# Homework 3

Xiaocheng Zhou (1155184323)

April 12, 2023

#### Answers

1. Please conduct a simulation study for model stated in the question 1. Use bias and RMS to summarize the result of Bayesian analysis based on 10 replications.

A simulation study was conducted to generate 500 samples for 10 replications, respectively, based on the SEM and true parameters (Appendix 1.1). Then each dataset was applied to estimate the parameters  $\theta = [\mu, b, \lambda, \gamma, \Phi, \psi_{\varepsilon}, \psi_{\delta}]$  using the code in Appendix 1.3 based on the true model specified in Appendix 1.2. The bias and RMS of estimates are summarized as Table 1.

$$\operatorname{Bias}(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^{R} \hat{\theta}_r - \theta$$
$$\operatorname{RMS}(\hat{\theta}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^{R} (\hat{\theta}_r - \theta)^2}$$

Table 1: Bias and RMSE over the 10 replicated estimates

$\theta = \text{true value}$	Bias	RMS	$\theta = \text{true value}$	Bias	RMS
$\mu_1 = 0$	-0.017	0.144	$\lambda_{6,2} = 0.9$	-0.159	0.197
$\mu_2 = 0$	0.000	0.084	$\lambda_{7,2} = 0.7$	-0.100	0.104
$\mu_3 = 0$	-0.022	0.094	$\lambda_{9,3} = 0.9$	-0.110	0.157
$\mu_4 = 0$	0.001	0.010	$\lambda_{10,3} = 0.8$	0.015	0.103
$\mu_5 = 0$	0.000	0.008	$\gamma_1 = 0.4$	-0.016	0.113
$\mu_6 = 0$	0.003	0.011	$\gamma_2 = 0.5$	-0.055	0.100
$\mu_7 = 0$	-0.000	0.012	$\phi_{1,1} = 1$	0.107	0.114
$\mu_8 = 0$	-0.050	0.132	$\phi_{1,2/2,1} = 0.2$	0.046	0.067
$\mu_9 = 0$	0.005	0.087	$\phi_{2,2} = 0.81$	0.101	0.125
$\mu_{10} = 0$	-0.036	0.081	$\psi_{\varepsilon 4} = 0.3$	0.075	0.075
b = 0.3	0.033	0.133	$\psi_{\varepsilon 5} = 0.3$	0.076	0.076
$\lambda_{2,1} = 0.8$	-0.000	0.169	$\psi_{\varepsilon 6} = 0.25$	0.126	0.126
$\lambda_{3,1} = 0.8$	-0.020	0.173	$\psi_{\varepsilon 7} = 0.25$	0.125	0.125
$\lambda_{5,2} = 0.7$	-0.103	0.104	$\psi_{\delta} = 0.36$	0.007	0.041

2. a. Specify a SEM for this multisample problem, write your model in a matrix form, and state the conditions needed for model identification.

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ I found it is hard to let the model converge well by checking that plots from different initial values did not meet together even though the Rhat values  $\sim 1$  after 3,5000 iterations, so I try to use the two sets of initial values that are close to the true values to conduct the simulation study, on which the reported results are based.

Let g=1 be the index representing public high school, g=2 private one, and let  $i=1,\cdots,N^{(g)}$  be the index representing the samples collected from group g, i.e.  $N^{(1)} = 3074$  and  $N^{(2)} = 2909$  then we can specify the SEM as follow. Measurement equations are

$$oldsymbol{v}_i^{(g)} = oldsymbol{\mu}^{(g)} + oldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(g)} oldsymbol{\omega}_i^{(g)} + oldsymbol{arepsilon}_i^{(g)},$$

and the Structure equations can be specified linearly as

$$\eta_i^{(g)} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(g)} + \delta_i^{(g)},$$

where

in which  $m{y}^{*(g)}_{i,1:5}$  are the latent continuous measurement for ordered categorical variables  $m{z}^{(g)}_{i,1:5}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{i,4:7}^{(g)}$  are the canonical parameters for  $\boldsymbol{y}_{i,4:7}^{(g)}$  that are from EFDs. Given shared threshold parameters  $\alpha_{k,1:b_k}$  for each  $y_{ik}^{*(g)}$ , the relationship between latent continuous values and observed values can be specified as

