

Comparing and weighting imperfect models using D-probabilities

Meng Li¹ and David B. Dunson²

¹Department of Statistics, Rice University

²Department of Statistical Science, Duke University

September 8, 2018

Abstract

We propose a new approach for assigning weights to models using a divergence-based method (*D-probabilities*), relying on evaluating parametric models relative to a nonparametric Bayesian reference using Kullback-Leibler divergence. D-probabilities are useful in goodness-of-fit assessments, in comparing imperfect models, and in providing model weights to be used in model aggregation. D-probabilities avoid some of the disadvantages of Bayesian model probabilities, such as large sensitivity to prior choice, and tend to place higher weight on a greater diversity of models. In an application to linear model selection against a Gaussian process reference, we provide simple analytic forms for routine implementation and show that D-probabilities automatically penalize model complexity. Some asymptotic properties are described, and we provide interesting probabilistic interpretations of the proposed model weights. The framework is illustrated through simulation examples and an ozone data application.

Key words: Gaussian process; Gibbs posterior; Kullback-Leibler divergence; Model aggregation; Model selection; M-open; Nonparametric Bayes; Posterior probabilities.

1 Introduction

Dealing with uncertainty in model choice is one of the fundamental tasks in statistics (Claeskens and Hjort, 2008). Suppose we have a list of parametric models under consideration $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k\}$ for the observations $y^{(n)} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ with \mathcal{Y} the sample space. Each model \mathcal{M}_j has a corresponding likelihood $p(\cdot \mid \theta_j, \mathcal{M}_j)$, with $\theta_j \in \Theta_j$ a finite dimensional parameter. Then it becomes of substantial interest to provide a *weight* on each model \mathcal{M}_j to be used in goodness-of-fit assessments of model adequacy, for comparing model performance, and for aggregating different models targeted to prediction. One of the most popular approaches is to use Bayesian model probabilities as weights, with these weights forming the basis of Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA). This article is motivated by an attempt to define weights that can improve upon Bayesian model probabilities.

Assigning equal prior probabilities to each model for simplicity, and letting $\pi(\cdot | \mathcal{M}_j)$ denote the prior density for θ_j , for $j = 1, \dots, k$, the posterior probability of model \mathcal{M}_j is

$$\text{pr}(\mathcal{M}_j | y^{(n)}) = \pi_j = \frac{L_j(y^{(n)})}{\sum_{l=1}^k L_l(y^{(n)})}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k,$$

where $L_j(y^{(n)}) = \int p(y^{(n)} | \theta_j, \mathcal{M}_j) \pi(\theta_j | \mathcal{M}_j) d\theta_j$ is the marginal likelihood. Philosophically, in order to interpret $\text{pr}(\mathcal{M}_j | y^{(n)})$ as a model *probability*, one must rely on the (arguably always flawed) assumption that one of the models in the list \mathcal{M} is exactly true, known as the \mathcal{M} -closed case. However, from a pragmatic perspective, one can use $\text{pr}(\mathcal{M}_j | y^{(n)})$ as a model weight, regardless of the question of interpretation. This pragmatic view is supported by the well known result that asymptotically for regular parametric models, the posterior probability on the model that is closest to the true data-generating model in Kullback-Leibler divergence converges to one.

Unfortunately, as model weights, Bayesian model probabilities have some practical disadvantages. They are not useful for assessing model adequacy in an *absolute* sense, and hence are not calibrated for goodness-of-fit assessments. Instead, they provide a measure of model performance *relative* to the other models under comparison. A poor model may be assigned a high probability when the competing models are very poor, while a good model may be assigned a low probability when there are many good and/or similar competing models. In addition, Bayesian model probabilities suffer from large sensitivity to the choice of the prior $\pi(\theta_j | \mathcal{M}_j)$ without an agreed upon method of default prior specification (Liang et al., 2008). Usual non-informative priors used in parameter estimation under a given model are typically improper and cannot be used. In practice we have observed a tendency of BMA to be *over confident* in weighting models - assigning weights that are too close to zero or one.

