





# BAYESIAN ADAPTIVE INDEPENDENCE SAMPLING WITH LATENT VARIABLES Christian M. Davey<sup>1</sup>, Jonathan M. Keith<sup>1</sup>, Christian P. Robert<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University, Australia
<sup>2</sup>Research Centre in Decision Mathematics, Université Paris-Dauphine, France
<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, United Kingdom

The Bayesian Adaptive Independence Sampler (BAIS) [5] is a population MCMC algorithm consisting of N independence samplers run in parallel, all with a common proposal density. The proposal is a multivariate normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$  that adapts at each iteration to progressively improve sampler performance. Adaptation is achieved by drawing parameters  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  from a posterior distribution  $p(\mu, \Sigma | x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  using a Bayesian model applied to the current N independence samples  $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ . The distribution to be sampled is thus a product of  $p(\mu, \Sigma | x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  and N independent replications of the target f(x). Hence, the adaptation can be continued indefinitely.

Independence samplers work best when the proposal approximates the target distribution. Consequently, BAIS is not an efficient sampling strategy for multimodal distributions that are poorly approximated by a multivariate normal. Here we generalise BAIS to allow the proposal to be a finite mixture of K multivariate normal distributions. This is done by augmenting each independence sampler with a latent variable, a strategy we call Bayesian Adaptive Independence Sampling with Latent variables (BAIS+L). In this work we describe the significant practical and computational problems that arise in implementing BAIS+L, and discuss exact and approximate strategies for solving these problems.

### An Approximate Sampler

The Bayesian Adaptive Independence Sampler with Latent variables (BAIS+L), outlined in Algorithm 1 updates K means  $\mu_k$  and covariances matrices  $\Sigma_k$  following [2, pp. 86–87]. As in [2]  $\mu_0$  is the prior mean,  $\nu_0$ , and  $\Lambda_0$ , are the prior degrees of freedom and prior scale on the distribution of each  $\Sigma_k$ , respectively, and  $\kappa_0$  is the prior number of observations of the scale of each  $\Sigma_k$ . An exact acceptance ratio  $\alpha$  for this approach involves an intractable quantity. Therefore, BAIS+L uses an approximate ratio, which leads to the stationary distribution being an approximation of the intended target.

#### Algorithm 1 BAIS+L

- 1: for Iteration t = 1 to t = T do
- 2: for Mixture component k = 1 to k = K do
- Compute  $o_k$  then  $\bar{x}_k$  then  $S_k$ .
- Generate  $\Sigma_k$  then  $\mu_k$ .
- 5: end for

#### Lemma

A population of samples, generated with a Metropolis-Hastings [6, 3] sampler that updates each element of the population using a transition kernel, with parameters dependent only on the remaining elements and a standard Metropolis-Hastings acceptance ratio, will have the desired target as its stationary distribution [1].

## An Exact Sampler

The Bayesian Adaptive Mixture Independence Sampler (BAMIS), outlined in Algorithm 2, is justified the preceding Lemma, thus avoiding the need to introduce approximations, as in BAIS+L.

# **Comparing Approaches**

Scatter plots of the mean convergence time (top-left) and the mean ratio of the effective number of samples to the total number of samples (top-right) of a 5D quartic function [4, 7] on  $\mathbf{x} \in [-1.28, 1.28]^5$ ,

$$f(\{x_1,\ldots,x_5\}) = \sum_{d=1}^{5} (ix_d^2 + \eta), \quad \eta \sim \mathcal{U}[0,1),$$

with K = 6, suggest that BAIS+L produces faster convergence and mixing than BAMIS but that this improvement diminishes with N.





