Advanced Simulation - Lecture 7

George Deligiannidis

February 10th, 2019

Markov chains - continuous space

- The state space $\mathbb{X}$ is now continuous, e.g. $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- $(X_t)_{t\geq 1}$ is a Markov chain if for any (measurable) set A,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_t \in A | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, ..., X_{t-1} = x_{t-1}) \\ = \mathbb{P}(X_t \in A | X_{t-1} = x_{t-1}).\end{aligned}$$

  The future is conditionally independent of the past given the present.

- We have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t \in A | X_{t-1} = x) = \int_A K(x, y)\, dy = K(x, A),$$

  that is conditional on $X_{t-1} = x$, X_t is a random variable which admits a probability density function $K(x, \cdot)$.

- $K : \mathbb{X}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the **kernel** of the Markov chain.

Markov chains - continuous space

- Denoting μ_1 the pdf of X_1, we obtain directly

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, ..., X_t \in A_t)$$
$$= \int_{A_1 \times \cdots \times A_t} \mu_1(x_1) \prod_{k=2}^{t} K(x_{k-1}, x_k)\, dx_1 \cdots dx_t.$$

- Denoting by μ_t the distribution of X_t, Chapman-Kolmogorov equation reads

$$\mu_t(y) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mu_{t-1}(x) K(x, y)\, dx$$

and similarly for $m > 1$

$$\mu_{t+m}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mu_t(x) K^m(x, y)\, dx$$

where

$$K^m(x_t, x_{t+m}) = \int_{\mathbb{X}^{m-1}} \prod_{k=t+1}^{t+m} K(x_{k-1}, x_k)\, dx_{t+1} \cdots dx_{t+m-1}.$$

Example

- Consider the autoregressive (AR) model

$$X_t = \rho X_{t-1} + V_t$$

where $V_t \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \tau^2\right)$. This defines a Markov chain such that

$$K(x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\tau^2}(y-\rho x)^2\right).$$

- We also have

$$X_{t+m} = \rho^m X_t + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \rho^{m-k} V_{t+k}$$

so in the Gaussian case

$$K^m(x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau_m^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(y-\rho^m x)^2}{\tau_m^2}\right)$$

with $\tau_m^2 = \tau^2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left(\rho^2\right)^{m-k} = \tau^2 \frac{1-\rho^{2m}}{1-\rho^2}$.

Irreducibility and aperiodicity

Definition

Given a probability measure μ over $\mathbb{X}$, a Markov chain is μ-irreducible if

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{X} \quad \forall A : \mu(A) > 0 \quad \exists t \in \mathbb{N} \quad K^t(x, A) > 0.$$

A μ-irreducible Markov chain of transition kernel K is periodic if there exists some partition of the state space $\mathbb{X}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{X}_d$ for $d \geq 2$, such that

$$\forall i, j, t, s: \ \mathbb{P}\left(X_{t+s} \in \mathbb{X}_j \middle| X_t \in \mathbb{X}_i\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & j = i + s \mod d \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}.$$

Otherwise the chain is aperiodic.

Recurrence and Harris Recurrence

For any measurable set A of $\mathbb{X}$, let

$$\eta_A = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_A(X_k),$$

the number of visits to the set A.

Definition

A μ-irreducible Markov chain is recurrent if for any measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{X} : \mu(A) > 0$, then

$$\forall x \in A \quad \mathbb{E}_x(\eta_A) = \infty.$$

A μ-irreducible Markov chain is Harris recurrent if for any measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{X} : \mu(A) > 0$, then

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{X} \quad \mathbb{P}_x(\eta_A = \infty) = 1.$$

Harris recurrence is stronger than recurrence.

Invariant Distribution and Reversibility

Definition

A distribution of density π is invariant or *stationary* for a Markov kernel K, if

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}} \pi(x) K(x, y) \, dx = \pi(y).$$

A Markov kernel K is π-reversible if

$$\forall f \quad \iint f(x, y) \pi(x) K(x, y) \, dx dy = \iint f(y, x) \pi(x) K(x, y) \, dx dy$$

where f is a bounded measurable function.

Detailed balance

In practice it is easier to check the detailed balance condition:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{X} \qquad \pi(x)K(x,y) = \pi(y)K(y,x)$$

Lemma

If detailed balance holds, then π is invariant for K and K is π-reversible.

Example: the Gaussian AR process is π-reversible, π-invariant for

$$\pi(x) = \mathcal{N}\left(x; 0, \frac{\tau^2}{1-\rho^2}\right)$$

when $|\rho| < 1$.

Law of Large Numbers

Theorem

Suppose the Markov chain $\{X_i; i \geq 0\}$ is π−irreducible, with invariant distribution π, and suppose that $X_0 = x$.
Then for any π-integrable function $\varphi : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varphi(X_i) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \varphi(w)\, \pi(w)\, \mathrm{d}w$$

almost surely, for π−almost every x.

*If the chain in addition is Harris recurrent then this holds for **every** starting value x.*

Convergence

Theorem

Suppose the kernel K is π-irreducible, π-invariant, aperiodic. Then, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{X}}\left|K^t(x,y)-\pi(y)\right|dy=0$$

for $\pi-$almost all starting values x.

Under some additional conditions, one can prove that there exists a $\rho<1$ and a function $M:\mathbb{X}\to\mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all measurable sets A and all n

$$|K^n(x,A)-\pi(A)|\leq M(x)\rho^n.$$

The chain is then said to be **geometrically ergodic**.

Central Limit Theorem

Theorem

Under regularity conditions, for a Harris recurrent, π-invariant Markov chain, we can prove

$$\sqrt{t}\left[\frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{t}\varphi(X_i)-\int_{\mathbb{X}}\varphi(x)\,\pi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right]\xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{N}\left(0,\sigma^2(\varphi)\right),$$

where the asymptotic variance can be written

$$\sigma^2(\varphi)=\mathbb{V}_\pi\left[\varphi\left(X_1\right)\right]+2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\mathrm{Cov}_\pi\left[\varphi\left(X_1\right),\varphi\left(X_k\right)\right].$$

This formula shows that (positive) correlations increase the asymptotic variance, compared to i.i.d. samples for which the variance would be $\mathbb{V}_\pi(\varphi(X))$.

