

Bayesian Statistics

Seung-Hoon Na

Chonbuk National University

Bayesian statistics

- Using the posterior distribution to summarize everything we know about a set of unknown variables
- **Summarizing posterior distributions**
 - MAP estimation
 - Credible intervals

MAP estimation



- MAP estimate: the posterior mode
 - The most popular choice among **point estimates** of an unknown quantity
 - Reduces to an optimization problem, for which efficient algorithms often exist
 - Interpreted in non-Bayesian terms → the log prior as a regularizer

MAP estimation: Drawbacks

- **No measure of uncertainty**
 - But, in many applications it is important to know how much one can trust a given estimate
- **Overfitting**
 - If we don't model the uncertainty in our parameters, then our predictive distribution will be overconfident

MAP estimation: Drawbacks

- The mode is an untypical point
 - Choosing the mode as a summary of a posterior distribution is often a very poor choice, since the mode is usually quite untypical of the distribution, unlike the mean or median



두 경우에서 Mean이 mode보다 주어진 분포에 대한 더 나은 요약を提供함

MAP estimation: Drawbacks

- **Not invariant to reparameterization**

- To see this, reparameterize x with $y = f(x)$

$$p_y(y) = p_x(x) \left| \frac{dx}{dy} \right| \leftarrow \text{Jacobian}$$

- **MAP estimate for x**

$$\hat{x} = \operatorname{argmax}_x p_x(x)$$

- **MAP estimate for y**


$$\hat{y} = \operatorname{argmax}_y p_y(y) \neq f(\hat{x})$$

Reparameterization이후 MAP결과 이전의 MAP결과와 달라진다

MAP estimation: Drawbacks

- Not invariant to reparameterization

$$x \sim \mathcal{N}(6, 1) \quad f(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-x + 5)}$$



The mode of the transformed distribution is not equal to the transform of the original mode

MAP estimation: Drawbacks

- **Not invariant to reparameterization:** an example in the context of MAP estimation

- The Bernoulli distribution $p(y = 1|\mu) = \mu$

- Prior: $p_\mu(\mu) = 1 \mathbb{I}(0 \leq \mu \leq 1)$

- Parameterization 1: $\theta = \sqrt{\mu}$

$$\hat{\theta}_{MAP} = \arg \max_{\theta \in [0,1]} 2\theta = 1 \quad \leftarrow p_\theta(\theta) = p_\mu(\mu) \left| \frac{d\mu}{d\theta} \right| = 2\theta$$

- Parameterization 2: $\phi = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \mu}$

$$\hat{\phi}_{MAP} = \arg \max_{\phi \in [0,1]} 2 - 2\phi = 0 \quad \leftarrow p_\phi(\phi) = p_\mu(\mu) \left| \frac{d\mu}{d\phi} \right| = 2(1 - \phi)$$

The MAP estimate depends on the parameterization

Credible Intervals

베이즈 신용 구간

- In addition to point estimates, a measure of confidence is often required

점 추정외에, 신뢰 척도도 필요

→ Uncertainty를 모델링하기 위한 point기반 방법

- **$100(1 - \alpha)\%$ credible interval**

- One of the standard measures of confidence in some (scalar) quantity θ

$$C_\alpha(\mathcal{D}) = (\ell, u) : P(\ell \leq \theta \leq u | \mathcal{D}) = 1 - \alpha$$

- **Central interval** 중심 신용 구간

- The specific credible interval with $(1 - \alpha)/2$ mass in each tail

Central interval: 해당구간을 제외한 나머지 양끝에 각각 $(1 - \alpha)/2$ 의 확률 질량을 가짐

Credible Intervals


- **Highest posterior density (HPD) regions**
 - A problem with central intervals
 - There might be points outside the CI which have higher probability density.
 - Definition of HPD (given α)

$$C_{\alpha}(\mathcal{D}) = \{\theta : p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) \geq p^*\}$$

$$1 - \alpha = \int_{\theta: p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) > p^*} p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) d\theta$$


HPD region is sometimes called a **highest density interval** or **HDI**

Central interval vs. HPD region




(a) Central interval and (b) HPD region for a Beta(3,9) posterior.

