arXiv:1409.2437v5 [stat.ME] 24 Jun 2015

Fast Marginal Likelihood Estimation of the Ridge Parameter(s) in Ridge Regression and Generalized Ridge Regression for Big Data

George Karabatsos*
University of Illinois-Chicago

March 2, 2022

Abstract

Unlike the ordinary least-squares (OLS) estimator for the linear model, a ridge regression linear model provides coefficient estimates via shrinkage, usually with improved mean-square and prediction error. This is true especially when the observed design matrix is ill-conditioned or singular, either as a result of highly-correlated covariates or the number of covariates exceeding the sample size. This paper introduces novel and fast marginal maximum likelihood (MML) algorithms for estimating the shrinkage parameter(s) for the Bayesian ridge and power ridge regression models, and an automatic plug-in MML estimator for the Bayesian generalized ridge regression model. With the aid of the singular value decomposition of the observed covariate design matrix, these MML estimation methods are quite fast even for data sets where either the sample size (n) or the number of covariates (p) is very large, and even when $p > n$. On several real data sets varying widely in terms of n and p, the computation times of the MML estimation methods for the three ridge models, respectively, are compared with the times of other methods for estimating the shrinkage parameter in ridge, LASSO and Elastic Net (EN) models, with the other methods based on minimizing prediction error according to cross-validation or information criteria. Also, the ridge, LASSO, and EN models, and their associated estimation methods, are compared in terms of prediction accuracy. Furthermore, a simulation study compares the ridge models under MML estimation, against the LASSO and EN models, in terms of their ability to differentiate between truly-significant covariates (i.e., with non-zero slope coefficients) and truly-insignificant covariates (with zero coefficients).
KEYWORDS: Ridge Regression, Marginal Maximum Likelihood Estimation, LASSO, Elastic Net.

*1040 W. Harrison St. (MC 147), Chicago, Illinois, 60304, U.S.A. E-mail: gkarabatsos1@gmail.com. Phone: (312) 413-1816. FAX: (312) 996-5651.

1 Introduction

The linear regression model is ubiquitous in statistics. To begin to set the notational scene for the rest of the paper, we first give a brief overview of concepts related to this model. The linear model is defined by $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, for observed dependent variable observations $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$, with $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ik})_{n\times p}$ the observed $n \times p$ design matrix of p covariates having sample covariance matrix $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p)^\intercal \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the p slope coefficient parameters. Also, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n)^\intercal$ is the vector of regression errors with mean (expectation) $\mathrm{E}(\varepsilon) = 0$ and variance $\mathrm{Var}(\varepsilon) = \sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The ordinary least-squares (OLS) estimator of the linear model is given by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{y}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-p}||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}||^2$. Throughout, with no loss of generality[1], it is assumed that all variables have been rescaled to have zero-mean with $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = 0$, and that $\mathbf{X}$ is in correlation form such that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ki} = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ki}^2 = 1$, for $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Then the estimate of the intercept parameter β_0 becomes zero and ignorable.

The linear model satisfies the equivalence relation $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where the latter equation gives the canonical linear model (Searle, 1982), defined on the orthogonalized space, with coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q)^\intercal \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $q = \min(n, p)$. Specifically the orthogonalized space is based on a singular value decomposition (s.v.d.) of $\mathbf{X}$, given by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{W}^\intercal$, where $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ are orthogonal matrices of dimensions $n \times q$ and $p \times q$, respectively; the columns of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}$ give the q principal components of $\mathbf{X}$; and $\mathbf{D} = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_q)$ is the diagonal matrix of singular values $d_1 > \cdots > d_q$, where $(d_1^2, \ldots, d_q^2)$ provide at most the first $q \leq p$ non-zero eigenvalues $(d_1^2, \ldots, d_p^2)$ of $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$. The OLS estimator of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is given by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^\intercal\mathbf{y}$, giving the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{W}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ for the original data space.

It is well-known that for the given population parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$, the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is unbiased, and has mean-squared error (and hence total variance) given by $\mathrm{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^p d_k^{-2}$. Also, $\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ has mean-squared error $\mathrm{MSE}(\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2\} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\intercal\mathbf{V}_\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$. The prediction error is $\mathrm{PE}(\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathrm{MSE}(\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \sigma^2$, with expected value ($\mathbb{E}$) taken over the joint population distribution of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ fixed, and $\mathbf{V}_\mathbf{X}$ is the population covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}$. The matrix $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is positive-definite if and only all p of its eigenvalues are positive, in which case the OLS estimator $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$ clearly has finite $\mathrm{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. If also $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}_p$ with $\mathbf{I}_p$ the p-dimensional identity matrix, leading to determinant $|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|$ of 1, then $\mathbf{X}$ is called orthogonal (orthonormal). The number $0 \leq |\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}| \leq 1$ measures the orthogonality of $\mathbf{X}$ (Cooley & Lohnes, 1971).

The OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ can be poorly determined and exhibit high MSE when $\mathbf{X}$ exhibits multicollinearity due to the presence of highly-correlated covariates. In this case, $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is ill-conditioned, with $|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}|$ near 0, and smallest eigenvalue $d_p^2 \to 0$ leading to $\mathrm{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \to \infty$ and $\mathrm{PE}(\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \to \infty$. The OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ does not even exist when two or more covariates in $\mathbf{X}$ are perfectly correlated, or when the number of covariates exceeds the number of observations (i.e., when $p > n$). In this case, the matrix $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is singular, and is thus not

[1]The p coefficient estimates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ obtained from the rescaled data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ can be transformed back to intercept and slope coefficient estimates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^* = (\widehat{\beta}_0^*, \widehat{\beta}_1^*, \ldots, \widehat{\beta}_p^*)^\intercal$ on the scale of the original data set $\underline{\mathcal{D}}_n = (\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{y}})$, via $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^* = \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{y}_i - \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\underline{\mathbf{X}}}^{-1}\right)^\intercal, \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\underline{\mathbf{X}}}^{-1}\right)^\intercal\right)^\intercal$, where $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\underline{\mathbf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\underline{\mathbf{X}}})$ give the p column means and standard deviations of the columns of $\underline{\mathbf{X}} = (\underline{x}_{ik})_{n\times p}$, respectively. The symbol $\circ$ refers to the Hadamard product operator.

of full rank (i.e., $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}) < p$) with $|\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}| = 0$. However, these days, applied statistical research is often concerned with the analysis of large data sets where either the number of variables p or observations n is very large. Specifically, a data set with a large number of covariates (p) can likely give rise to singular or ill-conditioned $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$, as a result of the number of covariates exceeding the sample size (i.e., $p \geq n$), and/or as a result of multicollinearity. For example, multicollinearity can likely occur when the data consist of a large number of covariates (p), or can occur when the data set is constructed by merging multiple data sets that have one or more variables in common.

Ridge regression, which defines the alternative estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = (\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X} + \lambda\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{y}$, provides a solution to the inability of the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to handle ill-conditioned or singular $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$. Here, $\lambda > 0$ is the ridge parameter that shrinks the estimate of the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ towards zero, with the amount of shrinking an increasing function of λ. Compared to the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, the ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ introduces some bias in exchange for lower mean-squared $\text{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and prediction error $\text{PE}(\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, especially when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is ill-conditioned or singular (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970). However, unlike the OLS estimator, the ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ exists even when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is singular, because $(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X} + \lambda\mathbf{I}_p)$ is necessarily non-singular when $\lambda > 0$.

The ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ can be characterized in at least four equivalent ways (e.g., Hastie, et al. 2009). First, the ridge estimator is equivalent to the penalized least-squares estimator, $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} ||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}||^2 + \lambda\sum_{k=1}^{p}\beta_k^2$. Second, in terms of the orthogonalized space, the ridge estimator is given by $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \mathbf{W}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_\lambda$, with $\widehat{\alpha}_{\lambda,k} = \{d_k^2/(d_k^2 + \lambda)\}\widehat{\alpha}_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, q$. This shows that the ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ is obtained by shrinking the canonical OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_q)^\intercal$ by the factors $\{d_k^2/(d_k^2+\lambda)\}$ (resp.), and therefore applies a greater amount of shrinkage to OLS estimates $\widehat{\alpha}_k$ having relatively small eigenvalues. Third, from a Bayesian point of view, the ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ is the mean of the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ under a p-variate normal prior distribution, corresponding to normal probability density function (p.d.f.) $\text{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p)$ for the conditional random variable $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$. Thus, from a Bayesian decision-theoretic perspective, $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ is the choice of point estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ that minimizes the posterior expected squared-error loss. Fourth, when $\lambda = 0$, the ridge estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ becomes the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

In ridge regression, the quality of coefficient estimates $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ and predictions hinge on the choice of the ridge parameter, λ. As a result, several methods have been proposed to estimate this parameter, based on either automatic plug-in estimation, cross-validation, information criteria optimization, or Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), which we now briefly review. An enormous literature on these methods has developed over the past 45 years, however, the vast majority of them rely on the OLS estimates $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$ (Cule & DeIorio, 2012). In keeping with the general spirit of this paper, we focus our review on ridge methods that can handle data sets where $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is either positive-definite, ill-conditioned, or singular (including when $p \geq n$), unless indicated otherwise.

The standard, Hoerl-Kennard-Baldwin (HKB) (1975) plug-in estimator for the ridge regression model is defined by $\widehat{\lambda}_{\text{HKB}} = p\widehat{\sigma}^2/\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\intercal\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. This estimator is motivated by the fact that $\lambda_{\text{HKB}} = p\sigma^2/\boldsymbol{\beta}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the choice of λ that minimizes the model's expected prediction error when $\mathbf{X}$ is orthonormal (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970). The HKB estimator relies on the OLS estimate $\widehat{\sigma}^2$, and therefore does not exist when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is singular, including when $p \geq n$.

However, this estimator was extended to singular and $p \geq n$ settings (Cule & DeIorio, 2013), by replacing $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ with the error variance estimate $\widehat{\sigma}^2_r = \frac{1}{n-\widehat{r}}||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\widehat{r}}||^2$ obtained from a principal components regression having $\widehat{r} \leq q = \min(n, p)$ components with coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r)^\intercal$. Here, $\widehat{r}$ is the value of r that minimizes $r - \sum_{k=1}^{q} d_k^4/(d_k^2 + \lambda_r)^2$. Therefore $\widehat{r}$ best matches the degrees of freedom for variance in the ridge regression model with ridge parameter $\lambda_{\widehat{r}} = \widehat{r}\widehat{\sigma}^2_{\widehat{r}}/\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\intercal_{\widehat{r}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\widehat{r}}$. The HKB plug-in estimator is attractive because it quickly obtains a ridge estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ without iteration. However this estimator may lead to an estimate of λ that is not necessarily optimal for the given data set at hand, especially when $\mathbf{X}$ is not orthonormal.

The method of cross-validation, for ridge regression, involves first specifying a grid of trial values of λ, and then selecting the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ as the trial value that provides the smallest prediction error for the ridge regression model in K-fold cross-validation, usually 10-fold or n-fold (e.g., Hastie et al. 2009, Ch. 3, 7). The method takes K (at least nearly) equal-sized partitions of the n observations at random, and then for each trial value of λ, measures the model's overall mean-squared predictive error over all K partitions. Overall mean-squared error is based on obtaining the estimate $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(k)}_{\lambda}$ for one partition and measuring the predictive error on all the other $K-1$ partitions, for all $k = 1, \ldots, K$. However, K-fold cross-validation is computationally expensive for data sets where either n or p is large, because this method requires K separate estimations of the parameters of the ridge regression model for every trial value of λ. Typically in practice, at least 100 trial values of λ are used.

Alternatively, the posterior distribution of the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \lambda)$ of the ridge model, including their (marginal) posterior mean and variances, may be estimated by MCMC sampling of this distribution. This is a Bayesian ridge regression (RR) model, which assumes normal likelihood density $\mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)$ for the data. The conditional random variables $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \lambda$ may be assigned a conjugate multivariate normal (n) inverse-gamma (ig) prior distribution with probability density function defined by:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \lambda) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p)\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b),$$

and λ is assigned a gamma $\mathrm{ga}(\lambda \,|\, a_\lambda, b_\lambda)$ prior distribution (Denison et al. 2002). Throughout,

$$\mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = (2\pi)^{-p/2}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-1/2} \exp\left[(-1/2)(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\intercal\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\right]$$

denotes the (p) multivariate normal p.d.f., and the p.d.f.s of the inverse gamma and gamma distributions are respectively given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ig}(s \,|\, a, b) &= (b^a/\Gamma(a))s^{-a-1}\exp(-b/s) \\ \mathrm{ga}(s \,|\, a, b) &= (b^a/\Gamma(a))s^{a-1}\exp(-bs) \end{aligned}$$

with each gamma distribution parameterized (resp.) by shape and rate parameters (a, b) (e.g., Johnson et al. 1994). Alternatively, the conditional random variable $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \lambda$ may be assigned a non-conjugate prior distribution (Griffin & Brown, 2013; Tsonias & Tassiopoulos, 2014). However, similar to the cross-validation method, the MCMC estimation procedure is also computationally expensive when either p, n, or when the number of MCMC samples is large. This is true especially when the procedure is used along with MCMC convergence diagnostics such as trace plots and MCMC batch means analysis, as recommended (e.g.,

Flegal & Jones, 2011). Besides, it is impossible to fully confirm convergence of MCMC samples to the posterior distribution (Cowles & Carlin, 1996).

Generalized cross-validation (GCV) (Golub, et al. 1979), an alternative method which approximates n-fold cross-validation, can provide a computationally-faster method to estimate the ridge parameter λ. The GCV criterion is defined by:

$$\mathrm{GCV}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{\intercal}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda}}{1-\mathrm{df}_{\lambda}/n}\right)^2, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{df}_{\lambda} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,p)} d_k^2/(d_k^2+\lambda)$ is the effective degrees of freedom for a ridge model with parameter λ. Then an estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ can be obtained as the value of λ which minimizes $\mathrm{GCV}(\lambda)$. Usually in practice, the minimizing λ is found after evaluating $\mathrm{GCV}(\lambda)$ over a fine grid of hypothesized trial values of λ. However, the $\mathrm{GCV}(\lambda)$ criterion, like the Akaike Information Criterion defined by $\mathrm{AIC}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\{||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda}||^2 + 2\mathrm{df}_{\lambda}\}$ with penalty term $2\mathrm{df}_{\lambda}$ (AIC; Akaike, 1973), is an inconsistent selector of the true-value of λ as $n \to \infty$ holding p fixed (Shao, 1997); and tends to lead to a ridge estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ that yields an over-fitted ridge regression model (see Zhang, et al. 2009). A consistent estimator $\widehat{\lambda}$ of λ, if p fixed as $n \to \infty$ (Zhang, et al. 2009), can be defined as the minimizer of the Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Schwarz, 1978) given by

$$\mathrm{BIC}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\{||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda}||^2 + \log(n)\mathrm{df}_{\lambda}\}, \tag{2}$$

which is based on a Laplace approximation of the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ of the data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ (Ripley, 1996, p.64).

For the Bayesian RR model, a more principled approach to estimating the ridge parameter λ is by maximizing the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ directly, instead of minimizing some approximation of it. In particular the ratio $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)/\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda')$ gives a Bayes factor describing how much the data has changed the odds for λ versus λ', with $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ the weight of evidence for λ (Good, 1950).

Under the theory of the Bayesian linear model (Denison et al., 2002), the marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ of the Bayes RR model depends on the determinant $|\mathbf{X}^{\intercal}\mathbf{X} + \lambda\mathbf{I}_p|$, which is computationally-demanding when p is large. However, we will show in this paper that after taking a s.v.d. of the design matrix $\mathbf{X}$, the marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\lambda)$ for the Bayesian RR model can be re-expressed by a simpler equation that does not depend on any computationally-expensive matrix operations, such as determinants or inverses, whether or not $p > n$ (Karabatsos, 2014). This means that the marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ for the model, which is a log-concave function of λ, can be rapidly evaluated over many trial values of λ. Then a simple optimization algorithm can be constructed, that quickly finds the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ that maximizes the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$, even for data sets where either p or n is very large. Then conditionally on $\widehat{\lambda}$, the ridge estimate $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\lambda}}$ can be readily obtained to make inferences about $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and to make predictions with the Bayesian RR model. For $p > n$ settings, an alternative, simplified equation of the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\lambda)$ was proposed for the same Bayesian RR model, where the equation depends on the $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U}$

obtained from the s.v.d. $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{UDW}^\intercal$ of $\mathbf{X}$ (Neto et al., 2014). However, we will show later with real data sets that this equation can be computationally-prohibitive when n is sufficiently large, especially when it is evaluated over multiple trial values of λ.