Central Limit Theorem

Example: for the AR Gaussian model,
$\pi(x) = \mathcal{N}\left(x; 0, \tau^2/(1-\rho^2)\right)$ for $|\rho| < 1$ and

$$\mathbb{C}\mathrm{ov}\left(X_1, X_k\right) = \rho^{k-1}\mathbb{V}\left[X_1\right] = \rho^{k-1}\frac{\tau^2}{1-\rho^2}.$$

Therefore with $\varphi(x) = x$,

$$\sigma^2(\varphi) = \frac{\tau^2}{1-\rho^2}\left(1 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\rho^k\right) = \frac{\tau^2}{1-\rho^2}\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} = \frac{\tau^2}{(1-\rho)^2},$$

which increases when $\rho \to 1$.

Markov chain Monte Carlo

- We are interested in sampling from a distribution π, for instance a posterior distribution in a Bayesian framework.

- Markov chains with π as invariant distribution can be constructed to approximate expectations with respect to π.

- For example, the Gibbs sampler generates a Markov chain targeting π defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$ using the full conditionals

$$\pi(x_i \mid x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_d).$$

Gibbs Sampling

- Assume you are interested in sampling from

$$\pi(x) = \pi(x_1, x_2, ..., x_d), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

- Notation: $x_{-i} := (x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, ..., x_d)$.

Systematic scan Gibbs sampler. Let $\left(X_1^{(1)}, ..., X_d^{(1)}\right)$ be the initial state then iterate for $t = 2, 3, ...$

1. Sample $X_1^{(t)} \sim \pi_{X_1|X_{-1}}\left(\cdot | X_2^{(t-1)}, ..., X_d^{(t-1)}\right)$.

$\vdots$

j. Sample $X_j^{(t)} \sim \pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(\cdot | X_1^{(t)}, ..., X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_{j+1}^{(t-1)}, ..., X_d^{(t-1)}\right)$.

$\vdots$

d. Sample $X_d^{(t)} \sim \pi_{X_d|X_{-d}}\left(\cdot | X_1^{(t)}, ..., X_{d-1}^{(t)}\right)$.

Gibbs Sampling

A few questions one can ask about this algorithm:

- Is the joint distribution π uniquely specified by the conditional distributions $\pi_{X_i|X_{-i}}$?
- A: Not in general![1]
- Does the Gibbs sampler provide a Markov chain with the correct stationary distribution π?
- A: Not in general!
- If yes, does the Markov chain converge towards this invariant distribution?
- It will turn out to be the case under some mild conditions.

---

[1] J.P. Hobert, C.P. Robert, C. Goutis, Connectedness conditions for the convergence of the Gibbs sampler (1997)

Hammersley-Clifford Theorem

Theorem

Consider a distribution with continuous density $\pi(x_1, x_2, ..., x_d)$ *such that*

$$supp(\pi) = supp\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{d} \pi_{X_i}\right).$$

Then for any $(z_1, ..., z_d) \in supp(\pi)$, *we have*

$$\pi(x_1, x_2, ..., x_d) \propto \prod_{j=1}^{d} \frac{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x_j \middle| x_{1:j-1}, z_{j+1:d}\right)}{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(z_j \middle| x_{1:j-1}, z_{j+1:d}\right)}.$$

The condition above is known as the **positivity condition**.

Equivalently, if $\pi_{X_i}(x_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, then

$$\pi(x_1, \ldots, x_d) > 0.$$

Proof of Hammersley-Clifford Theorem

Proof.

We have

$$\pi(x_{1:d-1}, x_d) = \pi_{X_d|X_{-d}}(x_d | x_{1:d-1})\pi(x_{1:d-1}),$$
$$\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d) = \pi_{X_d|X_{-d}}(z_d | x_{1:d-1})\pi(x_{1:d-1}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x_{1:d}) &= \pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, x_d)}{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d)} \\
&= \pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, x_d)/\pi(x_{1:d-1})}{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d)/\pi(x_{1:d-1})} \\
&= \pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi_{X_d|X_{1:d-1}}(x_d \mid x_{1:d-1})}{\pi_{X_d|X_{1:d-1}}(z_d \mid x_{1:d-1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d) &= \pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d)}{\pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d)} \\
&= \pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi(x_{1:d-1}, z_d)/\pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_d)}{\pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d)/\pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_d)} \\
&= \pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d) \frac{\pi_{X_{d-1}|X^{-(d-1)}}(x_{d-1} \mid x_{1:d-2}, z_d)}{\pi_{X_{d-1}|X^{-(d-1)}}(z_{d-1} \mid x_{1:d-2}, z_d)}
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi\left(x_{1:d}\right) = \pi(x_{1:d-2}, z_{d-1}, z_d) &\frac{\pi_{X_{d-1}|X_{-(d-1)}}\left(x_{d-1} \middle| x_{1:d-2}, z_d\right)}{\pi_{X_{d-1}|X_{-(d-1)}}\left(z_{d-1} \middle| x_{1:d-2}, z_d\right)} \\
\times &\frac{\pi_{X_d|X_{-d}}\left(x_d \middle| x_{1:d-1}\right)}{\pi_{X_d|X_{-d}}\left(z_d \middle| x_{1:d-1}\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

By $z \in \text{supp}(\pi)$ we have that $\pi_{X_i}(z_i) > 0$ for all i. Also, we are allowed to suppose that $\pi_{X_i}(x_i) > 0$ for all i. Thus all the conditional probabilities we introduce are positive since

$$\pi_{X_j|X^{-j}}(x_j \mid x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_d)$$
$$= \frac{\pi(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_d)}{\pi(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, z_j, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_d)} > 0.$$

By iterating we have the theorem. $\square$

Example: Non-Integrable Target

- Consider the following conditionals on $\mathbb{R}^+$

$$\pi_{X_1|X_2}(x_1|x_2) = x_2 \exp(-x_2 x_1)$$
$$\pi_{X_2|X_1}(x_2|x_1) = x_1 \exp(-x_1 x_2).$$

  We might expect that these full conditionals define a joint probability density $\pi(x_1, x_2)$.

