arXiv:1008.1550v1 [stat.ME] 9 Aug 2010

Hyper-g Priors for Generalized Linear Models

Daniel Sabanés Bové* Leonhard Held†

Version: 22nd November 2021



Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics Unit

Abstract

We develop an extension of the classical Zellner's g-prior to generalized linear models. The prior on the hyperparameter g is handled in a flexible way, so that any continuous proper hyperprior $f(g)$ can be used, giving rise to a large class of hyper-g priors. Connections with the literature are described in detail. A fast and accurate integrated Laplace approximation of the marginal likelihood makes inference in large model spaces feasible. For posterior parameter estimation we propose an efficient and tuning-free Metropolis-Hastings sampler. The methodology is illustrated with variable selection and automatic covariate transformation in the Pima Indians diabetes data set.

Keywords: g-prior, generalized linear model, integrated Laplace approximation, variable selection, fractional polynomials.

*E-mail: daniel.sabanesbove@ifspm.uzh.ch
†E-mail: leonhard.held@ifspm.uzh.ch

1. Introduction

Assume that we have observed responses y_i coming from a generalized linear model (GLM, see McCullagh and Nelder, 1989) incorporating the covariate vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ via the linear predictors $\eta_i = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The response function (inverse link function) h transforms η_i to the mean $\mathbb{E}(y_i) = \mu_i = h(\eta_i)$, which in turn is mapped to the canonical parameter $\theta_i = (db/d\theta)^{-1}(\mu_i)$ of the exponential family. Here $db/d\theta$ is the first derivative of the function b that defines the form of the likelihood for $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$ via

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \propto \exp\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_i\theta_i - b(\theta_i)}{\phi_i} \right\}, \tag{1}$$

where each θ_i depends on the intercept β_0 and the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ of regression coefficients as described above. Often the canonical response function $h = db/d\theta$ is used which leads to the identity $\theta_i = \eta_i = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}$. The dispersions $\phi_i = \phi/w_i$ are assumed known and can incorporate weights w_i. The variance $\mathrm{Var}(y_i) = \phi_i d^2b/d\theta^2(\theta_i)$ is expressed through the variance function $v(\mu_i) = d^2b/d\theta^2((db/d\theta)^{-1}(\mu_i))$ as $\mathrm{Var}(y_i) = \phi_i v(\mu_i)$.

A Bayesian analysis starts by assigning prior distributions to the unknown model parameters β_0 and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. However, usually there is not only uncertainty with respect to the model parameters, but also to the model itself, see e. g. Clyde and George (2004). Let γ be the model index contained in some model space Γ. Typically, the variable selection problem is considered, where $\gamma \in \{0,1\}^m$ contains binary inclusion indicators for all m available covariates. Here we think more generally of uncertainty about the form (including the dimension p_γ) of the covariate vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma i}$, which may also comprise different transformations of the original variables. For example, when γ indicates a quadratic transformation of x_i, then $\boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma i} = (x_i, x_i^2)^T$. Thus, priors $f(\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \gamma)$ need to be assigned, for all models $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Manual elicitation of all these priors is clearly infeasible when Γ is large. In this situation priors which automatically derive from γ are attractive, and we will propose such a prior in this paper. Model inference then uses the posterior model probabilities

$$f(\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}) \propto f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) f(\gamma), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \tag{2}$$

which combine the marginal likelihood

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma+1}} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma, \gamma) f(\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \gamma)\, d\beta_0 d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \tag{3}$$

with the prior model probabilities $f(\gamma)$.

In the special case of the classical normal linear model with known error variance ϕ and $w_i \equiv 1$, the g-prior for the regression coefficients was proposed by Zellner (1986) as a "reference informative prior". It is the normal distribution with zero mean vector and covariance matrix $g\phi(\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \phi \sim \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\big(\boldsymbol{0}_{p_\gamma}, g\phi(\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}\big), \tag{4}$$

and is usually combined with a locally uniform (Jeffreys) prior on β_0, assuming that the design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma = (\boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma 1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma n})^T$ has been centered to ensure $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{1}_n = \boldsymbol{0}_{p_\gamma}$. Often also the error variance ϕ is assumed unknown and assigned a Jeffreys prior. The g-prior can be interpreted as the conditional posterior of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$ given a locally uniform prior and an imaginary sample $\boldsymbol{y}_0 = \boldsymbol{0}_n$ from the normal linear model with original design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$ and scaled error variance $g\phi$. This implements the idea that after accounting for the mean level β_0 not included in the g-prior, there is no difference between observations due to the covariates in $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$ modelled through $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$. In addition to this nice interpretation, the g-prior has other advantages, such as invariance of the implied prior for the linear predictor under rescaling and translation of the covariates (Robert and Saleh, 1991, p. 71), and automatic adaption to situations with near-collinearity between different covariates (Robert, 2001, p. 193).

The hyperparameter $g > 0$ in (4) acts as an inverse prior sample size, and is thus very sensitive to prior elicitation. Larger values of g lead to preference of less complex models, a phenomenon known as the Lindley-Jeffreys paradox (Lindley, 1957; see also Robert, Chopin, and Rousseau, 2009, p. 161). Moreover, a fixed g does not allow the Bayes factor of a perfectly fitting model versus the null model go to infinity (Berger and Pericchi, 2001). Therefore, much research has been done in developing automatic specifications of g (George and Foster, 2000; Hansen and Yu, 2001; Fernández, Ley, and Steel, 2001; Cui and George, 2008). The multivariate Cauchy priors of Zellner and Siow (1980) correspond to fully Bayesian inference with an inverse-gamma prior for g. Unfortunately, the corresponding marginal likelihood $f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma)$ has no closed form.

Therefore Liang, Paulo, Molina, Clyde, and Berger (2008) proposed the hyper-g prior, which is a special case of the incomplete inverse-gamma prior by Cui and George (2008). These hyperpriors retain a closed form expression for $f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma)$ which is vital for efficient model inference.

In this article we develop an extension of the classical g-prior (4) to GLMs. The prior on the hyperparameter g is handled in a flexible way, so that any continuous proper hyperprior $f(g)$ can be used. In Section 2, this generalized hyper-g prior is derived and connections with the literature are described. Because model inference is the main practical use of this automatic prior formulation, we will propose a fast and accurate numerical approximation of the marginal likelihood in Section 3. Section 3 also covers posterior parameter estimation with a tuning-free Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampler. The methodology is applied to variable selection in Section 4 and to fractional polynomial modelling in Section 5. Section 6 discusses possibilities for future research.