The ordinary Bayesian (normal) RR model, despite or because of its simplicity, often provides competitive predictive power, compared to linear models that assign more complex prior distributions for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ (e.g., Griffin & Brown, 2013). However the RR model is not a panacea because it occasionally exhibits worse predictive performance, as a result of it over-shrinking the OLS coefficients $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_q)^\intercal$ for components that have relatively small eigenvalues (Polson & Scott, 2012; Griffin & Brown, 2013). Therefore, in addition to the Bayesian RR model, in this study we also consider two more general Bayesian ridge regression models, each of which assigns a more complex prior distribution to $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ that can adaptively assign more weight to components that have small eigenvalues, as needed.

The first is given by the Bayesian power ridge regression (PRR) model (Frank & Friedman, 1993), defined by a conjugate multivariate normal inverse-gamma prior distribution, with probability density function (p.d.f.):

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \lambda, \delta) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^\delta) \mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b) \tag{3}$$

for $\boldsymbol{\beta},\ \sigma^2 \,|\, \lambda, \delta$. Here, the prior covariance matrix for the PRR model a function of two parameters, (λ, δ), where λ is a global shrinkage parameter and δ expresses eigenvalue preference. A value $\delta < 0$ expresses greater preference (less shrinkage) for principal components of $\mathbf{X}$ with smaller eigenvalues; the value $\delta = 0$ corresponds to ordinary ridge regression and no eigenvalue preference; and a value $\delta > 0$ expresses greater preference (less shrinkage) for principal components with higher eigenvalues, as in principle components regression and penalized least-squares regression. When $\delta = -1$, the power ridge prior density $\mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^\delta)$ coincides with the g-prior (Zellner, 1986). The g-prior replicates the covariance structure of the design matrix, provides an automatic scaling based on the data, and is related to the Fisher information matrix of the linear model up to the scalar $1/\lambda$ (Chen & Ibrahim, 2003).

In this study, we show that for the Bayesian PRR model, after taking a s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, it is possible to re-express the marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \delta)$ of the model by a simpler equation that require no computationally-expensive matrix operations, as in the case of the Bayesian RR model that assumes conditional prior density $\mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{I}_p)$, as mentioned earlier. Then for the Bayesian PRR model, it is possible to develop a fast and simple optimization algorithm that can quickly search over multiple trial values of the two dimensional space of (λ, δ), to find the estimate $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ that maximizes the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \delta)$. This is true even for very large data sets where either p or n is very large.

We also consider the Bayesian generalized ridge regression (GRR) model, which assigns a normal inverse-gamma prior distribution to $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda}$, with probability density function

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W} \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\intercal) \mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b), \tag{4}$$

based on multiple free shrinkage parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)$ for the q principal components of $\mathbf{X}$ obtained from the s.v.d. $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{UDW}^\intercal$ of $\mathbf{X}$ (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970). Special cases of the GRR model includes the RR model which assumes a single shrinkage parameter with $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_q$; and includes the power ridge regression model which assumes that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a function ϕ of two parameters and the q eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X}$, with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \phi(\lambda, \delta)$. In this

study we also show that after taking a s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, the generalized ridge model also admits a marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ that can be computed by a simple equation that requires no computationally-expensive matrix operations, including matrix determinants and inverses.

Interestingly, we also show that for the Bayesian GRR model, the MML estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\widehat{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\lambda}_q)$ can be obtained through fast and direct calculation of a set of simple closed-form equations, to provide an automatic plug-in estimator of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ that does not require iteration. This automatic plug-in estimator allows $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ to be singular and allows σ^2 to be an unknown parameter with inverse-gamma prior distribution. It is perhaps interesting that the fully general ridge regression model admits faster computational speed in marginal maximum likelihood estimation of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, compared to that of the simpler, ordinary ridge regression and power ridge regression models that have only 1 and 2 parameters for the prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$, respectively. Previous research (Walker and Page, 2001) proposed another set of closed-form equations to provide a plug-in marginal maximum likelihood estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. However, these equations assumed that the error variance σ^2 is fixed and known, and that in applied settings, it is provided by the OLS estimate $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ when σ^2 is unknown. As mentioned, the OLS estimate $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ is unavailable (unstable) when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is singular (ill-conditioned).

In general, the marginal maximum likelihood estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has an obvious interpretation from a frequentist perspective, for either the Bayesian RR model based on estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \widehat{\lambda}$, the Bayesian PRR model where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is a function of the estimate $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$, or the Bayesian GRR model based on the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\widehat{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\lambda}_q)$. Later we will show later that if the ridge parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is assigned a uniform prior distribution, then the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be characterized as the posterior mode of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ under the "Bayes empirical Bayes" framework, a fully Bayesian approach to empirical Bayes (Deely & Lindley, 1981), and is preferred according to the Bayes factor (e.g., Kass & Raftery, 1995) over all pairwise comparisons of all possible ridge parameter values $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\}$.

Conditionally on an obtained ridge marginal maximum likelihood estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, for either the Bayesian RR, PRR, or GRR model, we will show that the marginal posterior covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, posterior predictive quantities of Y given any chosen $\mathbf{x}$, and various auxiliary statistics can be efficiently calculated without needing to evaluate any matrix inverses and large-scale matrix multiplications, which are known to be computationally-expensive when either p or n is large. The subset of "significant" predictors, among the p given covariates, can be identified from Bayesian hypothesis tests of the null hypothesis $H_{0k} : \beta_k = 0$, against the general alternative hypotheses $H_{1k} : \beta_k \neq 0$, for covariates X_k, $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Specifically, in standard practice, a null hypothesis $H_{0k} : \beta_k = 0$ is rejected, thereby labelling the covariate X_k as a "significant predictor," when the 95% posterior credible interval of β_k excludes zero, with interval defined by the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the marginal posterior distribution of β_k. Alternatively, the hypothesis test may be based on whether or not zero is included in the posterior interquartile range (50% credible interval) of the marginal posterior distribution of β_k (Li & Lin, 2010). Yet another alternative statistic is provided by the scaled neighborhood (SN) criterion. This criterion rejects the null hypothesis $H_{0k} : \beta_k = 0$ when the posterior probability of β_k being within one marginal posterior standard deviation of zero is less than 1/2 (Berger, 1993; Li & Lin, 2010).

Conditioning posterior inferences of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ on an estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ does not account for the extra variability that is inherent in the estimation of the ridge parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. For practice involving

real data, this extra variability is negligible when n is sufficiently large, and may not matter much when it is simply of interest to identify significant predictors (covariates), as either having slope coefficients with 95% (or interquartile) posterior credible intervals that exclude zero, or as having SN criteria below the threshold of 1/2. Again, in this study we focus on estimation methods that provide fast, deterministic, and approximate posterior estimation of model parameters, which may be desired in practice for data sets where either p or n can be very large. For very large data sets and/or for data sets having important policy implications, such a deterministic estimation method may be preferred over slower and random-output MCMC posterior estimation methods that aim to fully account for the uncertainty in all ridge model parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \lambda)$. Moreover, for such large data sets, Bayesian point estimation may be preferred over estimation of the full posterior distribution. This is because it is difficult to fully describe the full joint posterior distribution of more than two model parameters, either graphically or analytically (Bernardo & Juárez, 2003), aside from the fact that MCMC may be too computationally-inefficient for sufficiently large data sets. Indeed, many applications of ridge regression models may involve hundreds or thousands of slope coefficient parameters (i.e., covariates).

Ridge regression is unable shrink slope coefficient estimates to exactly zero and hence is unable to eliminate (zero-out) "insignificant" predictors (covariates) from the linear model. In contrast, popular "sparse" shrinkage methods, such as the LASSO (Tibshirani, 1996) and the Elastic Net (EN; Zou & Hastie, 2005) can each shrink coefficient estimates to exactly zero to eliminate (zero-out) "insignificant" predictors (covariates) in the linear model, according to the penalized least squares estimator

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda,\alpha} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{\arg\min} ||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}||^2 + \lambda \sum_{k=1}^{p} \left(\tfrac{(1-\alpha)}{2} \beta_k^2 + \alpha |\beta_k| \right). \tag{5}$$

Above, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, and the choice $\alpha = 1$ defines the LASSO estimator, and $\alpha = 0$ defines a RR estimator, while the choice $\alpha = 1/2$ is viewed as a reasonable compromise (Zou & Hastie, 2005). For either the LASSO or the EN, the shrinkage parameter λ is usually estimated either as the minimizer of 10-fold cross validated mean-square predictive error, or by minimizing a generalized information criterion GIC(λ) (Fan & Tang, 2013). Sparse shrinkage methods also include Bayesian variable selection linear models that are equipped with indicator (0,1) parameters that set slope coefficients to zero with positive prior probability (e.g., Bottolo & Richardson, 2012).

However, from a Bayesian perspective, there are at least three good reasons why shrinkage methods like ridge regression may be preferred over the sparse shrinkage methods. First, it may be argued that no continuous quantity like a slope coefficient β_k is ever precisely zero (Draper, 1999). Similarly, for a Bayesian variable selection model, the posterior average of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is surely non-zero, after averaging over the indicator parameters (Polson & Scott 2012). Then point-null hypotheses of the form $\beta_k = 0$ seem unrealistic, and the posterior average of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ obtained under either of these methods may be practically indistinguishable from the posterior average of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ obtained under a pure shrinkage method. Second, a pure shrinkage method can provide computational gains over sparse shrinking and Bayesian variable selection (model averaging), in terms of speed and simplicity (Polson & Scott 2012). Moreover, shrinkage regression models, in part because they never entirely eliminate (zero-out) predictors, tend to have lower prediction error compared to sparse shrinkage regression methods

(e.g., Tibshirani, 1996).

In the following sections, we describe and illustrate the marginal maximum likelihood estimation methodology, for each of the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models. In order to provide full context for these models, Section 2.1 provides a brief review of the classical inferential theory of the Bayesian linear model (e.g., Denison, et al. 2002; O'Hagan & Forster, 2004). Then in Section 2.2, we define the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models. There we show that for each of these Bayesian models, the posterior mean and covariance estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, and auxiliary statistics such as posterior intervals and SN criteria, can be efficiently calculated the help of the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, without needing to evaluate any computationally-expensive matrix operations such as inverses, determinants, and large-scale matrix multiplications. In practice, this is an important feature when either p or n is large. Then in Section 2.3, we show that for each of the three Bayesian ridge models, the marginal density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \mid \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ can be simplified into an equation involving no matrix operations whatsoever, after taking a s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$. We will also show how the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be obtained for each of the three Bayesian ridge models, under the Bayes empirical Bayes framework (Deely & Lindley, 1981). As mentioned, in this study we will introduce fast iterative algorithms for estimating the parameters of the Bayesian RR and PRR models. For the Bayesian GRR model, we present a set of closed-form equations to provide a non-iterative and automatic plug-in estimator of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, leading to estimates of the coefficients and error variance. For each of the three Bayesian ridge models, the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ provides a basis to directly calculate the posterior mean and covariance estimate of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$, as well as the auxiliary statistics. In Section 3, we briefly review the literature to support the idea that the Bayesian GRR model, including the Bayesian RR and PRR model, has a large scope for applied statistics, because of the model's ability to handle data with a very large number of covariates p (e.g., hundreds or thousands) and corresponding slope coefficient parameters. Ridge regression can provide a flexible and approximate Bayesian nonparametric modeling (Müller & Quintana, 2004), even for linear classification of a binary dependent variable.

Section 4 illustrates the marginal likelihood estimation methodology for the three Bayesian ridge models, through the analysis of 10 real data sets. For nearly all these data sets, the number of covariates (p) range from several hundred to around fifteen thousand. Several of these data sets involve more covariates than observations (i.e., $p > n$). We will also compare the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models under marginal likelihood estimation, with other approaches. They include the Bayesian RR model with ridge parameter λ estimated either by (1) the extended HKB plug-in estimator (Cule & DeIorio, 2013); or (2) by maximizing the original marginal likelihood equation that requires the computation of matrix determinants; or (3) by maximizing the marginal likelihood equation that does not require the computation of matrix determinants but depends on the $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U}$ obtained from the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$ (Neto et al., 2014); or (4) by minimizing 10-fold cross-validated mean-square predictive error; or (5) by minimizing the GCV(λ) criterion. They also include the ordinary Bayesian RR model, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mid \lambda$ assigned a conjugate multivariate-normal inverse-gamma prior distribution along with a gamma prior distribution for λ. They also include the LASSO model and the EN model (with parameter $\alpha = 1/2$), each with shrinkage parameter λ estimated either by minimizing 10-fold cross-validated mean-square predictive error, or by minimizing a Generalized Information Criterion GIC(λ), or by minimizing a Bayesian information criterion BIC(λ), a special case of GIC(λ). Here the GIC(λ) and BIC(λ) criteria are

defined in a way to provide model (or λ) selection that allows the number of covariates p to increase at an exponential rate with n, as $n \to \infty$ (see Fan & Tang, 2013). Across all the different approaches mentioned here, we will compare computation times for parameter estimation, as well as compare the predictive fit to the data according to 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared predictive error. Also we will compare the different ridge regression models in terms of the log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ of the data conditionally on the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Section 4 also reports the results of a simulation study that compares the performance of the 95%, interquartile, and SN hypothesis testing criteria of the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models estimated under marginal maximum likelihood estimation, with the performance of the LASSO and EN models. They are compared in terms of the ability to differentiate between truly-significant from truly-insignificant predictors (covariates), according to Receiver Operator Curve (ROC) analyses. Here, the LASSO and EN models have shrinkage parameter λ estimated either by minimizing GIC(λ) or BIC(λ).

2 Bayesian Generalized Ridge Regression

2.1 The Bayesian Linear Model

Here we review inference methods with the Bayesian linear model, as given in standard textbooks (e.g., Denison et al., 2002; O'Hagan & Forster, 2004)

Consider a given set of data, $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$, where $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n\times p}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$. The Bayesian linear regression model, which assigns a conjugate normal-inverse gamma (NIG) prior density to $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$, is defined by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n) = \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2), && \text{(6a)}\\
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \sigma^2\mathbf{V})\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b), && \text{(6b)}\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V}, a, b), && \text{(6c)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathrm{n}_n(\cdot \,|\, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and $\mathrm{n}(\cdot \,|\, \mu, \sigma^2)$ denote the probability density functions (p.d.f.s) of the n-variate normal distribution and the univariate normal distribution (resp.), and where $\mathrm{ig}(\cdot \,|\, a, b)$ denotes the density function of the inverse-gamma distribution with shape a and rate b (and scale $1/b$). Also, $\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V}, a, b)$ denotes the p.d.f. of the NIG distribution, which as shown in (6b)-(6c) is defined by a product of the multivariate normal p.d.f. and the inverse-gamma p.d.f. (Lindley & Smith, 1972).

Since the joint prior distribution of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ has a NIG distribution, it then follows that, marginally, the prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a Student distribution with mean $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{m}$, covariance matrix $\mathbb{V}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (b/(a-1))\mathbf{V}$, and degrees of freedom $2a$. Also, the prior distribution of σ^2 is an inverse-gamma distribution with mean $\mathbb{E}(\sigma^2) = b/(a-1)$ and variance $\mathbb{V}(\sigma^2) = b^2/\{(a-1)^2(a-2)\}$.

The prior predictive distribution of an observable dependent response, y, conditionally on chosen covariates $\mathbf{x}$, is a Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$
\mathrm{st}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{m}, b(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x}), a) = \iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V},\, a, b)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2, \qquad (7)
$$

with mean $\mathbb{E}(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{m}$, variance $\mathbb{V}(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = (b/(a-2))(1+\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{V}\mathbf{x})$, and degrees of freedom a. More generally, the prior predictive distribution of any given vector of observations $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$, conditionally on any given design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n \times p}$, is a multivariate Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\mathrm{st}(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\mathbf{m}, b(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{X}^\intercal), a) = \iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V},\, a, b) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathrm{d}\sigma^2, \tag{8}$$

along with mean $\mathbb{E}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{m}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbb{V}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = (b/(a-2))(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{X}^\intercal)$, where the diagonal elements of $\mathbb{V}_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X})$ give the prior predictive variances of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$, respectively.