One possibility is to consider Bayesian model selection from an \mathcal{M} -open or \mathcal{M} -complete perspective to allow the true model to fall outside of \mathcal{M} ; the \mathcal{M} -complete case assumes the true model is known but possibly too complex (Bernardo and Smith, 1994). In these cases, one can formulate the model selection problem in a decision theoretic framework (Bernardo and Smith, 1994; Gutiérrez-Peña et al., 2009; Clyde and Iversen, 2013), selecting the model in \mathcal{M} that maximizes expected utility. Expected utility can be approximated either via cross-validation (Clyde and Iversen, 2013) or using a nonparametric prior (Gutiérrez-Peña and Walker, 2005; Gutiérrez-Peña et al., 2009). Cross validation is computationally intensive, and maximizing expected utility produces a single optimal model without uncertainty quantification or weights to be used in model aggregation.

There is a rich literature on alternative methods for weighting models. As an approximation to BMA weights, it is common to calculate the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC_j) for each model \mathcal{M}_j , and then use weights proportional to $\exp(-\text{BIC}_j/2)$ (Kass and Wasserman, 1995; Hoeting et al., 1999). Many authors have proposed to use cross validation to empirically estimate weights to be used in model aggregated predictions. One example is the so-called *super learner* (van der Laan et al., 2007). If the focus is on aggregating models, or more broadly predictive algorithms, then it is possible to recast the problem as a two-stage linear regression - in the first stage one fits each of the predictive algorithms separately and obtains the corresponding estimated predictive values, while in the second stage these predictive values are used as predictors in a linear regression. One can then exploit the rich toolbox of methods for fitting high-dimensional linear regression models to aggregate large numbers of predictive algorithms. Rigollet and Tsybakov (2012) developed an

exponential weighting method targeted to aggregation of sparse Gaussian regression models. All of these methods are focused on providing weights for model aggregation, and are not useful for goodness-of-fit assessments of (absolute) model adequacy.

We propose a simple definition of model weights that are calibrated in an *absolute* sense. To estimate these weights, we require knowledge of the oracle model that generated the data. Using a nonparametric Bayes surrogate for the oracle, we provide methods for estimation and inference. The proposed model weights provide assessment of model adequacy and goodness-of-fit, describe uncertainty in model selection, and are useful in model aggregation. While the framework is broad, we focus primarily on comparing linear models using a Gaussian process surrogate. The framework reduces sensitivity to the prior choice, and default prior specification including improper priors can be used as long as the posteriors under each model are proper. These advantages are verified by a comprehensive simulation study under univariate settings (Section 6) and an ozone data application involving multivariate predictors (Section 7).

Our notion of model weights has a connection to a range of concepts in the literature including Boltzmann (1878). We establish various probabilistic interpretations using an explicit decision rule in the setting of hypothetical repeated experiments and p-values in Section 5. The calibration and coherence of the new model weights may make the framework an appropriate foundation for a wide range of problems beyond linear model selection.

2 Absolute and relative model weights

2.1 Definition of model weights

Let \mathcal{N}^* be the oracle model which generated the data and f^* be the corresponding density function. Let $\text{KL}(f, g) = \int f \log(f/g)$. For any model \mathcal{M}_j with density f_j , we define the following *absolute* model weights:

$$\pi_j = \exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (1)$$

which equals the exponentiated negative Kullback-Leibler divergence between \mathcal{M}_j and the oracle model. This definition is closely related to the notion of the *extent* of a distribution, which was introduced by Campbell (1966) using the exponentiated entropy, with the relative entropy Kullback-Leibler divergence as a special case. To our knowledge, this notion of extent has been overlooked outside of information theory.

Under (1) $\pi_j \in (0, 1)$ since $\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)$ is always nonnegative. However, simply obeying this constraint does not make π_j interpretable as a probability or useful as a basis of inference. One obtains a probabilistic interpretation of the model weights (1) in an absolute sense if π_j corresponds to the probability of an appropriately chosen event that reflects the likelihood under \mathcal{M}_j relative to \mathcal{N}^* . Indeed, in Section 5.2 we show that π_j is the probability of selecting \mathcal{M}_j based on a randomized decision rule that chooses \mathcal{M}_j in the absence of sufficient evidence in the data to distinguish \mathcal{M}_j from \mathcal{N}^* .

2.2 Conditional model weights

The definition of π_j in (1) provides an absolute measure of adequacy of a specific model. In quantifying the relative performance of different models in a pre-specified list \mathcal{M} , and in aggregating

these models to obtain an ensemble predictive algorithm, it is useful to define conditional model weights. We define the conditional weight for model \mathcal{M}_j as

$$\pi_{j|\mathcal{M}} = \frac{\pi_j}{\sum_{l=1}^k \pi_l} = \frac{\exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\}}{\sum_{l=1}^k \exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_l)\}}, \quad (2)$$

which is simply the absolute weight for model \mathcal{M}_j divided by the sum of the corresponding weights for each of the models in \mathcal{M} .

