

Stat 710: Mathematical Statistics

Lecture 2

Jun Shao

Department of Statistics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706, USA

Lecture 2: Bayes action and generalized Bayes action

Definition 4.1 (Bayes action)

Let \mathcal{A} be an action space in a decision problem and $L(\theta, a) \geq 0$ be a loss function

For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, a *Bayes action* w.r.t. Π is any $\delta(x) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$E[L(\vec{\theta}, \delta(x)) | X = x] = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} E[L(\vec{\theta}, a) | X = x]$$

where the expectation is w.r.t. the posterior distribution $P_{\theta|x}$

Remarks

- The Bayes action minimizes the posterior expected loss
- x is fixed, although $\delta(x)$ depends on x
- The Bayes action depends on the prior
- The Bayes action depends on the loss function

Lecture 2: Bayes action and generalized Bayes action

Definition 4.1 (Bayes action)

Let \mathcal{A} be an action space in a decision problem and $L(\theta, a) \geq 0$ be a loss function

For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, a *Bayes action* w.r.t. Π is any $\delta(x) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$E[L(\vec{\theta}, \delta(x)) | X = x] = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} E[L(\vec{\theta}, a) | X = x]$$

where the expectation is w.r.t. the posterior distribution $P_{\theta|x}$

Remarks

- The Bayes action minimizes the posterior expected loss
- x is fixed, although $\delta(x)$ depends on x
- The Bayes action depends on the prior
- The Bayes action depends on the loss function

Proposition 4.1 (Existence and uniqueness of Bayes actions)

Assume the conditions in Theorem 4.1; $L(\theta, a)$ is convex in a for each fixed θ ; for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x] < \infty$ for some a .

(i) If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{R}^p$ is compact, then a Bayes action exists for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

(ii) If $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{R}^p$ and $L(\theta, a)$ tends to ∞ as $\|a\| \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta_0 \subset \Theta$ with $\Pi(\Theta_0) > 0$, then a Bayes action exists for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

(iii) In (i) or (ii), if $L(\theta, a)$ is strictly convex in a for each fixed θ , then the Bayes action is unique.

Proof

The convexity of L implies that $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x]$ as a function of a with any fixed x is convex and continuous. Result (i) follows from the fact that any continuous function on a compact set attains its minimum.

Result (ii) follows from the fact that

$$\lim_{\|a\| \rightarrow \infty} E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x] \geq \lim_{\|a\| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Theta_0} L(\theta, a) dP_{\theta|x} = \infty$$

Result (iii) holds because $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x]$ is strictly convex in a

Proposition 4.1 (Existence and uniqueness of Bayes actions)

Assume the conditions in Theorem 4.1; $L(\theta, a)$ is convex in a for each fixed θ ; for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x] < \infty$ for some a .

(i) If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{R}^p$ is compact, then a Bayes action exists for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

(ii) If $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{R}^p$ and $L(\theta, a)$ tends to ∞ as $\|a\| \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta_0 \subset \Theta$ with $\Pi(\Theta_0) > 0$, then a Bayes action exists for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

(iii) In (i) or (ii), if $L(\theta, a)$ is strictly convex in a for each fixed θ , then the Bayes action is unique.

Proof

The convexity of L implies that $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x]$ as a function of a with any fixed x is convex and continuous. Result (i) follows from the fact that any continuous function on a compact set attains its minimum.

Result (ii) follows from the fact that

$$\lim_{\|a\| \rightarrow \infty} E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x] \geq \lim_{\|a\| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Theta_0} L(\theta, a) dP_{\theta|x} = \infty$$

Result (iii) holds because $E[L(\vec{\theta}, a)|X = x]$ is strictly convex in a

Example 4.1: the estimation of $\vartheta = g(\theta)$

Assume $\int_{\Theta} [g(\theta)]^2 d\Pi < \infty$, \mathcal{A} = the range of $g(\theta)$, and $L(\theta, a) = [g(\theta) - a]^2$ (squared error loss).

Using the argument in Example 1.22, we obtain the Bayes action

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{\Theta} g(\theta) f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\Pi}{m(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\int_{\Theta} g(\theta) f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\Pi}{\int_{\Theta} f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\Pi},$$

which is the posterior expectation of $g(\vec{\theta})$, given $X = \mathbf{x}$.