A set of data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ updates the NIG prior density (6c) to a posterior density $\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n)$. Given the conjugacy of the NIG prior p.d.f. (6c) with the normal likelihood p.d.f. (6a), the posterior p.d.f. (distribution) is also a NIG, with p.d.f. given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n) &= \frac{\mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V},\, a, b)}{\displaystyle\iint \mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{V},\, a, b) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathrm{d}\sigma^2} && \text{(9a)} \\
&= \mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \sigma^2 \overline{\mathbf{V}}) \mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{a}, \overline{b}) && \text{(9b)} \\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}), && \text{(9c)}
\end{aligned}$$

with data-updated parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathbf{V}} &= (\mathbf{V}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1}, && \text{(10a)} \\
\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \overline{\mathbf{V}} \left(\mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{y} \right), && \text{(10b)} \\
\overline{a} &= a + n/2, && \text{(10c)} \\
\overline{b} &= b + (\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\intercal \overline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}})/2. && \text{(10d)}
\end{aligned}$$

Above, the second term of the $\overline{b}$ equation is equal to half the sum of squared residuals of the fit, using the posterior mean $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Since the joint posterior distribution of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ has a NIG distribution with p.d.f. $\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b})$, it then follows that the marginal posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a Student distribution with mean $\mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) = \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, covariance $\mathbb{V}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) = (\overline{b}/(\overline{a}-1))\overline{\mathbf{V}}$, and degrees of freedom $2a + n$; and that the marginal posterior distribution of σ^2 is an inverse-gamma distribution with probability density function $\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{a}, \overline{b})$, mean $\mathbb{E}\left(\sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) = \overline{\sigma}^2 = \overline{b}/(\overline{a}-1)$ and variance $\mathbb{V}\left(\sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) = \overline{b}^2 / \left\{(\overline{a}-1)^2(\overline{a}-2)\right\}$.

If $\mathbf{V}^{-1} \to \mathbf{0}$, $a \to 0$, and $b \to 0$ in the NIG prior p.d.f. $\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}, a, b)$, then the posterior mean of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ becomes the OLS estimator, with $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{y}$, along with posterior covariance matrix $\widehat{\sigma}^2 \overline{\mathbf{V}} = \widehat{\sigma}^2 (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}^2 = (\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\intercal \overline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})/(n-p)$ gives the OLS estimate of σ^2. Also, the sampling distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \widehat{\sigma}^2$ is a multivariate normal distribution with density $\mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\sigma}^2 (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1})$. The square roots of the diagonal elements $\mathrm{diag}(\widehat{\sigma}^2 (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1})$ provide the standard errors of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

The normalizing constant (denominator) of the posterior density (9a) is the marginal likelihood of the linear model, defined by:

$$\pi(\mathcal{D}_n) = \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}|^{1/2} b^a \Gamma(\overline{a})}{|\mathbf{V}|^{1/2} \overline{b}^{\overline{a}} \Gamma(a) \pi^{n/2}}, \tag{11}$$

and corresponds to log marginal likelihood:

$$\begin{aligned}\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n) &= \log|\overline{\mathbf{V}}|^{1/2} - \log|\mathbf{V}|^{1/2} + a\log b - \overline{a}\log\overline{b} && \text{(12a)}\\ &\quad + \log\Gamma(\overline{a}) - \log\Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2}\log\pi && \text{(12b)}\\ &= \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{n} \log\pi\left(y_i \,|\, (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}), \ldots, (y_1, \mathbf{x}_1)\right). && \text{(12c)}\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that we compare two different linear models, $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$, assigned NIG prior distributions with densities $\text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{V}_1, a_1, b_1)$ and $\text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{V}_2, a_2, b_2)$, respectively. Then the Bayes factor, defined by a ratio of posterior odds to prior odds, given by

$$B_{12} = \frac{\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \mathcal{M}_1)}{\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \mathcal{M}_2)} = \frac{\pi(\mathcal{M}_1 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n)}{\pi(\mathcal{M}_2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n)} \Big/ \frac{\pi(\mathcal{M}_1)}{\pi(\mathcal{M}_2)}, \tag{13}$$

provides a measure of whether the data $\mathcal{D}_n$ have increased or decreased the odds on model $\mathcal{M}_1$ relative to model $\mathcal{M}_2$ (Kass & Raftery, 1995). The natural log of the Bayes factor, $\log B_{12}$, measures the weight of evidence of model $\mathcal{M}_1$ versus model $\mathcal{M}_2$ (Good, 1950). A Bayes factor B_{12} ($\log B_{12}$, resp.) that takes on a value less than 1 (less than 0, resp.) indicates higher support for model $\mathcal{M}_2$ over model $\mathcal{M}_1$; a value between 1 to 3 (between 0 to 1.1, resp.) indicates a slightly higher odds for model $\mathcal{M}_1$ versus model $\mathcal{M}_2$ that is "non-significant"; a value between 3 to 10 (between 1.1 to 2.3, resp.) indicates substantially higher odds for model $\mathcal{M}_1$; a value between 10 to 30 (between 2.3 to 3.4, resp.) indicates a strongly-higher odds in favor of model $\mathcal{M}_1$; a value between 30 to 100 (between 3.4 to 4.6, resp.) indicates very strongly-higher odds in favor of model $\mathcal{M}_1$; and a value greater than 100 (4.6, resp.) indicates a decisively-higher odds in favor of model $\mathcal{M}_1$ (Jeffreys, 1961).

The posterior predictive distribution of an observable dependent response, y, given a chosen covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$, is given by the Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\text{st}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{b}(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{x}), \overline{a}) = \int\int \text{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)\text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b})\text{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\text{d}\sigma^2, \tag{14}$$

along with mean $\mathbb{E}_n(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, variance $\mathbb{V}_n(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = (\overline{b}/(\overline{a} - 2))(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{x})$, and degrees of freedom $\overline{a}$. By extension, the posterior predictive distribution of any given vector of dependent observations $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$, conditionally on any chosen design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n\times p}$, is given by the multivariate Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\text{st}(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{b}(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal), \overline{a}) = \iint \text{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)\text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b})\text{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\text{d}\sigma^2, \tag{15}$$

along with mean vector $\mathbb{E}_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbb{V}_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = (b/(a-2))(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal)$. The diagonal elements of $\mathbb{V}_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X})$ give the posterior predictive variances of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$, respectively.

The usual auxiliary statistics can be calculated from a Bayesian normal linear model that is fit to data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$. They include:

- R-squared, $R^2 = 1 - \{||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}||^2/||\mathbf{y} - \overline{y}\mathbf{I}_n||^2\}$, with $\overline{y} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$;

- The $n \times n$ hat matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{V}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^\intercal = \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal, \tag{16}$$

  where $\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{E}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}$, with diagonal elements $\text{diag}(\mathbf{H}) = (h_{11}, \ldots, h_{nn})^\intercal$ measuring the influence or leverage of the dependent observations $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ on the estimates $(\widehat{y}_1, \ldots, \widehat{y}_n)$, respectively (for related definitions under the OLS context, see Hoaglin & Welsch 1978);

- Standardized residuals, given by $r_i = \{y_i - \mathbb{E}_n(Y_i \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i)\}/\{(1 - h_{ii})^{1/2}\mathbb{V}_n^{1/2}(Y_i \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i)\}$, or approximated by $r_i \approx \{y_i - \mathbb{E}_n(Y_i \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i)\}/\overline{\sigma}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$;

- The change in coefficient estimates after removing y_i, given by $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(i)} = \overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{x}_i(y_i - \mathbb{E}_n(Y_i \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i))/(1 - h_{ii})$, assuming prior mean $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$ for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ (Hoaglin & Welsch 1978);

- The effective degrees of freedom of the model, given by the trace $\text{df} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_{i=1}^n h_{ii}$; while $\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\intercal)$ is the degrees of freedom for the variance σ^2, and $\text{tr}(2\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\intercal)$ is the degrees of freedom for regression error (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990).

In conclusion, as shown in equation (10a), the computation of the NIG posterior mean $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and covariance matrix $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ depends on a matrix inversion; as shown in (11), the computation of the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n)$ depends on the computation of matrix determinants $|\overline{\mathbf{V}}|^{1/2}$ and $|\mathbf{V}|^{1/2}$; and as shown in (14) and (16), the computation of the posterior predictive p.d.f. of $\mathbf{y}$ given $\mathbf{X}$, and of the hat matrix $\mathbf{H}$, depends on a matrix multiplication $\mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal$. The matrix inverse, determinants, and multiplication are computationally expensive when either p or n is large, especially when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is non-diagonal. However, as we show in the next two subsections, under either the Bayesian RR, PRR, or GRR models, and after taking a singular value decomposition (s.v.d.) of $\mathbf{X}$, the equations of the posterior covariance matrix, marginal likelihood, and the posterior predictive p.d.f., and hat matrix, can each be simplified to a form where they do not require the direct computation of any matrix inverses, determinants, or large-scale matrix multiplications. This fact helps speed up the computation of these quantities, considerably.

2.2 Bayesian Ridge Regression

The ridge regression (RR) model can be characterized as a Bayesian linear model that assigns a normal $\text{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p)$ prior distribution for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, conditionally on σ^2. If a normal inverse-gamma $\text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p, a, b)$ prior is assigned to $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$, then all the same inferential procedures of the Bayesian normal linear model apply to the ridge regression model, as described in the previous subsection.

After taking a s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, we can gain further insight about the properties of the estimators under OLS, Bayesian RR, power ridge regression (PRR), and generalized ridge regression (GRR) models. We can also gain insight about more computationally-efficient strategies for computing the quantities necessary for performing prior and posterior inferences with each of the three ridge models.

Recall that the s.v.d. of a design matrix $\mathbf{X}$ is given by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{W}^\intercal$, where $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ are orthogonal matrices of dimensions $n \times q$ and $p \times q$, respectively, with $q = \min(n, p)$

and $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{UD} = \mathbf{XW}$. Here, $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_q)$ is the diagonal matrix of singular values $d_1 > \cdots > d_q > 0$, with $(d_1^2, \ldots, d_q^2)$ giving at most the first $q \leq p$ non-zero eigenvalues $(d_1^2, \ldots, d_p^2)^\intercal$ of $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$, and giving the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{Z}$. Also, the columns of $\mathbf{XW}$ give the q principal components of $\mathbf{X}$, so that the column-wise sum of squares over the rows yields returns the eigenvalues $(d_1^2, \ldots, d_q^2)$.

The canonical normal linear model, for the orthogonalized data $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y})$, is defined by the multivariate normal likelihood density:

$$\text{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{XW}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n), \tag{17}$$

The OLS estimate of the canonical regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q)^\intercal$ is given by:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_q)^\intercal = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^\intercal\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{Z})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{y} = \text{diag}(d_1^2, \ldots, d_q^2)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{y}. \tag{18}$$

Then for the normal linear model for the original data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$, with likelihood defined by multivariate normal likelihood p.d.f.,

$$\text{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n), \tag{19}$$

the OLS estimate of the slope coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is given by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{W}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. Also, for either the canonical linear model defined on the orthogonalized data $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y})$, or for the normal linear model defined for the original data $\mathcal{D}_n = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$, the OLS estimate of the error variance parameter σ^2 satisfies the equality:

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \tfrac{1}{n-p}||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}||^2 = \tfrac{1}{n-p}||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}||^2.$$

Suppose that an NIG prior distribution is assigned to the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2)$ of the canonical normal linear model, with this prior having p.d.f.:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2) &= \text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}, a, b) && \text{(20a)} \\
&= \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1})\text{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b), && \text{(20b)} \\
&= \text{nig}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}, a, b) && \text{(20c)}
\end{aligned}$$

In (20b), the multivariate normal conditional prior p.d.f.

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2) = \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}) = \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}), \tag{21}$$

defines the GRR prior for the slope coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ of the canonical model, given σ^2.

Based on standard results involving affine transformations, the (conditional) multivariate normal prior distribution (p.d.f.) of (21), for the slope coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2$ of the canonical model, implies that for the original data space, the conditional prior distribution for $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (given σ^2) has multivariate normal p.d.f.:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2) = \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal) = \text{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\mathbf{W}^\intercal). \tag{22}$$

The prior density (22) gives the prior distribution (p.d.f.) for the generalized ridge regression (GRR) (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970). Also, the NIG prior distribution (p.d.f.) for the parameters

$(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2)$ of the canonical model, given by (20), implies a NIG prior distribution (p.d.f.) for the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ of the normal linear model defined on the original data space, with prior p.d.f. given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal, a, b) && \text{(23a)}\\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal)\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b) && \text{(23b)}\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\mathbf{W}^\intercal, a, b) && \text{(23c)}\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, a, b). && \text{(23d)}
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that under the Bayesian GRR model, the prior predictive distribution of an observable dependent response, y, conditionally on chosen covariates $\mathbf{x}$, is a Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{st}(y \,|\, \mathbf{0}, b(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x}), a) && \text{(24a)}\\
= &\iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal,\, a, b)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2, && \text{(24b)}
\end{aligned}$$

with mean $\mathbb{E}(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{m}$, variance $\mathbb{V}(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = (b/(a-2))(1+\mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x})$, and degrees of freedom a. More generally, the prior predictive distribution of any given vector of observations $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$, conditionally on any given design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n\times p}$, is a multivariate Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{st}(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, b(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{X}^\intercal), a) && \text{(25)}\\
= &\iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal,\, a, b)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2, && \text{(26)}
\end{aligned}$$

along with mean $\mathbb{E}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$ (with $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$) and covariance matrix $\mathbb{V}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = (b/(a-2))(\mathbf{I}_p+\mathbf{X}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{X}^\intercal)$, where the diagonal elements of $\mathbb{V}_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \,|\, \mathbf{X})$ give the prior predictive variances of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$, respectively.

A special case of the GRR prior (22) is given by the ordinary ridge regression (RR) prior, which assumes the equality constraint $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_q$. In this case, the multivariate normal prior p.d.f. (22) for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(27a)}\\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\mathbf{W}^\intercal) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p), && \text{(27b)}
\end{aligned}$$

and corresponds to multivariate normal prior p.d.f.:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_q) \qquad \text{(28)}$$

for the canonical normal linear model (17).

Another special case of the GRR prior (22) includes the power ridge regression (PRR) prior (Frank & Friedman, 1993), which assumes that the prior p.d.f. (22) for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(29a)}\\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(d_1^{2\delta}/\lambda, \ldots, d_q^{2\delta}/\lambda)\mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(29b)}\\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{W}\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(29c)}\\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X})^\delta), && \text{(29d)}
\end{aligned}$$

for parameters δ and $\lambda > 0$, so that $\lambda_k = d_k^{2\delta}/\lambda$, for $k = 1, \ldots, q$. In (29), the conditional prior p.d.f. for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$, for the normal linear model (19), implies for the canonical linear model (17), a multivariate normal prior distribution (p.d.f.) for $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2$, defined by:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \mathrm{diag}(d_1^{2\delta}/\lambda, \ldots, d_q^{2\delta}/\lambda)). \tag{30}$$

As mentioned, if $\delta = 0$, then the PR prior reduces to the ordinary ridge prior $\mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2/\lambda \mathbf{I}_p)$, so that $\mathrm{diag}(d_1^{2\delta}, \ldots, d_q^{2\delta}) = \mathbf{I}_q$, thereby expressing no preference for the eigenvalues. A prior parameter $\delta > 0$ expresses greater preference for larger eigenvalues, and defines a prior that gives rise to (approximately) principle components regression and penalized least squares regression. A prior choice $\delta < 0$ expresses greater preference for smaller eigenvalues for the coefficients. In particular, the choice $\delta = -1$ yields Zellner's (1986) g-prior, in which case the conditional prior (29) for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2) &= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{W} \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(31a)} \\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{W} \mathrm{diag}(d_1^{-2}/\lambda, \ldots, d_q^{-2}/\lambda) \mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(31b)} \\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathbf{W}^\intercal) && \text{(31c)} \\
&= \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X})^{-1}). && \text{(31d)}
\end{aligned}$$

Also, if $\mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{X}$ is singular and $\delta \neq 0$, then the PRR prior (29) for the conditional random variable $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ becomes a singular normal distribution.