The weights in (2) can be used to compare alternative parametric models. Equation (2) has the same form as the famous Boltzmann-Gibbs weights in statistical mechanics with unit inverse temperature, where $\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)$ is the energy of model j . By defining conditional model weights relative to other models in the list \mathcal{M} , we obtain a direct alternative to posterior model probabilities used in Bayesian inferences. We will later show that the weights in (2) are asymptotically equivalent to usual posterior model probabilities if $f^* = f_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, so that the oracle model exactly corresponds to one of the candidate parametric models. Although we view this assumption as unrealistic, this property is nonetheless reassuring.

2.3 Estimation of model weights: D-probabilities

The model weights π_j and $\pi_{j|\mathcal{M}}$ cannot be calculated directly, because the oracle model f^* is unknown and models in \mathcal{M} typically contain unknown parameters. To allow f^* to be unknown, we introduce a nonparametric reference model \mathcal{N} , which can be considered to be sufficiently flexible to accurately approximate the oracle, with accuracy improving with sample size. The nonparametric reference has density f_0 and parameter θ_0 . The absolute and conditional model weights given the model list \mathcal{M} become

$$\pi_j = \exp\{-n\widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j)\}, \quad \pi_{j|\mathcal{M}} = \frac{\exp\{-n\widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j)\}}{\sum_{l=1}^k \exp\{-n\widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_l)\}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j)$ is an estimate of the Kullback-Leibler divergence between model \mathcal{M}_j and the reference model \mathcal{N} .

We propose the following two estimators: a posterior mean estimator

$$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) = \int \int \text{KL}\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\} \pi(\theta_j | y^{(n)}) \pi(\theta_0 | y^{(n)}) d\theta_j d\theta_0, \quad (4)$$

and an estimator based on posterior predictive densities

$$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) = \text{KL}(\widehat{f}_0, \widehat{f}_j), \quad \text{where } \widehat{f}_j(\cdot) = \int f_j(\cdot | \theta_j) \pi(\theta_j | y^{(n)}) d\theta_j, \quad \text{and } j = 0, 1, \dots, k. \quad (5)$$

These two estimators address the uncertainty of parameters (θ_j, θ_0) differently: the posterior mean estimator uses the posterior mean of $\text{KL}\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\}$, while the posterior predictive estimator uses the Kullback-Leibler divergence between predictive densities of each model. As shown later in Section 4, the two estimators have the same asymptotic behavior and converge to the minimum Kullback-Leibler divergence to the oracle model among $\theta_j \in \Theta_j$ under mild conditions.

In practice, one can use whichever approximation is most convenient, or even rely on a mixture of (4) and (5).

We refer to the quantities in expression (3) as *D-probabilities*, as they provide a divergence-based alternative to Bayesian posterior model probabilities. D-probabilities provide an absolute measure of model adequacy and goodness-of-fit and avoid large sensitivity to prior choice; both of these issues are notoriously poorly addressed in the Bayesian literature. The main challenges in the use of D-probabilities include the need to choose a nonparametric reference model, and develop accurate approximation algorithms. The nonparametric Bayes literature provides a rich menu of possibilities for \mathcal{N} , ranging from Dirichlet processes (Ferguson, 1973) to Gaussian processes (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006); for a review, refer to Hjort et al. (2010). There is a rich literature showing that Bayesian nonparametric models often have appealing frequentist asymptotic properties, such as appropriate notions of consistency (Schwartz, 1965) and optimal rates of convergence (van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2009; Bhattacharya et al., 2014; Castillo, 2014; Shen and Ghosal, 2015; Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017).

For simplicity in exposition and computational ease, we focus on normal linear models with a Gaussian process reference for the remainder of the article except for Section 5. In this case, conditional on covariance parameters, the Kullback-Leibler divergence between each parametric model and the nonparametric model can be calculated analytically, allowing us to rapidly conduct analyses and more easily study properties of the proposed model weights. There has been extensive study showing optimality properties of Gaussian process priors, such as rate adaptive behavior in nonparametric regression (van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2009).