Central interval vs. HPD region



The HDI may not even be a connected region




Inference for a difference in proportions

- Two sellers offering an item for the same price.
 - Seller 1: 90 pos, 10 neg || Seller 2: 2 pos, 0 neg

➔ Who should you buy from?

prior $\theta_i \sim \text{Beta}(1, 1)$



posterior


$$p(\theta_1|\mathcal{D}_1) = \text{Beta}(91, 11)$$

$$p(\theta_2|\mathcal{D}_2) = \text{Beta}(3, 1)$$

Inference for a difference in proportions

$$\delta = \theta_1 - \theta_2 \quad p(\delta > 0 | \mathcal{D}) = 0.710$$

$$p(\delta > 0 | \mathcal{D}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \mathbb{I}(\theta_1 > \theta_2) \text{Beta}(\theta_1 | y_1 + 1, N_1 - y_1 + 1) \text{Beta}(\theta_2 | y_2 + 1, N_2 - y_2 + 1) d\theta_1 d\theta_2$$



Monte carlo방법을 통해
 $p(\delta > 0 | \mathcal{D})$ 를 근사시:
0.718 (교재코드)

- $p(\theta_1 | \mathcal{D})$ 과 $p(\theta_2 | \mathcal{D})$ 를
샘플링

Bayesian model selection

- Model selection problem
 - How should we choose the best one, among a set of models of different complexity?
- **Cross validation**: require fitting each model K times

- **Bayesian model selection**

Bayesian model selection은
CV에서처럼 각 모델별
K번 fitting이 필요하지 않음

$$p(m|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|m)p(m)}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} p(m, \mathcal{D})}$$

- **Marginal likelihood (or integrated likelihood, or evidence)**

$$p(\mathcal{D}|m) = \int p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|m)d\boldsymbol{\theta}$$

$p(m)$ 이 uniform인 경우 Bayesian model selection은
Marginal likelihood을 따르는 방식이 됨

Bayesian Occam's razor

- MLE or MAP estimate
 - Overfitting problem: Models with more parameters will achieve higher likelihood
- But, when maximizing *marginal likelihood*, instead of likelihood
 - models with more parameters do not necessarily have higher *marginal* likelihood
 - So, it can handle overfitting → **Bayesian Occam's razor effect**

Bayesian Occam's razor effect:

Likelihood가 아니라 파라미터로 적분한 형태인 marginal likelihood를 criterion으로 선택하면 overfitting에 빠지는 것을 자연스럽게 방지

How Bayesian Occam's razor effect?

- 1) Marginal likelihood is like a leave-one-out CV

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = p(y_1)p(y_2|y_1)p(y_3|y_{1:2}) \dots p(y_N|y_{1:N-1})$$

model이 복잡하면 (too complex), 초기 examples들을 overfitting
하나 나머지 examples들을 잘 예측하지 못하게 됨


- 2) Conservation of probability mass

$$\sum_{\mathcal{D}'} p(\mathcal{D}'|m) = 1 \quad \leftarrow \text{모든 dataset에 대한 확률 합이 1}$$

- Complex models, which can predict many things, must spread their probability mass thinly, and hence will not obtain as large a probability for any given data set as simpler models
- model이 복잡하면 (too complex), 다양한 많은 예제들을 골고루 예측할 수 있게 되어, 각 dataset에 대한 prob mass가 낮은 값을 가지며 spread된다 (y축에서 봤을때 thin).
- 반면, 단순 모델 (simple model)의 경우, 예측가능한 예제의 집합이 제한되며, 따라서 특정 dataset의 prob mass가 상대적으로 높음

How Bayesian Occam's razor effect?

- Conservation of probability mass




Bayesian Occam's razor

- $N=5$, green: true dashed: prediction


$d=1$

$d=1$, $\log ev = -18.593$, EB



$d=2$



$d=2$, $\log ev = -20.218$, EB



Bayesian Occam's razor

- $N=5$, green: true dashed: prediction

$d=3$




Not enough data to justify a complex model
→ So, the MAP model is $d=1$

Bayesian Occam's razor

- **N=30**, green: true dashed: prediction


d=1

d=1, logev=-106.110, EB



d=2

d=2, logev=-103.025, EB




Bayesian Occam's razor


- **N=30**, green: true dashed: prediction

d=3

d=3, logev=-107.410, EB



N=30, method=EB



d=2: this is the right model

Bayesian Occam's razor: Ridge regression

- **Ridge regression** $\phi(x) = [1, x, x^2, \dots, x^d]$
 - Suppose we fit a degree 12 polynomial to $N = 21$ data points
 - **MLE** using least square:
6.560, -36.934, -109.255, 543.452, 1022.561, -3046.224, -3768.013,
8524.540, 6607.897, -12640.058, -5530.188, 9479.730, 1774.639, -2821.526
 - **MAP**: Put zero-mean Gaussian prior