$$z_{ik}^{(g)} = m \text{ if } \alpha_{k,m} \leq y_{ik}^{*(g)} < \alpha_{k,m+1}, \ k = 1, \cdots, 5, m = 0, 1, \cdots, b_k$$

$$p\left(y_{ik}^{(g)}|\boldsymbol{\omega}_i^{(g)}\right) = \exp\left\{\left[y_{ik}^{(g)}\vartheta_{ik}^{(g)} - b(\vartheta_{ik}^{(g)})\right]/\psi_{\varepsilon,k+3}^{(g)} + c_k\left(y_{ik}^{(g)}, \psi_{\varepsilon,k+3}^{(g)}\right)\right\}, \ k = 4, \cdots, 7.$$

To identify this SEM with multisample data, we impose following identification conditions

- i) to identify each measurement equation, fix  $\lambda_{1,1} = \lambda_{4,2} = \lambda_{7,3} = \lambda_{9,4} = 1$  and others, like in  $\Gamma^{(g)}$ , equal 0;
- ii) to identify the issue induced by ordered categorical variables, unify the normal distribution of latent  $y^{*(g)}_{ik}$  implicitly by fix  $\alpha^{(1)}_{k,1} = \Phi^{-1}(f^{(1)}_{k,1})$  and  $\alpha^{(1)}_{k,b_k} = \Phi^{-1}(f^{(1)}_{k,b_k})$ ; iii) specially, if the ordered categorical variables is dichotomous, then unify the normal distribution
- of latent  $y_{ik}^{*(g)}$  directly by fixing the  $\psi_{\varepsilon K} = 1$ ; iv) to let the latent continuous variables share scale among groups, e.g. select the first group as the
- reference and impose  $\alpha_k^{(g)} = \alpha_k^{(1)} =: \alpha_k, k = 1, \dots, 5, g = 1, 2$ . b. Describe the major difference in the posterior inference of SEM with multisample data.

The major difference exists in the estimation of  $[\theta|\alpha, Y, \Omega, X, X, Z]$  the specification of their prior distributions:

- i) For nonconstrained parameters, their priors in different groups are naturally assumed to be independent, so in estimating the unconstrained parameters, the prior distributions specified for each group and the group-corresponding data are used.
- ii) For constrained parameters, only one prior distribution for these constrained parameters is needed, and all the data over all groups should be combined in the estimation.
- Moreover, the original dependent parameters are assumed to have independent priors, i.e.  $p(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(g)},$  $\Psi_{\varepsilon}^{(g)}$ ) =  $p(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(g)})p(\mathbf{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}^{(g)})$  for both variant or invariant case. Because in the estimation of some dependent parameters, such as  $\left[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{k}^{\mathsf{T}}|\psi_{\varepsilon k}^{(g)}\right]$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{1}:\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)}=\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)}=\mathbf{\Lambda},\mathbf{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}^{(1)}\neq\mathbf{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}^{(2)}$ , it is not suitable to estimate  $\left| \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^\mathsf{T}, \psi_{\varepsilon k}^{(g)} \right|$  jointly, since it is difficult to select a  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k^\mathsf{T}$  with a set different  $\psi_{\varepsilon k}^{(g)}$ for different groups. And for convenience, we assume independence uniformly.

c. Briefly describe how to test the invariant constraint for factor loadings across the subpopulations using Bayes factor and DIC. [Hint: the major steps of BF/DIC calculation across iterations] To test the invariant constrant for factor loadings across subpopulations, we specify two models,  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ 

$$\mathcal{M}_{1}: \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i}^{(g)} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{i}^{(g)} \end{cases}$$
(1)  
$$\mathcal{M}_{2}: \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i}^{(g)} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{i}^{(g)} \end{cases}$$
(2)

$$\mathcal{M}_{2}: \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i}^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i}^{(g)} \\ \eta_{i}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(g)} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i}^{(g)} + \delta_{i}^{(g)} \end{cases}$$

$$i = 1, \dots, N^{(g)}, \ q = 1, 2$$

$$(2)$$

#### **Bayes Factor**

(1) Find a link model  $\mathcal{M}_t$  with path  $t \in [0, 1]$  to link  $\mathcal{M}_1$  (when t = 0) and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  (when t = 1) directly.