According to standard inference procedures with the Bayesian linear model, under the NIG prior p.d.f. (20) for the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2)$ of the canonical linear model, including GRR prior p.d.f. (21) for $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \sigma^2$, the posterior distribution of $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2)$ is a NIG distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n) &= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1 + d_1^2, \ldots, \lambda_q + d_q^2)^{-1}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && \text{(32a)} \\
&= \mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \sigma^2 \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1 + d_1^2, \ldots, \lambda_q + d_q^2)^{-1}) \mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && \text{(32b)} \\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, (\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q) + \mathbf{Z}^\intercal \mathbf{Z})^{-1}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && \text{(32c)} \\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}), && \text{(32d)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathbf{Z}^\intercal \mathbf{y} = (\overline{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}1}, \ldots, \overline{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}p})^\intercal = \left(\frac{d_1^2/\lambda_1}{1 + d_1^2/\lambda_1} \widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \frac{d_q^2/\lambda_q}{1 + d_q^2/\lambda_q} \widehat{\alpha}_q \right)^\intercal, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{a} &= a + n/2, && \text{(34a)} \\
\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} &= b + (\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\intercal \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})/2 && \text{(34b)} \\
&= b + \left(\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^q \overline{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^2 (\lambda_k + d_k^2) \right)/2 && \text{(34c)} \\
&= b + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^q \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2} \right). && \text{(34d)}
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ has posterior distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n) &= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \mathbf{W}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1 + d_1^2, \ldots, \lambda_q + d_q^2)^{-1}\mathbf{W}^{\intercal}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && (35)\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{W}\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \mathbf{W}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\mathbf{W}^{\intercal}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && (36)\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}), && (37)\\
&= \mathrm{n}_p(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \sigma^2\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}), && (38)\\
&= \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) && (39)
\end{aligned}$$

with marginal posterior means and variances that are readily calculated by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) &= \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{W}\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, && (40)\\
\mathbb{V}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) &= (\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/(\overline{a} - 1))\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, && (41)\\
\mathbb{E}\left(\sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) &= \overline{\sigma}^2_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/(\overline{a} - 1), && (42)\\
\mathbb{V}\left(\sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n\right) &= \overline{b}^2_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\left\{(\overline{a} - 1)^2(\overline{a} - 2)\right\}, && (43)
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. Above, $\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ satisfies the equality:

$$\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = b + (\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\intercal}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})/2 = b + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q}\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2}\right), \tag{44}$$

which is computationally-efficient since the latter term does not require a large matrix multiplication.

While the equations (32)-(44) for the posterior distribution of $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma^2)$ and of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ were stated for the Bayesian GRR model, they easily extend to the Bayesian PRR model, and to the Bayesian RR model, using characterizations of these latter two models, stated earlier. Specifically, for the Bayesian RR model, posterior equations (32)-(44) hold after assuming $\lambda_k = \lambda$, for $k = 1, \ldots, q$ and for parameter λ. For the Bayesian PRR model, posterior equations (32)-(44) hold after assuming $\lambda_k = d_k^{2\delta}/\lambda$, for $k = 1, \ldots, q$ and for parameters (δ, λ). For the g-prior, given by a PRR prior with $\delta = -1$, the conditional posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2$ has a p-variate normal p.d.f.:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \sigma^2, \mathcal{D}_n) = \mathrm{n}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,\middle|\, \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + 1}\right)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + 1}\right)\sigma^2(\mathbf{X}^{\intercal}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\right), \tag{45}$$

so that under the g-prior, the conditional posterior mean and variance of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a shrunken version of the OLS estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

Now we remark on the bias and mean-squared error properties of the OLS estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and the GRR estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. First, it is well-known that the OLS estimator is unbiased, that is, its bias $\mathrm{b}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is given by:

$$\mathrm{b}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} = \int \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}F(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) - \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0} \tag{46}$$

for any given true population parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, with expectation $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}$ taken over a given population distribution $F(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ of $(\mathbf{X} = (x_{ik})_{n\times p}, \mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{p\times 1})$, holding $n > 0$ and

$p > 0$ fixed, and with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ denoting an OLS estimate obtained from a sample of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ from that population. The mean-squared error (MSE) of the OLS estimator, which is also the variance of the estimator since it is unbiased, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})} ||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}||^2 = \text{b}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \text{b}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \text{tr}\mathbb{V}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}) \quad (47a) \\ &= \text{tr}\mathbb{V}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}) = \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{d_k^2}, \quad (47b) \end{aligned}$$

where $||\cdot||$ denotes the L^2 norm, and $\text{tr}\mathbb{V}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}$ denotes the trace (tr) of the sampling covariance matrix. Therefore, if $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is ill-conditioned with one or more of the eigenvalues d_k^2 near or at zero, then the corresponding inverses $1/d_k^2$, and hence the $\text{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ of the OLS estimator diverges to infinity.

Under the Bayesian GRR model, the bias for the estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is given by:

$$\text{b}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{W}\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)\mathbf{W}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{W}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\mathbf{W}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta} \quad (48)$$

(e.g., Singh, 2010). In general, the bias is non-zero if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is non-zero. The mean-squared error of the GRR model is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})} ||\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\} - \boldsymbol{\beta}||^2 = \text{b}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \text{b}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \text{tr}\mathbb{V}_{(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y})}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \quad (49a) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{d_k^2\sigma^2 + \lambda_k^2\alpha_k^2}{\left(d_k^2 + \lambda_k\right)^2} \quad (49b) \end{aligned}$$

(Goldstein & Smith, 1974, p.288), which as shown, is a function of $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)$ and is always decreasing at $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}$. This implies the existence of a ranges of values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that the $\text{MSE}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ of the ridge estimator is always lower that the $\text{MSE}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ of the OLS estimator, for any linear model. This is true especially when $\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is ill-conditioned or singular. Also the preceding discussion about the bias and the MSE for the estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ under the Bayesian GRR model also extend to the Bayesian RR model under the assumption $\lambda_k = \lambda$, for $k = 1, \ldots, q$; and extend to the Bayesian PRR model under the assumption $\lambda_k = d_k^{2\delta}/\lambda$, for $k = 1, \ldots, q$.

As a consequence of taking the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, the posterior quantities do not require computationally-expensive matrix operations on large non-diagonal matrices, for either the Bayesian GRR model, or special cases of this model including the Bayesian RR model (where $\lambda_k = \lambda$, $k = 1, \ldots, q$), and the Bayesian PRR model (where $\lambda_k = d_k^{2\delta}/\lambda$, $k = 1, \ldots, q$). For example, for each of these three ridge models, the marginal posterior mean of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be efficiently computed by $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{W}\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, as shown by equation (40); and the computation for the posterior rate $\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ of the error variance parameter σ^2 can be computed without needing to evaluate the matrix product $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, as shown by equation (44).

As a consequence of taking the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$, we can also calculate other posterior quantities without needing to perform other computationally-expensive matrix operations, for either of the three ridge models. These operations include matrix inversion to obtain the $p \times p$ posterior covariance matrix $\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$; and include large-scale matrix products such as $\mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{x}$ or $\mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal$ that are needed to make posterior predictive inferences. Such operations are computationally expensive when either p or n is large.

To elaborate, we now describe the computationally efficient strategies for the posterior quantities for the Bayesian GRR, RR, and PRR models. In the remainder of this subsection we will explain these strategies in terms of the Bayesian GRR model having NIG prior (20), with the understanding that the Bayesian RR model assumes a specialized NIG prior under the constraints $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_q$; while the Bayesian PRR model assumes a specialized prior under the constraints $\lambda_k = d_k^{2\delta}/\lambda$ for $k = 1, \ldots, q$.

The marginal posterior variances of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, extracted from the marginal posterior covariance matrix in equation (41), can be more simply computed as:

$$\left(\frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\overline{a}-1}\right)\mathrm{diag}(\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}1} \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k} \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}p} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{(\overline{a}-1)} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^{q} w_{1k}^2/(\lambda_k + d_k^2) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^{q} w_{kk}^2/(\lambda_k + d_k^2) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^{q} w_{pk}^2/(\lambda_k + d_k^2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{50}$$

where the w_{1k}s are the elements of the matrix $\mathbf{W}$ obtained from the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$. The above computational strategy avoids the computationally-demanding matrix inversion $\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\mathbf{V}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X})^{-1}$.

Also, while the posterior predictive distribution of an observable response, y, given a chosen covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$, is a Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\mathrm{st}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{b}(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{x}), \overline{a}) = \iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2, \tag{51}$$

the variance $\mathbb{V}_n(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x})$ of this distribution can be efficiently computed as:

$$\mathbb{V}_n(Y \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\overline{a}-2}\right)(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\overline{a}-2}\right)\left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} x_k w_{kl}\right)^2}{\lambda_l + d_l^2}\right), \tag{52}$$

while avoiding the need to directly evaluate the computationally-expensive matrix product $\mathbf{x}^\intercal\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{x}$. Similarly, the posterior predictive distribution of any chosen vector of dependent response $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\intercal$, conditionally on any chosen design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n\times p}$, is a multivariate Student distribution with p.d.f.:

$$\mathrm{st}(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{b}(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal), \overline{a}) = \iint \mathrm{n}(y \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\,, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\beta}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2. \tag{53}$$

Here, the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix $\mathbb{V}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}) = (b/(a-2))(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal)$, which give the marginal posterior predictive variances of $(Y_n, \ldots, Y_n) \,|\, \mathbf{X}$, can be efficiently computed as:

$$\mathrm{diag}\{\mathbb{V}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X})\} = \left(\frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\overline{a}-2}\right)(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^\intercal) = \left(\frac{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\overline{a}-2}\right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} x_{1k} w_{kl}\right)^2}{\lambda_l + d_l^2} \\ \vdots \\ 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} x_{nk} w_{kl}\right)^2}{\lambda_l + d_l^2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{54}$$

without needing to directly evaluate the computationally-expensive matrix product $\mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^{\intercal}$.

Also, if $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^{\intercal}$ and $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ip})_{n\times p}$ give the observed dependent responses and covariates of the data $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$, then the diagonal elements of the hat matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathbf{X}^{\intercal}$ from (16) are readily obtained as:

$$\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{H}) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} \\ \vdots \\ h_{nn} \end{pmatrix} = \left(\frac{\overline{a} - 2}{\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}\right)\operatorname{diag}\{\mathbb{V}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X})\} - 1. \tag{55}$$

The Bayesian GRR model has degrees of freedom (effective number of model parameters) that can be efficiently computed by:

$$\mathrm{df} = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{ii} = \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{d_k^2}{d_k^2 + \lambda_k}, \tag{56}$$

with degrees of freedom for variance efficiently computed by $\sum_{k=1}^{q} d_k^4 / \left(d_k^2 + \lambda_k\right)^2$.

Finally, for either the Bayesian GRR, RR, and PRR regression models, various auxiliary statistics can be used to test for the (predictive) significance of each covariate X_k, for $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Since the posterior probability that $H_0 : \beta_k = 0$ is always zero (for $k = 1, \ldots, p$), a common practice is to view the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_k = 0$ as an approximation to the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_k \in [-t, t]$ for some small constant $t > 0$ (Berger 1993). Then we may reject the null hypothesis when zero is outside the 95% marginal posterior interval of β_k,

$$\left(\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}^{-1}(.025 \,|\, \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2}), \mathrm{St}_{2a+n}^{-1}(.975 \,|\, \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2})\right), \tag{57}$$

or outside the interquartile (50%) marginal posterior interval of β_k,

$$\left(\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}^{-1}(.25 \,|\, \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2}), \mathrm{St}_{2a+n}^{-1}(.75 \,|\, \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2})\right), \tag{58}$$

or when the scaled neighborhood (SN) criterion of β_k, given by

$$\mathrm{SN}_k = \mathrm{St}_{2a+n}(\{\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2} - \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}\}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2}) - \mathrm{St}_{2a+n}(\{-\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2} - \overline{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}\}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2}), \tag{59}$$

is less than 1/2 (Li & Lin, 2010). Above, $\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}(\cdot)$ denotes the standard Student cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) with mean zero, variance 1, and $2a+n$ degrees of freedom, with $\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}^{-1}(u)$ giving a quantile at $u \in [0, 1]$. Also, the SN criterion is defined by the marginal posterior probability that β_k lies within the interval $[-\widetilde{v}_k^{1/2}, \widetilde{v}_k^{1/2}]$ of β_k values within one marginal posterior standard deviation of 0.

2.3 MML Estimation of λ Based on the S.V.D.

Consider the marginal likelihood (MML) estimation of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. For this, we will consider the "Bayes Empirical Bayes" statistical framework (Deely & Lindley, 1981), which defines the posterior density of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$ for the Bayesian GRR model as:

$$\pi_u(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n) = \int \mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\pi(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \tag{60a}$$

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n) \propto \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})\pi(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \tag{60b}$$

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{q} \mathrm{u}(\lambda_k \,|\, 0, \lambda_{\max}), \tag{60c}$$

with uniform prior densities $\mathrm{u}(\lambda_k \,|\, 0, \lambda_{\max})$ assuming a suitably large $\lambda_{\max}$ such as 10^{10}, and assuming a non-informative prior inverse-gamma density for σ^2, approximated by $\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a = 0^+, b = 0^+)$, with $0^+ = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} t$. Then in the above setup (60), the MML point-estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is not only the choice of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ which maximizes the marginal likelihood $\pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, and the log-marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, but is also the mode of the posterior density $\pi(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n)$; and gives rise to the posterior mode point-estimate $\mathrm{nig}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}})$ for the posterior density (distribution) of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$.

For the Bayesian RR model, with NIG prior density given by equation (23) (equation (20) for the canonical space), assuming the constraint $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_q$, it can be shown using simple algebra that:

$$\log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}}{|\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}} = \log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}}{|\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ q \log \lambda - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \log \left(\lambda + d_k^2 \right) \right\}, \tag{61}$$

and

$$\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = b + (\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\intercal \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})/2 = b + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda + d_k^2} \right). \tag{62}$$

Figure 1 in `http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/figuresRidge.pdf`

Then for this model, the log-marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \log |\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} - \log |\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} + a \log b - \overline{a} \log \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} && \text{(63a)} \\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(\overline{a}) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi && \text{(63b)} \\
&= \tfrac{q}{2} \log \lambda - \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{q} \log \left(\lambda + d_k^2 \right) + a \log b && \text{(63c)} \\
&\quad - \overline{a} \log \left\{ b + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda + d_k^2} \right) \right\} && \text{(63d)} \\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(\overline{a}) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi. && \text{(63e)}
\end{aligned}$$

After retaining only the terms that depend on λ, we find that the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ is the choice $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$ which maximizes:

$$q \log \lambda - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \log \left(\lambda + d_k^2 \right) - n \log \left(\mathbf{y}^\intercal \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda + d_k^2} \right). \tag{64}$$

Given data $\mathcal{D}_n$, the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ for the ridge model can be quickly obtained by a two-step algorithm. The first step evaluates $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ for successive values $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}k$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, until a value k^* is found such that $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda = \frac{1}{4}k^*) < \log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda = \frac{1}{4}(k^* - 1))$. The second step obtains the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ as the the value $\lambda \in [\max\{0, \frac{1}{4}(k^* - 1)\}, \frac{1}{4}(k^* + 1)]$ which minimizes $-\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$. The minimization step can be performed by using the `fminbnd()` function of MATLAB (Natick, MA).

For the Bayesian RR model, Figure 1 presents the relationship between λ, the log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, mean-squared error of the RR estimate $\mathrm{MSE}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, and the generalized cross-validation criterion $\mathrm{GCV}(\lambda)$. This relationship is based on fitting the Bayesian RR model to a data set that was simulated according to $n = 100$ observations, $p = 10$ covariates, with each dependent observation sampled as $Y_i \,|\, \mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathrm{N}(\mathbf{x}_i^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{\beta}, s^2 = 1)$, covariates $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ip})^{\intercal}$ drawn from a p-variate normal distribution with variances equal 1 and inter-variable correlations of $1/2$. Among other things, the figure shows that, as a function of λ, the maximization of the log-marginal likelihood roughly corresponds to a minimization of the mean-squared error. Also, this figure suggests that the function $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ is log-concave, and this will be further illustrated on real data sets in Section 4.