Magnitude is too large

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \prod_j \mathcal{N}(w_j | 0, \tau^2)$$

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \mathcal{N}(y_i | w_0 + \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma^2) + \sum_{j=1}^D \log \mathcal{N}(w_j | 0, \tau^2)$$

$$J(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - (w_0 + \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$$

$$\lambda \triangleq \sigma^2 / \tau^2$$


$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{ridge}} = (\lambda \mathbf{I}_D + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$$

➔ Ridge regression

λI term adds a "ridge" to the main diagonal


Bayesian Occam's razor: Ridge regression

Almost least square (MLE)




Wiggle curve
 $\ln \lambda = -20.135$
 $\lambda = 1.8 * 10^{-9}$

Ridge regression (MAP)




Smooth curve
 $\ln \lambda = -8.571$
 $\lambda = 1.895 * 10^{-4}$

Bayesian Occam's razor: Ridge regression



Bayesian Occam's razor

$p(D|\lambda)$ vs. $\log(\lambda)$ in polynomial ridge regression
(degree = 14; $N = 21$)



Marginal likelihood에 기반한
Model selection 과 CV와 유사

→ Empirical Bayes

Bayesian model selection:

Empirical Bayes

- Instead of evaluating the evidence at a finite grid of values, use numerical optimization:

$$\lambda^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\lambda} p(\mathcal{D}|\lambda)$$

➔ **Empirical Bayes** or
Type II maximum likelihood

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- For parameter inference in a fixed model m
 - $p(\theta|D, m) \propto \frac{p(\theta|m)p(D|\theta, m)}{p(D|m)}$
 - $p(D|m)$ can be ignored as normalization constant
- But, for comparing models, we need $p(D|m)$
 - In general, computing $p(D|m)$ is hard,
 - In the case that we have a conjugate prior, the computation can be easy

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- Prior: $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = q(\boldsymbol{\theta})/Z_0$
- Likelihood: $p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = q(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})/Z_\ell$
- Posterior: $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = q(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})/Z_N$

$$q(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = q(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \text{Unnormalized posterior}$$

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathcal{D})}$$

$$\frac{q(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})}{Z_N} = \frac{q(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})q(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{Z_\ell Z_0 p(\mathcal{D})}$$

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{Z_N}{Z_0 Z_\ell}$$

So $P(D|m)$ is based on normalization constants

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- **Beta-binomial model**

Beta function

$$\text{Beta}(x|a, b) = \frac{1}{B(a, b)} x^{a-1} (1-x)^{b-1} \quad B(a, b) \triangleq \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}$$

– Posterior: $p(\theta|D) = \text{Beta}(\theta|a + N_1, b + N_0)$

– Normalization constant (Z_N) of $p(\theta|D)$: $B(a + N_1, b + N_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) &= \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\theta)p(\theta)}{p(\mathcal{D})} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(\mathcal{D})} \left[\frac{1}{B(a, b)} \theta^{a-1} (1-\theta)^{b-1} \right] \left[\binom{N}{N_1} \theta^{N_1} (1-\theta)^{N_0} \right] \\ &= \binom{N}{N_1} \frac{1}{p(\mathcal{D})} \frac{1}{B(a, b)} \left[\theta^{a+N_1-1} (1-\theta)^{b+N_0-1} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- **Beta-binomial model**

The normalization constant (Z_N) of $p(\theta|D)$:
 $B(a + N_1, b + N_0) \rightarrow$

$$\frac{1}{B(a + N_1, b + N_0)} = \binom{N}{N_1} \frac{1}{p(\mathcal{D})} \frac{1}{B(a, b)}$$

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \binom{N}{N_1} \frac{B(a + N_1, b + N_0)}{B(a, b)}$$

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- Dirichlet-multinoulli model