2. The generalized hyper-g prior

2.1. Prior construction

Consider the imaginary sample $\boldsymbol{y}_0 = h(0)\mathbf{1}_n$ from the GLM with original design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$ and weights vector $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)^T$, but scaled dispersion $g\phi$. Using an improper flat prior for the regression coefficients vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$, its posterior given $\boldsymbol{y}_0$ is proportional to the likelihood (1),

$$f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_0, g, \gamma) \propto \exp\left\{ \frac{1}{g\phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(0) w_i \theta_i - w_i b(\theta_i) \right\}. \tag{5}$$

This distribution can be recognized as the Chen and Ibrahim (2003, formula 2.6) prior, although the authors have only considered the case with $w_i \equiv 1$. Similar to their theorem 3.1, we can prove that the mode of this distribution is at $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma = \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}$ (see Appendix A). Moreover, it results from standard Bayesian asymptotic theory (e. g. Bernardo and Smith, 2000, p. 287) that this distribution converges for $n \to \infty$ to the normal distribution

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma \sim \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\big(\mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}, g\phi c(\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}\big) \tag{6}$$

Family	Link	c
Gaussian	Identity	1
	(Log)	1
Poisson	Log	1
	Identity	(0)
Bernoulli	Logit	4
	Cauchit	$\pi^2/4$
	Probit	$\pi/2$
	Complementary log-log	$e-1$
Gamma	Log	1
Inverse Gaussian	(Log)	1

Table 1 – *Exponential families, usual link functions and resulting factors c. Note that for the Gamma and the Inverse Gaussian family, the natural links μ^{-1} and μ^{-2}, respectively, cannot be used because then $h(0) = \infty$. Parenthesized links should not be used because the uniqueness of the prior mode at $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma = \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}$ is not sure (Wedderburn, 1976). Parenthesized c's point out problems there.*

where $c = v(h(0)) \cdot dh/d\eta(0)^{-2}$ and $\boldsymbol{W} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{w})$, because the inverse of the expected Fisher information $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ evaluated at the mode is $I(\mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma})^{-1} = g\phi c(\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}$ (cf. Chen and Ibrahim, 2003, theorem 2.3). The "generalized g-prior" (6) differs from the standard g-prior (4) only by the constant c and the weight matrix $\boldsymbol{W}$. Both are especially important in binomial regression when w_i is the sample size of the observed proportion, say $y_i = s_i/w_i$ if $s_i \sim \text{Bin}(w_i, \mu_i)$ is the number of successes: In Table 1 it can be seen that only for the Bernoulli family $c \neq 1$.

Since the intercept β_0 parametrizes the average linear predictor in each model, we can use the improper flat prior $f(\beta_0) \propto 1$. Thus, our generalized g-prior does not shrink the intercept towards zero, while the prior on the regression coefficients again implements the non-informative prior idea that $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$ has *a priori* no effect on the centered observations. The factor g is assigned a (continuous) hyperprior $f(g)$, which we treat generally in the paper. The hyperprior $f(g)$ used in our approach must be proper to ensure that Bayes factor comparisons with the null model, which does not include the parameter g, are

valid. As g is assigned a hyperprior, we call the resulting prior a "generalized hyper-g prior".

2.2. Comparison with the literature

An immediate question is why we do not use the exact Chen and Ibrahim (2003) prior, which is also a generalization of the standard g-prior. The main problem with this conjugate prior given in (5) is that it does not have a closed form for non-normal exponential families, i. e. the normalizing constant of (5) is unknown. This complicates the computation of the marginal likelihood and the MCMC sampling considerably. Chen, Huang, Ibrahim, and Kim (2008) propose a solution where they run an MCMC sampler on the full model, and then derive estimates for submodels. However, this approach is not applicable in problems with simultaneous variable selection and transformation as that presented in Section 5 because no full model exists in that case. Regarding the hyperparameter g, Chen and Ibrahim (2003) propose to assign an inverse-gamma prior to it.

Alternatively, Gupta and Ibrahim (2009) proposed the information matrix prior, which uses the expected Fisher information matrix $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ similarly to a precision matrix for a normal distribution up to a scalar variance factor g:

$$f_{GI}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) \propto \left|I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)\right|^{1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2g}\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma^T I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma\right\}. \tag{7}$$

This will only be a Gaussian distribution if the matrix $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ actually does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$, e. g. for the normal linear model where the standard g-prior is reproduced by (7). By contrast, the precision of our generalized g-prior in (6) results from evaluating $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ at the prior mode, producing a matrix which does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$. Gupta and Ibrahim (2009) fix the hyperparameter g at a "moderately large" value ($g \geq 1$) and do not consider inference for it.

The information matrix prior is strongly linked with the unit information prior approach of Kass and Wasserman (1995), who proposed the general idea that the amount of information in the prior on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$ should be equal to the amount of information about it contained in one observational unit. The amount of information is measured by the (expected) Fisher information, so that the precision is chosen as $n^{-1}I(\mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma})$ in the normal

prior

$$f_{KW}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) = \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}, nI(\mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma})^{-1}\right). \tag{8}$$

This proposal is close to ours in (6), except that the hyperparameter is fixed at $g = n$. Note that Kass and Wasserman (1995) also required the nuisance parameter β_0 to be null-orthogonal to the parameter of interest $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$, which we ensure by centering the covariates around zero. The unit information prior was used by Ntzoufras, Dellaportas, and Forster (2003) and Overstall and Forster (2010) in the GLM context.

Hansen and Yu (2003, p. 156) also use the expected Fisher information, but evaluate it at the maximum likelihood (ML) estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma$ to obtain a prior precision matrix:

$$f_{HY}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) = \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}, gI(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma)^{-1}\right). \tag{9}$$

Hansen and Yu find the dependence of their prior on the data $\boldsymbol{y}$ "hard to accept", although it can be interpreted as an empirical-Bayes approach. Also in this flavour, the authors maximize the (approximate) conditional marginal likelihood in order to eliminate g. Subsequent model selection is then based on a modified conditional marginal likelihood ("minimum description length").

Instead of using the *expected* Fisher information matrix $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$, Wang and George (2007) use the *observed* Fisher information matrix $J(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$. While for canonical response functions the equality $I(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma) = J(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ holds, in general $J(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma)$ is different and depends on the observed response vector. Wang and George (2007) evaluate it at the original response $\boldsymbol{y}$ and the ML estimate to obtain the correlation structure of the normal distribution:

$$f_{WG}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) = \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}, gJ(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma)^{-1}\right). \tag{10}$$

By comparison, our generalized g-prior (6) does not use the original data $\boldsymbol{y}$, but only the design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$. Analogously to Hansen and Yu (2003), Wang and George (2007) select model-specific values for g by maximizing the conditional marginal likelihood $f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma)$, but they also consider fully Bayesian inference for g.