For the Bayesian PRR model, which in terms of the NIG prior (23) (equation (20) for the canonical space) assumes that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a function of two parameters (λ, δ) and the eigenvalues $(d_k^2)_{k=1}^q$ of $\mathbf{X}^{\intercal}\mathbf{X}$, the direct evaluation of the matrix determinants can be avoided because:

$$\log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}}{|\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}} = \log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}}{|\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{q} \left\{ \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta}) - \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2) \right\}, \tag{65}$$

and because:

$$\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = b + (\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\intercal}\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})/2 = b + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{(d_k^{4\delta+4}\widehat{\alpha}_k^2)\left(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2\right)}{\left(\lambda + d_k^{2\delta+2}\right)^2} \right). \tag{66}$$

Then for this model, we can write the log marginal likelihood function as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \delta) && (67)\\
&= \log |\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} - \log |\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} + a \log b - \overline{a} \log \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} && (68)\\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(\overline{a}) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi && (69)\\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{q} \left\{ \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta}) - \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2) \right\} + a \log b && (70)\\
&\quad - \overline{a} \log \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{(d_k^{4\delta+4}\widehat{\alpha}_k^2)\left(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2\right)}{\left(\lambda + d_k^{2\delta+2}\right)^2} \right) \right\} && (71)\\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(a + n/2) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi. && (72)
\end{aligned}$$

After retaining only the terms that depend on (λ, δ), it then follows that the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ is the choice of parameters (λ, δ) that maximizes:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q} \left\{ \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta}) - \log(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2) \right\} - n \log \left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{(d_k^{4\delta+4}\widehat{\alpha}_k^2)\left(\lambda/d_k^{2\delta} + d_k^2\right)}{\left(\lambda + d_k^{2\delta+2}\right)^2} \right). \tag{73}$$

The estimate the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ can be obtained by a two stage algorithm. After initiating with $\widehat{\delta} = 0$, the first stage of the algorithm evaluates $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \widehat{\delta})$ searches through successive values $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}k$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, until a value k^* is found such that $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda = \frac{1}{4}k^*, \widehat{\delta}) < \log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda = \frac{1}{4}(k^* - 1), \widehat{\delta})$, and then obtains the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ as the the value $\lambda \in [\max\{0, \frac{1}{4}(k^* - 1)\}, \frac{1}{4}(k^* + 1)]$ which minimizes $-\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \widehat{\delta})$

using the `fminbnd()` MATLAB function. The second stage of the algorithm updates the estimate $\widehat{\delta}$ as the minimizer of $-\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \widehat{\lambda}, \delta)$ using `fminbnd()` again. The two stages are repeated until the last update $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ produces an increase in $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \widehat{\lambda}, \delta)$ that is less than 10^{-4}. We will find in Section 4 that this marginal maximum likelihood estimation algorithm is reasonably fast for a large range of data sets, but it is necessarily slower than the estimation algorithm for the Bayesian RR model.

For the Bayesian PRR model, Figure 2 presents the relationship between the parameters λ and δ, the log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \delta)$, and the mean-squared error of the PRR estimate $\mathrm{MSE}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. This displayed relationship is based on fitting the Bayesian PRR model to the same simulated data set that was analyze by the Bayesian RR model, as mentioned earlier.

Figure 2 in `http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/figuresRidge.pdf`

For the Bayesian GRR model, with NIG prior density given by equation (23) (equation (20) for the canonical space), the log marginal likelihood of the data can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \log |\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} - \log |\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2} + a \log b - \overline{a} \log \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} && (74)\\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(\overline{a}) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi && (75)\\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{q} \{\log(\lambda_k) - \log(\lambda_k + d_k)\} + a \log b && (76)\\
&\quad - \overline{a} \log \left\{ b + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2} \right) \right\} && (77)\\
&\quad + \log \Gamma(a + n/2) - \log \Gamma(a) - \tfrac{n}{2} \log \pi. && (78)
\end{aligned}$$

For the general ridge model, the direct evaluation of the matrix determinants $|\overline{\mathbf{V}}|$ and $|\mathbf{V}|$ can be avoided because:

$$\log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}}{|\mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|^{1/2}} = \log \frac{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}}{|\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}|^{1/2}} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{q} \log(\lambda_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \log(\lambda_k + d_k) \right\}, \tag{79}$$

and

$$\overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = b + (\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\intercal} \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})/2 = b + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2} \right). \tag{80}$$

It then follows that the marginal maximum likelihood estimate of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is the maximizer of

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q} \{\log(\lambda_k) - \log(\lambda_k + d_k)\} - n \log \left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{q} \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2} \right). \tag{81}$$

We can immediately see from the equation above that the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is obtained by finding the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}_k$ that maximizes the functions:

$$\phi(\lambda_k) = \log(\lambda_k) - \log(\lambda_k + d_k) - n \log \left(\mathbf{y}^{\intercal}\mathbf{y} - \frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 d_k^4}{\lambda_k + d_k^2} \right), \tag{82}$$

for all $k = 1, \ldots, q$, each of which have first derivative:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda_k}\phi(\lambda_k) = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d_k^2\left(d_k^4\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 + n\lambda_k d_k^2\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 - (\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y})d_k^2 - (\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y})\lambda_k\right)}{\lambda_k\left(d_k^2+\lambda_k\right)\left(-d_k^4\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 + (\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y})d_k^2 + (\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y})\lambda_k\right)}. \tag{83}$$

Solving for λ_k at $\dfrac{d}{d\lambda_k}\phi(\lambda_k) = 0$ yields:

$$\widehat{\lambda}_k = \max\left(\frac{d_k^2\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y} - d_k^4\widehat{\alpha}_k^2}{d_k^2 n\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 - \mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y}}, \lambda_{\max}\mathbf{1}\left(\frac{d_k^2\mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y} - d_k^4\widehat{\alpha}_k^2}{d_k^2 n\widehat{\alpha}_k^2 - \mathbf{y}^\intercal\mathbf{y}} \leq 0\right)\right), \text{ for } k = 1, \ldots, q, \tag{84}$$

to provide the marginal maximum likelihood estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\widehat{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\lambda}_k, \ldots, \widehat{\lambda}_q)$ for the Bayesian GRR model.

3 On the Ridge Models and Corresponding Estimation Approaches

Sections 1-3 focused on Bayesian GRR, PRR, and RR linear regression models, assuming a continuous-valued dependent variable. These ridge models and corresponding estimation approaches may appear limited in scope. However, by drawing from the existing literature, it may be argued that this scope can be large for applied regression analysis. We list some of the arguments below.

3.1 Ridge Regression as (approximate) Bayesian Nonparametric Modeling

The ridge regression model allows for a fast least-squares estimation of model parameters, even when the number of covariates p is very large (e.g., in the hundreds or thousands), and when $p > n$. This modeling approach, where the number of coefficient parameters p may be very large, is similar in spirit to Bayesian nonparametric (BNP) modeling. This modeling approach involves the specification of models with infinitely (or massively) many parameters, for the purposes of providing flexible and robust statistical inference (Müller & Quintana, 2004). So for the ridge regression model, if the number of covariates p is chosen to be an increasing function of n, then the model meets this technical definition of the BNP model as $n \to \infty$. Indeed, it was recently shown that, despite its simple prior structure, the Bayesian RR model displayed good predictive performance for many data sets (Griffin & Brown, 2013).

For example, a flexible linear model where p grows with n, may assume the mean function:

$$\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathbf{x}] = \mathbf{x}^\intercal\boldsymbol{\beta} = \sum_{k=1}^{L}\beta_k x_k + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_i B_i(\mathbf{x}), \tag{85}$$

where $B_i(\mathbf{x})$ is a multivariate spline, such as a cubic spline $B_i(\mathbf{x}) = ||\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i||^3$ with knots $\mathbf{x}_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ (Müller & Rios Insua, 1998; Denison et al., 2002, p. 102). Here, $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_i B_i(\mathbf{x})$ is the linear combination of basis functions that captures departures of linearity of the underlying regression function. The covariates of this mean function (85) can be easily specified (before centering and scaling all the $p = L + n$ covariates), before subjecting $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ to ridge shrinkage posterior estimation. Also, high dimensional (large p) shrinkage linear regression models can be characterized by Lévy processes (see Polson & Scott, 2012).

3.2 Ridge Regression as a Student Process

As the prior predictive density equation (24) shows, the Bayesian GRR model assumes that $h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a Student process with zero mean function $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{x})) = 0$ and non-stationary covariance function

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{x})h(\mathbf{x}')) = b(1 + \mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{W} \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\intercal \mathbf{x}')(a-2)^{-1}. \tag{86}$$

Given σ^2, $h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process (GP) under the "weight-space view," with covariance function

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{V}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \sigma^2 \mathbf{W} \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\intercal \mathbf{x}' \tag{87}$$

(Rasmussen & Williams, 2006). Since the Student distribution assigns more probability in the tails, compared to the normal distribution, the Student process provides more robust inference than the GP (Denison et al. 2002, p. 29). However, the difference between the two processes is minimal for reasonable sample sizes ($n > 100$), because the Student process tends to a GP as $\overline{a} \to \infty$, as shown by the posterior predictive (51).

Nevertheless, the GP, and the Student process, provide examples of flexible BNP models (Müller & Quintana, 2004). While the "weight-space view" may not provide a fully-flexible GP modeling approach (Rasmussen & Williams, 2006), an important limitation of the GP approach is that it usually requires repeated inversions of $n \times n$ matrices, in order to compute the covariance function for different values of the covariance parameters. Such matrix inversions are computationally demanding or even prohibitive when n is sufficiently large. A possible remedy for large-n settings is to approximate a pure GP model by using a lower-dimensional covariance function matrix. Alternatively, as done in this paper, a flexible and more interpretable GP can always be specified, in a far more computationally-efficient manner, by adopting the weight-space view and taking the number of covariates p to be very large, with the covariates possibly including spline terms.

3.3 Ridge Regression for Classification and Bayesian Density Regression

As mentioned in Section 1, we assume that dependent variable observations are zero-mean centered and continuous. This is done with no loss of generality, as we argue now. First, binary regression, that is regression involving a binary (two-class) dependent variable, is often of interest in statistical practice. Logistic regression provides a standard binary regression model. However, both frequentist and Bayesian estimation of the logistic regression model requires iteration, and this estimation can become too computationally expensive for data sets that are sufficiently large. An alternative and computationally-fast (albeit less natural) approach is to code the binary class observations as $\widetilde{Y}_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, n$), and then apply the cutoff of 0 to the predictions based on a shrinkage linear regression model fit by penalized least-squares (Hastie et al., 2009, Section 16.4). In this spirit, the ridge regression model can be fit to the dependent responses $\mathbf{y} = \widetilde{\mathbf{y}} - \overline{y}$ (with $\overline{y}$ the mean of $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} = (\widetilde{y}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{y}_n)^\intercal$). Then for a given covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$, the posterior predictive probability of a positive class $Y_i^{(c)} = 1$ can be estimated by

$$\widehat{\Pr}(Y + \overline{y} \geq 0 \,|\, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^\infty \text{st}\left(y + \overline{y} \,|\, \mathbf{x}^\intercal \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda, \overline{b}_\lambda \left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} x_k w_{kl}\right)^2}{\lambda_l + d_l^2}\right), \overline{a}\right) \mathrm{d}y, \tag{88}$$

and the posterior predictive probability of class $\widetilde{Y} = -1$ can be estimated by $1 - \widehat{\Pr}(Y + \overline{y} \geq 0 \,|\, \mathbf{x})$, where the Student density in (88) is from (51).

When there are more than two classes, labeled as $c = 1, \ldots, C$, with observations c_l (for $l = 1, \ldots, n_c$), it is possible to take a "one-versus-all" approach to linear classification (Rifkin & Klatau, 2004). That is, consider the vector of $n = n_c C$ centered dependent variable observations $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^{(c)} - \overline{y}$, where $\mathbf{y}^{(c)} = (\mathbf{y}_1^\intercal, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_l^\intercal, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_{n_c}^\intercal)^\intercal$, $\mathbf{y}_l^\intercal = (y_l^{(1)}, \ldots, y_l^{(C)})^\intercal$ and $y_l^{(c)} = \mathbf{1}(c_l = c) - \mathbf{1}(c_l \neq c)$ for $c = 1, \ldots, C$ and $l = 1, \ldots, n_c$, and with $\overline{y}$ the mean of $\mathbf{y}^{(c)}$. Each observation vector $\mathbf{y}_l^\intercal$, for $l = 1, \ldots, n_c$, corresponds to a covariate matrix $\underline{\mathbf{X}}_l$ consisting of row vectors $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_{lc}^\intercal = (\mathbf{1}(c_l = 1)\underline{\mathbf{x}}_l^\intercal, \ldots, \mathbf{1}(c_l = C)\underline{\mathbf{x}}_l^\intercal)$, for $c = 1, \ldots, C$, respectively. Also let $\mathbf{X}$ be the design matrix, after centering and scaling each of the columns of $\underline{\mathbf{X}} = (\underline{\mathbf{X}}_1^\intercal, \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{X}}_{n_c}^\intercal)^\intercal$, with $\underline{\mathbf{X}}$ having column means $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x$ and column standard deviations $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x$. Then we may consider a linear model $\mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ subject to ridge regression shrinkage estimation. For a given covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$, we may estimate the posterior predictive probabilities $\widehat{\Pr}(Y + \overline{y} \geq 0 \,|\, \mathbf{z}_c)$, for $c = 1, \ldots, C$, with $\mathbf{z}_c = (\mathbf{x}_c - \boldsymbol{\mu}_x)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x^{-1}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_c^\intercal = (\mathbf{1}(c = 1)\underline{\mathbf{x}}^\intercal, \ldots, \mathbf{1}(c = C)\underline{\mathbf{x}}_l^\intercal)$. Then the optimal class prediction is given by the class $c \in \{1, \ldots, C\}$ with the highest $P_c = \widehat{\Pr}(Y + \overline{y} \geq 0 \,|\, \mathbf{z}_c)$.

Moreover, $P_{c0} - \xi$, for $c = 0, 1, \ldots, C$, collectively provide a corrected histogram probability density estimate for the C classes, if ξ is chosen so that $\sum_{c=1}^{C} P_{c0} - \xi = 1$ (Glad et al. 2003). If so desired, the given histogram may be smoothed, say, by linear interpolation. Then here, the linear model provides a type of "Bayesian density regression" (e.g., see Karabatsos & Walker, 2012). Also, this histogram/density correction method provides another way to estimate class probabilities from linear classifiers (see Wu et al., 2004).

4 Illustrations

4.1 Illustrations on Real Data

We illustrate the marginal maximum likelihood estimation algorithm on a variety of data sets that range widely in terms of sample size (n) and the number of covariates (p). The ten data sets are described as follows:

- The `Iris` data set (Fisher, 1936), with septal length as the dependent variable, and with covariates of septal width, petal length, and petal width.

- The `Teacher` data set, a time series data set collected to investigate the effect of a new teacher curriculum, versus the old curriculum, on the respective teaching abilities of undergraduate teacher education students who attended one of four Chicago universities (see Karabatsos & Walker, 2015). The dependent response is a test score on math teaching ability, obtained after completing a math teaching course. The covariates include time (in years), indicator (0,1) of new curriculum, and 347 indicators (0,1) of student, which were included for the purposes of providing a robust posterior (mean) estimate of the new curriculum effect (coefficient).

- Two versions of the classic, `Diabetes` data set (Efron et al. 2004), each with dependent variable defined by a measure of disease progression one year after baseline. This first

version of the data set, `DiabetesQ`, includes 65 covariates defined by 10 covariates at baseline, their squares, and their two-way interactions. The second version of the data set, `DiabetesS`, includes over 500 covariates, including the 65 quadratic covariates, plus 442 65-variate cubic splines with knots defined by all $n = 442$ observed values of the 65-dimensional covariate vectors (see Section 3).

- The `Meaning` data set, which contains the ratings of 1,194 high school students from 9 public high schools of Chicago and New York. The students individually provided ratings on an 18-item survey about the meaningfulness of past reading experiences (Tatum & Karabatsos, 2013). In total, the data set includes nearly 21,000 ratings, and over 100 student, teacher, and school background covariates.

- The `Blog` data set, with the dependent variable being the number of comments on the blog after 24 hours. The sample size exceeds 52,000, and there are over 2,500 covariates, formed by taking the powers of 1, 2, and 3 of each of the 840 original covariates. This large data set file, named blogData_train.csv, was obtained from https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/BlogFeedback.