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{B(\mathbf{N} + \boldsymbol{\alpha})}{B(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \quad B(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^K \Gamma(\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}$$

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\Gamma(N + \sum_k \alpha_k)} \prod_k \frac{\Gamma(N_k + \alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)}$$

Marginal Likelihood: $p(D|m)$

- Gaussian-Gaussian-Wishart model

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{D}) &= \frac{Z_N}{Z_0 Z_l} \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^{ND/2}} \frac{1}{2^{ND/2}} \frac{\left(\frac{2\pi}{\kappa_N}\right)^{D/2} |\mathbf{S}_N|^{-\nu_N/2} 2^{(\nu_0+N)D/2} \Gamma_D(\nu_N/2)}{\left(\frac{2\pi}{\kappa_0}\right)^{D/2} |\mathbf{S}_0|^{-\nu_0/2} 2^{\nu_0 D/2} \Gamma_D(\nu_0/2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^{ND/2}} \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{\kappa_N}\right)^{D/2} \frac{|\mathbf{S}_0|^{\nu_0/2}}{|\mathbf{S}_N|^{\nu_N/2}} \frac{\Gamma_D(\nu_N/2)}{\Gamma_D(\nu_0/2)} \end{aligned}$$

BIC approximation to log marginal likelihood

- Bayesian information criterion (BIC)

$$\text{BIC} \triangleq \log p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \frac{\text{dof}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{2} \log N \approx \log p(\mathcal{D})$$

- A penalized log likelihood

of degree of freedom in the model

- BIC in linear regression

- Likelihood

$$\log p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = -\frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi\hat{\sigma}^2) - \frac{N}{2} \text{RSS} = \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{mle}^T \mathbf{x}_i)^2$$

$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \text{RSS}/N$

- BIC

$$\text{BIC} = -\frac{N}{2} \log(\hat{\sigma}^2) - \frac{D}{2} \log(N)$$

BIC approximation to log marginal likelihood

- BIC cost

$$\text{BIC-cost} \triangleq -2 \log p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\theta}) + \text{dof}(\hat{\theta}) \log N \approx -2 \log p(\mathcal{D})$$

- BIC cost in linear regression

$$\text{BIC-cost} = N \log(\hat{\sigma}^2) + D \log(N)$$

- Or minimum description length (MDL) principle

- The score for a model in terms of how well it fits the data, minus how complex the model is to define.

- Akaike information criterion

$$\text{AIC}(m, \mathcal{D}) \triangleq \log p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\theta}_{MLE}) - \text{dof}(m)$$

AIC의 BIC보다 penalty가 작음 →

BIC에 비해 보다 복잡한 모델이 선택될 수 있음

- Derived from a frequentist framework

- Cannot be interpreted as an approximation to the marginal likelihood

Model selection: Effect of the prior

- Marginal likelihood \rightarrow involve model averaging \rightarrow
So, the prior plays an important role
- E.g.) Model selection for linear regression
 - Prior $p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I})$
 - α is large \rightarrow simple model; α is small \rightarrow complex model
- **Hierarchical Bayesian:** when prior is unknown
 - **Put a prior on the prior**
 - Marginal likelihood

$$p(\mathcal{D}|m) = \int \int p(\mathcal{D}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha, m)p(\alpha|m)d\mathbf{w}d\alpha$$

Require to integrate out both w and $\alpha \rightarrow$ computationally hard

Model selection: Empirical Bayes

- **Hierarchical Bayesian**: when prior is unknown
 - Approximation to optimize α :

$$p(\mathcal{D}|m) \approx \int p(\mathcal{D}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|\hat{\alpha}, m)d\mathbf{w}$$

Computationally easier

$$\hat{\alpha} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\alpha} p(\mathcal{D}|\alpha, m) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\alpha} \int p(\mathcal{D}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha, m)d\mathbf{w}$$

→ Empirical Bayes (EB)

Model selection: Bayes Factor

- Two models we are considering
 - M_0 : the **null hypothesis**
 - M_1 : the **alternative hypothesis**
- **Bayes factor**: the ratio of marginal likelihoods

$$BF_{1,0} \triangleq \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|M_1)}{p(\mathcal{D}|M_0)} = \frac{p(M_1|\mathcal{D})}{p(M_0|\mathcal{D})} \bigg/ \frac{p(M_1)}{p(M_0)}$$