$$\mathcal{M}_t : \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{v}_i^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(g)} + (1 - t)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\omega}_i^{(g)} + t\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(g)}\boldsymbol{\omega}_i^{(g)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^{(g)} \\ \eta_i^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(g)}\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(g)} + \delta_i^{(g)} \end{cases}$$

$$i = 1, \dots, N^{(g)}, \ g = 1, 2$$

$$(3)$$

(2) Differentiate the complete-data log-likelihood. Since  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i,-9:12}^{(g)} = \boldsymbol{v}_{i,-9:12}^{(g)} - [\boldsymbol{\mu}_{-9:12}^{(g)} + (1-t)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{-4}\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,-4}^{(g)} + (1-t)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{-4}$  $t\mathbf{\Lambda}_{-4}^{(g)}\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,-4}^{(g)}] \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\varepsilon,-9:12})), \text{ then}$ 

$$\begin{split} y_{i2}^{(g)} &= \mu_{1}^{(g)} + (1-t)\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i1}^{(g)} \\ y_{i2}^{(g)} &= \mu_{2}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{2,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{2,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i2}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{(g)} &= \mu_{3}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{3,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{3,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i3}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{3}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{3,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{3,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i3}^{(g)} \\ y_{i1}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{4}^{(g)} + (1-t)\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + t\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i4}^{(g)} \\ y_{i2}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{5}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{5,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{5,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i5}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{6}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{6,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{6,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i6}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{6}^{(g)} + (1-t)\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + t\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i7}^{(g)} \\ y_{i5}^{*(g)} &= \mu_{8}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{8,3}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{8,3}^{(g)}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + \varepsilon_{i8}^{(g)} \\ U(\theta, \alpha, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{\Omega}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, t) &= \frac{d}{dt}\log p(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{\Omega}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}|\theta, \alpha, t) \\ \begin{bmatrix} y_{i2}^{(g)} - \left(\mu_{2}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{2,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{2,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)}\right) \Big] \left(-\lambda_{2,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \lambda_{2,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon2}^{(g)} + \xi_{i3}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} - \left(\mu_{3}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{3,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{3,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)}\right) \Big] \left(-\lambda_{3,1}\eta_{i}^{(g)} + \lambda_{3,1}^{(g)}\eta_{i}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon3}^{(g)} + \xi_{i3}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} - \left(\mu_{5}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{5,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{5,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)}\right) \Big] \left(-\lambda_{5,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + \lambda_{5,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon5}^{(g)} + \xi_{i5}^{(g)} \\ y_{i3}^{*(g)} - \left(\mu_{6}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{6,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{6,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)}\right) \Big] \left(-\lambda_{6,2}\xi_{i1}^{(g)} + \lambda_{6,2}^{(g)}\xi_{i1}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon6}^{(g)} + \xi_{i5}^{(g)} \\ \left[ y_{i5}^{*(g)} - \left(\mu_{6}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{8,3}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{8,3}^{(g)}\xi_{i2}^{(g)}\right) \right] \left(-\lambda_{8,3}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + \lambda_{8,3}^{(g)}\xi_{i2}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon6}^{(g)} + \xi_{i5}^{(g)} \\ \left[ y_{i5}^{*(g)} - \left(\mu_{6}^{(g)} + (1-t)\lambda_{8,3}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + t\lambda_{8,3}^{(g)}\xi_{i2}^{(g)}\right) \right] \left(-\lambda_{8,3}\xi_{i2}^{(g)} + \lambda_{8,3}^{(g)}\xi_{i2}^{(g)}\right) / \psi_{\varepsilon6}^{(g)} + \xi_{i5}^{(g)} \right) \right] \right]$$

where  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}^{(1)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(2)}]$ , latent continuous measurements, contains all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{*}_{i,1:5}^{(g)}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)}_{i,4:7}$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{V}^{(1)}, \mathbf{V}^{(2)}]$ , observed variables from EFDs, contains all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{(g)}_{i,4:7}$   $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}^{(2)}]$ , observed continuous data, contains all  $\boldsymbol{y}_{i,1:3}^{(g)},$   $\mathbf{Z}=\left[\mathbf{Z}^{(1)},\mathbf{Z}^{(2)}\right]$ , observed ordered categorical data, contains all  $\boldsymbol{z}_{i,1:5}^{(g)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \left[\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(2)}\right]$ , latent variables, contains all  $\eta_i^{(g)}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1:3}^{(g)}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  contains all the parameters to be estimated,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(2)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}^{(2)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(2)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(2)}, \, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\delta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\delta}^{(2)}$ Calculate the estimated log-BF by dividing [0,1] into S+1 segments such that  $0=t_{(0)}<$  $t_{(1)} < \cdots < t_{(S)} < t_{(S+1)} = 1$  and sampling J observations simulated from the joint posterior