Marin and Robert (2007, p. 101) avoid the use of a Fisher information matrix altogether when they propose the "non-informative g-prior"

$$f_{MR}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) = \mathrm{N}_{p_\gamma}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, \mathbf{0}_{p_\gamma}, g(\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}\right) \tag{11}$$

for binary regression with probit and logit link functions. The factor g is assigned the improper prior $f(g) \propto g^{-3/4}$, which can be regarded as a degenerate inverse-gamma distribution with shape $-1/4$ and scale 0. Note that using this improper hyperprior prohibits Bayes factor comparisons with the null model.

3. Implementation

3.1. Marginal likelihood computation

Under the generalized hyper-g prior, the marginal likelihood introduced in (3) is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma+1}} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma, \gamma) \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) f(g)\, dg\, d\beta_0 d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \\ &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) f(g)\, dg, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the conditional marginal likelihood of the GLM γ (given g) is

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma+1}} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma, \gamma) f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma)\, d\beta_0 d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma. \tag{13}$$

Note that both (13) and (12) are only defined up to a constant, which we have fixed at unity, as we use the improper prior $f(\beta_0) \propto 1$. In general, no closed form expressions are available. The obvious exception is the special case of normal likelihood, which was mentioned in Section 1 and will be referred to again later on in this section. Therefore, in order to be able to efficiently explore a large model space Γ, we need to develop a fast but accurate numerical approximation to the marginal likelihood. This will be a two-step procedure: The conditional marginal likelihood (13) is computed by a Laplace approximation. Plugging this into (12), the hyperparameter g will be integrated out with respect to its prior by numerical integration. Together, this is an integrated Laplace approximation (ILA), which was proposed more generally by Rue, Martino, and Chopin (2009).

For ease of notation, denote by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma} = (\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma^T)^T$ the vector of all coefficients. Then

the Laplace approximation (Lindley, 1980; Tierney and Kadane, 1986) of (13) is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) &\approx \frac{f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma}, \gamma) f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma} \,|\, g, \gamma)}{\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, g, \gamma)} \\ &= f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma}, \gamma)(2\pi g\phi c)^{-p/2} \left|\boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma\right|^{1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(g\phi c)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{*T}_{0\gamma} \boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma \boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma}\right\} \\ &\quad \times (2\pi)^{(p+1)/2} \left|\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma}\right|^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

when $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, g, \gamma)$ is the Gaussian approximation of the conditional coefficients posterior with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma}$ and precision matrix $\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma}$. Since the conditional coefficients prior can be seen to have a normal kernel $f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma} \,|\, g, \gamma) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\beta}^T_{0\gamma} \boldsymbol{R}_{0\gamma} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma}\right\}$ with (singular) precision

$$\boldsymbol{R}_{0\gamma} = \operatorname{diag}\left\{0, (g\phi c)^{-1} \boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma\right\}, \tag{15}$$

the Bayesian iterative weighted least squares (IWLS) algorithm (West, 1985; Gamerman, 1997) can be used to compute the moments of the Gaussian approximation. Note that this is different and potentially more accurate than the approach by Rue et al. (2009, p. 327) who preserve the sparsity of the prior precision $\boldsymbol{R}_{0\gamma}$ in the resulting posterior precision $\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma}$. The accuracy of the Laplace approximation (14) can be even further improved by including higher-order terms of the underlying Taylor expansion. For canonical response functions, Raudenbush, Yang, and Yosef (2000) derived a convenient correction factor corresponding to a sixth-order Laplace approximation. In the applications of Sections 4 and 5, we have used this correction (see Appendix B for details), which clearly improved the ILA while requiring only slightly more computation time.

The one-dimensional integration in (12) is performed on the log-scale over $z = \log(g)$ using Gauss-Hermite quadrature. First, we find the (approximate) posterior mode z^* and variance σ^{*2} of z using its unnormalized (approximate) posterior density

$$f(z, \boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) = f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, z, \gamma) f(z). \tag{16}$$

The mode z^* is numerically determined by the `optimize` routine in `R` (R Development Core Team, 2010; Brent, 1973). The variance σ^{*2} can be computed as the negative inverse second derivative of the log posterior at z^* by numerical differentiation (routine

`dfridr` from Press, Teukolsky, Vetterling, and Flannery, 2007, p. 231). Second, we apply the Gauss-Hermite quadrature (Naylor and Smith, 1982)

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{N} m_j f(z_j, \boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma), \tag{17}$$

where the actual weights $m_j = \omega_j \exp(t_j^2)\sqrt{2}\sigma^*$ and nodes $z_j = z^* + \sqrt{2}\sigma^* t_j$ depend on z^*, σ^* as well as original weights ω_j and nodes t_j, $j = 1, \ldots, N$. These can be obtained from the Golub and Welsch (1969) algorithm, which is implemented in the `R`-function `gauss.quad` (Smyth, Hu, and Dunn, 2009). $N = 20$ seems to be sufficient, given that this includes nodes in a range of about seven standard deviations around z^* (as then $\sqrt{2}t_{20} \approx 7.6$). Note that the Gauss-Hermite approximation in (17) is exact if $f(z, \boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma)$ is the product of $\mathrm{N}(z \,|\, z^*, \sigma^{*2})$ and a polynomial of at most order $2N - 1$.

3.2. Metropolis-Hastings sampler

Given a model $\gamma \in \Gamma$ we would like to sample from the joint posterior of the model-specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma}^T, z)^T$. To this end, we propose a tuning-free Metropolis-Hastings (MH) sampling scheme with proposal kernel

$$q(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma) = q(\boldsymbol{\beta}'_{0\gamma} \,|\, z', \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma}) q(z') \tag{18}$$

for the proposal $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma$ given the current sample $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma$. The independence proposal density $q(z')$ is constructed by linearly interpolating pairs $\big(z_j, f(z_j, \boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma)\big)$ and then normalizing this function to unity integral. Note that many pairs are already available from the optimization and integration of (16) in the marginal likelihood computation. Thus, $q(z)$ is close to the posterior density $f(z \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, \gamma)$, suggesting high acceptance rates of the sampler. Also, generating random variates from $q(z)$ using inverse sampling is straightforward as the corresponding cumulative distribution function is piecewise quadratic.

For the coefficients, $q(\boldsymbol{\beta}'_{0\gamma} \,|\, z', \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma})$ is a Gaussian proposal density: Starting from the current vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma}$ and the proposed prior covariance factor $g' = \exp(z')$, a single step of the Bayesian IWLS is made, resulting in the mean vector and the precision matrix of the proposal (Gamerman, 1997). In order to compute the acceptance probability of the move from $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma$ to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma$,

$$\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma) = 1 \wedge \frac{f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{0\gamma}, \gamma) f(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma \,|\, \gamma)}{f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma}, \gamma) f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \gamma)} \cdot \frac{q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma)}{q(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma)}, \tag{19}$$

note that the prior contributions have the form $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \gamma) = f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g, \gamma) f(g) g$, the last factor g being due to the change of variable $z = \log(g)$ in the proposal parametrization. For the reverse proposal kernel value $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_\gamma)$, another IWLS step starting from the proposed vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}'_{0\gamma}$ and the current factor $g = \exp(z)$ is necessary.

