

Composite Bayesian inference

Alexis Roche*

CHUV / Siemens Healthcare / EPFL
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

This paper revisits the concept of composite likelihood from the perspective of probabilistic inference, and proposes a generalization called “super composite likelihood” for more flexible use of data information. It is shown that super composite likelihood yields a class of discriminative models suitable for unsupervised or weakly supervised learning.

1 Introduction

Conventional Bayesian inference and other likelihood-based paradigms rest upon the existence of a statistical data-generating model that is both experimentally plausible and computationally tractable. Because this is challenging when the data is inherently complex, common practice to implement feasible inference algorithms is to use deliberately misspecified data-generating models [20, 19] such as in *naïve Bayes* [12] or minimum description length [9], or to resort to highly supervised discriminative modeling approaches [12], not to mention ad-hoc methodology.

Composite likelihood (see [17] and the references therein) is some kind of middle-way approach that extends the familiar notion of likelihood without requiring a full data-generating model. The key idea is to model an arbitrary set of low-dimensional features separately and then combine them, instead of modeling the data distribution as a whole. This may also be viewed as a *divide & conquer* method of approximating the actual likelihood. While maximum composite likelihood does not inherit the general property of maximum likelihood to yield asymptotically minimum-variance estimators, it may offer an excellent trade-off between computational and statistical efficiency.

In this note, composite likelihood is interpreted as a probabilistic opinion pool [8, 6] of “experts” using different pieces of information, or clues, extracted from the data. Each expert acts as a local Bayesian statistician expressing an opinion in the form of a posterior distribution on the unknown parameters of interest, or hypotheses, given a specific clue. Composite likelihood can therefore be associated with a probability distribution on hypotheses, hence extending Bayesian analysis to problems where a proper likelihood function is intractable.

I further justify a generalization of composite likelihood called *super composite likelihood* whereby clues can be weighted differently depending on hypotheses in order to provide further flexibility in designing efficient inference procedures. This more general concept also encompasses another likelihood approximation strategy known as *PDF projection* [2].

*alexis.roche@{centraliens.net,gmail.com,epfl.ch}

This paper is intended to serve as supporting material for a companion paper (in preparation), where the super composite likelihood framework is applied to the problem of image registration [18] to provide a probabilistic interpretation of existing methods from the computer vision literature.

2 Composite likelihood as opinion pooling

Let Y an observable multivariate random variable with sampling distribution $p(y|\theta)$ conditional on some unobserved parameter of interest, $\theta \in \Theta$, where Θ is a known set. Given an experimental outcome y , the likelihood is the sampling distribution evaluated at y , seen as a function of θ :

$$L(\theta) = p(y|\theta).$$

For a high-dimensional Y , this expression may be intractable if a plausible generative model is lacking, or involves nuisance parameters that are too cumbersome to integrate out. A natural workaround known as *data reduction* is then to extract some lower-dimensional feature $z = f(y)$, where f is a many-to-one mapping, and consider the potentially more convenient likelihood function:

$$\ell(\theta) = p(z|\theta).$$

Substituting $L(\theta)$ with $\ell(\theta)$ boils down to restricting the sample space, thereby “delegating” statistical inference to an agent provided with partial information. While it is valid for an agent observing z only to consider $\ell(\theta)$ as the likelihood function of the problem, the drawback is that $\ell(\theta)$ might be poorly informative about θ due to the information loss incurred by data reduction. To make the trick statistically more efficient, we may extract several features simultaneously, $z_i = f_i(y)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and try to aggregate the likelihood functions $\ell_i(\theta) = p(z_i|\theta)$ that they elicit.