- The `Wheat` and `Yarn` data sets, which have been used to illustrate the weaknesses of RR in past research. The `Yarn` data set contains 28 samples of Positive Emission Tomography (PET) yarns, with dependent variable being is density of yarn, and covariates (predictors) being the Near Infrared (NIR) spectrum of 268 wavelengths. This data set was obtained from the pls package (Wehrens & Mevik, 2007) of the R software (2014). We consider this data set, since the ordinary ridge model was found to have relatively worse cross-validated predictive error, compared to linear models assigned other more sophisticated shrinkage priors (Griffin & Brown, 2013). This is apparently true because the RR model can shrink over-shrink the OLS coefficients $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_q)^\intercal$ for components that have relatively small eigenvalues (Polson & Scott, 2012; Griffin & Brown, 2013). A similar point was made in a previous study (Fearn, 1983) that provided the `Wheat` data set, consisting of 24 observations of protein content, regressed on the reflectance of NIR radiation by the wheat samples at six different wavelengths in the range 1680-2310 nm.

- The `Lymphoma` data set, containing nearly 80 observations on over 7,000 covariates, with dependent variable indicating $(1, -1)$ the presence of diffuse large b-cell lymphoma versus Follicular Lymphoma (FL) morphology (Shipp et al. 2012). This large data set is available through a web link associated with the cited article.

- The `Cancer` data set (Petricoin, et al. 2002), containing observations of a binary dependent variable indicating $(1, -1)$ either the presence or absence of ovarian cancer, and containing data on over 15,000 covariates. This large data set is available through a web link associated with the cited article.

For each data set, before fitting the ridge regression model, the observations of each of the variables were mean-centered, and each of the p covariates were also scaled to have variance 1, as mentioned in Section 1. For each of the `Iris`, `Teacher`, `Diabetes`, `Meaning`, `Blog`, `Wheat`, and `Yarn` data sets, the dependent responses were also scaled to have variance 1.

For each of the 10 data sets, Table 1 presents computation times for various tasks of data analysis, in seconds. All reported computation times are based on a 64-bit laptop computer with 2.8 GHz Intel Core i7 processor and 16 megabytes RAM, with no parallel computing techniques used. Fairly similar computation times were obtained from an older 64-bit laptop with a 2.4 GHz Intel i5 processor and 4 megabytes RAM.

Table 1 reports the time needed: to load the data into MATLAB (times reported under column "data"); to compute the singular value decomposition (s.v.d.) of the given design matrix $\mathbf{X}$ (column "s.v.d."); and to compute OLS estimates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ provided a non-singular $\mathbf{X}$ (column "OLS", with "Sing" indicating a singular $\mathbf{X}$).

			Computation Time (seconds)				
Data Set	n	p	**data**	**s.v.d.**	**OLS**	**RR**	**RRN**
`Iris`	150	3	0.01	.001	0.0003	0.003	0.01
`Teacher`	347	349	1.35	.04	Sing	0.003	0.17
`DiabetesQ`	442	65	0.93	.01	0.002	0.008	0.07
`DiabetesS`	442	507	1. 00	.03	Sing	0.054	0.189
`Meaning`	20, 994	113	8.20	0.05	Sing	0.019	29266
`Blog`	52, 397	2, 520	3.77	2.05	Sing	0.074	$>$ 8h
`Wheat`	24	6	0.52	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.06
`Yarn`	28	268	1.01	0.001	Sing	0.002	0.004
`Lymphoma`	77	7, 129	1.82	0.01	Sing	0.002	0.01
`Cancer`	253	15, 154	11.34	0.10	Sing	0.002	0.34

Data Set	n	p	**RRf**	**HKB**	**GCV**	**Ridge10**
`Iris`	150	3	0.001	0.00002	14.56	0.71
`Teacher`	347	349	$>$ 8h	0.05	43.80	6.16
`DiabetesQ`	442	65	0.02	0.00003	23.80	1.57
`DiabetesS`	442	507	0.05	0.18	58.30	11.35
`Meaning`	20, 994	113	$>$ 8h	0.002	644.48	44.46
`Blog`	52, 397	2, 520	$>$ 8h	0.03	9074.19	851.96
`Wheat`	24	6	0.22	0.0003	13.62	0.21
`Yarn`	28	268	0.03	0.001	16.99	4.83
`Lymphoma`	77	7, 129	$>$ 8h	0.002	208.30	123.33
`Cancer`	253	15, 154	$>$ 8h	0.02	2245.26	300.74

Table 1: Computation times, for s.v.d.: singular value decomposition; OLS: Ordinary Least-Squares Estimate; RR: MML estimation for Ridge Regression model, using algorithm of this paper, based on the s.v.d.; RRN: Ridge regression using Neto et al. (2014) marginal likelihood equation based on the s.v.d.; RRf: Ridge regression using full marginal likelihood equation, using direct calculation of matrix determinants; HKB: Ridge regression using HKB plug-in estimator of lambda; GCV: Ridge regression using minimum GCV estimator of lambda; Ridge10: Ridge regression using estimator of lambda based on minimizing 10-fold cross-validated mean square predictive error; Sing: OLS estimate non-existent because the cross-product of the design matrix X was singular. ¿ 8h means that computations took over 8 hours to complete.

Table 1 also reports the time needed to obtain the ridge marginal maximum likelihood (MML) estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ for the Bayesian RR model, for various methods. Methods include the MML estimation algorithm introduced in Section 2.3, which maximizes equation (64) based on the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$ (column "RR"); the MML estimation algorithm that directly uses the $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U}$ obtained from the s.v.d. $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{W}^\intercal$ to compute the marginal likelihood over trial values of λ (Neto et al., 2014) (column "RRN"); and the MML estimation algorithm that computes the full marginal likelihood equation (11) directly, including the direct computation of the matrix determinants, and without taking a s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$ (column "RRf"). The table also reports the computation time to obtain the ridge estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$, based on other estimators. The other estimators include the HKB plug-in estimator $\widehat{\lambda}_{\text{HKB}}$ (column "HKB"); the estimator of λ based on finding the value λ that minimizes the GCV(λ) criterion over a grid of trial lambda values ranging from 0 to 500 separated by .005 (column "GCV"); and the estimator of λ based on minimizing the 10-fold cross-validated mean square predictive error over a grid of 100 trial lambda values equally-spaced on a log scale that range from 0 a value $\lambda_{\max}$. Here, $\lambda_{\max}$ is chosen large enough to produce a coefficient vector estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda_{\max}}$ that is virtually a zero $\mathbf{0}$ vector, a default of the `lasso()` procedure of MATLAB (Friedman et al. 2010). In general, for a trial value $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ of the shrinkage parameter of a linear model (e.g., the Bayesian RR model has scalar shrinkage parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \lambda$), the 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared predictive error of the trial value $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is given by:

$$\text{CV}_{10}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{10}\sum_{i \in C_k}\left(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\intercal \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(-k)}\right)^2, \tag{89}$$

based on a random partition of the observation indices $i = 1, \ldots, n$ into subsets C_k, for $k = 1, \ldots, 10$. The mean square statistic $\text{CV}_{10}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ has standard error:

$$\text{SE}\left[\text{CV}_{10}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}\left\{\frac{1}{9}\sum_{k=1}^{10}\left(\text{CV}_{10}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - \overline{\text{CV}_{10}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})}\right)^2\right\}^{1/2}, \tag{90}$$

$$\text{with } \text{CV}_{10}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n_k}\sum_{i \in C_k}\left(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\intercal \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(-k)}\right)^2. \tag{91}$$

As shown in Table 1 (column "RR"), for each of the 10 data sets, the MML estimation algorithm that maximizes equation (64) (in Section 2.3, using the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$) computed the MML estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ in less than one-tenth of a second. For all 10 data sets, this MML estimation algorithm was faster than the MML estimation algorithm that instead uses the $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U}$ of the s.v.d. to compute the marginal likelihood equation (of Neto et al., 2014) over trial values of λ; and faster than the MML estimation algorithm that instead computes the full marginal likelihood equation (11) directly, including the computation of the matrix determinants. For each of the `Meaning` and `Blog` data sets, the MML estimation algorithm that computed the marginal likelihood using the matrix $\mathbf{U}$ (Neto et al., 2014) needed over 8 hours to obtain the ridge MML estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$. Also, for 5 of the 10 data sets, the MML estimation algorithm that directly computes the full marginal likelihood equation (11) led to a MML estimation algorithm that needed over 8 hours to obtain the ridge MML estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$. Finally, as might be expected, the MML estimation algorithm that maximizes

equation (64) required more computation time than the automatic plug-in HKB estimator of the ridge parameter $\widehat{\lambda}_{\text{HKB}}$, and required less computation time than the ridge estimator of λ that is based on finding the value of λ that minimizes the GCV(λ) criterion.

			Computation Time (seconds)				
Data Set	n	p	RR	PRR	GRR	FB	L10CV
`Iris`	150	3	0.003	0.05	0.00001	11.55	0.97
`Teacher`	347	349	0.003	0.44	0.00002	153.31	10.94
`DiabetesQ`	442	65	0.008	0.44	0.00001	18.29	61.93
`DiabetesS`	442	507	0.054	2.75	0.00002	331.19	780.14
`Meaning`	20,994	113	0.019	3.86	0.00003	38.44	679.07
`Blog`	52,397	2,520	0.074	26.70	0.00003	1373.39	11259.2
`Wheat`	24	6	0.001	0.02	0.00001	10.77	13.96
`Yarn`	28	268	0.002	0.02	0.00001	13.39	5.80
`Lymphoma`	77	7,129	0.002	0.30	0.00002	44.35	69.73
`Cancer`	253	15,154	0.002	0.04	0.00002	299.30	272.81

Data Set	n	p	EN10CV	LGIC	EGIC	LBIC	EBIC
`Iris`	150	3	1.14	0.14	0.15	0.17	0.17
`Teacher`	347	349	9.87	1.56	1.66	1.63	1.62
`DiabetesQ`	442	65	49.15	5.19	4.27	4.93	4.34
`DiabetesS`	442	507	557.19	72.50	50.78	72.45	50.67
`Meaning`	20,994	113	703.43	78.93	81.59	92.55	90.67
`Blog`	52,397	2,520	16890.3	1290.1	1510.8	1458.6	1683.6
`Wheat`	24	6	7.95	1.43	0.85	1.41	0.86
`Yarn`	28	268	6.41	0.67	0.75	0.64	0.75
`Lymphoma`	77	7,129	68.58	10.94	11.30	11.18	11.08
`Cancer`	253	15,154	265.21	41.73	41.20	41.16	40.53

Table 2: Computation time to estimate the shrinkage parameter (lambda), for RR: Ridge Regression via MML estimation; PRR: Power Ridge Regression via MML estimation; GRR: Generalized Ridge Regression via MML estimation; FB: Ridge Regression based on MCMC sampling; L10CV: LASSO via 10-fold cross-validation; EN10CV: Elastic Net via 10-fold cross-validation; LGIC: LASSO via GIC minimization; EGIC: Elastic Net via GIC minimization; LBIC: LASSO via BIC minimization; EBIC: Elastic Net via BIC minimization. Sing: OLS estimate non-existent because the cross-product of the design matrix X was singular.

Table 2 compares the computation times of the MML estimation algorithm that finds the MML estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ which maximizes equation (64) (in Section 2.3, using s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$), against the computation times of other models and related estimation approaches, namely:

1. The Bayesian PRR model under the MML estimation algorithm that finds the MML estimate $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ maximizes equation (73) (Section 2.3, using s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$);

2. Bayesian GRR model that makes use of the automatic plug-in estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ of equation (84) for MML estimation (Section 2.3, using s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$);

3. The Bayesian RR model with full posterior distribution estimated using 110,000 MCMC sampling iterations, with the model assuming normal data likelihood density, $\mathrm{n}_n(\mathbf{y} \,|\, \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)$, and parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \lambda)$ assigned a conjugate normal inverse-gamma prior distribution with probability density function:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \lambda) = \mathrm{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta} \,|\, \mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}_p)\mathrm{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, a, b)\mathrm{ga}(\lambda \,|\, a_\lambda, b_\lambda)$$

(Denison et al. 2002), based on an attempt to specify a non-informative prior (σ^2, λ) by choosing each of the prior parameters $(a, b, a_\lambda, b_\lambda)$ to be near zero;

4. Three approaches to the LASSO model with shrinkage parameter estimated, respectively, by the choice of value λ which minimizes either the 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared predictive error $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\lambda)$ of equation (89); or the Generalized Information Criterion $\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda)$ (Fan & Tang, 2013), given by:

$$\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\left\{||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda||^2 + a_n|\mathcal{S}_\lambda|\right\}$$

where $|\mathcal{S}_\lambda|$ is the number of non-zero terms in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$. The choice $a_n = \log\{\log(n)\}\log(p)$ has been recommended in practice (Fan & Tang, 2013, p. 539). The modified version of the Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Schwarz, 1978), $\mathrm{BIC}(\lambda)$, is a special case of the $\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda)$ that assumes $a_n = \log\{\log(n)\}\log(n)$, and provides consistent model selection in terms of identifying the subset of the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ that are zero (Fan & Tang, 2013, p. 539);

5. Three approaches to the EN model assuming $\alpha = 1/2$ and with shrinkage parameter estimated, respectively, by the choice of value λ which minimizes either the 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared predictive error $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\lambda)$ of equation (89); the Generalized Information Criterion $\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda)$ (Fan & Tang, 2013); or the modified BIC.

The approaches based on $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\lambda)$ minimization are each based on obtaining the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ as the value of λ that minimizes $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\lambda)$ over a grid of 100 λ values ranging from 0 to $\lambda_{\max}$, equally-spaced on a log scale, such that $\lambda_{\max}$ is chosen as the minimum value of λ where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \mathbf{0}$. This is a default for the `lasso()` procedure of MATLAB (Friedman et al. 2010). The approaches based on $\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda)$ minimization (or modified $\mathrm{BIC}(\lambda)$ minimization) are each based on obtaining the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ as the value of λ that minimizes $\mathrm{GIC}(\lambda)$ (or the modified $\mathrm{BIC}(\lambda)$) over a grid of 200 λ values ranging from 0 to $\lambda_{\max}$, equally-spaced on a log scale, such that $\lambda_{\max}$ is chosen as the minimum value of λ where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \mathbf{0}$, as suggested in a prior study (Fan & Tang, 2013).

The MCMC approach to estimating the Bayesian RR model deserves some elaboration. In each MCMC sampling iteration, a sample from the full conditional posterior distribution of the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is obtained by first drawing a random sample of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ from the full conditional posterior distribution, given by:

$$\Pi\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \,|\, \mathcal{D}_n, \sigma^2\right) = \textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{p} \mathrm{n}(\alpha_k \,|\, \overline{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}, \sigma^2(\lambda + d_k^2)^{-1}) \tag{92}$$

and then taking $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ as a sample from the full conditional posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ (Polson & Scott, 2012); and then a sample of the error variance σ^2 from its full conditional distribution is obtained by drawing from an inverse gamma distribution with p.d.f. $\text{ig}(\sigma^2 \,|\, \overline{a}, \overline{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$, according to equations (33) and (34) assuming $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_r$; whereas a sample of λ from its full conditional posterior distribution is obtained by drawing from a gamma distribution with p.d.f. $\text{ga}(a_\lambda + p/2, b_\lambda + (2\sigma^2)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \beta_k^2)$. A total of 110,000 MCMC sampling iterations has been suggested as providing a converged estimate of the posterior distribution of the model parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2, \lambda)$ for the Bayesian RR model (Tsonias & Tassiopoulos, 2014).