Besides producing parameter samples from the posterior $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, \gamma)$, the MH sampler can also be used to compute an MCMC estimate of the marginal likelihood $f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma)$, thereby providing an independent check of the numerical estimate presented in Section 3.1. We will use the method by Chib and Jeliazkov (2001, section 2.1), which was competitive in a review by Han and Carlin (2001) and is still a benchmark for new developments (see e. g. Nott, Kohn, and Fielding, 2008). The estimate is based on the basic identity

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) = \frac{f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma, \gamma) f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma \,|\, \gamma)}{f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, \gamma)}, \tag{20}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma$ is usually chosen as a configuration with high posterior density which is fixed before the MCMC sampling. Then the detailed balance of the Markov chain ensures that the unknown posterior ordinate can be estimated by

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, \gamma) \approx \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{B} \alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}_\gamma) q(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}_\gamma)}{\sum_{k=1}^{B} \alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma)}, \tag{21}$$

where the $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(j)}_\gamma$ are the posterior samples and the $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}_\gamma$ are iid draws from the proposal distribution $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \,|\, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*_\gamma)$. Since each acceptance probability in (21) requires two additional IWLS steps, $4B$ additional IWLS steps are required for the Chib and Jeliazkov (2001) estimate if B posterior samples are used.

3.3. Performance in the conjugate case

For illustration of the performance of the proposed implementation, we consider the special case of normal linear regression with fixed error variance ϕ. Using the g-prior (4), the conditional coefficients posterior is Gaussian,

$$f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\gamma} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}, g, \gamma) = \mathrm{N}\left(\beta_0 \,|\, \bar{y}, \phi/n\right) \mathrm{N}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma \,|\, g(g+1)^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma,\, g(g+1)^{-1} \phi (\boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1}\right), \tag{22}$$

where the ordinary least squares estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma = (\boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma)^{-1} \boldsymbol{X}^T_\gamma \boldsymbol{y}$ is shrunk by the factor $g(g+1)^{-1}$. Thus, the Laplace approximation (14) of the conditional marginal likelihood

is exact. It is given by

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) = (g+1)^{-p_\gamma/2} \exp\left\{(g+1)^{-1}\left[-\frac{SSR_\gamma}{2\phi}\right]\right\} \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{SSE_\gamma}{2\phi}\right\}, \tag{23}$$

where SSE_γ and SSR_γ are the error and regression sums of squares, respectively. From the form of (23) we see that an inverse-gamma prior $\mathrm{IG}(a, b)$ on $g+1$ will be conjugate to this likelihood. Since $g > 0$ must be ensured, this distribution must be truncated to $(1, \infty)$, yielding the incomplete inverse-gamma prior (Cui and George, 2008, p. 891)

$$f(g) = M(a, b)(g+1)^{-(a+1)} \exp\{-b/(g+1)\} \tag{24}$$

with the normalising constant

$$M(a, b) = \frac{b^a}{\int_0^b t^{a-1} \exp(-t)\, dt} \tag{25}$$

and the corresponding marginal likelihood


$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, \gamma) = \frac{M(a, b)}{M(a_\gamma, b_\gamma)} \exp\left\{-\frac{SSE_\gamma}{2\phi}\right\}, \tag{26}$$

where the updated parameters $a_\gamma = a + p_\gamma/2$ and $b_\gamma = SSR_\gamma/(2\phi) + b$ determine the posterior of g in model γ.

In order to show results from a real data set, we consider the ozone data introduced by Breiman and Friedman (1985) in the notation of Sabanés Bové and Held (2010), where $n = 330$. Deciding whether to include each of the nine meteorological covariates z_0 and $z_4, \ldots, z_{11}$ in the linear regression of the daily maximum ozone concentration y yields a model space Γ of size $2^9 = 512$. For all $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the ILA (17) and the MCMC estimate (20) of the exact marginal likelihood value (26) were computed using the fixed (full-model variance estimate) $\phi = 19.75$ and the hyperprior parameters $a = 0.01, b = 0.01$. Figure 1 shows that the errors of ILA and MCMC are very small here compared to the absolute true values.

For all models, the acceptance rates of the MH algorithm were above 97%. Figure 2 shows that even for the model with the lowest acceptance rate, the true posterior density of $z = \log(g)$ is very close to its ILA estimate $q(z)$. This explains the almost perfect acceptance rates of the MH scheme.


Figure 1 – *Errors of ILA and MCMC estimates (y-axes) compared to the exact marginal likelihood values (x-axes) for all 512 models. MCMC estimates are based on* $B = 4500$ *samples which were saved after burn-ins of length* 1000 *(every 2nd iteration). Note that the marginal likelihood values include the additional constant factor* $\sqrt{2\pi\phi/n}$ *compared to* (26).



(a) Errors of the ILA estimates.

(b) Errors of the MCMC estimates. The vertical bars represent 95% MCMC confidence intervals (coverage is 95.1% here).

Figure 2 – *True posterior density of z (solid line) compared with the ILA (dashed line) and MCMC (histogram) estimates. Small ticks above the horizontal axis indicate where nodes z_j for the construction of the ILA estimate $q(z)$ were located (cf. Section 3.2).*



4. Variable selection

We illustrate the methodology for non-normal data with the Pima Indians diabetes data set (Frank and Asuncion, 2010; Ripley, 1996), which contains $n = 532$ complete records on diabetes presence and $m = 7$ associated covariates described in Table 2. First, we restrict ourselves to variable selection in the logistic regression model, yielding a model space Γ of size $2^7 = 128$. In Section 5, we will also consider power transformations of the covariates.

Three different prior distributions for the covariance factor g are compared for a fully Bayesian analysis:

F1 $f(g) = \mathrm{IG}(g \mid 1/2, n/2)$, corresponding to the Zellner and Siow (1980) approach;

F2 $f(g) = 1/n(1 + g/n)^{-2}$, corresponding to the hyper-g/n prior (Liang et al., 2008, p. 416);

F3 $f(g) = \mathrm{IG}(g \mid 0.001, 0.001)$, which is a standard choice for variance parameters.