This leads to a classical problem of combining probabilistic opinions from possibly redundant “experts” [16, 8, 6, 1]. Genest *et al* [7] showed, in particular, that the only pooling operator that does not explicitly depend on θ and preserves *external Bayesianity* is the generalized logarithmic opinion pool:

$$p_\star(\theta) = \frac{1}{Z} \pi(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\theta)^{w_i}, \quad \text{with} \quad Z = \int \pi(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\theta)^{w_i} d\theta, \quad (1)$$

where $\pi(\theta)$ is some reference distribution or prior, and w_i are arbitrary positive¹ weights that sum up to one,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1.$$

External Bayesianity essentially means that it should not matter whether a prior on θ is incorporated before or after pooling opinions, provided that all experts agree on the same prior. Importantly, the log-linear pool does not assume mutual feature independence, as would the same factorized form as (1) with all unitary weights, $w_1 = \dots = w_n = 1$. Instead, expert redundancy is assumed by default, and is effectively encoded by the unit sum constraint on weights².

¹Negative weights can be chosen only if the parameter set Θ is finite [7].

²Nevertheless, features which are *known* to be mutually independent can be merged into a single feature, which results in increasing their weights in the log-linear pool.

Strikingly, (1) reduces to an analogous of Bayes rule: $p_\star(\theta) \propto \pi(\theta)L_c(\theta, \mathbf{w})$, where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^\top$ denotes the vector of weights and the quantity:

$$L_c(\theta, \mathbf{w}) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\theta)^{w_i} \quad (2)$$

plays exactly the same role as a traditional likelihood function. $L_c(\theta, \mathbf{w})$ shares a convenient factorized form with the likelihood derived under mutual feature independence, sometimes called *naïve Bayes* likelihood in the literature [12]. The only difference is that the single-feature likelihoods are scaled by the weights $w_i \leq 1$, hence producing a flatter posterior distribution. In comparison with classical likelihood, the clear computational advantage is that we only need to evaluate the marginal feature distributions, rather than the joint distribution of all features.

We recognize in (2) a general expression known as a *marginal composite likelihood* [17], although it is derived here under the restriction that the weights sum up to one. It is an open problem to determine an appropriate scaling of weights that justifies plugging composite likelihood into Bayes rule. The recommendation for unit sum weights is particularly simple compared to, *e.g.*, tuning a constant weight so as to best adjust the pseudo posterior variance matrix to the asymptotic variance matrix of the maximum composite likelihood estimator [13]. A close-in-spirit curvature adjustment is proposed in [15]. Such approaches reconcile the frequentist and Bayesian notions of uncertainty to some extent, but are not externally Bayesian since they do not warrant unit sum weights. When we refer to composite likelihood in the sequel, it is assumed that the weights sum up to one.

3 Composite likelihood as message approximation

Composite likelihood may also be understood as a means to approximate the true likelihood function³ or, in the language of graphical models, the *message* that the data sends to the latent variable θ . It computes a simplified message by extracting arbitrary features from the data and treating them as non-coalescent clues in the sense that their statistical dependences are not modeled (although not ignored). The whole idea is depicted by the factor graph [5] in Figure 1(b), where only factors involving single clues are connected to the latent variable, thereby enabling efficient computations.

Interestingly, this approximation scheme is optimal in an information-theoretic sense. As noted in [6], the log-linear pool minimizes the average Kullback-Leibler divergence to the probabilistic opinions:

$$p_\star = \arg \min_p \sum_{i=1}^n w_i D(p \| p_i), \quad (3)$$

where $p_i(\theta) \propto \pi(\theta)\ell_i(\theta)$ is the posterior distribution of expert i . Note that, even though the weights are arbitrary in (3), the optimal solution normalizes them to unit sum. Therefore, composite likelihood arises as the best possible consensus among experts according to some natural measure, in addition to satisfying the external Bayesianity axiom. Interpreting the average divergence from experts (3) as a proxy for the divergence from “the truth” $p(\theta|y)$, composite likelihood can be seen as a variational approximation to the true likelihood. This corresponds to the intuitive notion that a consensus among sufficiently many experts should not be far from the truth.

³By *true likelihood*, we mean the likelihood corresponding to a specified yet intractable generative model. In practice, such a model is obviously not required.