	λ estimate (and δ for PRR; for GRR, min λ and max λ)							
Data Set	RR	HKB	GCV	FB	PRR	δ_{PRR}	GRR	
`Iris`	0.17	0.16	0.07	0.001	0.03	-0.53	0.48	2.98
`Teacher`	10^{-4}	2×10^4	0.001	2.53	0.001	2.78	181.93	10^{10}
`DiabetesQ`	67.70	0.35	85.95	10^{-4}	536.79	0.33	41.41	10^{10}
`DiabetesS`	446.05	10^7	103.89	164.91	2×10^3	0.19	2.21	10^{10}
`Meaning`	250.45	0.55	4.83	10^{-4}	0.86	-0.65	56.07	10^{10}
`Blog`	410.88	10^{-10}	4.81	10^{-16}	0.49	-0.68	5×10^3	10^{10}
`Wheat`	0.003	0.003	0.01	0.02	0.005	-0.35	0.08	10^{10}
`Yarn`	10^{-4}	9.79	10^{-3}	10^3	4×10^{-5}	0.11	10^{10}	10^{10}
`Lymphoma`	10^{-4}	8×10^5	10^{-3}	2×10^{19}	4×10^{-5}	0.29	2×10^4	10^{10}
`Cancer`	10^{-4}	4×10^8	10^{-3}	3×10^{19}	4×10^{-5}	0.11	10^{10}	10^{10}

Data Set	L10CV	E10CV	LGIC	EGIC	LBIC	EBIC
`Iris`	10^{-4}	0.0002	10^{-4}	0.0002	0.02	0.02
`Teacher`	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.33
`DiabetesQ`	0.04	0.07	0.12	0.24	0.12	0.12
`DiabetesS`	0.04	0.07	0.12	0.24	0.24	0.24
`Meaning`	10^{-5}	4×10^{-5}	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04
`Blog`	10^{-3}	0.0003	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05
`Wheat`	.0003	10^{-3}	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01
`Yarn`	0.02	10^{-3}	0.29	1.95	0.07	1.95
`Lymphoma`	0.04	0.14	0.56	1.12	0.56	1.12
`Cancer`	0.01	0.01	0.18	1.70	0.18	0.77

Table 3: Lambda estimates, for RR: Ridge Regression via MML estimation; HKB: Ridge Regression via the HKB estimator; GCV: Ridge Regression via the minimum GCV estimator; FB: Ridge Regression via MCMC sampling; PRR: Power Ridge Regression via MML estimation (including delta); GRR: Generalized Ridge Regression via MML estimation; L10CV: LASSO via 10-fold cross-validation; EN10CV: Elastic Net via 10-fold cross-validation; LGIC: LASSO via GIC minimization; EGIC: Elastic Net via GIC minimization; LBIC: LASSO via BIC minimization; EBIC: Elastic Net via BIC minimization.

We see from Table 2 that, predictably, the Bayesian GRR model with automatic plug-in MML estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ obtained the fastest computation times across all the data sets by

far, followed by the iterative Bayesian RR MML estimation procedure, and then followed by the iterative Bayesian PRR MML estimation procedure. Also, the MCMC estimation procedures for the Bayesian RR model, the cross-validation estimation procedures, and the estimation procedures based either on minimizing GIC(λ) or minimizing BIC(λ), were noticeably slower. Table 3 presents the point-estimates of λ (or $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ or (λ, δ)) for the various estimation procedures.

	Log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \mid \widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$				
Data Set	RR	RR:HKB	RR:GCV	PRR	GRR
`Iris`	-61.73^*	-61.73^*	-62.12^*	-61.02^*	-64.40
`Teacher`	-396.88	-409.60	-398.34	-385.07	-333.14^*
`DiabetesQ`	-389.63	-494.49	-390.06	-388.88	-373.33^*
`DiabetesS`	-375.83	-511.75	-392.63	-375.61	-325.36^*
`Meaning`	-21262.87	-21480.97	-21378.56	-21232.10	-21168.23^*
`Blog`	-44738.55	-48392.54	-44898.27	-44334.46	-43931.02^*
`Wheat`	-31.50^*	-31.51^*	-31.74^*	-31.05^*	-40.37
`Yarn`	40.22	-0.49	38.72	42.02^*	-33.56
`Lymphoma`	-73.32	-107.32	-74.79	-71.83^*	-69.49^*
`Cancer`	52.74	-298.40	51.27	55.00^*	-61.43

Table 4: Log-marginal likelihood, for RR: the Ridge Regression model via MML estimation; RR: HKB: the Ridge Regression model via the HKB estimator; PRR: the Power Ridge Regression model via MML estimation; GRR: Generalized Ridge Regression via MML estimation.

Figure 3 in `http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/figuresRidge.pdf`

Focusing on the point-estimation procedures involving either the Bayesian RR, PRR, or GRR models, Table 4 compares the log-marginal likelihood between the procedures and models. For the Bayesian RR model, we find that for all 10 data sets, the MML estimation procedure led to a higher log-marginal likelihood, compared to the HKB estimator, and estimation via GCV minimization. Also, the Bayesian GRR model under MML estimation attained the highest marginal likelihood for 6 of the 10 data sets, while the Bayesian PRR model under MML estimation attained the highest marginal likelihood for all the remaining 4 data sets, compared to the Bayesian RR model under either MML, HKB, or GCV estimation of the shrinkage parameter (λ). For the `Iris` and `Wheat` data sets, the Bayesian RR and PRR models and associated estimation procedures were tied for first, whereas for the `Lymphoma` data set the Bayesian PRR and GRR models and associated MML estimation procedures were tied for first (within 1.1 units of the log-marginal likelihood; see Section 1).

Figure 4 in `http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/figuresRidge.pdf`

For each of the ten data sets, Figure 3 presents the log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$ as a function of λ, along with the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ shown by a vertical dashed line. This figure shows the concavity of $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda)$. Figure 4 presents, for the Bayesian PRR model, the surface of the log marginal likelihood $\log \pi(\mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \lambda, \delta)$ as a function of (λ, δ), for each of the 10 data sets.

For further illustration, Figure 5 presents the results of the `DiabetesQ` data, under the Bayesian GRR model estimated under MML maximization. As reported in Table 4, this model attained the highest log-marginal likelihood for this data set. In this figure, the left panel presents the coefficient estimates $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\lambda}}$ for the 65 covariates. For each of the covariates, respectively, the middle panel presents a box plot of the marginal posterior distributions of the coefficients including the posterior mean estimate, the 50% marginal posterior interval, and the 95% marginal posterior credible interval; and the right panel presents the results of the scaled neighborhood criterion. According to the 95% marginal posterior credible interval of the middle panel, the 15 following covariates were significant predictors of disease progression: `age`, `sex`, `bmi`, `map`, `tch`, `ltg`, `glu`, `age*sex`, `age*ltg`, `sex*tch`, `sex*glu`, `bmi*map`, `map*ltg`, `age^2`, and `sex^2`.

Figure 5 in `http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/figuresRidge.pdf`

Across the 10 data sets, Table 5 compares the cross-validated mean-squared predictive error $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ between the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models, and the LASSO and EN models, conditionally on the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ (e.g., the estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ or $(\widehat{\lambda}, \widehat{\delta})$ or $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, as applicable) obtained from any one of the various estimation procedures mentioned earlier. The Bayesian GRR model under MML estimation obtained the best (lowest) $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ criterion for 5 of the 10 real data sets, whereas the Bayesian PRR model under MML estimation obtained the best (lowest) $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ criterion for 4 of the 10 data sets. For the `Iris`, `Meaning`, and `Blog` data sets, multiple models (and associated estimation procedures) were tied for best, including the Bayesian PRR and GRR models for the `Iris` and `Meaning` data sets.

Table 6, for the various models and associated estimation procedures, compares the ratio of the best minimizing $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ mean-square criterion to the $\mathrm{CV}_{10}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ mean-square criterion. This ratio is a measure of relative predictive efficiency, for each of the 10 data sets. From this perspective, the Bayesian PRR model under MML estimation has the best relative predictive efficiency on the average.

In closing, we return to the discussion of the `Wheat` and `Yarn` data sets, which posed problems for the RR model. This is because the model can over-shrink the OLS coefficients $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\widehat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_q)^\intercal$ for the principal components in $\mathbf{XW}$ of $\mathbf{X}$ that have relatively small eigenvalues (Polson & Scott, 2012; Griffin & Brown, 2013). However, for these two data sets, the Bayesian PRR model performed best among all the ridge models in terms of marginal likelihood according to Table 4. Table 5 shows that in terms of 10-fold cross-validated mean-square predictive error, the Bayesian PRR model performed among the best, and decisively the best for the `Yarn` data set, compared to all the ridge, LASSO and EN models and associated estimation methods. In fact for the more challenging `Yarn` data set, the Bayesian PRR model obtained a mean-squared predictive error of near zero. Hence the Bayes PRR

model can help solve the aforementioned problem that data sets, like the `Wheat` and `Yarn`, pose to the RR model.

	10-fold CV($\boldsymbol{\lambda}$) Mean Squared Error						
Data Set	OLS	RR	HKB	GCV	FB	PRR	GRR
`Iris`	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*
`Teacher`	Sing	0.92	0.94	0.89*	0.90	0.92	0.92
`DiabetesQ`	0.58	0.51	0.58	0.53	0.58	0.51	0.49*
`DiabetesS`	Sing	0.54	0.99	0.50	0.52	0.57	0.39*
`Meaning`	Sing	0.87*	0.87*	0.87*	0.87*	0.87*	0.87*
`Blog`	Sing	0.65	0.65	0.64*	6^9	0.65	0.64*
`Wheat`	0.03	0.03	0.02*	0.03	0.02*	0.03	0.06
`Yarn`	Sing	0.27	0.86	0.22	0.10	.00002*	0.04
`Lymphoma`	Sing	0.17	0.67	0.15*	0.70	0.17	0.16
`Cancer`	Sing	0.03*	0.91	0.03*	0.91	0.03*	0.13

Data Set	L10CV	E10CV	LGIC	EGIC	LBIC	EBIC
`Iris`	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*	0.17	0.16
`Teacher`	0.95	0.95	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.99
`DiabetesQ`	0.51	0.50	0.55	0.56	0.55	0.55
`DiabetesS`	0.51	0.50	0.55	0.57	0.56	0.56
`Meaning`	0.87*	0.87*	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.90
`Blog`	0.64*	0.64*	0.65	0.65	0.66	0.66
`Wheat`	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.18	0.13
`Yarn`	0.001	0.001	0.12	1.00	0.01	1.05
`Lymphoma`	0.24	0.25	0.75	0.76	0.75	0.76
`Cancer`	0.03*	0.03*	0.11	0.93	0.11	0.32

Table 5: 10-fold cross-validated (CV) mean-squared error, for OLS: Ordinary Least-Squares estimator (Sing. means nonexistent OLS estimate due to X being singular); RR: Ridge Regression via MML estimation; HKB: Ridge Regression via the HKB estimator; GCV: Ridge Regression via the minimum GCV estimator; FB: Ridge Regression via lambda estimate obtained from MCMC sampling; PRR: Power Ridge Regression via MML estimation; GRR: Generalized Ridge Regression via MML estimation; L10CV: LASSO via 10-fold cross-validation; EN10CV: Elastic Net via 10-fold cross-validation; LGIC: LASSO via GIC minimization; EGIC: Elastic Net via GIC minimization; LBIC: LASSO via BIC minimization; EBIC: Elastic Net via BIC minimization.

	Ratio of smallest 10-fold CV(λ) MS error to model 10-fold CV(λ) MS error						
Data Set	OLS	RR	HKB	GCV	FB	PRR	GRR
`Iris`	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
`Teacher`	Sing	0.97	0.95	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.95
`DiabetesQ`	0.84	0.96	0.84	0.92	0.84	0.96	1.00
`DiabetesS`	Sing	0.72	0.39	0.78	0.75	0.68	1.00
`Meaning`	Sing	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98
`Blog`	Sing	0.98	0.98	1.00	0.00	0.98	1.00
`Wheat`	0.67	0.67	1.00	0.67	1.00	0.67	0.33
`Yarn`	Sing	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
`Lymphoma`	Sing	0.88	0.22	1.00	0.21	0.88	0.94
`Cancer`	Sing	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.23

Data Set	L10CV	E10CV	LGIC	EGIC	LBIC	EBIC
`Iris`	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.94
`Teacher`	0.94	0.94	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.90
`DiabetesQ`	0.96	0.98	0.89	0.88	0.89	0.89
`DiabetesS`	0.76	0.78	0.71	0.68	0.70	0.70
`Meaning`	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.97
`Blog`	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97
`Wheat`	0.50	0.50	0.40	0.15	0.11	0.15
`Yarn`	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
`Lymphoma`	0.63	0.60	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
`Cancer`	1.00	1.00	0.27	0.03	0.27	0.09

Table 6: Relative predictive efficiency, for OLS: Ordinary Least-Squares estimator (Sing. means nonexistent OLS estimate due to X being singular); RR: Ridge Regression via MML estimation; HKB: Ridge Regression via the HKB estimator; GCV: Ridge Regression via the minimum GCV estimator; FB: Ridge Regression via lambda estimate obtained from MCMC sampling; PRR: Power Ridge Regression via MML estimation (including delta); GRR: Generalized Ridge Regression via MML estimation; L10CV: LASSO via 10-fold cross-validation; EN10CV: Elastic Net via 10-fold cross-validation; LGIC: LASSO via GIC minimization; EGIC: Elastic Net via GIC minimization; LBIC: LASSO via BIC minimization; EBIC: Elastic Net via BIC minimization.

4.2 Simulation Study

Here, we report the results of a simulation study that investigates the ability of various statistical procedures to detect "significant" covariates having non-zero coefficients, and detect "non-significant" covariates having zero-valued coefficients, using Receiver Operator Curve (ROC) analysis. Statistical procedures include, under the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models, the posterior interquartile criterion, the 95% posterior interval criterion, and the scaled neighborhood (SN) criterion. Procedures also include, under the LASSO model and the EN model (with $\alpha = 1/2$), the identification of zero-valued (and non-zero valued) coefficient estimates in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\lambda}}$, with shrinkage parameter estimate $\widehat{\lambda}$ obtained either by mini-

mizing GIC(λ) or by minimizing BIC(λ) over a grid of 200 λ values ranging from 0 to $\lambda_{\max}$, equally-spaced on a log scale (with $\lambda_{\max}$ the minimum value of λ leading to $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \mathbf{0}$; Fan & Tang, 2013).

The simulation study is based on a fully-crossed 10×2 design, and 50 data sets were simulated for each of the 20 cells of the design. The 10 "row" levels of the simulation design reflect, respectively, the 10 real data sets mentioned in the previous subsection, in terms of the sample size (n), the number of covariates (p), the covariate matrix of the p covariates, and in terms of the error variance σ^2 defined as identical to the posterior-mean error variance estimate $\overline{\sigma}^2$ of the Bayesian PRR model. The error variance estimates for the 10 data sets listed in Table 6 are given respectively by:

$$(.15, 3 \times 10^{-13}, .48, .49, .87, .62, .03, 3.8 \times 10^{-8}, 4.1 \times 10^{-10}, 1.3 \times 10^{-9}).$$

Each of the 2 "column" levels of the simulation design are based on simulating $\beta_k \sim \mathrm{N}(0, 1)$ independently for $k = 1, \ldots, p$, where for the first design level, 25% of the betas were randomly selected to be set to zero, and for the second design level around 75% of betas were randomly selected to be set to zero. Note that for each of the 20 ($= 10 \times 2$) conditions of the design, the p coefficients (β_ks) are simulated once in this way, then for each of the 50 replications, covariate data are simulated by n independent samples $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathrm{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X} + .001\mathbf{I}_p)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then dependent variable data were simulated by n conditionally independent samples $y_i \sim \mathrm{N}(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}, \overline{\sigma}^2)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Here, $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{X} + .001\mathbf{I}_p$ is the covariance matrix of the covariates, with a small diagonal constant added to ensure a positive definite matrix, while $\overline{\sigma}^2$ is the relevant posterior mean estimate of σ^2 under the Bayesian PRR model. For the 6 of the 20 conditions that simulate the `DiabetesS`, `Meaning`, and `Blog` data sets, the LASSO and EN models were not run, using either GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization. This is because in these cases these models (and associated minimization procedures) were too computationally-slow to be fitted in a reasonable time over the 50 data replications.

For the ROC analyses of the simulated data, sensitivity is defined as the estimated probability that a given statistic correctly identifies a truly zero-valued coefficient, and specificity is defined as the estimated probability that the statistic correctly identifies a truly nonzero-valued coefficient. In all ROC analyses, the definitions of sensitivity and specificity account for the fact that a higher value of the standard Student c.d.f. statistic $\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}(\overline{\beta}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2})$ ($k = 1, \ldots, p$) (relevant to the interquartile and 95% posterior interval criteria), and that a lower value of SN_k, each indicates a covariate has a coefficient that is more significantly-different than zero. Also, for the LASSO and EN models, estimated under either GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization, the sensitivity is defined as the probability that the true-zero data-generating coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ have corresponding coefficient estimates in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\lambda}}$ that are zero. The sensitivity is defined as the probability that the true-nonzero data-generating coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ have corresponding coefficient estimates in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{\lambda}}$ that are nonzero.

