

Advanced Bayesian Methods: Theory and Applications in R

Posterior Summaries

Nikolaus Umlauf https://nikum.org/abm.html

Posterior Summaries

- While the ultimate outcome of Bayesian inference is the posterior, this is often compressed into posterior summaries, in particular
 - posterior point estimates and
 - posterior measures of uncertainty.
- Typical point estimates:
 - posterior mean (estimated by averages of samples),
 - posterior median (estimated by empirical median),
 - posterior mode (difficult to determine from samples).
- Typical measures of uncertainty:
 - posterior variance / standard deviation (estimated by empirical analogues),
 - posterior quantiles.

Credible Intervals

• A pointwise Bayesian credible interval $[\theta_{s,low}, \theta_{s,upp}]$ for a scalar parameter θ_s is characterized by the posterior coverage probability

$$P(\theta_{s,\mathsf{low}} \leq \theta_s \leq \theta_{s,\mathsf{upp}} | \mathbf{y}) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

where $1 - \alpha$ denotes the desired coverage level.

• A simultaneous band for multiple parameters $\{ heta_s, s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ should have

$$P(heta_{s,\mathsf{low}} \leq heta_s \leq heta_{s,\mathsf{upp}}, s \in \mathcal{S}|\mathbf{y}) \geq 1 - lpha$$

Credible Intervals

• Symmetric and highest posterior density credible intervals:



Credible Intervals

In R:

```
R> library("HDInterval")
```

Simulate beta distributed data (as in the density plot before).

```
R > x <- rbeta(1000, shape1 = 2, shape2 = 5)
```

HDI intervals for samples and the beta distribution.

```
R> i <- hdi(x, credMass = 0.8)
R> j <- hdi(qbeta, credMass = 0.8, shape1 = 2, shape2 = 5)</pre>
```

R> print(rbind(i, j))

lower upper i 0.06738695 0.4619858 j 0.05126051 0.4483045

Bayesian Tests

• To test the hypotheses

 $H_0: \theta \in \Theta_0$ vs. $H_1: \theta \notin \Theta_0$

we can compute the posterior probabilities

 $p_0 = P(\theta \in \Theta_0 | \mathbf{y})$ and $p_1 = P(\theta \notin \Theta_0 | \mathbf{y}).$

• The decision can then be based on the ratio

 $\frac{p_1}{p_0}$

that measures the evidence in favor of H_1 as compared to H_0 .

Bayesian Tests

- H_1 and H_0 are therefore treated symmetrically in the Bayesian context.
- Unfortunately, point hypotheses can not meaningfully be tested in the Bayesian paradigm since then

$$P(\theta = \theta_0 | \mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

- Instead of formally testing hypothesis, the decision between H_0 and H_1 is often made based on model choice procedures in the Bayesian framework.
- As an alternative, one often considers a Bayesian credible interval for θ and evaluates whether θ_0 is contained in the credible interval or not.

```
Bayesian Tests
```

In R:

```
R> library("bamlss")
```

Simulate some data.

```
R> set.seed(123)
R> n <- 1000
R> x1 <- rnorm(n)
R> x2 <- rnorm(n)
R> y <- 1.2 + 0.5 * x1 + rnorm(n, sd = 0.2)</pre>
```

Estimate linear model using MCMC. R> b <- bamlss(y ~ x1 + x2)

Bayesian Tests

95% Credible intervals.

Inference for Derived Quantities

Goal: Conduct Bayesian inference for a derived quantity

 $\eta = g(heta).$

- Convenient feature of MCMC: If $\theta^{[1]}, \ldots, \theta^{[T]}$ is a sample from the posterior of $\theta, g(\theta^{[1]}), \ldots, g(\theta^{[T]})$ will be a sample from the posterior of the transformed parameter.
- No restrictions on the transformation $g(\cdot)$ and no need to deal with asymptotic considerations

Inference for Derived Quantities

Example in R:

```
R > nd <- data.frame("x1" = x1, "x2" = x2)
R> par <- predict(b, newdata = nd, type = "parameter", FUN = identity)
R> print(names(par))
R> print(dim(par$mu))
R> Probs <- NULL
R> for(i in 1:ncol(par$mu)) {
     tpar <- list("mu" = par$mu[, i], "sigma" = par$sigma[, i])</pre>
+
     p <-1 - family(b) $p(1, tpar) ## Same as 1 - pnorm(1, ...).
+
     Probs <- cbind(Probs. p)
+
  7
+
R> Probs <- apply(Probs, 1, mean)
R > col <- rep(1, n)
R > col[Probs > 0.6] <- 2
R > par(mfrow = c(1, 2), mar = c(4, 4, 1, 1))
R > plot(x1, y, col = col)
```

Inference for Derived Quantities

R> abline(h = 1, lty = 2)
R> plot(x1, Probs, col = col)



• Bayesian information criterion (BIC)

$$\mathsf{BIC}(M_l) = -2\ell(\hat{ heta}_l) + \log(n)\mathsf{df}_l$$

where df_l is the number of parameters in model *l*.

• Deviance information criterion (DIC)

$$\mathsf{DIC} = \overline{D(\theta)} + \mathsf{pd}_{\mathsf{DIC}}$$

where

$$\overline{D(\theta)} = -2\log(p(\mathbf{y}| heta)) = rac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}D(heta^{[t]})$$

denotes the model deviance and

$$\mathsf{pd}_{\mathsf{DIC}} = \overline{D(\theta)} - D(\overline{\theta}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} D(\theta^{[t]}) - D\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \theta^{[t]}\right)$$

provides an estimate for the effective parameter count.

• Widely applicable information criterion (WAIC)

WAIC = 2 (
$$D_{\text{WAIC}} + p_{\text{WAIC}}$$
) with $D_{\text{WAIC}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} p\left(y_i | \theta^{[t]}\right)\right)$

as the measure of model fit,

$$\mathsf{p}_{\mathsf{WAIC}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widehat{\mathsf{Var}}\left(\mathsf{log}\left(p(y_i|oldsymbol{ heta})
ight)
ight)$$

as the measure of model complexity, and the empirical variance

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Var}}(a) = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (a_t - \overline{a})^2.$$

Example in R:

```
R> library("bamlss")
R> data("cars")
```

Two models, simple linear and a polynomial model

```
R> m1 <- bamlss(dist ~ speed, data = cars)
R> m2 <- bamlss(dist ~ poly(speed, 3), data = cars)</pre>
```

p2

Compute information criteria.

R > BIC(m1, m2)BTC df m1 3.077717 428.3615 m2 5.014228 434.6961 R > DIC(m1, m2)DIC pd m1 419.3991 3.077717 m2 420.0945 5.014228 R > WAIC(m1, m2)WATC1 WAIC2 p1 419,4495,420,1763,3,128132,3,491537 m 1 m2 419.5214 420.6983 4.441135 5.029594