\beta_j \mid \sigma^2, \lambda] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} DE(\lambda/\sigma)$$

where

$$p(\beta_j) = \frac{\lambda}{2\sigma} \exp(-\lambda |\beta_j| / \sigma)$$

notice that

$$\begin{aligned} -\log P(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= -\sum_{j=1}^p \log(p(\beta_j)) \\ &= A^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} [\beta_j \mid \sigma, \eta_j] &\stackrel{\text{indep}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2/\eta_j) \\ [\eta_j^{-1} \mid \lambda] &\stackrel{\text{indep}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda^2/2) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} &\sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2/\eta_1 & & \\ & \sigma^2/\eta_2 & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & \sigma^2/\eta_p \end{bmatrix}$$

- η_j is inverse-Gaussian
- do not get true zeros in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$
- but do get SEs (even when $|\beta_j| \approx 0$)

4.3 Horseshoe prior

$$\begin{aligned} [\beta_j \mid \sigma^2, \lambda_j^2] &\stackrel{\text{indep}}{\sim} N(-, \sigma^2 \lambda_j^2) \\ \lambda_j &\stackrel{\text{indep}}{\sim} C^+(0, A) \end{aligned}$$

Priors for A :

- $A \sim C^+(0, 1)$
- $A \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\beta} &\sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta) \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\beta &= \text{diag}(\sigma^2 \lambda_1, \sigma^2 \lambda_2, \dots, \sigma^2 \lambda_p) \end{aligned}$$

Comments

- Many priors in this family: global local priors

$$\beta_j \sim N(0, \sigma^2 A^2 \lambda_j^2)$$

where $p(A, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ determines behavior of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

- Do we need $\beta_j = 0$ or is $|\beta_j| \approx 0$ good enough?
- Threshold procedures:

- Recall

$$\kappa_j = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_j^2} \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$$

is the amount of shrinkage to zero

- Reasonable:

$$\hat{b}_j = \mathbb{I}\left(\kappa_j < \frac{1}{2}\right) \hat{\beta}_j$$

where $\hat{\beta}_j$ is the posterior mean.