MVE550 2020 Lecture 8.1 Compendium Chapter 4 Bayesian inference for Branching processes

Petter Mostad

Chalmers University

November 22, 2020

Bayesian inference for Branching processes

- Say you have observed some data, and you want to find a branching process (of the type discussed in Dobrow) that appropriately models the data, to then make predictions. How?
- ► A branching process is characterized by the probability vector a = (a₀, a₁, a₂,...,) where a_i is the probability for *i* offspring in the offspring process.
- ▶ Let y₁, y₂,..., y_n be the counts of offspring in n observations of the offspring process. If a is given we have the likelihood

$$\pi(y_1,\ldots,y_n\mid a)=\prod_{i=1}^n a_{y_i}$$

- ► To complete the model, we need a prior on *a*. However, it is tricky to define a prior on the infinite-dimensional set of possible vectors *a*.
- So, instead we will consider two situations where we make additional assumptions on the offspring process.

Using a Binomial likelihood

Assume the offspring process is Binomial(N, p) for some parameter p and a fixed known N. We get the likelihood

$$\pi(y_1,\ldots,y_n \mid p) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Binomial}(y_i; N, p).$$

A possibility is to use a prior p ~ Beta(α, β). Writing S = ∑ⁿ_{i=1} y_i we get the posterior

 $p \mid \mathsf{data} \sim \mathsf{Beta}(\alpha + S, \beta + nN - S).$

More generally, if π(p) = f(p) for any positive function integrating to 1 on [0, 1], we get

 $\pi(p \mid \mathsf{data}) \propto_p \mathsf{Beta}(p; 1 + S, 1 + nN - S)f(p)$

▶ We can then for example compute numerically the posterior probability that the branching process is supercritical, i.e., that Pr(p > 1/N | data), with (see R computations)

$$\int_{1/N}^{1} \pi(p \mid \mathsf{data}) \, dp = \frac{\int_{1/N}^{1} \mathsf{Beta}(1+S, 1+nN-S)f(p) \, dp}{\int_{0}^{1} \mathsf{Beta}(1+S, 1+nN-S)f(p) \, dp}$$

Using a Multinomial likelihood

Assume there is a maximum of N offspring and that
 p = (p₀, p₁,..., p_N) is an unknown probability vector so that p_i is
 the probability of i offspring. We get the likelihood

$$\pi(y_1,\ldots,y_n \mid p) = \text{Multinomial}(c;p)$$

where $c = (c_0, ..., c_N)$ is the vector of counts in the data of cases with 0, ..., N offspring, respectively.

If we use the prior p ∼ Dirichlet(α) where α = (α₀,..., α_N) is a vector of pseudocounts, we get

$$p \mid data \sim Dirichlet(\alpha + c).$$

Note that Dirichlet(1,...,1) corresponds to the uniform distribution. Using this prior, we get the posterior expectation for p

$$\mathsf{E}\left(p\mid\mathsf{data}\right)=\frac{c+(1,1,\ldots,1)}{n+N+1}.$$

 We can simulate from the posterior to investigate for example the probability of being supercritical. MVE550 2020 Lecture 8.2 Compendium Chapter 5 MCMC for Bayesian inference

Petter Mostad

Chalmers University

November 24, 2020

► A discrete time continuous state space Markov chain is a sequence

 X_0, X_1, \ldots

of continuous random variables with the property that, for all n > 0,

 $\pi(X_{n+1} \mid X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n) = \pi(X_{n+1} \mid X_n)$

- We work with time-homogeneous Markov chains, so that the *density* $\pi(X_{n+1} \mid X_n)$ is the same for all *n*.
- Ergodicity is defined in a similar way as for discrete state space chains: The chain needs to be irreducible, aperiodic, and positive recurrent.
- The fundamental limit theorem for ergodic Markov chains holds: In the limit as n → ∞, the chain approaches a unique positive stationary distribution.