- Convert the Bayes factor to a posterior over models
 - When $p(M_1) = p(M_0) = 0.5$:

$$p(M_0|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{BF_{0,1}}{1 + BF_{0,1}} = \frac{1}{BF_{1,0} + 1}$$

Model selection: Bayes Factor

- Jeffreys' scale of evidence for interpreting Bayes factors

Bayes factor $BF(1, 0)$	Interpretation
$BF < \frac{1}{100}$	Decisive evidence for M_0
$BF < \frac{1}{10}$	Strong evidence for M_0
$\frac{1}{10} < BF < \frac{1}{3}$	Moderate evidence for M_0
$\frac{1}{3} < BF < 1$	Weak evidence for M_0
$1 < BF < 3$	Weak evidence for M_1
$3 < BF < 10$	Moderate evidence for M_1
$BF > 10$	Strong evidence for M_1
$BF > 100$	Decisive evidence for M_1

Bayes Factor: An Example

- Testing if a coin is fair
 - M_0 : a fair coin with $\theta = 0.5$
 - M_1 : a biased coin where $\theta \in [0, 1]$
- Marginal likelihood


$$p(\mathcal{D}|M_0) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^N$$

$$p(\mathcal{D}|M_1) = \int p(\mathcal{D}|\theta)p(\theta)d\theta = \frac{B(\alpha_1 + N_1, \alpha_0 + N_0)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_0)}$$

Bayes Factor: An Example


- $N=5$, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 1$

#heads가 2또는 3인 경우
M0 선택



Bayes Factor: An Example

- BIC approximation



Uninformative Priors

- If we don't have strong beliefs about what θ should be, it is common to use an **uninformative** or **non-informative** prior, and to “let the data speak for itself”.

- **Haldane prior** $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{Beta}(c, c) = \text{Beta}(0, 0)$

- This is an improper prior \rightarrow doesn't integrate to 1 \rightarrow But, the posterior is proper

- **Jeffreys priors** $p_{\phi}(\phi) \propto (I(\phi))^{\frac{1}{2}}$

- If $p(\phi)$ is non-informative, then any reparameterization of the prior, such as $\theta = h(\phi)$ for some function h , should also be non-informative.

Reparameterization에 상관없이 non-informative임을 보존하는 prior

Jeffreys priors

$$p_{\phi}(\phi) \propto (I(\phi))^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

- Fisher information:

$$I(\phi) \triangleq -\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{d \log p(X|\phi)}{d\phi} \right)^2 \right]$$

- a measure of curvature of the expected negative log likelihood and hence a measure of stability of the MLE

Jeffreys priors: Derivation

$$\frac{d \log p(x|\theta)}{d\theta} = \frac{d \log p(x|\phi)}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{d\theta}$$

$$I(\theta) = -\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{d \log p(X|\theta)}{d\theta} \right)^2 \right] = I(\phi) \left(\frac{d\phi}{d\theta} \right)^2$$

$$I(\theta)^{\frac{1}{2}} = I(\phi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{d\phi}{d\theta} \right|$$

$$p_{\theta}(\theta) = p_{\phi}(\phi) \left| \frac{d\phi}{d\theta} \right| \propto (I(\phi))^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{d\phi}{d\theta} \right| = I(\theta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Jeffreys priors

- **Bernoulli:** $X \sim \text{Ber}(\theta)$

$$\log p(X|\theta) = X \log \theta + (1 - X) \log(1 - \theta)$$

– **Score function**

$$s(\theta) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\theta} \log p(X|\theta) = \frac{X}{\theta} - \frac{1 - X}{1 - \theta}$$

– **Observed information**

$$J(\theta) = -\frac{d^2}{d\theta^2} \log p(X|\theta) = -s'(\theta|X) = \frac{X}{\theta^2} + \frac{1 - X}{(1 - \theta)^2}$$

– **Fisher information**

$$I(\theta) = E[J(\theta|X)|X \sim \theta] = \frac{\theta}{\theta^2} + \frac{1 - \theta}{(1 - \theta)^2} = \frac{1}{\theta(1 - \theta)}$$

Jeffreys priors

- **Bernoulli**

$$p(\theta) \propto \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 - \theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta(1 - \theta)}} \propto \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$$

- **Multinoulli**


$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \text{Dir}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}\right)$$