Although we focus on Bayesian machinery, one can estimate D-probabilities using any method that estimates $\text{KL}(f_0, f_j)$. Substantial work has focused on estimating the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two unknown densities based on samples from these densities (Leonenko et al., 2008; Pérez-Cruz, 2008; Bu et al., 2018). Our setting is somewhat different, but the local likelihood methods of Lee and Park (2006) and the Bayesian approach of Viele (2007) can potentially be used, among others. On the other hand, our proposed estimator of $\text{KL}(f_0, f_j)$ may be of independent interest and can be used in other contexts.

3 D-Bayes inference for linear models

3.1 Analytical forms of D-probabilities

Let $\{(x_i, y_i) : x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip}) \in \mathbb{R}^p, y_i \in \mathbb{R}\}_{i=1}^n$ be independent and identically distributed observations following the model

$$y \mid x \sim N\{\mu(x), \sigma^2\}, \quad (6)$$

where x is a p -dimensional predictor and y is a univariate response. Let $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $X = (x_1^T, \dots, x_n^T)^T$. Letting $j = 0$ index the reference model \mathcal{N} and $j = 1, \dots, k$ index the parametric models, we let $\mu_j(\cdot)$ and σ_j^2 denote the mean function and variance, respectively, for model j . According to the chain rule of the Kullback-Leibler divergence, $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ is equal to the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the conditional densities of y given x followed by an expectation with respect to the distribution of x . We use the empirical distribution of x for

both $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ and $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$, which for example means that the term in (4) is calculated by $\text{KL}\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{KL}\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0, x_i), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j, x_i)\}/n$.

We use a Gaussian process prior for $\mu_0(\cdot)$, with $\mu_0(\cdot) | \sigma, \tau, \lambda \sim \text{GP}\{0, \sigma^2 k(\cdot, \cdot; \lambda, \tau)\}$ and covariance function

$$k(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}; \lambda, \tau) = \tau^2 \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{-(x_{i_1,j} - x_{i_2,j})^2}{2\lambda_j^2} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

having predictor-specific bandwidth parameters $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)^T$. For notational convenience, we suppress the dependence of the covariance function on λ and τ ; estimation of these hyper-parameters is discussed in Section 3.2. The prior distribution of σ_0^2 is specified as $p(\sigma_0^2) \propto 1/\sigma_0^2$. Let K be the covariance matrix whose (i, j) th element is $k(x_i, x_j)$, and $\mu_0^{(n)} = \{\mu_0(x_1), \dots, \mu_0(x_n)\}$ be the conditional mean vector. Then the reference model \mathcal{N} assumes $Y | \mu_0^{(n)}, \sigma_0 \sim N\{\mu_0^{(n)}, \sigma_0^2 I_n\}$, with priors $\mu_0^{(n)} | \sigma_0 \sim N(0, \sigma_0^2 K)$ and $p(\sigma_0^2) \propto 1/\sigma_0^2$. Letting $H = (I + K^{-1})^{-1} = K(K + I)^{-1}$, we have

$$\mu_0^{(n)} | X, Y, \sigma_0 \sim N(HY, \sigma_0^2 H), \quad \sigma_0^2 | X, Y \sim \text{IG} \left\{ \frac{n}{2}, \frac{1}{2} Y^T (I - H) Y \right\}.$$

For model \mathcal{M}_j , let x_j be a p_j -dimensional sub-vector of x and $\mu_j(x) = (1, x_j^T) \beta_j$, so that model \mathcal{M}_j has parameters $\theta_j = (\beta_j, \sigma_j^2)$. Letting X_j denote the corresponding design matrix including a column of ones, the mean vector is $\mu_j^{(n)} = \{\mu_j(x_1), \dots, \mu_j(x_n)\}^T = X_j \beta_j$. With the following prior distributions:

$$\beta_j | \sigma_j^2 \sim N(0, \sigma_j^2 \Sigma_j), \quad p(\sigma_j^2) \propto 1/\sigma_j^2, \quad (8)$$

for some prior covariance matrix Σ_j , the posterior distributions are

$$\mu_j^{(n)} | \sigma_j^2, X_j, Y \sim N(H_j Y, \sigma_j^2 H_j), \quad \sigma_j^2 | X_j, Y \sim \text{IG} \left\{ \frac{n}{2}, \frac{1}{2} Y^T (I - H_j) Y \right\},$$

where $H_j = X_j (X_j^T X_j + \Sigma_j^{-1})^{-1} X_j^T$.