Variable	Description
y	Signs of diabetes according to WHO criteria (Yes = 1, No = 0)
x_1	Number of pregnancies
x_2	Plasma glucose concentration in an oral glucose tolerance test [mg/dl]
x_3	Diastolic blood pressure [mm Hg]
x_4	Triceps skin fold thickness [mm]
x_5	Body mass index (BMI) [kg/m^2]
x_6	Diabetes pedigree function
x_7	Age [years]

Table 2 – *Description of the variables in the Pima Indians diabetes data set.*

We also consider model-specific empirical-Bayes estimation of g using the conditional marginal likelihood (13), abbreviating this approach as **EB**. Moreover, the standard criteria **AIC** and **BIC** are computed for each model. We use the prior model probabilities

$$f(\gamma) = \frac{1}{m+1}\binom{m}{p_\gamma}^{-1} \tag{27}$$

for an appropriate multiplicity adjustment (George and McCulloch, 1993; Scott and Berger, 2010). Posterior model probabilities then follow from (2), where for EB the maximized conditional marginal likelihood (13) and for BIC the approximation $\exp(-1/2\,\mathrm{BIC})$ (e. g. Kass and Raftery, 1995) is used instead of $f(\boldsymbol{y}\,|\,\gamma)$. Similar model weights proportional to $\exp(-1/2\,\mathrm{AIC})$ can also be calculated for AIC as proposed by Buckland, Burnham, and Augustin (1997).

In Table 3, the resulting posterior probabilities and AIC weights for variable inclusion are shown. All methods clearly select x_1, x_2, x_5 and x_6. The corresponding model is the *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) model in F1, F2, F3 and BIC, while for EB and AIC also x_7 is included in the top model. This covariate would be included as well in the median probability model (Barbieri and Berger, 2004) for all methods except BIC. For x_3 and x_4, the evidence for inclusion is consistently weak. For comparison, Holmes and Held (2006) used vague iid normal priors for all coefficients and a flat model prior $f(\gamma) = 2^{-7}$, obtaining clear evidence for inclusion of the MAP covariates.

	F1	F2	F3	EB	AIC	BIC
x_1	0.961	0.965	0.968	0.970	0.972	0.946
x_2	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
x_3	0.252	0.309	0.353	0.384	0.309	0.100
x_4	0.248	0.303	0.346	0.376	0.296	0.103
x_5	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.997
x_6	0.994	0.995	0.996	0.996	0.998	0.987
x_7	0.528	0.586	0.629	0.659	0.670	0.334

Table 3 – *Posterior probabilities and AIC weights for variable inclusion in the Pima data.*

It is interesting that the inclusion probabilities under F1, F2 and F3 are qualitatively similar. The reason could be that the sample size is relatively large in this example, reducing the importance of the hyperprior specification for g. For EB, most inclusion probabilities are even higher than for F3. The AIC weights are more similar to F2 probabilities (except for x_7). The BIC based probabilities are mostly lower, and close to the (not shown) probabilities under F1 when a flat model prior is used.

While the posterior inclusion probabilities are visibly different for the six approaches, the model-averaged fits to the data are very close, as shown in Figure 3. In parallel to estimating the posterior parameter distributions leading to these fitted probabilities for F1, F2, F3 and EB, we also estimated the marginal likelihood by MCMC. The resulting MCMC estimates were close to the ILA estimates, comparison plots looking like Figure 4 for F3. Note that the coverage of the MCMC confidence intervals is lower than in Figure 2b, because the ILA approximations are not exact.

5. Fractional polynomials

Fractional polynomials (FPs) are used for systematic power transformations of the covariates $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ (Royston and Altman, 1994). They widen the class of ordinary polynomials insofar as the powers are taken from the fixed set $\{-2, -1, -1/2, 0, 1/2, 1, 2, 3\}$, which also contains square roots, reciprocals and the logarithm by the Box and Tidwell (1962) convention $x^0 \equiv \log(x)$. For each covariate x_k, at most two powers are chosen

Figure 3 – *Model-averaged fitted probabilities in the Pima Indians variable selection example.*





Figure 4 – *Errors of ILA with respect to MCMC estimates of the marginal likelihood under F3, for all 128 models in the Pima Indians variable selection example. MCMC estimates are based on (at least)* $B = 5000$ *samples which were saved after burn-ins of length* 1000 *(every 2nd iteration). The vertical bars represent 95% MCMC confidence intervals (coverage is 72.7% here).*



and collected in the tuple $\boldsymbol{p}_k$, while the corresponding coefficients are collected in the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$, determining the FP transform $x_k^{\boldsymbol{p}_k}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$. The special case $p_{k1} = p_{k2}$ is handled by multiplication with the logarithm, e. g. $x_k^{(2,2)} = \left(x_k^2, x_k^2 \log(x_k)\right)$. Variable selection is embedded in this framework, because x_k is not included in the model if $\boldsymbol{p}_k = \emptyset$. Each model is thus uniquely identified by $\gamma = (\boldsymbol{p}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_m)$, the covariate vectors are $\boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma i} = (x_{1i}^{\boldsymbol{p}_1}, \ldots, x_{mi}^{\boldsymbol{p}_m})^T$ and the vector of regression coefficients is $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1^T, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_m^T)^T$. Sabanés Bové and Held (2010) implemented Bayesian inference in normal linear FP models, and more details on FPs can be found in references therein.

The model space Γ comprises 45^m models, and thus the use of an automatic prior for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$, conditional on the model γ, is very attractive. The generalized g-prior (6) is automatic and only depends on the global hyperparameter g. We will again compare the three fully Bayesian approaches (F1, F2, F3) with the empirical-Bayes procedure (EB) which were introduced in Section 4 and avoid manual specification of g. The prior model probabilities $f(\gamma) = \prod_{k=1}^m f(\boldsymbol{p}_k)$ depend on the prior FP transformation probabilities

$$f(\boldsymbol{p}_k) = \frac{1}{3}\binom{7 + |\boldsymbol{p}_k|}{|\boldsymbol{p}_k|}^{-1} \tag{28}$$

which have the same form as (27): each degree $|\boldsymbol{p}_k| \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ is equally probable, and all tuples $\boldsymbol{p}_k$ of the same degree are equally probable. This implements Jeffreys's "simplicity postulate" that simpler models must have greater prior probability than more complex models (Jeffreys, 1961, section 1.6), indeed the null model has the largest prior probability 3^{-m}.

For the Pima data the model space Γ has size $45^7 \approx 3.7 \cdot 10^{11}$, rendering an exhaustive evaluation of all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ infeasible. Therefore we use an MCMC model composition (Madigan and York, 1995) approach: Starting from the null model, we move through Γ by successive slight modifications of the configuration γ. The modifications are accepted with MH acceptance probabilities, which ensures that models with higher posterior probability are more likely to be visited; see Sabanés Bové and Held (2010) for details. For all four approaches (F1, F2, F3 and EB), we ran this model sampler for one million iterations. To get an idea of the computational complexity, note that on average 10.8 (F2) and 22.1 (EB) models could be evaluated per second (on 2.8 GHz CPUs). All computations have been implemented in an `R`-package including an efficient `C++` core for the MCMC parts, which is available from the first author.