- Hammersley-Clifford would give

$$\pi(x_1, x_2, ..., x_d) \propto \frac{\pi_{X_1|X_2}(x_1|z_2)}{\pi_{X_1|X_2}(z_1|z_2)} \frac{\pi_{X_2|X_1}(x_2|x_1)}{\pi_{X_2|X_1}(z_2|x_1)}$$
$$= \frac{z_2 \exp(-z_2 x_1) x_1 \exp(-x_1 x_2)}{z_2 \exp(-z_2 z_1) x_1 \exp(-x_1 z_2)} \propto \exp(-x_1 x_2).$$

- However $\iint \exp(-x_1 x_2)\, dx_1\, dx_2 = \infty$ so $\pi_{X_1|X_2}(x_1|x_2) = x_2 \exp(-x_2 x_1)$ and $\pi_{X_2|X_1}(x_1|x_2) = x_1 \exp(-x_1 x_2)$ are not compatible.

Example: Positivity condition violated



Figure: Gibbs sampling targeting
$\pi(x,y) \propto \mathbb{1}_{[-1,0]\times[-1,0]\cup[0,1]\times[0,1]}(x,y)$.

Positivity condition violated: any density of the form

$$f(x) = \alpha \mathbb{1}_{[-1,0]^2} + (1-\alpha)\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]^2},$$

has same conditionals.

Invariance of the Gibbs sampler I

The kernel of the Gibbs sampler (case $d = 2$) is

$$K(x^{(t-1)}, x^{(t)}) = \pi_{X_1|X_2}(x_1^{(t)} \mid x_2^{(t-1)})\pi_{X_2|X_1}(x_2^{(t)} \mid x_1^{(t)})$$

Case $d > 2$:

$$K(x^{(t-1)}, x^{(t)}) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}(x_j^{(t)} \mid x_{1:j-1}^{(t)}, x_{j+1:d}^{(t-1)})$$

Proposition

The systematic scan Gibbs sampler kernel admits π as invariant distribution.

Invariance of the Gibbs sampler II

Proof for $d = 2$.

Let $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$. Then we have

$$\int K(x,y)\pi(x)dx = \int \pi(y_2 \mid y_1)\pi(y_1 \mid x_2)\pi(x_1, x_2)dx_1 dx_2$$

$$= \pi(y_2 \mid y_1) \int \pi(y_1 \mid x_2)\pi(x_2)dx_2$$

$$= \pi(y_2 \mid y_1)\pi(y_1) = \pi(y_1, y_2) = \pi(y).$$

$\square$

Irreducibility and Recurrence

Proposition

Assume π satisfies the positivity condition, then the Gibbs sampler yields a $\pi-$irreducible and recurrent Markov chain.

Proof.

Recurrence. Will follow from irreducibility and the fact that π is invariant, [a]

(One step)Irreducibility. Let $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, such that $\pi(\mathbb{X}) = 1$. Write K for the kernel and let $A \subset \mathbb{X}$ such that $\pi(A) > 0$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} K(x, A) &= \int_A K(x, y) \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_A \pi_{X_1 | X_{-1}}(y_1 \mid x_2, \ldots, x_d) \times \cdots \times \pi_{X_d | X_{-d}}(y_d \mid y_1, \ldots, y_{d-1}) \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

[a] Meyn and Tweedie, Markov chains and stochastic stability, Prop'n 10.1.1.

Proof.

Thus if for some $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and A with $\pi(A) > 0$ we have $K(x, A) = 0$, we must have that

$$\pi_{X_1 | X_{-1}}(y_1 \mid x_2, \ldots, x_d) \times \cdots \times \pi_{X_d | X_{-d}}(y_d \mid y_1, \ldots, y_{d-1}) = 0,$$

for almost all $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_d) \in A$.

Therefore, by the Hammersley-Clifford theorem, we must also have that

$$\pi(y_1, y_2, ..., y_d) \propto \prod_{j=1}^{d} \frac{\pi_{X_j | X_{-j}}\left(y_j \middle| y_{1:j-1}, x_{j+1:d}\right)}{\pi_{X_j | X_{-j}}\left(x_j \middle| y_{1:j-1}, x_{j+1:d}\right)} = 0,$$

for almost all $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_d) \in A$ and thus $\pi(A) = 0$ obtaining a contradiction.

Note: Positivity not necessary for irreducibility; e.g. $f \propto \mathbb{1}_{|x| \leq 1}$.

LLN for Gibbs Sampler

Theorem

If the positivity condition is satisfied then for any π-integrable function $\varphi : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varphi\left(X^{(i)}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \varphi(x)\, \pi(x)\, \mathrm{d}x$$

for $\pi-$almost all starting values $X^{(1)}$.

Example: Bivariate Normal Distribution

- Let $X := (X_1, X_2) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ where $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \rho \\ \rho & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

- The Gibbs sampler proceeds as follows in this case

(a) Sample $X_1^{(t)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_1 + \rho/\sigma_2^2 \left(X_2^{(t-1)} - \mu_2\right), \sigma_1^2 - \rho^2/\sigma_2^2\right)$

(b) Sample $X_2^{(t)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_2 + \rho/\sigma_1^2 \left(X_1^{(t)} - \mu_1\right), \sigma_2^2 - \rho^2/\sigma_1^2\right)$.

