#### Bayesian Inference via the Blended Paradigm

John Lewis, Yoonkyung Lee, Steven MacEachern

The Ohio State University With Support from: The Nationwide Center for Advanced Customer Insights NSF

Tuesday, August 5, 2013

## Introduction to the Blended Paradigm

- Traditional Bayesian Framework:
  - $Y \sim [Y|\theta]$  and  $\theta \sim [\theta]$
  - Given the observed Y = y, pass to the posterior:

 $[\theta|y] \propto [y|\theta][\theta]$ 

- Deficiencies:
  - We may not fully believe the likelihood  $[Y|\theta]$
  - More modeling may not fix this problem
- Acknowledge inadequacy of our model
- Drive Bayesian update with the 'good' portion of the likelihood

### Introduction to the Blended Paradigm

- Blended Paradigm Framework:
  - Here, T(Y) is a 'robust' summary of the data
    - 'Robust' means insensitivity to the deficiencies in the model for inferences of interest
    - Model for  $[Y|\theta]$  implies model for  $[T(Y)|\theta]$
  - $T(Y) \sim [T(Y)|\theta]$  and  $\theta \sim [\theta]$
  - Given the observed T(y) = t, pass to the posterior:

 $[\theta|t] \propto [t|\theta][\theta]$ 

- Implementation via MCMC
- Goal : To obtain better inference through a wise choice of T(Y)

### **Proof of Concept-Outliers**

· Simon Newcomb's famous measurements of the speed of light



### Model

- Model for the data:  $Y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\mu, \sigma^2), i = 1, \cdots, 66$ 
  - Full Likelihood
  - Restricted Likelihood  $T(Y) = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$
  - $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$  robust M-estimators using Huber's loss and 'Proposal 2'
- Fixed priors:  $\mu \sim N(\eta, \tau^2)$ ,  $\sigma^2 \sim IG(\alpha, \beta)$

• 
$$\eta=-222$$
,  $au=$  540,  $lpha=$  5,  $eta=$  200

 Priors derived from experimental data on the speed of light conducted before Newcomb's study

#### Posteriors

Marginal Posteriors for µ Marginal Posteriors for  $\sigma^2$ 0.10 - Full 0.08



#### Posteriors

Marginal Posteriors for µ Marginal Posteriors for  $\sigma^2$ 0.10 Full - Full Deleted Outliers Deleted Outliers 0.8 Huber --- Huber 0.08 0.6 0.06 Density Density 4.0 0.04 02 0.02 0.0 0.0 20 25 X X-del 30 ff 35 s<sup>2</sup> - del 50 100 150 °2 μ  $\sigma^2$ 

• Overall conclusion: Reduced bias and variance

## Model Fitting

- $[T(Y)|\theta]$  typically intractable
- Small dimensions: grid estimation
- Larger dimensions: data augmented MCMC
  - $[\theta, Y|T(y)]$ 
    - $[\theta|Y, T(y)] = [\theta|Y]$
    - $[Y|\theta, T(y)]$
- First step: full posterior
- Second step: Metropolis-Hastings

# MH Step

• MH ratio

$$\frac{[y^{**}|\theta,t]}{[y_{curr}|\theta,t]}\frac{p(y_{curr}|y^{**})}{p(y^{**}|y_{curr})}$$

- Ratio of Likelihoods: normalizing constants cancel
- Proposal density:
  - Start Y<sup>∗</sup> ∼ g
  - Transform  $H: Y^* \to Y^{**}$ , so that  $T(Y^{**}) = T(y)$
  - Use this recipe to derive the proposal density (not a standard transformation)

n = 3: sample space lies on the plane defined by  $\bar{y} = 0$ 

















- Proposal density
  - Starting distribution g: uniform on the circle
  - Adjustment 1: Stretch out to the target shape

• r<sup>-1</sup>

• Adjustment 2: Attenuation to get density along the target shape

•  $cos(\gamma)$ 

• 
$$p(y^{**}) \propto \frac{\cos(\gamma)}{r}$$

• MCMC for  $[Y_1|\theta, T(y), Y_1 > 0], \theta = (\mu, \sigma) = (0, 1)$ 



• MCMC for  $[Y_1|\theta, T(y), Y_1 > 0], \mu = (.4, -.5, .1), \sigma = 0.1$ 



• MCMC for  $[Y_1|\theta, T(y), Y_1 > 0], \mu = (.4, -.5, .1), \sigma = 0.3$ 



n = 3: sample space does not lie in a plane



n = 3: sample space does not lie in a plane

















- Earlier adjustments result in distribution in the plane
- Need the distribution in the original space
- One final adjustment
  - Comparison of the infinitesimal arc lengths in projected space to full space





• MCMC for  $[Y_1|\theta, T(y), Y_2 = 0], \theta = (\mu, \sigma) = (0, 1)$ 



• Without the second adjustment



• MCMC for  $[Y_2|\theta, T(y), Y_1 = 0]$ ,  $\mu = (-.5, .4, .1)$ ,  $\sigma = .5$ 



## Summary of the MH Step

- The recipe for the proposal
  - Start Y\* uniform on unit sphere
  - Transform  $H: Y^* \to Y^{**}$  so that  $T(Y^{**}) = T(y)$
- *H* involves
  - Stretch in deviation space:  $r^{-1}$
  - Attenuation in the deviation space
  - Attenuation for the original space

Summary of the MH Step

- T(Y) = (L(Y), S(Y))
- Both attenuations involve abla L and abla S
- Extension to *n* dimensions
  - Stretch in deviation space:  $r^{-(n-2)}$
  - Attenuation in deviation space: compare norms of the n-1 dimensional tangent spaces for the sphere and the target manifold
  - Attenuation in original space: comparing n 2 dimensional volumes in the original space to the deviation space
  - Calculations need  $\nabla L$  and  $\nabla S$

## Conclusion

- The illustration today concerned the location and scale problem
  - Concern is outliers
- Modeling and computation extends to more interesting structures
  - Inclusion of covariates
  - Hierarchical models
- Benefits include
  - Reduced bias and smaller posterior variance
  - Ability to pool information
  - Ability to incorporate external information
- Blended paradigm also addresses model misspecification