	F1	F2	F3	EB
x_1	0.119	0.125	0.135	0.144
x_2	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
x_3	0.050	0.052	0.054	0.054
x_4	0.032	0.033	0.033	0.035
x_5	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
x_6	0.992	0.993	0.993	0.994
x_7	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999

Table 4 – *Posterior probabilities for variable inclusion in the Pima data when FP transformations are considered. The probabilities are based on 671 525 (F1), 719 929 (F2), 758 616 (F3), and 777 531 (EB) visited models.*

For all four approaches Table 4 shows clear evidence for the covariates x_2, x_5, x_6 and x_7 with posterior inclusion probabilities over 99%, while the other three covariates have probabilities below 15%. In comparison with the variable inclusion results for the untransformed covariates in Table 3, it is interesting that x_1 is no longer important when FP transformations are considered, while x_7 is much more important.

In addition to examining the marginal inclusion probabilities, it is necessary to look at the transformations of the covariates. Since all four approaches produce similar variable inclusion probabilities and also share the MAP model $\boldsymbol{x}_i = (x_{2i}, x_{5i}^{-2}, x_{6i}^{-1/2}, x_{7i}^{-2})^T$, we only look in detail at the approach F1 (the three other producing again very similar results). In order to account for the model uncertainty, it is best to look at model-averaged estimates of variable transformations, conditional on variable inclusion. To this end we varied the transformation of one of the covariates x_2, x_5, x_6, x_7 while fixing the others at their MAP configuration. Averaging over the 44 models each then results in the panels in Figure 5. Plasma glucose concentration (x_2) seems to have a strong positive linear association with diabetes log-odds, while the estimated positive effect of BMI (x_5) is levelling off non-linearly for (rare) high values and is weaker overall. Even smaller is the estimated positive effect of diabetes pedigree function (x_6) with the largest increase in diabetes risk between $x_6 = 0.1$ and $x_6 = 0.5$. The remaining estimated association of age (x_7) is clearly non-linear, with higher diabetes risk for middle-aged participants.

These results are qualitatively similar to those obtained by Cottet, Kohn, and Nott (2008, p. 665) for a larger subset of the original Pima Indians data.

The marginal posterior distributions for the covariance factor g differ slightly between the three prior choices F1, F2 and F3. Averaging over the best 1000 models in terms of posterior probability which have been visited by the model sampler, we get the histograms (for $z = \log(g)$) in Figure 6. The corresponding posterior means $\mathbb{E}(g \mid \boldsymbol{y})$ decrease from 282.5 for F1, 219.2 for F2 to 179.1 for F3, and this trend is also visible in the histograms. The results suggest a stronger prior shrinkage of the regression coefficients than that proposed by the unit information prior's fixed value $g = n = 532$ (cf. Section 2.2), as $\mathbb{P}(g < n \mid \boldsymbol{y})$ ranges from 90.9% for F1 to 95.7% for F3.


6. Discussion

In this article, we presented a generalization of the g-prior to GLMs, which can be interpreted analogously to the classical g-prior for normal linear models. In our implementation, the shrinkage-controlling hyperparameter g can be assigned any hyperprior, thus giving rise to a large class of generalized hyper-g priors. For mixtures of classical g-priors, Liang et al. (2008) could investigate theoretical model selection and prediction consistency properties. It would be desirable to also investigate such properties for our generalized hyper-g prior class. However, as fewer closed form expressions are available, derivation of comparable proofs will be more difficult in the GLM family.


Another important area of future research is the thorough comparison of the generalized hyper-g prior with the other approaches in the literature summarized in Section 2.2. For example, exhaustive simulation studies could shed light on different performances of the priors in variable selection. Perhaps also theoretical results can be derived to explain the different properties of the approaches.

Bayesian inference for FPs in GLMs was in fact the motivating application for this work. With huge model spaces to explore, the accurate numerical marginal likelihood approximation is vital for this and similar typical applications of the generalized hyper-g prior. Alternative MCMC estimates of the marginal likelihood were used to demonstrate the very good accuracy of the ILA. Yet, MCMC would not be suited for replacing the deterministic ILA approach in the stochastic model search, because the computation is slower by orders of magnitude and would require careful automatic monitoring of


Figure 5 – *Model-averaged FP transformations of selected Pima Indians covariates under hyperprior F1. Means (solid lines), pointwise (dashed lines) as well as simultaneous (dotted lines) 95% credible intervals are given. Small ticks above the x-axes indicate data locations.*




(a) Covariate x_2 (plasma glucose concentration)



(b) Covariate x_5 (BMI)




(c) Covariate x_6 (diabetes pedigree function)



(d) Covariate x_7 (age)

Figure 6 – *Comparison of marginal posteriors for $z = \log(g)$ under priors F1, F2 and F3. The histograms are based on the model average over the respective 1000 models with highest posterior probability visited by the model samplers.*



(a) Posterior for prior F1. **(b)** Posterior for prior F2. **(c)** Posterior for prior F3.

convergence. Of course, the deterministic marginal likelihood approximation could be used for any type of stochastic model search, such as those recently proposed by Hans, Dobra, and West (2007) and Dobra (2009).

Finally, we note that the classical g-prior has recently been extended in other directions as well. In the context of supervised machine learning, Zhang, Jordan, and Yeung (2008) replace $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$ by a (possibly singular) kernel matrix $\boldsymbol{K}_\gamma$ and prove consistency properties for the normal linear model. Maruyama and George (2008) remove the restriction of $p_\gamma \leq n-1$ for normal linear models by working with the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$. A similar extension is the "generalised singular g-prior" defined by West (2003) in the factor regression context. Along these lines, our generalized hyper-g prior could also be extended to the $p_\gamma > n$ case via the SVD $\boldsymbol{W}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{U}_\gamma \boldsymbol{D}_\gamma \boldsymbol{V}_\gamma$. We could just use the latent parameter $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{V}_\gamma \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$ of reduced dimension $k_\gamma = n-1$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{V}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{\delta}_\gamma$. Defining the corresponding design matrix as $\boldsymbol{Z}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{W}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{U}_\gamma \boldsymbol{D}_\gamma$, we have $\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma \boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{Z}_\gamma \boldsymbol{\delta}_\gamma$ and retain $\boldsymbol{Z}_\gamma^T \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{0}_{k_\gamma}$. Assigning the prior distribution $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\gamma \sim \mathrm{N}_{k_\gamma}(\mathbf{0}_{k_\gamma}, g\phi c \boldsymbol{D}_\gamma^{-2})$ then induces a normal prior on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\gamma$ with mean zero and singular precision $(g\phi c)^{-1}\boldsymbol{X}_\gamma^T \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{X}_\gamma$, and thus directly generalizes (6). Investigation of this approach for GLMs with many covariates is another possibility for future research.