Mixtures of conjugate priors

- a **mixture of conjugate priors** is also conjugate

$$p(\theta) = \sum_k p(z = k)p(\theta|z = k)$$

conjugate




- The posterior can also be written as a mixture of conjugate

$$p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = \sum_k p(z = k|\mathcal{D})p(\theta|\mathcal{D}, z = k)$$

- The posterior mixing weights:


$$p(Z = k|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{p(Z = k)p(\mathcal{D}|Z = k)}{\sum_{k'} p(Z = k')p(\mathcal{D}|Z = k')}$$

Marginal likelihood



Mixtures of conjugate priors: An Example

- Prior: $p(\theta) = 0.5\text{Beta}(\theta|a_1, b_1) + 0.5\text{Beta}(\theta|a_2, b_2)$
 $a_1 = b_1 = 20 \quad a_2 = b_2 = 10$
- Posterior: $p(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = 0.346 \text{Beta}(\theta|40, 30) + 0.654 \text{Beta}(\theta|50, 20)$



Hierarchical Bayes

- Bayesian model
 - Posterior: $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|D)$
 - Prior: $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\eta})$
 - $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ are the hyper-parameters
 - how to set $\boldsymbol{\eta}$?
- Hierarchical Bayesian model
 - Put a prior on priors

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\theta} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

- Also called **multi-level model**

Hierarchical Bayes: An Example

- **Modeling related cancer rates**

- N_i : The number of people in various cities
- x_i : the number of people who died of cancer in these cities
- Assumption: $x_i \sim \text{Bin}(N_i, \theta_i)$
- we want to estimate the cancer rates θ_i

- Approach 1) Estimate them all separately → suffer from the sparse data problem
- Approach 2) Parameter tying: assume all the θ_i are the same

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{\sum_i x_i}{\sum_i N_i}$$

Hierarchical Bayes:

Modeling related cancer rates


- Approach 3)
 - Assume that the θ_i are similar, but that there may be city-specific variations → Hierarchical Bayes
 - That is,

$$\theta_i \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} = (a, b)$$


$$p(\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{N}) = p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \prod_{i=1}^N \text{Bin}(x_i | N_i, \theta_i) \text{Beta}(\theta_i | \boldsymbol{\eta})$$

- Infer hyperparams $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (a, b)$ from the data
 - Empirical Bayes 등에 기반

Hierarchical Bayes: Modeling related cancer rates




Hierarchical Bayes: Modeling related cancer rates



Red line: $\mathbb{E} [a/(a + b)|\mathcal{D}]$

Hierarchical Bayes: Modeling related cancer rates

- 95% credible interval



Empirical Bayes

- How to infer hyperparameters?
- Suppose we have a two-level model

$$p(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{D}) \propto p(\mathcal{D} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta})$$

– Need to marginalize out $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to obtain $p(\boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow$ usually computationally hard

- **Empirical Bayes: Evidence procedure**

– Approximate the posterior on the hyper-parameters with point-estimate $p(\boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathcal{D}) \approx \delta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \operatorname{argmax} p(\mathcal{D} | \boldsymbol{\eta}) = \operatorname{argmax} \left[\int p(\mathcal{D} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right]$$

Empirical Bayes

- EB provides a computational cheap approximation in multi-level hierarchical Bayesian model, just as we viewed MAP estimation as an approximation to inference in the one level model $\theta \rightarrow D$.

Frequentist

Method	Definition
Maximum likelihood	$\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} p(\mathcal{D} \theta)$
MAP estimation	$\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} p(\mathcal{D} \theta)p(\theta \eta)$
ML-II (Empirical Bayes)	$\hat{\eta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \int p(\mathcal{D} \theta)p(\theta \eta)d\theta = \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} p(\mathcal{D} \eta)$
MAP-II	$\hat{\eta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \int p(\mathcal{D} \theta)p(\theta \eta)p(\eta)d\theta = \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} p(\mathcal{D} \eta)p(\eta)$
Full Bayes	$p(\theta, \eta \mathcal{D}) \propto p(\mathcal{D} \theta)p(\theta \eta)p(\eta)$