The posterior mean estimates of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ in (4) are obtained as follows. Conditional on unknown parameters $(\beta_j, \sigma_j, \mu_0^{(n)}, \sigma_0)$, the Kullback-Leibler divergence between model \mathcal{M}_j and the reference model \mathcal{N} is

$$\text{KL}(f_0, f_j | \beta_j, \sigma_j, \mu_0^{(n)}, \sigma_0) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_j^2} + \frac{(X_j \beta_j - \mu_0^{(n)})^T (X_j \beta_j - \mu_0^{(n)})}{n \sigma_j^2} - 1 + \log \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_0^2} \right\}.$$

Using the fact that $(X_j \beta_j - \mu_0^{(n)}) | \sigma_j, \sigma_0 \sim N\{(H_j - H)Y, \sigma_j^2 H_j + \sigma_0^2 H\}$, we can further marginalize out $\mu_0^{(n)}$ and β_j to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(f_0, f_j | \sigma_j, \sigma_0) &= E_{\beta_j, \mu_0^{(n)} | \sigma_j, \sigma_0} \{ \text{KL}(f_0, f_j | \beta_j, \sigma_j, \mu, \sigma, \lambda, \tau) \} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_j^2} + \frac{Y^T (H_j - H)^2 Y + \text{tr}(\sigma_j^2 H_j + \sigma_0^2 H)}{n \sigma_j^2} - 1 + \log \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_0^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{Y^T (H_j - H)^2 Y}{n \sigma_j^2} + \frac{\{1 + \text{tr}(H)/n\} \sigma_0^2}{\sigma_j^2} + \log \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{\text{tr}(H_j)}{n} - 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By further integrating out σ_j and σ_0 , we obtain that $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) = E_{\sigma_0, \sigma_j} \text{KL}(f_0, f_j \mid \sigma_j, \sigma_0)$ as

$$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) = \frac{1}{n}(\mathcal{G}_{j,1} + \mathcal{P}_{j,1}), \quad (9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,1} = \frac{n}{2} \left[\frac{Y^T(H_j - H)^2 Y}{Y^T(I - H_j)Y} + \frac{\{\text{tr}(H) + n\} Y^T(I - H)Y}{(n-2)Y^T(I - H_j)Y} + \log \frac{Y^T(I - H_j)Y}{Y^T(I - H)Y} - 1 \right],$$

and $\mathcal{P}_{j,1} = \text{tr}(H_j)/2$.

We next obtain $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$. Conditional on the variance parameters, the posterior predictive densities evaluated at $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ under the reference model and model \mathcal{M}_j are $N\{HY, \sigma_0^2(I + H)\}$ and $N\{H_j Y, \sigma_j^2(I + H_j)\}$, respectively. Therefore, the Kullback-Leibler divergence $\widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j)$ conditional on the variances (σ_j^2, σ_0^2) is

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j \mid \sigma_j, \sigma_0) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{Y^T(H_j - H)^T(I + H_j)^{-1}(H_j - H)Y}{n\sigma_j^2} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\sigma_0^2 \text{tr}\{(I + H_j)^{-1}(I + H)\}}{\sigma_j^2 n} + \log \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\det(I + H_j)}{\det(I + H)} - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating out the variance parameters σ_0^2 and σ_j^2 leads to

$$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) = \frac{1}{n}(\mathcal{G}_{j,2} + \mathcal{P}_{j,2}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{j,2} &= \frac{n}{2} \left[\frac{Y^T(H_j - H)^T(I + H_j)^{-1}(H_j - H)Y}{Y^T(I - H_j)Y} + \frac{Y^T(I - H)Y \text{tr}\{(I + H_j)^{-1}(I + H)\}}{Y^T(I - H_j)Y (n-2)} \right. \\ &\left. + \log \frac{Y^T(I - H_j)Y}{Y^T(I - H)Y} - \log \det(I + H) - 1 \right], \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{P}_{j,2} = \log \det(I + H_j)/2$.