A. Proof of prior mode zero

Consider the density function from (5). Dropping for brevity the notational dependency on the model γ, it can be rewritten as

$$f(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, g, \boldsymbol{y}_0) \propto \exp\left\{ \frac{1}{g\phi} \boldsymbol{w}^T \big(h(0)\boldsymbol{\theta} - b(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \big) \right\}, \tag{29}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n)^T$ and $b(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \big(b(\theta_1), \ldots, b(\theta_n) \big)^T$. To prove that the mode is at $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}_p$, note that this is a solution of the score equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \log f(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, g, \boldsymbol{y}_0) = \frac{1}{g\phi} \left(h(0) \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} - \frac{\partial b(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \right)^T \boldsymbol{w} = \mathbf{0}_p,$$

because $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}_p$ implies that $b'(\theta_i) \equiv b'(\theta) = \mu = h(0)$ and hence

$$\frac{\partial b(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} = \operatorname{diag}\big(b'(\theta_1), \ldots, b'(\theta_n) \big) = h(0) \boldsymbol{I}_n.$$

B. Higher-order Laplace approximation

Denote the standard Laplace approximation (14) by $\tilde{f}_{LA}(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma)$. Then Raudenbush et al. (2000, p. 148) show that

$$f(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) \approx \tilde{f}_{LA}(\boldsymbol{y} \,|\, g, \gamma) \left[1 - \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{(3)} b_i^2 - \frac{1}{48} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{(6)} b_i^3 + \frac{5}{24} \boldsymbol{k}^T (\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma})^{-1} \boldsymbol{k} \right] \tag{30}$$

is a sixth-order Laplace approximation when the canonical response function is used. Here $d_i^{(m)} = d^m h / d\eta^m(\eta_i^*)$ evaluated at $\eta_i^* = \boldsymbol{x}_{0\gamma i}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{0\gamma}$, $b_i = \boldsymbol{x}_{0\gamma i}^T (\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma})^{-1} \boldsymbol{x}_{0\gamma i}$ and $\boldsymbol{k} = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{(2)} b_i \boldsymbol{x}_{0\gamma i}$. Note that the quadratic forms can be efficiently computed using the Cholesky decomposition $\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma} = \boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{L}^T$, e. g. $\boldsymbol{k}^T (\boldsymbol{R}^*_{0\gamma})^{-1} \boldsymbol{k} = \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2$ where $\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{k}$.

References

M. M. Barbieri and J. O. Berger. Optimal predictive model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, 32(3):870–897, 2004. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/009053604000000238.

J. O. Berger and L. R. Pericchi. Objective Bayesian methods for model selection: introduction and comparison. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 38(1):135–207, 2001. ISSN 07492170. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/4356165`.

J. M. Bernardo and A. F. M. Smith. *Bayesian Theory*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2000.

G. E. P. Box and P. W. Tidwell. Transformation of the independent variables. *Technometrics*, 4(4):531–550, 1962.

L. Breiman and J. H. Friedman. Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80(391): 580–598, 1985.

R. P. Brent. *Algorithms for Minimization Without Derivatives*. Prentice-Hall series in automatic computation. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1973.

S. T. Buckland, K. P. Burnham, and N. H. Augustin. Model selection: an integral part of inference. *Biometrics*, 53(2):603–618, 1997. ISSN 0006341X. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/2533961`.

M. Chen and J. Ibrahim. Conjugate priors for generalized linear models. *Statistica Sinica*, 13:461–476, 2003.

M.-H. Chen, L. Huang, J. G. Ibrahim, and S. Kim. Bayesian variable selection and computation for generalized linear models with conjugate priors. *Bayesian Analysis*, 3(3):585–614, 2008. URL `http://ba.stat.cmu.edu/vol03is03.php`.

S. Chib and I. Jeliazkov. Marginal likelihood from the Metropolis-Hastings output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(453):270–281, 2001. ISSN 01621459. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/2670365`.

M. Clyde and E. I. George. Model uncertainty. *Statistical Science*, 19(1):81–94, 2004. ISSN 08834237. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/4144374`.

R. Cottet, R. J. Kohn, and D. J. Nott. Variable selection and model averaging in semiparametric overdispersed generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):661–671, 2008. ISSN 0162-1459. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1198/016214508000000346`.

W. Cui and E. I. George. Empirical Bayes vs. fully Bayes variable selection. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 138(4):888–900, 2008. ISSN 0378-3758. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V0M-4NK4G63-2/2/e2c24b01d141b02fe783c082a1e33489.

A. Dobra. Variable selection and dependency networks for genomewide data. *Biostatistics*, 10(4):621–639, 2009. ISSN 1465-4644. doi: 10.1093/biostatistics/kxp018.

C. Fernández, E. Ley, and M. F. J. Steel. Benchmark priors for Bayesian model averaging. *Journal of Econometrics*, 100(2):381–427, 2001. ISSN 0304-4076. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6VC0-41WBGR3-3/2/85049a7e98ddb45fb62eba86d29d39ca.

A. Frank and A. Asuncion. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2010. URL http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml.

D. Gamerman. Sampling from the posterior distribution in generalized linear mixed models. *Statistics and Computing*, 7(1):57–68, 1997. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018509429360.

E. I. George and D. P. Foster. Calibration and empirical Bayes variable selection. *Biometrika*, 87(4):731–747, 2000. ISSN 00063444. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2673607.

E. I. George and R. E. McCulloch. Variable selection via gibbs sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88(423):881–889, 1993. ISSN 01621459. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2290777.

G. Golub and J. Welsch. Calculation of Gauss quadrature rules. *Mathematics of Computation*, 23(106):221–230, 1969.

M. Gupta and J. Ibrahim. An information matrix prior for Bayesian analysis in generalized linear models with high dimensional data. *Statistica Sinica*, 19(4):1641–1663, 2009.

C. Han and B. Carlin. Markov chain Monte Carlo methods for computing Bayes factors: A comparative review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(455):1122–1132, 2001. ISSN 0162-1459.

C. Hans, A. Dobra, and M. West. Shotgun stochastic search for "large p" regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(478):507–516, 2007.

M. H. Hansen and B. Yu. Model selection and the principle of minimum description length. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(454):746–774, 2001. ISSN 0162-1459. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1198/016214501753168398.

M. H. Hansen and B. Yu. Minimum description length model selection criteria for generalized linear models. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 40(1):145–163, 2003. ISSN 07492170. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/4356183. Statistics and Science: A Festschrift for Terry Speed.