Fully Bayesian

Empirical Bayes: Beta-binomial model

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{D}|a, b) &= \prod_i \int \text{Bin}(x_i|N_i, \theta_i) \text{Beta}(\theta_i|a, b) d\theta_i \\ &= \prod_i \frac{B(a + x_i, b + N_i - x_i)}{B(a, b)} \end{aligned}$$

- Maximizing this marginal likelihood wrt a, b :

<https://tminka.github.io/papers/dirichlet/minka-dirichlet.pdf>

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- Suppose we have data from multiple related groups
 - x_{ij} : the test score for student i in school j , for $j = 1:D$, $i = 1:N_j$
 - Want to estimate the mean score for each school θ_j
 - Use hierarchical Bayes model to handle data-poor problem

$$\theta_j \sim N(\mu, \tau^2) \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} = (\mu, \tau)$$

- Joint distribution

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D} | \boldsymbol{\eta}, \sigma^2) = \prod_{j=1}^D \mathcal{N}(\theta_j | \mu, \tau^2) \prod_{i=1}^{N_j} \mathcal{N}(x_{ij} | \theta_j, \sigma^2)$$

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- Joint distribution, given the estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau})$

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D} | \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \sigma^2) = \prod_{j=1}^D \mathcal{N}(\theta_j | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}^2) \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma_j^2)$$

$$\bar{x}_j \triangleq \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} x_{ij}$$

$$\sigma_j^2 \triangleq \sigma^2 / N_j$$

- The posterior:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D} | \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \sigma^2) = \prod_{j=1}^D \mathcal{N}(\theta_j | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}^2) \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma_j^2)$$

Likelihood function을
sufficient statistics으로 단순화

C.f.) Simplify likelihood function using sufficient Statistics

- Because the MLE estimator and Bayes estimator are functions of sufficient statistic

<http://people.missouristate.edu/songfengzheng/teaching/mth541/lecture%20notes/sufficient.pdf>

$X_1, \dots, X_n \sim N(\mu, 1)$. Then,

$$L(\mu) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \right\} \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{n}{2} (\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\}$$

<http://www.stat.cmu.edu/~larry/=stat705/Lecture6.pdf>

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- The posterior (using Gaussian-related formulas):

$$p(\theta_j | \mathcal{D}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}^2) = \mathcal{N}(\theta_j | \hat{B}_j \hat{\mu} + (1 - \hat{B}_j) \bar{x}_j, (1 - \hat{B}_j) \sigma_j^2)$$

$$\hat{B}_j \triangleq \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_j^2 + \hat{\tau}^2}$$

- \hat{B}_j : controls the degree of **shrinkage** towards the overall mean, $\hat{\mu}$

Large sample size \rightarrow small $\sigma_j^2 \rightarrow$ small \hat{B}_j

- The posterior mean, when $\sigma_j = \sigma$:

$$\hat{\theta}_j = \hat{B} \bar{x} + (1 - \hat{B}) \bar{x}_j = \bar{x} + (1 - \hat{B})(\bar{x}_j - \bar{x})$$

Shrinkage: 각 그룹 mean은 전체 global mean 쪽으로 shrinkage된다

c.f.) Apply linear Gaussian systems

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_x, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x)$$

$$p(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_{x|y}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y})$$

$$p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y^{-1} \mathbf{A}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{x|y} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y} [\mathbf{A}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}) + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x]$$

$$p(\theta_j | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}) = N(\theta_j | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}^2)$$

$$p(D | \theta_j, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}) = N(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma_j^2)$$

$$p(\theta_j | D, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}) = N(\theta_j | \tilde{\mu}_j, \tilde{\sigma}_j^2)$$

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_j^2} = \frac{1}{\hat{\tau}^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_j^2} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j^2 = \frac{\hat{\tau}^2 \sigma_j^2}{\hat{\tau}^2 + \sigma_j^2}$$

$$\tilde{\mu}_j = \frac{\hat{\tau}^2 \sigma_j^2}{\hat{\tau}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_j^2} \theta_j + \frac{1}{\hat{\tau}^2} \hat{\mu} \right)$$

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- Estimating $\eta = (\mu, \tau)$ (case: $\sigma_j^2 = \sigma^2$)

$$\begin{aligned} p(\bar{x}_j | \mu, \tau^2, \sigma^2) &= \int \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma^2) \mathcal{N}(\theta_j | \mu, \tau^2) d\theta_j \\ &= \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_j | \mu, \tau^2 + \sigma^2) \end{aligned}$$