distribution  $[\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{V}, \boldsymbol{\Omega} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, t_{(s)}].$ 

$$\widehat{\log B_{21}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=0}^{S} (t_{(s+1)} - t_{(s)}) (\bar{U}_{(s+1)} + \bar{U}_{s})$$

$$\bar{U}_{(s)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} U(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(j)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(j)}, \mathbf{V}^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(j)}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, t_{(s)})$$

DIC

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{DIC}_k &= \bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) + d_k \\ & (\operatorname{goodness-of-fit}) \ \bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k} \left[ -2\log p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \mathcal{M}_k) | \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \right] \\ & (\operatorname{effective} \ \#\operatorname{params}) \ d_k = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k} \left[ -2\log p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \mathcal{M}_k) | \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \right] + 2\log p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k) \\ & \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k} \left[ -2\log p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \mathcal{M}_k) | \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \right] \approx -\frac{2}{J} \sum_{i=1}^{J} \log p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^{(j)}, \mathcal{M}_k), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k$  is the Bayesian estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$  and  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^{(j)}, j=1,\cdots,J\}$  are a set of observations simulated from the posterior distribution. The DIC values can be calculated automatically when using WinBUGS to fit  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

# 1 Appendix

### 1.1 Simulation data generation

```
library(mvtnorm)
 2
 3
   # set data repository
 4 datapath = paste0(getwd(), '/data')
 5 \, | \, \mathrm{dir.create} \, (\mathrm{datapath} \, , \, \, \mathrm{showWarnings} \, = \, \mathrm{FALSE} \, , \, \, \mathrm{recursive} \, = \, \mathrm{TRUE})
 7
   # data size
   iter = 10
9 N = 500
10|P = 10
11 Neta = 1 # not used here
12 | Nxi = 2 #
13 \mid Ngam = 2 #
14
15
   # set the true values of parameters
16 uby <- rep(0, P)
17 \mid 1am \leftarrow c(0.8, 0.8, 0.7, 0.9, 0.7, 0.9, 0.8)
18 \mid sgm \leftarrow c(1, 1, 1, 0.3, 0.3, 0.25, 0.25)
19 ubeta <- 0.3
20 \mid gam < -c(0.4, 0.5)
   phx \leftarrow matrix(data = c(1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.81), ncol = 2)
21
22 sgd <- 0.36
23
24
   \# set important prior param R_0
25
   # R0 <- matrix(c(7.0, 2.1, 2.1, 7.0), nrow = 2)
26
27
28 # containers for generated data
29 Y <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = N, ncol = P)
30 D <- numeric(N)
31 p <- numeric(P)
32 v <- numeric(P)
33
34
35
   # generate data
   for (t in 1:iter) {
36
37
     for (i in 1:N) {
38
       # BD[i] = rt(1, 5)
39
       # BC[i] = rt(1, 5)
40
       # generate the fixed covariates in SE (from Bernoulli(0.7))
41
42
       d \leftarrow rbinom(1, 1, 0.7)
       D[i] <- d
43
44
45
        # generate xi
46
       xi <- rmvnorm(1, c(0, 0), phx)
47
48
        # generate error term in SE
49
       del <- rnorm(1, 0, sqrt(sgd))</pre>
50
51
        # generate eta according to the SE
52
        eta <- ubeta * d + gam[1] * xi[1] + gam[2] * xi[2] + del
53
54
        # generate error term in ME
55
        eps <- numeric(7)</pre>
56
        for (k in 1:7) { eps[k] <- rnorm(1, 0, sgm[k]) }</pre>
57
58
        # generate theta in ME
       v[1] <- uby[1] + eta + eps[1]
59
       v[2] <- uby[2] + lam[1] * eta + eps[2]
60
       v[3] <- uby[3] + lam[2] * eta + eps[3]
61
62
       Y[i, 4] \leftarrow uby[4] + xi[1] + eps[4]
       Y[i, 5] <- uby[5] + lam[3] * xi[1] + eps[5]
63
       Y[i, 6] <- uby[6] + lam[4] * xi[1] + eps[6]
Y[i, 7] <- uby[7] + lam[5] * xi[1] + eps[7]
64
65
66
       v[8] <- uby[8] + xi[2]
```

```
67
       v[9] <- uby[9] + lam[6] * xi[2]
68
       v[10] <- uby[10] + lam[7] * xi[2]
69
70
       # transform theta to ordinal variables
71
       for (j in 1:3) {
72
         if (v[j] > 0) Y[i, j] <- 1
73
         else Y[i, j] <- 0</pre>
74
75
76
       # transform theta to binary variables
77
       for (j in 8:10) {
78
         p[j] \leftarrow exp(v[j]) / (1 + exp(v[j]))
79
         Y[i, j] <- rbinom(1, 1, p[j])
80
       }
81
     }
82
83
     # save data matrix
     write.table(Y, paste(datapath, "/Y-", t, ".txt", sep = ""))
84
     write.table(D, paste(datapath, "/D-", t, ".txt", sep = ""))
85
86
87
88
   true_params = list(
89
     lam = lam,
90
     uby = uby,
91
     sgm = sgm,
92
     ubeta = ubeta,
93
     gam = gam,
     phx = phx,
94
95
     sgd = sgd
96
97
   save(true_params, file = paste0(datapath, "/trueparams.RData"))
98
```