Hence, both the posterior mean estimator in (9) and posterior predictive density estimator in (10) admit the decomposition of the form $(\mathcal{G}_{j,t} + \mathcal{P}_{j,t})/n$ for $t = 1, 2$. Let the corresponding D-probabilities be $\pi_{j,t} = \exp(-\mathcal{G}_{j,t} - \mathcal{P}_{j,t})$. The term $\mathcal{G}_{j,t}$ is the goodness-of-fit of model \mathcal{M}_j compared to the reference model and $\mathcal{P}_{j,t}$ is a penalty term on model complexity. The trace of H_j is commonly used as the degrees of freedom of model \mathcal{M}_j , and the log determinant of the fitted covariance matrix $\log \det(I + H_j)$ introduces a penalty on the rank of the covariance matrix (Fazel et al., 2003). Unlike most model selection criteria in the literature, the D-probability $\pi_{j,t}$ is interpretable in an absolute sense for each candidate model, as discussed in Section 5. Therefore, the expression $\mathcal{G}_{j,t}$ keeps any constant even when it is the same across all models.

If we use the flat prior where $\Sigma_j^{-1} = 0$, the matrix H_j is idempotent and we thus have $\text{tr}(H_j) = p_j + 1$ and $\log \det(I + H_j) = (p_j + 1) \log 2$. Consequently, the D-probabilities penalize model complexity by

$$-\mathcal{P}_{j,1} = \frac{1}{2}(p_j + 1), \quad -\mathcal{P}_{j,2} = \frac{\log 2}{2}(p_j + 1). \quad (11)$$

When comparing two models \mathcal{M}_j and $\mathcal{M}_{j'}$ where $j \neq j'$, the relative penalties on model complexity are the same as used in some existing criteria. Specifically, the penalty term $\mathcal{P}_{j',1} - \mathcal{P}_{j,1} = (p_j - p_{j'})/2$ is used in the Akaike information criterion (Akaike, 1973, 1974) and the pseudo-Bayes factor (Geisser and Eddy, 1979), while $\mathcal{P}_{j',2} - \mathcal{P}_{j,2} = \log 2(p_j - p_{j'})/2$ is the penalty term in the posterior Bayes factor (Aitkin, 1991; Gelfand and Dey, 1994).

3.2 Selection of hyperparameters

We estimate the parameters (λ, τ) by maximizing the log marginal likelihood $\log p(Y \mid \lambda, \tau)$. Based on the log-likelihood of Y conditional on $\{\mu_0^{(n)}, \sigma_0^2, \lambda, \tau\}$, we first integrate out $\mu_0^{(n)}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(Y \mid \lambda, \tau, \sigma_0^2) &= -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\sigma_0^2 K + \sigma_0^2 I| - \frac{1}{2} Y^T (\sigma_0^2 K + \sigma_0^2 I)^{-1} Y \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} \log |K + I| - \frac{1}{2\sigma_0^2} Y^T (K + I)^{-1} Y, \end{aligned}$$

and further integrate out σ_0^2 ,

$$\log p(Y \mid \lambda, \tau) = -\frac{1}{2} \log |K + I| - \frac{n}{2} \log \{Y^T (K + I)^{-1} Y\} + \text{constant}. \quad (12)$$

Let $(\lambda_{\text{EB}}, \tau_{\text{EB}})$ be the empirical Bayes estimates maximizing equation (12). Then the D-probability of model \mathcal{M}_j is

$$\pi_j^{\text{EB}} = \exp\{-n \widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j \mid \lambda_{\text{EB}}, \tau_{\text{EB}})\}.$$

To avoid conditioning on an empirical point estimate of (λ, τ) , one may alternatively implement Markov chain Monte Carlo methods to draw posterior samples of the $(p+1)$ -dimensional parameter (λ, τ) based on the likelihood in (12) and priors with positive supports such as gamma distributions. Let $(\lambda^{(1)}, \tau^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda^{(J)}, \tau^{(J)})$ be the posterior samples after burn-in, then the D-probability of model \mathcal{M}_j is

$$\pi_j^{\text{MCMC}} = \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{J} \sum_{i=1}^J \widetilde{\text{KL}}(f_0, f_j \mid \lambda^{(i)}, \tau^{(i)})\right\}.$$