- Marginal likelihood

$$p(\mathcal{D} | \mu, \tau^2, \sigma^2) = \prod_{j=1}^D \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_j | \mu, \tau^2 + \sigma^2)$$

- Estimating μ using MLEs for a Gaussian

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=1}^D \bar{x}_j = \bar{x}$$

c.f.) Apply linear Gaussian systems

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_x, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x)$$

$$p(\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}_x + \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y + \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x\mathbf{A}^T)$$

$$p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y)$$

$$p(\theta_j | \mu, \tau) = N(\theta_j | \mu, \tau^2)$$

$$p(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}) = N(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma_j^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(\bar{x}_j | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\tau}) &= \int N(\theta_j | \mu, \tau^2) N(\bar{x}_j | \theta_j, \sigma_j^2) d\theta_j \\ &= N(\bar{x}_j | \mu, \tau^2 + \sigma_j^2) \end{aligned}$$

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- Estimating the variance τ^2 : moment matching

$$\hat{\tau}^2 + \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=1}^D (\bar{x}_j - \bar{x})^2 \triangleq s^2$$

$$\hat{\tau}^2 = \max\{0, s^2 - \sigma^2\} = (s^2 - \sigma^2)_+$$

- **Shrinkage factor:**

$$\hat{B} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + \hat{\tau}^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + (s^2 - \sigma^2)_+}$$

Empirical Bayes: Gaussian-Gaussian model

- Estimating $\eta = (\mu, \tau)$ (case: σ_j^2 are different)

- No closed form solution
- Instead, we need to use the EM algorithm or the approximated inference

σ_j^2 가 그룹별로 다른 경우의 Gaussian-Gaussian model을 위한 Empirical Bayes 방법에서는 closed form solution은 없고 EM 알고리즘이나 근사추론 방식이 필요

Gaussian-Gaussian model: An Example

- Predicting baseball scores

- b_j : The number of hits for $D = 18$ players, during $T = 45$ games
- Assume $b_j \sim \text{Bin}(T, \theta_j)$
- Want to estimate the θ_j

- The MLE: $\hat{\theta}_j = x_j$

$$x_j = b_j/T$$

- How about an EB approach?

Gaussian-Gaussian model: Predicting baseball scores

- EB approach (Gaussian shrinkage approach)

$$\mathbb{E}[x_j] = \theta_j \quad x_j = b_j/T$$

$$\text{var}[x_j] = \frac{1}{T^2} \text{var}[b_j] = \frac{T\theta_j(1 - \theta_j)}{T^2}$$

- To apply Gaussian shrinkage approach, we require the likelihood be Gaussian:

$$x_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_j, \sigma^2) \quad N_j = 1$$

- But, $\text{var}[x_j]$ is not constant (cannot be used as σ^2)

Gaussian-Gaussian model: Predicting baseball scores

- EB approach
 - Apply **variance stabilizing transform** to x_j to better match the Gaussian assumption

- **Variance stabilizing transformation**

a function $Y = f(X)$ such that $\text{var}[Y]$ is independent of $E[X] = \mu$

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu \quad \text{var}[X] = \sigma^2(\mu)$$

$$Y = f(X)$$

$$Y \approx f(\mu) + (X - \mu)f'(\mu)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}[Y] &\approx f'(\mu)^2 \text{var}[X - \mu] \\ &= f'(\mu)^2 \sigma^2(\mu)\end{aligned}$$

Gaussian-Gaussian model: Predicting baseball scores

- EB approach
 - Apply **variance stabilizing transform**:

$$y_j = f(x_j) = \sqrt{T} \arcsin(2x_j - 1)$$


- Then, we have approximately:

$$y_j \sim \mathcal{N}(f(\theta_j), 1) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, 1)$$

- Estimate $\hat{\mu}_j$ using Gaussian shrinkage
 - Then, transform back to get:

$$\hat{\theta}_j = 0.5(\sin(\hat{\mu}_j / \sqrt{T}) + 1)$$

Gaussian-Gaussian model: Predicting baseball scores



Gaussian-Gaussian model: Predicting baseball scores

Shrinkage방법이 MLE방법보다 MSE 오차가 3배 더 작게 나온다