- By proceeding this way, we generate a Markov chain $X^{(t)}$ whose successive samples are correlated. If successive values of $X^{(t)}$ are strongly correlated, then we say that the Markov chain mixes slowly.

Bivariate Normal Distribution



Figure: Case where $\rho = 0.1$, first 100 steps.

Bivariate Normal Distribution



Figure: Case where $\rho = 0.99$, first 100 steps.

Bivariate Normal Distribution



(a) Figure A

(b) Figure B

Figure: Histogram of the first component of the chain after 1000 iterations. Small ρ on the left, large ρ on the right.

Bivariate Normal Distribution



(a) b



(b) b

Figure: Histogram of the first component of the chain after 10000 iterations. Small ρ on the left, large ρ on the right.

Bivariate Normal Distribution



(a) Figure A



(b) Figure B

Figure: Histogram of the first component of the chain after 100000 iterations. Small ρ on the left, large ρ on the right.

Gibbs Sampling and Auxiliary Variables

- Gibbs sampling requires sampling from $\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}$.
- In many scenarios, we can include a set of auxiliary variables $Z_1, ..., Z_p$ and have an "extended" distribution of joint density $\overline{\pi}(x_1, ..., x_d, z_1, ..., z_p)$ such that

$$\int \overline{\pi}(x_1, ..., x_d, z_1, ..., z_p)\, dz_1 ... dz_d = \pi(x_1, ..., x_d).$$

  which is such that its full conditionals are easy to sample.
- Mixture models, Capture-recapture models, Tobit models, Probit models etc.

Mixtures of Normals



- Independent data $y_1, \ldots, y_n$

$$Y_i|\theta \sim \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_k \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2\right)$$

where $\theta = \left(p_1, \ldots, p_K, \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_K, \sigma_1^2, \ldots, \sigma_K^2\right)$.

Bayesian Model

- Likelihood function

$$p(y_1,...,y_n|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(y_i|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{p_k}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_k^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y_i-\mu_k)^2}{2\sigma_k^2}\right)\right).$$

  Let's fix $K=2$, $\sigma_k^2=1$ and $p_k=1/K$ for all k.
- Prior model

$$p(\theta) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(\mu_k)$$

  where

$$\mu_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha_k, \beta_k).$$

  Let us fix $\alpha_k=0, \beta_k=1$ for all k.
- Not obvious how to sample $p(\mu_1 \mid \mu_2, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$.

Auxiliary Variables for Mixture Models

- Associate to each Y_i an auxiliary variable $Z_i \in \{1, ..., K\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_i = k|\theta) = p_k \text{ and } Y_i | Z_i = k, \theta \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2\right)$$

so that

$$p\left(y_i \middle| \theta\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{P}(Z_i = k)\, \mathcal{N}\left(y_i; \mu_k, \sigma_k^2\right)$$

- The extended posterior is given by

$$p\left(\theta, z_1, ..., z_n \middle| y_1, ..., y_n\right) \propto p(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(z_i|\theta)\, p\left(y_i \middle| z_i, \theta\right).$$

- Gibbs samples alternately

$$\mathbb{P}(z_{1:n} | y_{1:n}, \mu_{1:K})$$
$$p\left(\mu_{1:K} \middle| y_{1:n}, z_{1:n}\right).$$

Gibbs Sampling for Mixture Model

- We have
$$\mathbb{P}\left(z_{1:n}\middle|\, y_{1:n},\theta\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}\left(z_i|\, y_i,\theta\right)$$
where
$$\mathbb{P}\left(z_i|\, y_i,\theta\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(z_i|\theta\right) p\left(y_i\middle|\, z_i,\theta\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{P}\left(z_i = k|\theta\right) p\left(y_i\middle|\, z_i = k,\theta\right)}$$
- Let $n_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{k\}}(z_i), n_k\overline{y}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \mathbf{1}_{\{k\}}(z_i)$ then
$$\mu_k\middle|\, z_{1:n}, y_{1:n} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{n_k\overline{y}_k}{1+n_k}, \frac{1}{1+n_k}\right).$$

Mixtures of Normals



Figure: 200 points sampled from $\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(-2,1)+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(2,1)$.

Mixtures of Normals



Figure: Histogram of the parameters obtained by 10,000 iterations of Gibbs sampling.

Mixtures of Normals



Figure: Traceplot of the parameters obtained by 10,000 iterations of Gibbs sampling.

Gibbs sampling in practice

- Many posterior distributions can be automatically decomposed into conditional distributions by computer programs.

- This is the idea behind `BUGS` (Bayesian inference Using Gibbs Sampling), `JAGS` (Just another Gibbs Sampler).

Gibbs Recap

- Given a target $\pi(x) = \pi(x_1, x_2, ..., x_d)$, Gibbs sampling works by sampling from $\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}(x_j | x_{-j})$ for $j = 1, ..., d$.

- Sampling exactly from one of these full conditionals might be a hard problem itself.

- Even if it is possible, the Gibbs sampler might converge slowly if components are highly correlated.

- If the components are not highly correlated then Gibbs sampling performs well, even when $d \to \infty$, e.g. with an error increasing "only" polynomially with d.