C. C. Holmes and L. Held. Bayesian auxiliary variable models for binary and multinomial regression. *Bayesian Analysis*, 1(1):145–168, 2006.

H. Jeffreys. *Theory of Probability*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, third edition, 1961.

R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery. Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430):773–795, 1995. ISSN 01621459. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2291091.

R. E. Kass and L. Wasserman. A reference Bayesian test for nested hypotheses and its relationship to the Schwarz criterion. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90 (431):928–934, 1995. ISSN 01621459. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2291327.

F. Liang, R. Paulo, G. Molina, M. A. Clyde, and J. O. Berger. Mixtures of g priors for Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103 (481):410–423, 2008.

D. V. Lindley. A statistical paradox. *Biometrika*, 44(1/2):187–192, 1957.

D. V. Lindley. Approximate Bayesian methods. In J. M. Bernardo, M. H. DeGroot, D. V. Lindley, and A. F. M. Smith, editors, *Bayesian Statistics: Proceedings of the First International Meeting Held in Valencia*, pages 223–245, Valencia, 1980. University of Valencia Press.

D. Madigan and J. York. Bayesian graphical models for discrete data. *International Statistical Review*, 63(2):215–232, 1995.

J.-M. Marin and C. P. Robert. *Bayesian Core: A Practical Approach to Computational Bayesian Statistics*. Springer texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2007.

Y. Maruyama and E. I. George. A g-prior extension for $p > n$. Technical report, Universities of Tokyo and Pennsylvania, 2008. URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/0801.4410`.

P. McCullagh and J. A. Nelder. *Generalized Linear Models*. Number 37 in Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman and Hall, second edition, 1989.

J. C. Naylor and A. F. M. Smith. Applications of a method for the efficient computation of posterior distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 31(3):214–225, 1982. ISSN 00359254. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/2347995`.

D. J. Nott, R. J. Kohn, and M. Fielding. Approximating the marginal likelihood using copula. Technical report, National University of Singapore, 2008. URL `http://arxiv.org/pdf/0810.5474`.

I. Ntzoufras, P. Dellaportas, and J. J. Forster. Bayesian variable and link determination for generalised linear models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 111(1-2): 165–180, 2003. ISSN 0378-3758. URL `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V0M-472JW2H-M/2/32df504c300e38e45f7415acfe984508`.

A. M. Overstall and J. J. Forster. Default Bayesian model determination methods for generalised linear mixed models. 2010. ISSN 0167-9473. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2010.03.008. URL `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V8V-4YP8TGG-2/2/17f2c7cb3e2907a5326ca6c48129b524`. In press.

W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery. *Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 3rd edition, 2007. URL `http://books.google.com/books?id=w47cyQLVQowC&printsec=frontcover&hl=de`.

R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2010. URL `http://www.R-project.org`. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.

S. W. Raudenbush, M.-L. Yang, and M. Yosef. Maximum likelihood for generalized linear models with nested random effects via high-order, multivariate Laplace approximation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9(1):141–157, 2000. ISSN 10618600. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/1390617.

B. D. Ripley. *Pattern Recognition and Neural Networks*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

C. P. Robert. *The Bayesian Choice*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2001.

C. P. Robert and A. K. M. E. Saleh. Point estimation and confidence set estimation in a parallelism model: an empirical Bayes approach. *Annales d'Économie et de Statistique*, 23:65–89, 1991. ISSN 0769489X. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/20075835.

C. P. Robert, N. Chopin, and J. Rousseau. Harold Jeffreys's Theory of Probability revisited. *Statistical Science*, 24(2):141–172, 2009. URL http://projecteuclid.org/DPubS?verb=Display&version=1.0&service=UI&handle=euclid.ss/1263478373&page=record.

P. Royston and D. G. Altman. Regression using fractional polynomials of continuous covariates: Parsimonious parametric modelling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 43(3):429–467, 1994. ISSN 0035-9254. URL http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0035-9254%281994%2943%3A3%3C429%3ARUFPOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H.

H. Rue, S. Martino, and N. Chopin. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 71(2):319–392, 2009. ISSN 1369-7412. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x.

D. Sabanés Bové and L. Held. Bayesian fractional polynomials. *Statistics and Computing*, 2010. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11222-010-9170-7. epub ahead of print.

J. G. Scott and J. O. Berger. Bayes and empirical-Bayes multiplicity adjustment in the variable-selection problem. Technical Report 2008-10, Duke University Department of Statistical Science, 2010.

G. Smyth, Y. Hu, and P. Dunn. *statmod: Statistical Modeling*, 2009. URL `http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=statmod`. R package version 1.4.1.

L. Tierney and J. B. Kadane. Accurate approximations for posterior moments and marginal densities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(393):82–86, 1986. ISSN 01621459. URL `http://www.jstor.org/stable/2287970`.

X. Wang and E. I. George. Adaptive Bayesian criteria in variable selection for generalized linear models. *Statistica Sinica*, 17(2):667–690, 2007.

R. W. M. Wedderburn. On the existence and uniqueness of the maximum likelihood estimates for certain generalized linear models. *Biometrika*, 63(1):27–32, 1976. doi: 10.1093/biomet/63.1.27. URL `http://biomet.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/63/1/27`.

M. West. Generalized linear models: scale parameters, outlier accommodation and prior distributions. In J. M. Bernardo, M. H. DeGroot, D. V. Lindley, and A. F. M. Smith, editors, *Bayesian Statistics 2: Proceedings of the Second Valencia International Meeting*, pages 531–558, Amsterdam, 1985. North-Holland.

M. West. Bayesian factor regression models in the "large p, small n" paradigm. In J. Bernardo, M. Bayarri, J. Berger, A. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. Smith, and M. West, editors, *Bayesian Statistics 7: Proceedings of the Seventh Valencia International Meeting*, pages 733–742. Oxford University Press, 2003.

A. Zellner. On assessing prior distributions and Bayesian regression analysis with g-prior distributions. In P. K. Goel and A. Zellner, editors, *Bayesian Inference and Decision Techniques: Essays in Honor of Bruno de Finetti*, volume 6 of *Studies in Bayesian Econometrics and Statistics*, chapter 5, pages 233–243. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.

A. Zellner and A. Siow. Posterior odds ratios for selected regression hypotheses. In J. M. Bernardo, M. H. DeGroot, D. V. Lindley, and A. F. M. Smith, editors, *Bayesian Statistics: Proceedings of the First International Meeting Held in Valencia*, pages 585–603, Valencia, 1980. University of Valencia Press.

Z. Zhang, M. I. Jordan, and D. Y. Yeung. Posterior consistency of the silverman g-prior in Bayesian model choice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, volume 22. Citeseer, 2008.