codes/generateData.R

### 1.2 True model in BUGS language

```
model{
1
     for (i in 1:N) {
3
       # measurement equation model
       for (j in 1:3) {
5
         y[i, j] ~ dnorm(mu[i, j], 1)I(low[z[i, j] + 1], high[z[i, j] + 1])
6
7
       ## winbugs cannot handle operation, in index variables, like k = j - 2 !!!!
      y[i, 4] ~ dnorm(mu[i, 4], psi[1])
8
      y[i, 5] ~ dnorm(mu[i, 5], psi[2])
      y[i, 6] ~ dnorm(mu[i, 6], psi[3])
10
       y[i, 7] ~ dnorm(mu[i, 7], psi[4])
11
12
       for (j in 8:P) {
         z[i, j] ~ dbin(pb[i, j], 1)
13
         pb[i, j] <- exp(mu[i, j]) / (1 + exp(mu[i, j]))</pre>
14
15
16
17
       mu[i, 1] <- uby[1] + eta[i]
       mu[i, 2] <- uby[2] + lam[1] * eta[i]</pre>
18
       mu[i, 3] <- uby[3] + lam[2] * eta[i]</pre>
19
20
       mu[i, 4] <- uby[4] + xi[i, 1]
21
       mu[i, 5] \leftarrow uby[5] + lam[3] * xi[i, 1]
       mu[i, 6] <- uby[6] + lam[4] * xi[i, 1]
22
       mu[i, 7] <- uby[7] + lam[5] * xi[i, 1]
23
24
       mu[i, 8] <- uby[8] + xi[i, 2]
25
       mu[i, 9] <- uby[9] + lam[6] * xi[i, 2]
26
       mu[i, 10] <- uby[10] + lam[7] * xi[i, 2]
27
28
29
       # structural equation model
30
       xi[i, 1:2] ~ dmnorm(zero2[1:2], phi[1:2, 1:2])
31
       eta[i] ~ dnorm(etamu[i], psd)
32
```

```
33
       etamu[i] <- ubeta * d[i] + gam[1] * xi[i, 1] + gam[2] * xi[i, 2]
34
     } # End for i
35
     for (k in 1:2) { zero2[k] <- 0 }</pre>
36
37
38
39
     # priors inputs for loadings and coefficients
    for (j in 1:P) { uby[j] ~ dnorm(0.0, 4.0) }
40
41
     for (j in 1:2) { lam[j] ~ dnorm(0.5, 4.0) }
42
43
     pslam[1] <- 4.0 * psi[2]
44
    lam[3] ~ dnorm(0.5, pslam[1])
45
46
     pslam[2] <- 4.0 * psi[3]
     lam[4] ~ dnorm(0.5, pslam[2])
47
     pslam[3] <- 4.0 * psi[4]
48
     lam[5] ~ dnorm(0.5, pslam[3])
49
50
51
     for (j in 6:7) { lam[j] ~ dnorm(0.5, 4.0) }
52
53
     ubeta ~ dnorm (0.5, psd)
54
     psgam <- 4.0 * psd
55
56
     for (k in 1:2) {
57
      gam[k] ~ dnorm(0.5, psgam)
58
59
60
61
     # priors inputs for precisions
62
    for (j in 1:4) {
63
      psi[j] ~ dgamma(9, 3)
       sgm[j] <- 1 / psi[j]
64
65
66
67
     psd ~ dgamma(9, 3)
68
     sgd <- 1 / psd
69
     phi[1:2, 1:2] ~ dwish(R[1:2, 1:2], 4)
70
    phx[1:2, 1:2] <- inverse(phi[1:2, 1:2])
71
72
  } # End of model
```