A more specific case

$g(\theta) = \theta^j$ for some integer $j \geq 1$

$f_{\theta}(x) = e^{-\theta} \theta^x I_{\{0,1,2,\dots\}}(x) / x!$ (the Poisson distribution) with $\theta > 0$

Π has a Lebesgue p.d.f. $\pi(\theta) = \theta^{\alpha-1} e^{-\theta/\gamma} I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta) / [\Gamma(\alpha)\gamma^{\alpha}]$
(the gamma distribution $\Gamma(\alpha, \gamma)$ with known $\alpha > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$)

Then, for $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and some function $c(x)$,

$$f_{\theta}(x)\pi(\theta)/m(x) = c(x)\theta^{x+\alpha-1} e^{-\theta(\gamma+1)/\gamma} I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta),$$

This is the gamma distribution $\Gamma(x + \alpha, \gamma/(\gamma + 1))$.

Example 4.1: the estimation of $\vartheta = g(\theta)$

Assume $\int_{\Theta} [g(\theta)]^2 d\Pi < \infty$, \mathcal{A} = the range of $g(\theta)$, and $L(\theta, a) = [g(\theta) - a]^2$ (squared error loss).

Using the argument in Example 1.22, we obtain the Bayes action

$$\delta(x) = \frac{\int_{\Theta} g(\theta) f_{\theta}(x) d\Pi}{m(x)} = \frac{\int_{\Theta} g(\theta) f_{\theta}(x) d\Pi}{\int_{\Theta} f_{\theta}(x) d\Pi},$$

which is the posterior expectation of $g(\vec{\theta})$, given $X = x$.

A more specific case

$g(\theta) = \theta^j$ for some integer $j \geq 1$

$f_{\theta}(x) = e^{-\theta} \theta^x I_{\{0,1,2,\dots\}}(x) / x!$ (the Poisson distribution) with $\theta > 0$

Π has a Lebesgue p.d.f. $\pi(\theta) = \theta^{\alpha-1} e^{-\theta/\gamma} I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta) / [\Gamma(\alpha)\gamma^{\alpha}]$ (the gamma distribution $\Gamma(\alpha, \gamma)$ with known $\alpha > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$)

Then, for $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and some function $c(x)$,

$$f_{\theta}(x)\pi(\theta)/m(x) = c(x)\theta^{x+\alpha-1} e^{-\theta(\gamma+1)/\gamma} I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta),$$

This is the gamma distribution $\Gamma(x + \alpha, \gamma/(\gamma + 1))$.

Without actually working out the integral $m(x)$, we know that

$$c(x) = (1 + \gamma^{-1})^{x+\alpha} / \Gamma(x + \alpha),$$

$$\delta(x) = c(x) \int_0^\infty \theta^{j+x+\alpha-1} e^{-\theta(\gamma+1)/\gamma} d\theta.$$

The integrand is proportional to the p.d.f. of the gamma distribution $\Gamma(j + x + \alpha, \gamma/(\gamma + 1))$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) &= c(x) \Gamma(j + x + \alpha) / (1 + \gamma^{-1})^{j+x+\alpha} \\ &= (j + x + \alpha - 1) \cdots (x + \alpha) / (1 + \gamma^{-1})^j. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\delta(x) = (x + \alpha)\gamma/(\gamma + 1)$ when $j = 1$.

Conjugate prior

An interesting phenomenon is that the prior and the posterior are in the same parametric family of distributions.

Such a prior is called a *conjugate* prior.

Without actually working out the integral $m(x)$, we know that

$$c(x) = (1 + \gamma^{-1})^{x+\alpha} / \Gamma(x + \alpha),$$

$$\delta(x) = c(x) \int_0^\infty \theta^{j+x+\alpha-1} e^{-\theta(\gamma+1)/\gamma} d\theta.$$

The integrand is proportional to the p.d.f. of the gamma distribution $\Gamma(j + x + \alpha, \gamma/(\gamma + 1))$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) &= c(x) \Gamma(j + x + \alpha) / (1 + \gamma^{-1})^{j+x+\alpha} \\ &= (j + x + \alpha - 1) \cdots (x + \alpha) / (1 + \gamma^{-1})^j. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\delta(x) = (x + \alpha)\gamma/(\gamma + 1)$ when $j = 1$.