- Metropolis–Hastings algorithm (1953, 1970) is a more general algorithm that can bypass these problems.
- Additionally Gibbs can be recovered as a special case.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm

- Target distribution on $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ of density $\pi(x)$.
- Proposal distribution: for any $x, x' \in \mathbb{X}$, we have $q\left(x' \middle| x\right) \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{X}} q\left(x' \middle| x\right) dx' = 1$.
- Starting with $X^{(1)}$, for $t = 2, 3, \ldots$
  (a) Sample $X^\star \sim q\left(\cdot | X^{(t-1)}\right)$.
  (b) Compute

$$\alpha\left(X^\star \middle| X^{(t-1)}\right) = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(X^\star)\, q\left(X^{(t-1)} \middle| X^\star\right)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})\, q\left(X^\star | X^{(t-1)}\right)}\right).$$

  (c) Sample $U \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$. If $U \leq \alpha\left(X^\star \middle| X^{(t-1)}\right)$, set $X^{(t)} = X^\star$, otherwise set $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm

- Metropolis–Hastings only requires point-wise evaluations of $\pi(x)$ up to a normalizing constant; indeed if $\widetilde{\pi}(x) \propto \pi(x)$ then

$$\frac{\pi(x^\star)\, q\left(x^{(t-1)} \middle| x^\star\right)}{\pi\left(x^{(t-1)}\right) q\left(x^\star | x^{(t-1)}\right)} = \frac{\widetilde{\pi}(x^\star)\, q\left(x^{(t-1)} \middle| x^\star\right)}{\widetilde{\pi}\left(x^{(t-1)}\right) q\left(x^\star | x^{(t-1)}\right)}.$$

- At each iteration t, a candidate is proposed.
- The **average acceptance probability** from the current state is

$$a\left(x^{(t-1)}\right) := \int_{\mathbb{X}} \alpha\left(x | x^{(t-1)}\right) q\left(x | x^{(t-1)}\right) dx$$

  in which case $X^{(t)} = X$, otherwise $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$.
- This algorithm clearly defines a Markov chain $(X^{(t)})_{t \geq 1}$.

Transition Kernel and Reversibility

Lemma

The kernel of the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm is given by

$$K(y \mid x) \equiv K(x, y) = \alpha(y \mid x) q(y \mid x) + (1 - a(x))\delta_x(y).$$

Proof.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& K(x, y) \\
& = \int q(x^\star \mid x)\{\alpha(x^\star \mid x)\delta_{x^\star}(y) + (1 - \alpha(x^\star \mid x))\delta_x(y)\} dx^\star \\
& = q(y \mid x)\alpha(y \mid x) + \left\{ \int q(x^\star \mid x)(1 - \alpha(x^\star \mid x)) dx^\star \right\} \delta_x(y) \\
& = q(y \mid x)\alpha(y \mid x) + \left\{ 1 - \int q(x^\star \mid x)\alpha(x^\star \mid x) dx^\star \right\} \delta_x(y) \\
& = q(y \mid x)\alpha(y \mid x) + \{1 - a(x)\} \delta_x(y).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Reversibility

Proposition

The Metropolis–Hastings kernel K is π–reversible and thus admit π as invariant distribution.

Proof.

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$, with $x \neq y$

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x)K(x,y) &= \pi(x)q(y \mid x)\alpha(y \mid x) \\
&= \pi(x)q(y \mid x)\left(1 \wedge \frac{\pi(y)q(x \mid y)}{\pi(x)q(y \mid x)}\right) \\
&= \left(\pi(x)q(y \mid x) \wedge \pi(y)q(x \mid y)\right) \\
&= \pi(y)q(x \mid y)\left(\frac{\pi(x)q(y \mid x)}{\pi(y)q(x \mid y)} \wedge 1\right) = \pi(y)K(y,x).
\end{aligned}$$

If $x = y$, then obviously $\pi(x)K(x,y) = \pi(y)K(y,x)$. $\square$

Reducibility and periodicity of Metropolis–Hastings

- Consider the target distribution

$$\pi(x) = \left(\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}(x) + \mathcal{U}_{[2,3]}(x)\right)/2$$

and the proposal distribution

$$q\left(x^\star \middle| x\right) = \mathcal{U}_{(x-\delta,x+\delta)}\left(x^\star\right).$$

- The MH chain is reducible if $\delta \leq 1$: the chain stays either in $[0,1]$ or $[2,3]$.

- Note that the MH chain is aperiodic if it always has a non-zero chance of staying where it is.

Some results

Proposition

If $q(x^\star | x) > 0$ for any $x, x^\star \in supp(\pi)$ then the Metropolis-Hastings chain is irreducible, in fact every state can be reached in a single step (strongly irreducible).

Less strict conditions in (Roberts & Rosenthal, 2004).

Proposition

If the MH chain is irreducible then it is also Harris recurrent(see Tierney, 1994).

LLN for MH

Theorem

If the Markov chain generated by the Metropolis–Hastings sampler is π–irreducible, then we have for any integrable function $\varphi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varphi\left(X^{(i)}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \varphi(x)\, \pi(x)\, dx$$

for every starting value $X^{(1)}$.

Random Walk Metropolis–Hastings

- In the Metropolis–Hastings, pick $q(x^\star \mid x) = g(x^\star - x)$ with g being a *symmetric* distribution, thus

$$X^\star = X + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim g;$$

  e.g. g is a zero-mean multivariate normal or t-student.
- Acceptance probability becomes

$$\alpha(x^\star \mid x) = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(x^\star)}{\pi(x)}\right).$$

- We accept...
  - a move to a more probable state with probability 1;
  - a move to a less probable state with probability

$$\pi(x^\star)/\pi(x) \leq 1.$$

Independent Metropolis–Hastings

- **Independent proposal**: a proposal distribution $q(x^\star \mid x)$ which does not depend on x.
    - Acceptance probability becomes

$$\alpha(x^\star \mid x) = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(x^\star)q(x)}{\pi(x)q(x^\star)}\right).$$

    - For instance, multivariate normal or t-student distribution.
- If $\pi(x)/q(x) < M$ for all x and some $M < \infty$, then the chain is **uniformly ergodic**.
- The acceptance probability at stationarity is at least $1/M$ (Lemma 7.9 of Robert & Casella).
- On the other hand, if such an M does not exist, the chain is not even geometrically ergodic!

Choosing a good proposal distribution

- Goal: design a Markov chain with small correlation $\rho\left(X^{(t-1)}, X^{(t)}\right)$ between subsequent values (why?).