codes/model1.txt

### 1.3 Simulation process

```
1 library (R2WinBUGS)
2
3
   # set experiment date
4
   timestamp = strftime(Sys.time(), "%Y%m%d-%H")
5 winBUGS.path = "D:/pkgs/WinBUGS14/"
6 datapath = paste0(getwd(), '/data')
   print(datapath)
9
10 # data size
11 iter = 10
12 \mid N = 500
13 P = 10
14 \mid \text{Nlam} = 7
15 Neta = 1
16 \mid Nxi = 2
17 \mid Ngam = 2
18
19 # containers for Bayesian estimates and standard errors
20 uby.E <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = P)
21 uby.SE <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = P)
22 lam.E <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Nlam)
23 lam.SE <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Nlam)
24 gam.E <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Ngam)
```

```
25 gam.SE <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Ngam)
26 phx.E <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Nxi^2)
27 phx.SE <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = Nxi^2)
28 ubeta.E <- numeric(iter)
29 ubeta.SE <- numeric(iter)
30
   # only continuous part of y's variances need to estimate
31
   sgm.E <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = 4)</pre>
32 sgm.SE <- matrix(data = NA, nrow = iter, ncol = 4)
33 sgd.E <- numeric(iter)
34 sgd.SE <- numeric(iter)
35
36
   # containers for HPD (Highest Probability Density) intervals
37 uby.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, P, 2))
38 ubeta.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, 2))
39 lam.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, Nlam, 2))
40 gam.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, Ngam, 2))
41 phx.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, Nxi^2, 2))
42 sgm.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, 4, 2))
43 sgd.hpd <- array(NA, c(iter, 2))
44
45
   # container for DIC values
46 DIC = numeric(iter)
47
48
  # parameters to be estimated
  parameters <- c("uby", "ubeta", "lam", "gam", "phx", "sgm", "sgd")
49
50
   # set important prior param R_0
51
52 \mid R0 = matrix(c(7.0, 2.1, 2.1, 7.0), nrow = 2)
53
   # initial values for MCMC in WinBUGS
54
   init1 <- list(</pre>
55
    uby = rep(0.5, P),
56
57
     ubeta = 0.5,
58
     lam = rep(0.5, Nlam),
59
     gam = rep(0.5, Ngam),
60
     phi = matrix(c(1, 0.5, 0.5, 1), nrow = Nxi),
     psi = rep(1, 4),
61
    psd = 1,
63
     xi = matrix(data = rep(0.3, N * Nxi), ncol = Nxi)
64
65
   init2 <- list(</pre>
66
    uby = rep(0, P),
67
68
     ubeta = 0,
69
     lam = rep(0, Nlam),
70
     gam = rep(0, Ngam),
71
     phi = matrix(c(2, 0, 0, 2), nrow = Nxi),
72
    psi = rep(2, 4),
73
     psd = 2,
     xi = matrix(data = rep(0.3, N * Nxi), ncol = Nxi)
74
75
76
   init3 <- list(</pre>
77
78
    uby = rep(0, P),
79
     ubeta = 0.3,
     lam = rep(0.8, Nlam),
80
81
     gam = rep(0.45, Ngam),
     phi = matrix(c(1, 0.2, 0.2, 1), nrow = Nxi),
82
83
     psi = rep(0.3, 4),
     psd = 0.4,
84
     xi = matrix(data = rep(0.3, N * Nxi), ncol = Nxi)
85
86
87
88
   init4 <- list(</pre>
89
     uby = rep(0, P),
     ubeta = 0.4,
90
91
     lam = rep(0.9, Nlam),
92
     gam = rep(0.5, Ngam),
93
     phi = matrix(c(1, 0.3, 0.3, 1), nrow = Nxi),
94
     psi = rep(0.4, 4),
     psd = 0.3,
```

```
96
     xi = matrix(data = rep(0.3, N * Nxi), ncol = Nxi)
97
98
   inits <- list(init3, init4)</pre>
100
101
102
   # Do simulations based on 10 replications
103
   for (t in 1:iter) {