Algorithm 2 BAMIS				
1:	for Iteration $t = 1$ to $t = T$ do			
2:	for Sampling chain $n = 1$ to $n = N$ do			
3:	for Mixture component $k = 1$ to $k = K$ do			
4:	Compute $o_k$ then $\bar{x}_k$ then $S_k$ .			
5:	Generate $\Sigma_k$ and $\mu_k$ as for <b>BAIS+L</b> .			
6:	end for			
7:	Generate $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_K)$ as for <b>BAIS+L</b> .			
8:	Propose $w \sim \text{Categorical}(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_K)$ .			
9:	Propose $y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_w, \Sigma_w)$ .			
10:	Compute $\alpha$ as for <b>BAIS+L</b> .			
11:	Generate $u \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ .			
12:	if $u \leq \alpha $ then			
13:	Set $\left  x_{n}^{(t)}, z_{n}^{(t)} \right  = (y, w).$			
14:	else $\begin{bmatrix} & & \\ & \\ & \\ & \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} & (t) \\ & (t) \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} & (t-1) \\ & (t-1) \end{bmatrix}$			
15:	Set $\left[x_n^{(l)}, z_n^{(l)}\right] = \left[x_n^{(l-1)}, z_n^{(l-1)}\right].$			
16:	end if			
17: <b>end for</b>				
18: end for				
$o_k$ $ar{x}_k$	$ = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} I_k \left[ z_i^{(t)} \right] + \sum_{i=n+1}^{N} I_k \left[ z_i^{(t-1)} \right] $ $ = \frac{1}{O_k} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{(t)} I_k \left[ z_i^{(t)} \right] + \sum_{i=n+1}^{N} x_i^{(t-1)} I_k \left[ z_i^{(t-1)} \right] \right\} $			
$\mathbf{S}_k$	$I_{k} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} I_{k} \left[ z_{i}^{(t)} \right] \left[ x_{i}^{(t)} - \bar{x}_{k} \right] \left[ x_{i}^{(t)} - \bar{x}_{k} \right]^{\mathrm{T}}$			

The difference between BAIS+L and BAMIS estimates of the first four central moments in each dimension (X, middle)left) decreased with N, especially for large K. This suggests that the stationary distributions of the two samplers approach each other as N increases. The bottom two contour plots show kernel density estimates of Shekel's foxholes [4, 7] without the top-right hole on  $\mathbf{x} \in [-65.536, 65.536]^2$  (true contour, middle-right). We generated these examples with the default kde2d function from R's [8] MASS library [9] from a poor BAIS+L run with K = 6, N = 40 and a good BAMIS run with K = 4, N = 80. The reduction in density around the edges of the sampled domain is due to the use of a normal kernel in the density estimation. A cursory glance over multiple such simulations suggested that BAIS+L and BAMIS performed comparably, with a larger N generally producing a clearer representation of the target for any K with each sampler (not shown).

$$\Sigma_k \sim \text{Inv-W}_{\nu_0+o_k} \left[ \Lambda_0 + \mathbf{S}_k + \frac{\kappa_0 o_k (\bar{x}_k - \mu_0) (\bar{x}_k - \mu_0)^{\mathrm{T}}}{\kappa_0 + o_k} \right],$$
  
where  $I_k(a) = 1$  if  $a = k$  and 0 otherwise.



References	chains and their applications". In:	<i>Comput.</i> 18.4 (2008), pp. 409–	[8] R Core Team. R: a language
	<i>Biometrika</i> 57.1 (1970), pp. 97–	420.	and environment for statistical
[1] I Resag et al "Ravesian com-	109.	[6] N. Metropolis et al. "Equation	computing. R Foundation for Sta-
putation and stochastic systems"	[4] I. Inghor and B. Boson "Co	of state calculations by fast com-	tistical Computing. Vienna, Aus-
In: Stat Sci 10.1 (1005) pp. 3	[4] D. Higher and D. Rosen. Ge-	puting machines". In: J. Chem.	tria, 2013.
66	ulated reannealing: a comparison"	<i>Phys.</i> 21.6 (1953), pp. 1087–1092.	[9] W. N. Venables and B. D.
	In Math Commut Model 16 11	[7] R. H. Storn and K. Price. "Dif-	Ripley. Modern applied statis-
[2] A. Gelman et al. <i>Bayesian data</i>	$\begin{array}{c} \text{III. Math. Comput. Model. 10.11} \\ (1002) & \approx 87,100 \end{array}$	ferential evolution—a simple and	tics with S. Fourth Ed. ISBN 0-
analysis. Second Ed. Chapman &	(1992), pp. 87–100.	efficient heuristic for global opti-	387-95457-0. New York: Springer,
Hall, 2004.	[5] J. M. Keith, D. P. Kroese,	mization over continuous spaces".	2002.
[3] W. K. Hastings. "Monte Carlo	and G. Y. Sofronov. "Adaptive in-	In: J. Global Optim. 11 (1997),	
sampling methods using Markov	dependence samplers". In: Stat.	pp. 341–359.	