Figure 1: Factor graph representations of a generative model (a) and its approximation using composite likelihood (b). In (a), the factor connecting the data y and the latent variable θ is the true likelihood, $L(y, \theta) = p(y|\theta)$. In (b), factors connecting y and the clues $z_1, z_2, \dots$ represent feature extractions, $\alpha_i(y, z_i) = \delta[y - f_i(z_i)]$, while factors connecting the clues and θ are scaled single-feature likelihoods, $\beta_i(z_i, \theta) = p(z_i|\theta)^{w_i}$. In both graphs, the factor shown in black is the prior $\pi(\theta)$.

4 Super composite likelihood

Due to the distribution of weights between experts, a drawback of composite likelihood, however, is that it is prone to *information overload* in the sense that it tends to “flatten out” when too many clues are included as relevant clues get downweighted.

If not merging clues for computational reasons, one could hope to mitigate this effect by optimizing the weights, *i.e.*, assigning strong weights only to those clues that are believed to be “most informative”. However, when chosen for simplicity, clues may not only convey limited information at individual level: their informativeness may also be very much hypothesis-dependent. Consider, for instance, diagnosing disease from a routine medical checkup. Body temperature may point to a bacterial infection by comparison with normality, but does not help detecting a non-infectious cardiovascular disease – and conversely for blood pressure.

This motivates a more general setting where clues can be weighted differently depending on hypotheses. To avoid unnecessary technicalities, we will assume from now on a finite set of hypotheses, $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$, where one particular hypothesis, θ_0 , is given the special status of reference, or “null” hypothesis.

Let us introduce the following auxiliary binary variables, for $j = 1, \dots, m$, defined by truncation of θ :

$$t_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta = \theta_j \\ 0 & \text{if } \theta = \theta_0 \end{cases} . \quad (4)$$

One can think of each variable t_j as an indicator light that flashes green ($t_j = 1$) or red ($t_j = 0$) whenever θ is in one of the particular two states θ_j or θ_0 , and does not respond otherwise. The collection of all t_j ’s may be thought of as a population code [10] for θ .

The key idea is as follows: instead of approximating the message sent from the data to θ in one piece as in Section 3, we may approximate each of the simpler messages sent to the t_j ’s. To that end, we construct a factor graph using the population code, depicted in Figure 2, which is equivalent to the graph in Figure 1(a) for the purpose of computing the posterior distribution $p(\theta|y)$. This graph involves multiple factors representing the “restricted” likelihood

functions,

$$L_j(t_j) = p(y|t_j) = \begin{cases} p(y|\theta_j) & \text{if } t_j = 1 \\ p(y|\theta_0) & \text{if } t_j = 0 \end{cases}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

as opposed to a single factor for the full likelihood $L(\theta)$. In addition, there are factors γ_j to synthesize the different messages sent to the binary variables $t_1, \dots, t_m$ into one sent to θ :

$$\gamma_j(t_j, \theta) = \begin{cases} \delta_{1t_j} & \text{if } \theta = \theta_j \\ \delta_{0t_j} & \text{if } \theta \neq \theta_j \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

where δ denotes the Kronecker delta.




Figure 2: Alternative graph using population coding for the computation of $p(\theta|y)$. See text for details.

The unnormalized joint distribution $f(y, \theta)$ represented by the graph in Figure 2 is:

$$\begin{aligned} f(y, \theta) &= \pi(\theta) \sum_{t_1=0}^1 \dots \sum_{t_m=0}^1 \prod_{j=1}^m L_j(t_j) \gamma_j(t_j, \theta) \\ &= \pi(\theta) \prod_{j=1}^m \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_j\}}(\theta) p(y|\theta_j) + [1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_j\}}(\theta)] p(y|\theta_0) \right\} \\ &= \pi(\theta) p(y|\theta) p(y|\theta_0)^{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