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

- The Metropolis Hastings algorithm is defined as before, except that the proposal distribution q(θ_{new} | θ) is now a probability density, not a probability mass function.
- Exactly as before, the limiting distribution of the Metropolis Hastings Markov chain is the target distribution, as long as the Markov chain is ergodic.
- The strong law of large numbers also holds in this situation, as previously noted.
- Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is making the approximation

$$\mathsf{E}_{\pi}\left(r(heta)
ight) pprox rac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}r(heta_{i})$$

where $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_N$ is a realization of steps from the Metropolis Hastings Markov chain with the distribution π as its target.

Bayesian inference with MCMC

- We have some data y₁,..., y_n and we want to make a probability prediction for y_{new}.
- We define (in this course) a parameter θ, and a probabilistic model so that

$$\pi(y_1,\ldots,y_n,y_{new},\theta) = \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \pi(y_i \mid \theta)\right] \pi(y_{new} \mid \theta) \pi(\theta)$$

- ► Thus $\pi(y_{new} \mid y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \int_{\theta} \pi(y_{new} \mid \theta) \pi(\theta \mid y_1, \ldots, y_n) d\theta$.
- Often when the dimension of θ is reasonably high: We use Metropolis Hastings to generate a sample θ₁,..., θ_N from π(θ | y₁,..., y_n) and approximate

$$\pi(y_{new} \mid y_1, \dots, y_n) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi(y_{new} \mid \theta_i)$$

▶ The acceptance probabiliby in MH may in case above be written

$$a = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(y_1, \dots, y_n \mid \theta^*)\pi(\theta^*)q(\theta \mid \theta^*)}{\pi(y_1, \dots, y_n \mid \theta)\pi(\theta)q(\theta^* \mid \theta)}\right)$$

Old example from Chapter 1:

$$y \mid p \sim Binomial(17, p)$$

 $p \sim Beta(2.3, 4.1)$
 $y_{new} \mid p \sim Binomial(3, p)$

- We would like to compute $Pr(y_{new} = 1 | y = 4)$.
- In this toy example we can do so
 - directly, using conjugacy
 - using discretization
 - using numerical integration
- ► As an illustration see R for use of Metropolis Hastings with
 - a random walk proposal
 - an independent proposal

The Normal Normal conjugacy

• Assume $y \sim \text{Normal}\left(\theta, \frac{1}{\tau_y}\right)$ where θ is unknown and the *precision* τ_y is known and fixed. Then the normal family is a conjugate family for θ .

• In fact, if
$$heta \sim \mathsf{Normal}\left(\mu, rac{1}{ au_{\mu}}
ight)$$
 then

$$heta \mid y \sim \mathsf{Normal}\left(rac{ au_y y + au_\mu \mu}{ au_y + au_\mu}, rac{1}{ au_y + au_\mu}
ight)$$

> The predictive distribution is also normal. In fact,

$$y \sim \operatorname{Normal}\left(\mu, \frac{1}{\tau_y} + \frac{1}{\tau_\mu}\right).$$

More conjugacies in Compendium appendix, and on Wikipedia...

Example using Gibbs sampling

• Consider the model with data y_1, \ldots, y_n and parameter $\theta = (\mu, \tau)$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n \mid \mu, \tau & \sim & \mathsf{Normal}(\mu, \tau^{-1}) \\ \mu & \sim & \mathsf{Normal}(\mu_0, \tau_0^{-1}) \\ \tau & \sim & \mathsf{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta) \end{array}$$

 $\mu_0, \tau_0, \alpha, \beta$ are fixed known numbers.

- Recall: Gibbs sampling uses proposals where, for each component of θ: fix all other components and simulate from the conditional distribution.
- In our case we may compute

$$\mu \mid y_1, \dots, y_n, \tau \sim \mathsf{Normal}\left(\frac{\tau_0 \mu_0 + \tau \sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{\tau_0 + n\tau}, \frac{1}{\tau_0 + n\tau}\right)$$

and

$$au \mid y_1, \dots, y_n, \mu \sim \mathsf{Gamma}\left(lpha + rac{n}{2}, eta + rac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu)^2
ight).$$

See R code for an implementation, computing the probability that a new y is less than y₁.

- Works for almost all models (when the dimension of θ is less than a few thousand).
- Easy to program.
- Difficult to find proposal functions that give an acceptable rate of convergence!
- Difficult to assess the convergence in a particular case: How accurate are your results?