Table 7 presents the ROC results of the simulation study, in terms of means and standard deviations of various ROC-based statistics over the 20 simulation conditions. The Table shows that for each of the statistics $\mathrm{St}_{2a+n}(\overline{\beta}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}k}/\widetilde{v}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}k}^{1/2})$ and SN_k, the Bayesian RR and PRR models had slightly higher estimated area under the curve (AUC) on average than the Bayesian GRR model. The SN_k criterion had highest sensitivity on average under the

Bayesian RR model compared to the PRR and GRR models, while the SN_k criterion had highest specificity on average under the Bayesian GRR model compared to the RR and PRR models. The interquartile posterior interval criterion had highest sensitivity on average under the Bayesian GRR model compared to the RR and PRR models, and had highest specificity on average under the Bayesian RR model compared to the PRR and GRR models. The 95% posterior interval criterion had highest sensitivity on average under the Bayesian GRR model compared to the RR and PRR models, and had highest specificity on average under the Bayesian RR and PRR models compared to the GRR model. Finally, the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models, the posterior interquartile criterion, the 95% posterior interval criterion, and the scaled neighborhood (SN) criterion, in nearly all instances, attained higher sensitivity and specificity, on average, compared to the LASSO model and EN models estimated under either GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization.

	CI	**SN**	**SN**	
Model	**AUC**	**AUC**	**Sens**	**Spec**
RR	.65 (.17)	.65 (.17)	.80 (.14)	.41 (.33)
PRR	.64 (.16)	.64 (.16)	.67 (.20)	.53 (.29)
GRR	.58 (.13)	.58 (.14)	.29 (.12)	.77 (.15)

	IQR PI		**95% PI**	
Model	**Sens**	**Spec**	**Sens**	**Spec**
RR	.49 (.32)	.68 (.17)	.25 (.31)	.96 (.07)
PRR	.61 (.27)	.56 (.18)	.36 (.30)	.85 (.20)
GRR	.84 (.11)	.20 (.09)	.52 (.31)	.58 (.24)

	IQR PI	**95% PI**	**SN**
Model	**S+S**	**S+S**	**S+S**
RR	1.18 (.19)	1.20 (.30)	1.21 (.23)
PRR	1.17 (.19)	1.21 (.28)	1.20 (.23)
GRR	1.04 (.06)	1.10 (.17)	1.06 (.09)
Model	**S+S**	**Sens**	**Spec**
LS:GIC	.57 (.25)	.30 (.26)	.27 (.27)
LS:BIC	.57 (.25)	.30 (.26)	.27 (.27)
EN:GIC	.55 (.24)	.26 (.25)	.29 (.28)
EN:BIC	.55 (.24)	.26 (.25)	.29 (.28)

Table 7: For ROC analyses of simulated data, the average (standard deviation in parentheses) of ROC statistics over all the simulation conditions. ROC statistics include the Area Under the Curve (AUC), Sensitivity (Sens), Specificity (Spec), and Sensitivity and Specificity (S+S) statistics. These statistics are calcualted for the 95 percent marginal posterior credible interval criterion (CI), for the interquartile range (or 50 percent) marginal posterior credible interval criterion (IQR), Ridge Regression (RR), Power Ridge Regression (PRR), and Generalized Ridge Regression (GRR) under MML estimation. They were also calculated for LASSO estimated under either GIC minimization (LS: GIC) or BIC minimization (LS: BIC); and for the Elastic Net estimated under either GIC minimization (EN: GIC) or BIC minimization (EN: BIC).

In terms of sensitivity *plus* specificity, the following results were obtained. For the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models, the posterior interquartile criterion, the 95% posterior interval criterion, and the SN criterion, in nearly all instances, attained higher sensitivity plus specificity on average, compared to the LASSO model and EN models estimated under either GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization. Sensitivity plus specificity was best on average under the Bayesian RR and PRR models, closely followed by the Bayesian GRR model. There were no large differences in the posterior interquartile criterion, the 95% posterior interval criterion, and the SN criterion, within each of the three ridge models. After considering the mean plus/minus 2 times the standard deviation of sensitivity plus specificity over the simulation conditions, no significant differences were found in sensitivity plus specificity between the three ridge models, and between the posterior interquartile, 95% posterior interval, and the SN criteria within each of the three ridge models.

5 Conclusions

While regression analysis is ubiquitous in many applied research areas, these days the field of statistics continues to enter more into the "Big data" era as computer storage continues to be cheaper. As a result, researchers have received more liberty to express their interest in performing regression analyses of ultra large (or big) data sets, either in terms of the number of observations and/or in terms of the number of covariates which may easily number at least in the hundreds or thousands. However, as the number of covariates in the data set increases, the risk for having a singular matrix $\mathbf{X}$ increases, either due to the presence of highly-correlated covariates and/or due to the number of covariates exceeding the sample size (i.e., $p > n$). Then for the linear model, the ordinary least-squares (OLS) estimate is either poorly-conditioned or non-existent, with high or infinite sampling variance, respectively. The ridge regression (RR) model provides one potential solution to this problem, through the use of a ridge parameter (λ) that controls the variance through shrinkage estimation. This leads to estimates of the linear regression coefficients with improved MSE and prediction, after introducing some bias. However, in practice, estimation of the ridge parameter in the RR model is often undertaken on the basis of cross-validation or MCMC methods, which are computationally slow for big data sets. Moreover, the RR model can exhibit poor predictive behavior when the principal components of $\mathbf{X}$, having small eigenvalues, are significantly correlated with the dependent variable.

To address the aforementioned issues, we introduced for each of the Bayesian RR, PRR and GRR models, very fast methods for finding the marginal maximum likelihood (MML) estimate of the ridge parameter(s) on the basis of the s.v.d. of $\mathbf{X}$. They in turn, for each model, provide fast computations of posterior mean and variance of the coefficients and error variance parameters, while avoiding the need to evaluate computationally-expensive matrix operations such as matrix inverses, determinants, and large matrix multiplications. For each of the three ridge models, the marginal maximum likelihood of the ridge parameter(s) is preferred according to the Bayes factor over all pairwise comparisons of all possible ridge parameter values. Also for each model, the maximum of the marginal likelihood corresponds to the posterior mode of the ridge parameter under the Bayes Empirical Bayes statistical framework, when the parameter is assigned a uniform prior. Moreover, while the MML estimation of the ridge parameter(s) for the Bayesian RR model and for the PRR model can

be undertaken using fast iterative algorithms, we introduced a closed-form and automatic plug-in estimator for the ridge parameters of the most general, Bayesian GRR model.

Through the analysis of 10 real data sets, involving hundreds to several thousands of observations and/or covariates, often where the number of covariates exceeds the number of observations (i.e., $p > n$), we showed that for each of the three Bayesian ridge models, the MML estimation methods introduced in this paper rapidly obtained the MML estimate of the ridge parameter(s). Also, the MML estimation methods were faster than other methods to estimating the shrinkage parameter (λ), involving either cross-validation, MCMC, or the LASSO model or EN model involving estimation via GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization. Furthermore, while for more than half of the 10 data sets, the Bayesian GRR model attained higher marginal likelihood than the RR and PRR models, all three ridge models tended to outperform the LASSO and EN models in terms of 10-fold cross-validated mean-square predictive error. Moreover, we showed that compared to the RR model, the Bayesian PRR model can provide better and good predictive performance for data sets where the principal components of $\mathbf{X}$ with small eigenvalues are significantly correlated with the dependent variable. However, $\mathbf{X}$ can be transformed into a better-conditioned matrix, to allow for a more appropriate analysis with the ordinary RR model (Hoerl, et al. 1985). Finally, a simulation study, which reflected key characteristics of these 10 data sets, demonstrated that test statistics used for the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models tended to have higher sensitivity and specificity for detecting significant and non-significant covariates (predictors), compared to the LASSO and EN models estimated under GIC(λ) or modified BIC(λ) minimization. The test statistics for the ridge models included the posterior interquartile criterion, the 95% posterior interval criterion, and the SN criterion, each of which can be rapidly computed as a function of the posterior means and variances of the coefficients of the linear model.

A free menu-driven software package for the Bayesian RR, PRR, and GRR models, estimated under MML, can be downloaded from:

`http://www.uic.edu/~georgek/HomePage/BayesRidgeSoftware.html`

This package includes most of the data sets that were studied in this paper (others can be obtained from web pages cited earlier). The webpage also contains example ridge analysis output of a large data set having many covariates.

6 Acknowledgements

This research is supported in part by National Science Foundation grant SES-1156372.

References

Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and the an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. Petrov & F. Csaki (Eds.), *Second International Symposium on Information Theory* (p. 267-281). Budapest: Academiai Kiado.

Berger, J. (1993). *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.

Bernardo, J., & Juárez, M. (2003). Intrinsic estimation. In J. Bernardo, M. Bayarri, J. Berger, A. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. Smith, & M. West (Eds.), *Bayesian statistics* (p. 465-476). Oxford University Press.

Bottolo, L., & Richardson, S. (2010). Evolutionary stochastic search for Bayesian model exploration. *Bayesian Analysis*, *5*, 583-618.

Chen, M.-H., & Ibrahim, J. (2003). Conjugate priors for generalized linear models. *Statistica Sinica*, *13*, 461-476.

Cooley, W., & Lohnes, P. (1971). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Cowles, M., & Carlin, B. (1996). Markov chain Monte Carlo convergence diagnostics: A comparative review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *91*, 833-904.

Cule, E., & De Iorio, M. (2012). *A semi-automatic method to guide the choice of ridge parameter in ridge regression*. Preprint arXiv:1205.0686.

Cule, E., & De Iorio, M. (2013). Ridge regression in prediction problems: Automatic choice of the ridge parameter. *Genetic Epidemiology*, *37*, 704-714.

Deely, J., & Lindley, D. (1981). Bayes empirical Bayes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *76*, 833-841.

Denison, D., Holmes, C., Mallick, B., & Smith, A. (2002). *Bayesian Methods for Nonlinear Classification and Regression*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Draper, D. (1999). Bayesian Model Averaging: A Tutorial: Comment. *Statistical Science*, *14*, 405-409.

Efron, B., Hastie, T., Johnstone, I., & Tibshirani, R. (2004). Least angle regression. *Annals of Statistics*, *32*, 407-499.

Fan, Y., & Tang, C.-Y. (2013). Tuning parameter selection in high dimensional penalized likelihood. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, *75*, 531-552.

Fearn, T. (1983). A misuse of ridge regression in the calibration of a near infrared reflectance instrument. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series C*, *32*, 73-79.

Fisher, R. (1936). The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. *Annals of Eugenics*, *7*, 179-188.

Flegal, J., & Jones, G. (2011). Implementing Markov chain Monte Carlo: Estimating with confidence. In S. Brooks, A. Gelman, G. Jones, & X. Meng (Eds.), *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo* (p. 175-197). Boca Raton, FL: CRC.

Frank, I., & Friedman, J. (1993). A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools (with discussion). *Technometrics*, *35*, 109-148.

Friedman, J., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *33*.

Glad, I., Hjort, N., & Ushakov, N. (2003). Correction of density estimators that are not densities. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, *30*, 415-427.

Goldstein, M., & Smith, A. (1974). Ridge-type estimators for regression analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *Series B*, *36*, 284-291.

Golub, G., Heath, M., & Wahba, G. (1979). Generalized cross-validation as a method for choosing a good ridge parameter. *Technometrics*, *21*, 215-223.

Good, I. (1950). *Probability and the Weighing of Evidence*. London: Charles Griffin and Company.

Griffin, J., & Brown, P. (2013). Some priors for sparse regression modelling. *Bayesian Analysis*, *8*, 691-702.

Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (1990). *Generalized Additive Models*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Hastie, T., Tibshiriani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction (2nd ed.)*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Hoaglin, D., & Welsch, R. (1978). The hat matrix in regression and ANOVA. *The American Statistician*, *32*, 17-22.

Hoerl, A., & Kennard, R. (1970). Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics*, *12*, 55-67.

Hoerl, A., Kennard, R., & Baldwin, K. (1975). Ridge regression: Some simulations. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, *4*, 105-123.

Hoerl, A., Kennard, R., & Hoerl, R. (1985). Practical use of ridge regression: A challenge met. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *Series C*, *34*, 114-120.

Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of Probability, 3rd Edition*. Oxford University Press.

Johnson, N., Kotz, S., & Balakrishnan, N. (1994). *Continuous univariate distributions, vol. 1*. New York: Wiley.

Karabatsos, G. (2014). *Fast Marginal Likelihood Estimation of the Ridge Parameter in Ridge Regression (Tech. Rep.).* ArXiv preprint 1409.2437.

Karabatsos, G., & Walker, S. (2012). Adaptive-modal Bayesian nonparametric regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, *6*, 2038-2068.

Karabatsos, G., & Walker, S. (2015, to appear). A Bayesian Nonparametric Causal Model for Regression Discontinuity Designs. In P. Müller & R. Mitra (Eds.), *Nonparametric Bayesian Methods in Biostatistics and Bioinformatics*. New York. (ArXiv preprint 1311.4482): Springer-Verlag.

Kass, R., & Raftery, A. (1995). Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *90*, 773-795.

Li, Q., & Lin, N. (2010). The Bayesian elastic net. *Bayesian Analysis*, *5*, 151-170.

Lindley, D., & Smith, A. (1972). Bayes estimates for the linear model (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *Series B*, *34*, 1-41.

Müller, P., & Insua, D. (1998). Issues in Bayesian analysis of neural network models. *Neural Computation*, *10*, 749-770.

Müller, P., & Quintana, F. (2004). Nonparametric Bayesian data analysis. *Statistical Science*, *19*, 95-110.

Neto, E., Jang, I., Friend, S., & Margolin, A. (2014). The stream algorithm: Computationally efficient ridge-regression via Bayesian model averaging, and applications to pharmacogenomic prediction of cancer cell line sensitivity. *Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing*, *19*, 27-38.

O'Hagan, A., & Forster, J. (2004). *Kendall's Advanced Theory of Statistics: Bayesian Inference (Vol. 2B)*. London: Arnold.

Petricoin, E., Ardekani, A., Hitt, B., Levine, P., Fusaro, V., Steinberg, S., Mills, G., Simone, C., Fishman, D., Kohn, E., & Liotta, L. (2002). Use of proteomic patterns in serum to identify ovarian cancer. *The Lancet*, *359*, 572-577.

Polson, N., & Scott, J. (2012). Local shrinkage rules, Lévy processes and regularized regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, *74*, 287-311.

R Development Core Team. (2015). *R: A language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria.

Rasmussen, C., & Williams, C. (2006). *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Rifkin, R., & Klautau, A. (2004). In defense of one-vs-all classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *5*, 101-141.

Ripley, B. (1996). *Pattern Recognition and Neural Networks*. Cambridge University press.

Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, *6*, 461-464.

Searle, S. (1982). *Matrix Algebra Useful for Statistics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Shao, J. (1993). Linear model selection by cross-validation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *88*, 486-494.

Shipp, M., Ross, K., Tamayo, P., Weng, A., Kutok, J., Aguiar, R., Gaasenbeek, M., Angelo, M., Reich, M., Pinkus, G., Ray, T., Koval, M., Last, K., Norton, A., Lister, T., Mesirov, J., Neuberg, D., Lander, E., Aster, J., & Golub, T. (2002). Diffuse large b-cell lymphoma outcome prediction by gene-expression profiling and supervised machine learning. *Nature Medicine*, *8*, 68-74.

Singh, R. (2010). A survey of ridge regression for improvement over ordinary least squares. *IUP Journal of Computational Mathematics*, *3*, 54-74.

Tatum, A., & Karabatsos, G. (2013). *A survey study of teens and texts (Tech. Rep.)*. University of Illinois-Chicago.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, *58*, 267-288.

Tsionas, E., & Tassiopoulos, A. (2014). *Bayesian implications of ridge regression and Zellner's g-prior (Tech. Rep.)*. Athens University of Economics and Business - Department of Economics. SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2387582.

Walker, S., & Page, C. (2001). Generalized ridge regression and a generalization of the Cp statistic. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, *28*, 911-922.

Wehrens, R., & Mevik, B.-H. (2007). *pls: Partial Least Squares Regression (PLSR) and Principal Component Regression (PCR)*. (R package version 2.1-0)

Wu, T.-F., Lin, C.-J., & Weng, R. (2004). Probability estimates for multi-class classification by pairwise coupling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *5*, 975-1005.

Zellner, A. (1986). On assessing prior distributions and Bayesian regression analysis with g-prior distributions. In P. Goel & A. Zellner (Eds.), *Bayesian Inference and Decision Techniques: Essays in Honor of Bruno de Finetti* (p. 233-243). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Zhang, Y., Li, R., & Tsai, C.-L. (2010). Regularization parameter selections via generalized information criterion. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *105*, 312-323.

Zou, H., & Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, *67*, 301-320.