clearly yielding the same posterior as $\pi(\theta) p(y|\theta)$, although not the same generative model $p(y|\theta)$ but this has no practical consequence for inference. The alternative graph enables a more flexible approximation scheme where each restricted likelihood $L_j(t_j)$ can be substituted with a specific composite likelihood $L_{cj}(t_j, \mathbf{w}_j)$ using own pre-determined weights, $\mathbf{w}_j = (w_{1j}, w_{2j}, \dots, w_{nj})^\top$:

$$L_{cj}(t_j, \mathbf{w}_j) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(z_i|t_j)^{w_{ij}} = \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_{ij}(z_i, t_j),$$

with:

$$\beta_{ij}(z_i, t_j) = \begin{cases} p(z_i|\theta_j)^{w_{ij}} = \ell_i(\theta_j)^{w_{ij}} & \text{if } t_j = 1 \\ p(z_i|\theta_0)^{w_{ij}} = \ell_i(\theta_0)^{w_{ij}} & \text{if } t_j = 0 \end{cases}, \quad (6)$$

and:

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n w_{ij} = 1.$$

This corresponds to replacing each factor L_i in Figure 2 with a subgraph of same structure as the subgraph highlighted in red in Figure 1(b), resulting in the further modified factor graph shown in Figure 3. Intuitively, hypothesis-dependent weights make it possible to emphasize the clues that are relevant to every particular hypothesis comparison θ_j vs. θ_0 , leading to potentially better approximations to the true odds, $p(\theta_j|y)/p(\theta_0|y)$, than using constant weights, although we shall caution that the approximation quality still depends on the choice of weights.




Figure 3: Super composite likelihood factor graph. See respectively (6) and (5) for the expression of the factors β_{ij} and γ_j .

The unnormalized joint distribution encoded by the factor graph in Figure 3 reads:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\star}(y, \theta) &= \pi(\theta) \sum_{t_1=0}^1 \dots \sum_{t_m=0}^1 \prod_{j=1}^m L_{cj}(t_j, \mathbf{w}_j) \gamma_j(t_j, \theta) \\ &= \pi(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^m \ell_i \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_j\}}(\theta) \theta + [1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_j\}}(\theta)] \theta_0 \right)^{w_{ij}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the associated posterior distribution on θ is easily found to be:

$$p_{\star}(\theta) = K \frac{\pi(\theta)}{\pi(\theta_0)} \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\ell_i(\theta)}{\ell_i(\theta_0)} \right]^{w_i(\theta)}, \quad (7)$$

where K is a normalizing constant and the functions $w_i(\theta)$ are defined by $w_i(\theta_j) = w_{ij}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $w_i(\theta_0) = 0$ conventionally.

As an opinion pooling rule, (7) is more general than the log-linear pool (1) as it explicitly depends on θ . Moreover, since the weights sum up to one for each $j \geq 1$, we have the equivalent expression:

$$p_{\star}(\theta) = K \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\pi(\theta) \ell_i(\theta)}{\pi(\theta_0) \ell_i(\theta_0)} \right]^{w_i(\theta)},$$

showing that the pool does not change depending on whether the prior is incorporated before or after combining experts. In other words, (7) is still externally Bayesian.

As in Section 2, we recognize a Bayes rule-type expression: $p_\star(\theta) \propto \pi(\theta)\mathcal{L}_c(\theta, \mathbf{W})$, with:

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\theta, \mathbf{W}) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\ell_i(\theta)}{\ell_i(\theta_0)} \right]^{w_i(\theta)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{W}$ denotes the $n \times m$ weight matrix with general element w_{ij} . We call (8) a super composite likelihood. Note that the super composite likelihood evaluated at a particular hypothesis boils down to a composite likelihood ratio,

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{W}) = \frac{L_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{w}_j)}{L_c(\theta_0, \mathbf{w}_j)}. \quad (9)$$

To see that (8) is indeed a generalization of composite likelihood, assume that $\mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{w}$ is the same for all j . This implies that (9) simplifies to $\mathcal{L}_c(\theta, \mathbf{W}) = L_c(\theta, \mathbf{w})/L_c(\theta_0, \mathbf{w})$, the denominator of which is independent from θ and can therefore be safely ignored. The super composite likelihood is then equivalent to the standard composite likelihood $L_c(\theta, \mathbf{w})$ for inference about θ , regardless of the chosen reference θ_0 .