- Two sources of correlation:
  - between the current state $X^{(t-1)}$ and proposed value $X \sim q\left(\cdot \mid X^{(t-1)}\right)$,
  - correlation induced if $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$, if proposal is rejected.

- Trade-off: there is a compromise between
  - proposing large moves,
  - obtaining a decent acceptance probability.

- For multivariate distributions: covariance of proposal should reflect the covariance structure of the target.

Choice of proposal

- Target distribution, we want to sample from

$$\pi(x) = \mathcal{N}\left(x; \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

- We use a random walk Metropolis–Hastings algorithm with

$$g(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{N}\left(\varepsilon; 0, \sigma^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

- What is the optimal choice of σ^2?
- We consider three choices: $\sigma^2 = 0.1^2, 1, 10^2$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 0.1^2$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 94\%$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 0.1^2$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 94\%$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 1$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 52\%$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 1$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 52\%$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 10$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 1.5\%$.

Metropolis–Hastings algorithm



Figure: Metropolis–Hastings on a bivariate Gaussian target. With $\sigma^2 = 10$, the acceptance rate is $\approx 1.5\%$.

Choice of proposal

- Aim at some intermediate acceptance ratio: 20%? 40%? Some hints come from the literature on "optimal scaling".
- Literature suggest tuning to get .234...
- Maximize the expected square jumping distance:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||X_{t+1} - X_t||^2\right]$$

- In multivariate cases, try to mimick the covariance structure of the target distribution.

  Cooking recipe: run the algorithm for T iterations, check some criterion, tune the proposal distribution accordingly, run the algorithm for T iterations again . . .
  "Constructing a chain that mixes well is somewhat of an art."
  All of Statistics, L. Wasserman.

The adaptive MCMC approach

- One can make the transition kernel K adaptive, i.e. use K_t at iteration t and choose K_t using the past sample $(X_1, \ldots, X_{t-1})$.

- The Markov chain is not homogeneous anymore: the mathematical study of the algorithm is much more complicated.

- Adaptation can be counterproductive in some cases (see Atchadé & Rosenthal, 2005)!

- Adaptive Gibbs samplers also exist.

⚠Extreme care is needed when designing adaptive algorithms: it's easy to make an algorithm with the wrong invariant distribution.

Sophisticated Proposals

- "Langevin" proposal relies on

$$X^{\star} = X^{(t-1)} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \nabla \log \pi \left(X^{(t-1)} \right) + \sigma W$$

where $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, so the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance ratio is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi(X^{\star}) q(X^{(t-1)} \mid X^{\star})}{\pi(X^{(t-1)}) q(X^{\star} \mid X^{(t-1)})} \\ & = \frac{\pi(X^{\star})}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})} \frac{\mathcal{N}(X^{(t-1)}; X^{\star} + \frac{\sigma}{2}.\nabla \log \pi \left(X^{\star} \right); \sigma^2)}{\mathcal{N}(X^{\star}; X^{(t-1)} + \frac{\sigma}{2}.\nabla \log \pi \left(X^{(t-1)} \right); \sigma^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

- Possibility to use higher order derivatives:

$$X^{\star} = X^{(t-1)} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \left[\nabla^2 \log \pi \left(X^{(t-1)} \right) \right]^{-1} \nabla \log \pi \left(X^{(t-1)} \right) + \sigma W.$$

Sophisticated Proposals

- We can use

$$q(X^\star|X^{(t-1)}) = g(X^\star;\varphi(X^{(t-1)}))$$

  where g is a distribution on $\mathbb{X}$ of parameters $\varphi(X^{(t-1)})$ and φ is a deterministic mapping

$$\frac{\pi(X^\star)q(X^{(t-1)}|X^\star)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})q(X^\star|X^{(t-1)})} = \frac{\pi(X^\star)g(X^{(t-1)};\varphi(X^\star))}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})g(X^\star;\varphi(X^{(t-1)}))}.$$

- For instance, use heuristics borrowed from optimization techniques.

Sophisticated Proposals

The following link shows a comparison of

- adaptive Metropolis-Hastings,
- Gibbs sampling,
- No U-Turn Sampler (e.g. Hamiltonian MCMC)

on a simple linear model.

twiecki.github.io/blog/2014/01/02/visualizing-mcmc/

Sophisticated Proposals

- Assume you want to sample from a target π with $\operatorname{supp}(\pi) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$, e.g. the posterior distribution of a variance/scale parameter.
- Any proposed move, e.g. using a normal random walk, to $\mathbb{R}^-$ is a waste of time.
- Given $X^{(t-1)}$, propose $X^\star = \exp(\log X^{(t-1)} + \varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. What is the acceptance probability then?

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(X^\star \mid X^{(t-1)}) &= \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(X^\star)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})} \frac{q(X^{(t-1)} \mid X^\star)}{q(X^\star \mid X^{(t-1)})}\right) \\ &= \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(X^\star)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})} \frac{X^\star}{X^{(t-1)}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Why?

$$\frac{q(y|x)}{q(x \mid y)} = \frac{\frac{1}{y\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\log y - \log x)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right]}{\frac{1}{x\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\log x - \log y)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right]} = \frac{x}{y}.$$

Random Proposals

- Assume you want to use $q_{\sigma^2}(X^\star|X^{(t-1)}) = \mathcal{N}(X; X^{(t-1)}, \sigma^2)$ but you don't know how to pick σ^2. You decide to pick a random $\sigma^{2,\star}$ from a distribution $f(\sigma^2)$:

$$\sigma^{2,\star} \sim f(\sigma^{2,\star}),\ \ X^\star|\sigma^{2,\star} \sim q_{\sigma^{2,\star}}(\cdot|X^{(t-1)})$$

so that

$$q(X^\star|X^{(t-1)}) = \int q_{\sigma^{2,\star}}(X^\star|X^{(t-1)}) f(\sigma^{2,\star}) d\sigma^{2,\star}.$$

- Perhaps $q(X^\star|X^{(t-1)})$ cannot be evaluated, e.g. the above integral is intractable. Hence the acceptance probability

$$\min\{1, \frac{\pi(X^\star) q(X^{(t-1)}|X^\star)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)}) q(X^\star|X^{(t-1)})}\}$$

cannot be computed.