     iterpath = paste0(getwd(),"/Q1.2_", t)
104
105
     dir.create(iterpath, showWarnings = FALSE, recursive = TRUE)
106
107
     Y <- as.matrix(read.table(paste(datapath, "/Y-", t, ".txt", sep = "")))
     D <- read.table(paste(datapath, "/D-", t, ".txt", sep = ""))$x</pre>
108
109
110
      data \leftarrow list(N = N, P = P, R = RO,
111
                  d = D, z = Y,
                  low = c(-2000, 0),
112
                  high = c(0, 2000)
113
114
     model = bugs(data, inits, parameters,
115
116
                   model.file = paste0(getwd(),"/../model1.txt"),
                   n.chains = 2,
117
118
                   n.iter = 5000
119
                   n.burnin = 3000
120
                   n.thin = 1,
121
                   DIC = TRUE,
                   bugs.directory = winBUGS.path,
122
123
                   working.directory = iterpath,
194
                   debug = FALSE)
125
126
      # save estimates and standard errors
     uby.E[t, ] = model$mean$uby
127
128
      uby.SE[t,] = model$sd$uby
129
      ubeta.E[t] = model$mean$ubeta
130
      ubeta.SE[t] = model$sd$ubeta
131
      lam.E[t, ] = model$mean$lam
     lam.SE[t, ] = model$sd$lam
132
      gam.E[t, ] = model$mean$gam
133
134
      gam.SE[t,] = model$sd$gam
135
      phx.E[t, ] = c(model$mean$phx)
      phx.SE[t, ] = c(model$sd$phx)
136
      sgm.E[t, ] = model$mean$sgm
137
138
      sgm.SE[t,] = model$sd$sgm
139
      sgd.E[t] = model$mean$sgd
      sgd.SE[t] = model$sd$sgd
140
141
      # save HPD intervals
142
143
      for (k in 1:P) {
144
        temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, k]
145
        uby.hpd[t, k,] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
     }
146
147
     temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, P + 1]
148
      ubeta.hpd[t, ] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
149
      for (k in 1:Nlam) {
150
        temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, P + 1 + k]
        lam.hpd[t, k,] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
151
152
153
      for (k in 1:Ngam) {
       temp = modelsims.array[ , 1, P + 1 + Nlam + k]
154
155
       gam.hpd[t, k,] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
156
157
     for (k in 1:Nxi^2) {
158
        temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, P + 1 + Nlam + Ngam + k]
159
       phx.hpd[t, k, ] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
160
161
     for (k in 1:4) {
162
        temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, P + 1 + Nlam + Ngam + Nxi^2 + k]
163
        sgm.hpd[t, k,] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
164
      temp = model$sims.array[ , 1, P + 1 + Nlam + Ngam + Nxi^2 + 4 + 1]
165
166
     sgd.hpd[t,] = boa.hpd(temp, 0.05)
```

```
167
     # save DIC values
168
169
     DIC[t] = model$DIC
170
171
     print(model$summary)
172
   }
173
174
   metr_params = list(
175
     E = list(
       uby = uby.E, ubeta = ubeta.E, lam = lam.E, gam = gam.E,
176
177
       phx = phx.E, sgm = sgm.E, sgd = sgd.E
178
     ),
179
     SE = list(
180
       uby = uby.SE, ubeta = ubeta.SE, lam = lam.SE, gam = gam.SE,
181
       phx = phx.SE, sgm = sgm.SE, sgd = sgd.SE
182
     HPD = list(
183
184
       uby = uby.hpd, ubeta = ubeta.hpd, lam = lam.hpd, gam = gam.hpd,
       phx = phx.hpd, sgm = sgm.hpd, sgd = sgd.hpd
185
186
187
188
189
   save(metr_params, file = paste0(getwd(), "/Q1.2_metrparams.RData"))
```

codes/simulation1.R