However, θ_0 plays a crucial normalization role whenever the columns of $\mathbf{W}$ are not identical, enabling complex, possibly sparse, weighting patterns. Consider, for instance, the case where each hypothesis gets evidence from a single clue, so that $\mathbf{W}$ has a single 1 in each column and all other elements 0. The super composite likelihood (8) then reduces to a likelihood ratio involving a single hypothesis-specific clue $z_{\iota(j)}$ determined by some mapping $\iota : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{W}) = \frac{\ell_{\iota(j)}(\theta_j)}{\ell_{\iota(j)}(\theta_0)} = \frac{p(z_{\iota(j)}|\theta_j)}{p(z_{\iota(j)}|\theta_0)}. \quad (10)$$

This expression was already used in [2, 11] motivated by a different argument than here, namely the *PDF projection theorem*, which states the full data-generating model maximizing entropy (relative to some reference distribution) under knowledge of the feature sampling distributions. As pointed out by [2], (10) closely approximates the true likelihood if each $z_{\iota(j)}$ is a near-sufficient statistic for θ_j vs. θ_0 , a condition that may be difficult to meet if the choice of clues is driven by computational efficiency. Super composite likelihood provides an alternative interpretation of PDF projection, while also extending it to multiple clues with unknown statistical dependences.

5 Further extensions

5.1 Conditional super composite likelihood

The derivation of super composite likelihood rests upon the definition of feature-based likelihood as $\ell_i(\theta) = p(z_i|\theta)$. As a straightforward extension, $\ell_i(\theta)$ may be conditioned by an additional “independent” feature $z_i^c = f_i^c(y)$ considered as a predictor of the “dependent” feature, $z_i = f_i(y)$, yielding the more general form:

$$\ell_i(\theta) = p(z_i|\theta, z_i^c). \quad (11)$$

Conditioning may be useful if it is believed that z_i^c alone is little or not informative about θ , but can provide relevant information when considered jointly with z_i , as in the case of regression covariates, for instance. Traditional composite likelihood (2) then amounts to a *conditional*

composite likelihood [17], a more general form of composite likelihood also including Besag’s historical *pseudo-likelihood* [4], which was a major breakthrough in computer vision.

Likewise, the derivation in Section 4 remains valid when independent features are used, and we can thus define a conditional version of super composite likelihood by plugging likelihood functions of the form (11) into (8).

5.2 Nuisance parameters

It is most often the case in practice that plausible feature generating models involve unknown quantities of no direct interest. The feature-based likelihood are then functions of both the parameter of interest θ and a nuisance parameter denoted ψ : $\ell_i(\theta, \psi) = p(z_i|\theta, \psi)$, or $\ell_i(\theta, \psi) = p(z_i|z_i^c, \theta, \psi)$ if independent features are used.

When weighting clues independently from the hypotheses, a joint composite likelihood on both parameters may be derived:

$$L_c(\theta, \psi, \mathbf{w}) = \prod_i \ell_i(\theta, \psi)^{w_i},$$

and further integrated with respect to some prior on the nuisance parameter to yield a function of θ only, which we may call the *composite evidence*:

$$\bar{L}_c(\theta, \mathbf{w}) = \int \pi(\psi) L_c(\theta, \psi, \mathbf{w}) d\psi. \quad (12)$$

This corresponds to using the factor graph represented in Figure 4 to approximate the message from the data to θ , where the factors β_i are now defined by $\beta_i(z_i, \theta, \psi) = \ell_i(\theta, \psi)^{w_i}$. Although ψ is not a clue, it is treated similarly as an auxiliary variable to be integrated out.