Random Proposals

- Instead you decide to accept your proposal with probability

$$\alpha_t = \min\left\{1, \frac{\pi\left(X^\star\right) q_{\sigma^{2,(t-1)}}\left(X^{(t-1)}\middle| X^\star\right)}{\pi\left(X^{(t-1)}\right) q_{\sigma^{2,\star}}\left(X^\star | X^{(t-1)}\right)}\right\}$$

  where $\sigma^{2,(t-1)}$ corresponds to parameter of the last accepted proposal.

- With probability α_t, set $\sigma^{2,(t)} = \sigma^{2,\star}$, $X^{(t)} = X^\star$, otherwise $\sigma^{2,(t)} = \sigma^{2,(t-1)}$, $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$.

- **Question**: Is it valid? If so, why?

Random Proposals

- Consider the extended target

$$\widetilde{\pi}\left(x,\sigma^2\right) := \pi(x) f\left(\sigma^2\right).$$

- Previous algorithm is a Metropolis-Hastings of target $\widetilde{\pi}(x,\sigma^2)$ and proposal

$$q(y,\tau^2|x,\sigma^2) = f(\tau^2) q_{\tau^2}(y|x)$$

- Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\widetilde{\pi}(y,\tau^2)}{\widetilde{\pi}(x,\sigma^2)} \frac{q(x,\sigma^2|y,\tau^2)}{q(y,\tau^2|x,\sigma^2)} \\ &= \frac{\pi(y) f(\tau^2)}{\pi(x) f(\sigma^2)} \frac{f(\sigma^2) q_{\sigma^2}(x|y)}{f(\tau^2) q_{\tau^2}(y|x)} = \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \frac{q_{\sigma^2}(x|y)}{q_{\tau^2}(y|x)}\end{aligned}$$

- **Remark**: we just need to be able to sample from $f(\cdot)$, not to evaluate it.

Using multiple proposals

- Consider a target of density $\pi(x)$ where $x \in \mathbb{X}$.
- To sample from π, you might want to use various proposals for Metropolis-Hastings $q_1(x'|x)$, $q_2(x'|x), \dots, q_p(x'|x)$.
- One way to achieve this is to build a proposal

$$q(x'|x) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j q_j(x'|x), \ \ \beta_j > 0, \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j = 1,$$

and Metropolis-Hastings requires evaluating

$$\alpha\left(X^\star \middle| X^{(t-1)}\right) = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(X^\star)\, q\left(X^{(t-1)} \middle| X^\star\right)}{\pi(X^{(t-1)})\, q(X^\star | X^{(t-1)})}\right),$$

and thus evaluating $q_j\left(X^\star \middle| X^{(t-1)}\right)$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$.

Motivating Example

- Let

$$q(x'|x) = \beta_1 \mathcal{N}(x'; x, \Sigma) + (1 - \beta_1)\mathcal{N}(x'; \mu(x), \Sigma)$$

  where $\mu : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$ is a clever but computationally expensive deterministic optimisation algorithm.

- Using $\beta_1 \approx 1$ will make most proposed points come from the cheaper proposal distribution $\mathcal{N}(x'; x, \Sigma)$...

- ...but you won't save time as $\mu\left(X^{(t-1)}\right)$ needs to be evaluated at every step.

Composing kernels

- How to use different proposals to sample from π without evaluating all the densities at each step?

- What about combining different Metropolis-Hastings updates K_j using proposal q_j instead? i.e.

$$K_j\left(x, x'\right) = \alpha_j\left(x' \middle| x\right) q_j\left(x' \middle| x\right) + \left(1 - a_j(x)\right) \delta_x\left(x'\right)$$

  where

$$\alpha_j(x'|x) = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(x')q_j(x|x')}{\pi(x)q_j(x'|x)}\right)$$
$$a_j(x) = \int \alpha_j(x'|x)q_j(x'|x)dx'.$$

Composing kernels

Generally speaking, assume

- p possible updates characterised by kernels $K_j(\cdot, \cdot)$,
- each kernel K_j is π-invariant.

Two possibilities of combining the p MCMC updates:

- **Cycle**: perform the MCMC updates in a deterministic order.
- **Mixture**: Pick an MCMC update at random.

Cycle of MCMC updates

- Starting with $X^{(1)}$ iterate for $t = 2, 3, \ldots$

(a) Set $Z^{(t,0)} := X^{(t-1)}$.

(b) For $j = 1, \ldots, p$, sample $Z^{(t,j)} \sim K_j\left(Z^{(t,j-1)}, \cdot\right)$.

(c) Set $X^{(t)} := Z^{(t,p)}$.

- Full cycle transition kernel is

$$K\left(x^{(t-1)}, x^{(t)}\right) = \int \cdots \int K_1\left(x^{(t-1)}, z^{(t,1)}\right) K_2\left(z^{(t,1)}, z^{(t,2)}\right) \cdots K_p\left(z^{(t,p-1)}, x^{(t)}\right) dz^{(t,1)} \ldots dz^{(t,p-1)}.$$

- K is π-invariant.

Mixture of MCMC updates

- Starting with $X^{(1)}$ iterate for $t = 2, 3, \ldots$

(a) Sample J from $\{1, \ldots, p\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(J = k) = \beta_k$.

(b) Sample $X^{(t)} \sim K_J\left(X^{(t-1)}, \cdot\right)$.