Conjugate prior

An interesting phenomenon is that the prior and the posterior are in the same parametric family of distributions.

Such a prior is called a *conjugate* prior.

Remarks

- Whether a prior is conjugate involves a pair of families; one is the family $\mathcal{P} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and the other is the family from which Π is chosen.
- Example 4.1 shows that the Poisson family and the gamma family produce conjugate priors.
- Many pairs of families in Table 1.1 (page 18) and Table 1.2 (pages 20-21) produce conjugate priors.
- Under a conjugate prior, Bayes actions often have explicit forms (in x) when the loss function is simple.
- Even under a conjugate prior, the integral in $\delta(x)$ in Example 4.1 involving a general g may not have an explicit form.
- In general, numerical methods have to be used in evaluating the integrals in $\delta(x)$ under general loss functions.
- More discussions on the computation of Bayes actions are given in §4.1.4.

Generalized Bayes action

The minimization in Definition 4.1 is the same as the minimizing

$$\int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \delta(x)) f_{\theta}(x) d\Pi = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, a) f_{\theta}(x) d\Pi$$

$\delta(x)$ is called a *generalized Bayes action*.

This is still defined even if Π is not a probability measure but a σ -finite measure on Θ , in which case $m(x)$ may not be finite.

If $\Pi(\Theta) \neq 1$, Π is called an *improper prior*.

A prior with $\Pi(\Theta) = 1$ is then called a proper prior.

The following is a reason why we need to discuss improper priors and generalized Bayes actions.

In many cases, one has no past information and has to choose a prior subjectively.

In such cases, one would like to select a *noninformative* prior that tries to treat all parameter values in Θ equitably.

A noninformative prior is often improper.

Example 4.3

Suppose that $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and X_i 's are i.i.d. from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, where $\mu \in \Theta \subset \mathcal{R}$ is unknown and σ^2 is known.

Consider the estimation of $\vartheta = \mu$ under the squared error loss.

If $\Theta = [a, b]$ with $-\infty < a < b < \infty$, then a noninformative prior that treats all parameter values equitably is the uniform distribution on $[a, b]$.

If $\Theta = \mathcal{R}$, however, the corresponding "uniform distribution" is the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{R} , which is an improper prior.

If Π is the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{R} , then

$$(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu^2 \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} d\mu < \infty.$$

By differentiating a in

$$(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\mu - a)^2 \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} d\mu$$

Example 4.3 (continued)

and using the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2$, where \bar{x} is the sample mean of the observations x_1, \dots, x_n , we obtain that

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu \exp \left\{ -n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} d\mu}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ -n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} d\mu} = \bar{x}.$$

Thus, the sample mean is a generalized Bayes action under the squared error loss.

From Example 2.25 and Exercise 91 in §2.6, if Π is $N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$, then the Bayes action is

$$\mu_*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} \mu_0 + \frac{n\sigma_0^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} \bar{x} \quad \text{and} \quad c^2 = \frac{\sigma_0^2 \sigma^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2}$$

Note that in this case \bar{x} is a limit of $\mu_*(\mathbf{x})$ as $\sigma_0^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

More detailed discussions of the use of improper priors, see Jeffreys (1939, 1948, 1961), Box and Tiao (1973), and Berger (1985).

Example 4.3 (continued)

and using the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2$, where \bar{x} is the sample mean of the observations x_1, \dots, x_n , we obtain that

$$\delta(x) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu \exp \left\{ -n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} d\mu}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ -n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} d\mu} = \bar{x}.$$

Thus, the sample mean is a generalized Bayes action under the squared error loss.

From Example 2.25 and Exercise 91 in §2.6, if Π is $N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$, then the Bayes action is

$$\mu_*(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} \mu_0 + \frac{n\sigma_0^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} \bar{x} \quad \text{and} \quad c^2 = \frac{\sigma_0^2 \sigma^2}{n\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2}$$

Note that in this case \bar{x} is a limit of $\mu_*(x)$ as $\sigma_0^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

More detailed discussions of the use of improper priors, see Jeffreys (1939, 1948, 1961), Box and Tiao (1973), and Berger (1985).