Figure 4: Extension of the composite likelihood factor graph in Figure 1(b) to account for nuisance parameters.

More generally, when weighting clues depending on hypotheses, we may use essentially the same idea as in Section 4, *i.e.*, replicate subgraphs such as the one depicted in red and magenta in Figure 4 in order to approximate the different messages sent from the data to each truncated variable t_j , as defined in (4). Note that, by replicating the same graph structure across variables t_j , the variable ψ is also replicated, so that the resulting factor graph in Figure 5 does not represent a joint distribution of the form $f_\star(y, \theta, \psi)$, but rather one of the form $f_\star(y, \theta, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_m)$. This makes the approximation more flexible by taking advantage of the fact that a marginal distribution on ψ is not required.




Figure 5: Extension of the super composite likelihood factor graph in Figure 3 to account for nuisance parameters. Here, the factors $\beta_{ij}(z_i, t_j, \psi_j)$ are defined by $\beta_{ij}(z_i, 1, \psi_j) = \ell_i(\theta_j, \psi_j)^{w_{ij}}$ and $\beta_{ij}(z_i, 0, \psi_j) = \ell_i(\theta_0, \psi_j)^{w_{ij}}$.

The posterior distribution encoded by this graph (integrated with respect to the replicates $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m$) is easily found to be:

$$p_{\star}(\theta) \propto \pi(\theta) \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{L}_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{w}_j)}{\bar{L}_c(\theta_0, \mathbf{w}_j)} & \text{if } \theta = \theta_j \text{ with } j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \\ 1 & \text{if } \theta = \theta_0 \end{cases},$$

where $\bar{L}_c(\cdot, \mathbf{w}_j)$ is the above-defined composite evidence function (12) associated with the weight vector $\mathbf{w}_j$. This justifies defining the *super composite evidence* as:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{W}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{L}_c(\theta_j, \mathbf{w}_j)}{\bar{L}_c(\theta_0, \mathbf{w}_j)} & \text{if } j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \\ 1 & \text{if } j = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

Obvious from (13) is that the super composite evidence conserves all odds θ_j *vs.* θ_0 integrated within their respective associated subgraphs, very much like its nuisance parameter-free version (9). The conservation of odds implies that evaluating the super composite likelihood at a particular θ is akin to computing a scaled Bayes factor, which may sometimes be efficiently approximated via a maximum likelihood ratio statistic.

6 Discussion

Composite likelihood is a relatively recent concept from computational statistics that has mainly been developed so far in a frequentist perspective as a surrogate for the maximum likelihood method [17]. In this paper, we have shown (to our best knowledge, for the first time) a connection between composite likelihood and probabilistic opinion pooling, thereby establishing composite likelihood as part of a *discriminative model* [12], *i.e.*, a model of the conditional distribution of an unobserved variable of interest depending on data.

In this perspective, composite likelihood is essentially a re-interpretation and a generalization of *naïve Bayes* that avoids the associated “naïve” mutual feature independence assumption. Specifically, when all features are given equal weight, the composite likelihood is the naïve Bayes likelihood raised to the power $1/n$, where n is the number of selected features, yielding the same maximum a posteriori estimator if a flat prior is used. However, beside providing a simple justification to the wide use of naïve Bayes algorithms, the opinion pooling viewpoint also entails a conservative rescaling of credibility sets derived from naïve Bayes, which gets more drastic as the number of features increases. This comes as a consequence of not assuming feature independence.

We argued that this rescaling may to some extent be unduly conservative when weighing features uniformly across potential outcomes of the unobserved variable, leading us to propose the more general concept of *super composite likelihood*. Super composite likelihood works by breaking into pieces both the observed and unobserved variable spaces to assemble a concise *message* passing from the former to the latter. The idea is best understood from the factor graph depicted in Figure 3, which ultimately describes a more general discriminative model than the one associated with standard composite likelihood.