- Corresponding transition kernel is

$$K\left(x^{(t-1)}, x^{(t)}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j K_j\left(x^{(t-1)}, x^{(t)}\right).$$

- K is π-invariant.
- The algorithm is *different* from using a mixture proposal

$$q\left(x' \middle| x\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j q_j\left(x' \middle| x\right).$$

Metropolis-Hastings Design for Multivariate Targets

- If $\dim(\mathbb{X})$ is large, it might be very difficult to design a "good" proposal $q(x'|x)$.

- As in Gibbs sampling, we might want to partition x into $x = (x_1, ..., x_d)$ and denote $x_{-j} := x \setminus \{x_j\}$.

- We propose "local" proposals where only x_j is updated

$$q_j(x'|x) = \underbrace{q_j\left(x'_j \middle| x\right)}_{\text{propose new component } j} \quad \underbrace{\delta_{x_{-j}}\left(x'_{-j}\right)}_{\text{keep other components fixed}} .$$

Metropolis-Hastings Design for Multivariate Targets

- This yields

$$\alpha_j(x,x') = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(x'_{-j},x'_j)q_j(x_j|x_{-j},x'_j)}{\pi(x_{-j},x_j)q_j(x'_j|x_{-j},x_j)} \underbrace{\frac{\delta_{x'_{-j}}(x_{-j})}{\delta_{x_{-j}}(x'_{-j})}}_{=1}\right)$$
$$= \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(x_{-j},x'_j)q_j(x_j|x_{-j},x'_j)}{\pi(x_{-j},x_j)q_j(x'_j|x_{-j},x_j)}\right)$$
$$= \min\left(1, \frac{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}(x'_j|x_{-j})q_j(x_j|x_{-j},x'_j)}{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}(x_j|x_{-j})q_j(x'_j|x_{-j},x_j)}\right).$$

One-at-a-time MH (cycle/systematic scan)

Starting with $X^{(1)}$ iterate for $t = 2, 3, ...$
For $j = 1, ..., d$,

- Sample $X^\star \sim q_j(\cdot | X_1^{(t)}, \ldots, X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_j^{(t-1)}, ..., X_d^{(t-1)})$.
- Compute

$$\alpha_j = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(X_j^\star \mid X_1^{(t)} \ldots X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_{j+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots X_d^{(t-1)}\right)}{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(X_j^{(t-1)} \mid X_1^{(t)} \ldots X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_{j+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots X_d^{(t-1)}\right)} \times \frac{q_j\left(X_j^{(t-1)} \middle| X_1^{(t)} ... X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_j^\star, X_{j+1}^{(t-1)} ... X_d^{(t-1)}\right)}{q_j\left(X_j^\star \middle| X_1^{(t)} ... X_{j-1}^{(t)}, X_j^{(t-1)}, X_{j+1}^{(t-1)} ... X_d^{(t-1)}\right)}\right).$$

- With probability α_j, set $X^{(t)} = X^\star$, otherwise set $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$.

One-at-a-time MH (mixture/random scan)

Starting with $X^{(1)}$ iterate for $t = 2, 3, \ldots$

- Sample J from $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(J = k) = \beta_k$.
- Sample $X^\star \sim q_J\left(\cdot | X_1^{(t)}, \ldots, X_d^{(t-1)}\right)$.
- Compute

$$\alpha_J = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi_{X_J|X_{-J}}\left(X_J^\star \mid X_1^{(t-1)} \ldots X_{J-1}^{(t-1)}, X_{J+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots\right)}{\pi_{X_J|X_{-J}}\left(X_J^{(t-1)} \mid X_1^{(t-1)} \ldots X_{J-1}^{(t-1)}, X_{J+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots\right)} \times \frac{q_J\left(X_J^{(t-1)} \middle| X_1^{(t-1)} \ldots X_{J-1}^{(t-1)}, X_J^\star, X_{J+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots X_d^{(t-1)}\right)}{q_J\left(X_J^\star \middle| X_1^{(t-1)} \ldots X_{J-1}^{(t-1)}, X_J^{(t-1)}, X_{J+1}^{(t-1)} \ldots X_d^{(t-1)}\right)}\right).$$

- With probability α_J set $X^{(t)} = X^\star$, otherwise $X^{(t)} = X^{(t-1)}$.

Gibbs Sampler as a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

Proposition

The systematic Gibbs sampler is a cycle of one-at-a time MH whereas the random scan Gibbs sampler is a mixture of one-at-a time MH where

$$q_j\left(x'_j \middle| x\right) = \pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x'_j \middle| x_{-j}\right).$$

Proof.

It follows from

$$\frac{\pi\left(x_{-j}, x'_j\right)}{\pi\left(x_{-j}, x_j\right)} \frac{q_j\left(x_j \middle| x_{-j}, x'_j\right)}{q_j\left(x'_j \middle| x_{-j}, x_j\right)}$$

$$= \frac{\pi\left(x_{-j}\right)\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x'_j \middle| x_{-j}\right)}{\pi\left(x_{-j}\right)\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x_j \middle| x_{-j}\right)} \frac{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x_j \middle| x_{-j}\right)}{\pi_{X_j|X_{-j}}\left(x'_j \middle| x_{-j}\right)} = 1.$$

$\square$

This is not a Gibbs sampler

Consider a case where $d = 2$. From $X_1^{(t-1)}, X_2^{(t-1)}$ at time $t-1$:

- Sample $X_1^\star \sim \pi(X_1 \mid X_2^{(t-1)})$, then $X_2^\star \sim \pi(X_2 \mid X_1^\star)$. The proposal is then $X^\star = (X_1^\star, X_2^\star)$.
- Compute

$$\alpha_t = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi(X_1^\star, X_2^\star)}{\pi(X_1^{(t-1)}, X_2^{(t-1)})} \frac{q(X^{(t-1)} \mid X^\star}{q(X^\star \mid X^{(t-1)})}\right)$$

- Accept $X^\star$ or not based on α_t, where here

$$\alpha_t \neq 1$$

!!