Perhaps the main interest of (super) composite likelihood lies in the essential difference with classical discriminative models (*e.g.*, Gaussian process [14] or maximum entropy [3] regression/classification models) that the data can convey direct information about nuisance parameters, hence alleviating the need for heavily supervised model training. In other words, the factor graph model underlying super composite likelihood in its parametric version (see Figure 5) is not reducible to a Bayesian network of the type represented in Figure 6, in which the data and the nuisance parameter are marginally independent.




Figure 6: Bayesian network representing a classical discriminative model. Note the independence between the data y and the nuisance parameter ψ .

The ability to yield weakly supervised or even unsupervised inference procedures is a most appealing property that reflects the fact that super composite likelihood is made of atomic feature generating models. It may be considered as a *semi-generative* modeling approach in the sense that it assembles partial generative models to build a discriminative model.

On the other hand, it should be stressed that the pre-determined weights assigned to the different associations between observed and unobserved values represent strong *a priori* knowledge regarding the informativeness of clues. A poor choice of weights will inevitably result in a poor approximation to the “true” Bayesian posterior – the posterior that would be obtained from a realistic generative model if it was tractable. In future work, we will investigate feature selection strategies to mitigate this problem.

References

- [1] D. Allard, A. Comunian, and P. Renard. Probability aggregation methods in Geoscience. *Mathematical Geosciences*, 44(5):545–581, 2012.
- [2] P. Baggenstoss. The PDF projection theorem and the class-specific method. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 51(3):672–685, 2003.
- [3] A. L. Berger, S. D. Pietra, and V. J. D. Pietra. A maximum entropy approach to natural language processing. *Computational Linguistics*, 22(1):39–71, 1996.
- [4] J. Besag. Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 36(2):192–236, 1974.
- [5] C. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Intelligence*. Springer, 2006.
- [6] A. Garg, T. Jayram, S. Vaithyanathan, and H. Zhu. Generalized opinion pooling. In *8th International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics*, pages 79–86, 2004.
- [7] C. Genest, K. J. McConway, and M. J. Schervish. Characterization of externally Bayesian pooling operators. *Annals of Statistics*, 14(2):487–501, 1986.
- [8] C. Genest and J. V. Zidek. Combining probability distributions: A critique and an annotated bibliography. *Statistical Science*, 1(1):114–135, 1986.
- [9] P. Grünwald. *The Minimum Description Length Principle*. MIT Press, 2007.
- [10] D. C. Knill and A. Pouget. The Bayesian brain: the role of uncertainty in neural coding and computation. *TRENDS in Neurosciences*, 27(12):712–719, 2004.
- [11] T. Minka. Exemplar-based likelihoods using the PDF projection theorem. *Microsoft Research Ltd.*, 2004.
- [12] A. Y. Ng and M. I. Jordan. On discriminative vs. generative classifiers: a comparison of logistic regression and naive Bayes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 841–848, 2001.
- [13] F. Pauli, W. Racugno, and L. Ventura. Bayesian composite marginal likelihoods. *Statistica Sinica*, 21:149–164, 2011.
- [14] C. Rasmussen and C. Williams. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [15] M. Ribatet, D. Cooley, and A. C. Davison. Bayesian inference from composite likelihoods, with an application to spatial extremes. *Statistica Sinica*, 22:813–845, 2012.
- [16] A. Tarantola and B. Valette. Inverse problems = quest for information. *J. geophys*, 50(3):150–170, 1982.
- [17] C. Varin, N. Reid, and D. Firth. An overview of composite likelihood methods. *Statistica Sinica*, 21(1):5–42, 2011.
- [18] P. Viola and W. M. Wells. Alignment by Maximization of Mutual Information. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 24(2):137–154, 1997.

- [19] S. G. Walker. Bayesian inference with misspecified models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143(10):1621–1633, 2013.
- [20] H. White. Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica*, 50(1):1–25, 1982.