4 Asymptotic behavior

In this section, we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the proposed $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ in Sections 2.3 for linear models, and relate conditional D-probabilities with usual posterior model probabilities. We consider a compact support for the covariates, which is taken as $[0, 1]^d$ without loss of generality. Let $C[0, 1]^d$ be the space of continuous functions on $[0, 1]^d$. For a function $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \in [0, 1]^d$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$, let $g_i(\cdot \mid x)$ be a univariate function such that for any $s \in [0, 1]$, $g_i(s \mid x) = g(\dots, x_{i-1}, s, x_{i+1}, \dots)$, i.e., the i th element in the argument is replaced by s . Let $\|g\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} |g(x)|$ be the supremum norm of a function g , then the anisotropic Hölder space $C^\alpha[0, 1]^d$ indexed by a vector of positive numbers $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ contains all functions g

such that for some $L > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]^d} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor} \|D^j g_i(\cdot | x)\|_\infty + \frac{\|D^{\lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor} g_i(y+h | x) - D^{\lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor} g_i(y | x)\|_\infty}{|h|^{\alpha_i - \lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor}} \right\} \leq L$$

for any (y, h) such that $y \in [0, 1]$, $h > 0$, $y + h \in [0, 1]$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$; here $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function and D^j is the j th derivative operator. Let $\alpha_0^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^{-1}$ be an exponent of global smoothness (Birgé, 1986; Barron et al., 1999; Hoffmann and Lepski, 2002).

For each model \mathcal{M}_j , we define

$$\theta_j^* = \arg \min_{\theta_j \in \Theta_j} \text{KL}\{f^*, f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\}, \quad \delta_j = \text{KL}\{f^*, f_j(\cdot | \theta_j^*)\}.$$

The parameter value θ_j^* is the so-called pseudotrue parameter (Bunke and Milhaud, 1998). A usual condition of Bayesian nonparametric models is that $\delta_j = 0$ for all f^* in a large set of densities. Unless f^* exactly follows the parametric model under consideration, we have $\delta_j > 0$ in general for any parametric model.

As the sample size n increases, the posterior measure for the density f under the nonparametric model \mathcal{N} will tend to concentrate in arbitrarily small Kullback-Leibler neighborhoods of the true data-generating model f^* . In contrast, the posterior measure for f under the parametric model \mathcal{M}_j will tend to concentrate on the point in the parametric class having the minimal Kullback-Leibler divergence from f^* . Heuristically, this type of behavior suggests that the proposed $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ will tend to converge to the minimal Kullback-Leibler divergence within the support of model \mathcal{M}_j as n increases. However, as an information criterion, the Kullback-Leibler divergence may behave erratically (Barron, 1998), and the individual convergence of f_0 and f_j does not directly imply the convergence of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ (Ikeda, 1960). We overcome these difficulties by taking advantage of the Gaussianity assumption on the errors, which allows us to relate the Kullback-Leibler divergence to well studied distances on model parameters. This is formalized in Theorem 4.1 based on the following assumptions.

- (a) Let $\theta_0^* = \{\mu_0^*, \sigma_0^*\}$ be the true parameter values under model (6), which satisfy $\mu_0^*(\cdot) \in C^\alpha[0, 1]^d$ and $\sigma_0^* \in [a, b] \subset [0, \infty)$. The covariate x is either fixed or randomly drawn from a density on $[0, 1]^d$ that is bounded away from zero and infinity.
- (b) For the reference model, the regression function μ_0 has a Gaussian process prior Π_λ with the squared exponential kernel function as in (7); the prior distribution of σ_0 has continuous density and is supported on $[a, b]$.
- (c) For each candidate model \mathcal{M}_j , the prior distribution of $\theta_j = (\beta_j, \sigma_j)$ is supported on $\Theta_j = \mathbb{R}^{p_j+1} \times [a, b]$, which has a continuous density that is bounded away from zero and infinity. The pseudotrue parameter θ_j^* is unique and interior to Θ_j .

Theorem 4.1. *Under model (6) and Assumptions (a), (b) and (c), for $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ in (4), if $\lambda_i = n^{\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0\alpha_i + \alpha_i)}(\log n)^{(d+1)\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0\alpha_i + \alpha_i)}$, there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$E_{\theta^*} |\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j| \leq cn^{-\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)}(\log n)^{(d+1)\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)}.$$

For $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ in (5), we have

$$0 \leq E_{\theta_0^*} \{ \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j \} \leq cn^{-\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)} (\log n)^{(d+1)\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)}$$

for sufficiently large n .

Proof. See the Appendix. □

The anisotropic Hölder space has been used to consider dimension-specific smoothness; for example, see Barron et al. (1999). The rate $n^{-\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)}$ is the minimax rate of convergence for a function in $C^\alpha[0, 1]^d$ according to Hoffmann and Lepski (2002). We can obtain a rate-adaptive version of Theorem 4.1 without requiring the knowledge of α to select λ by introducing an appropriate hyper-prior on λ following the random rescaling scheme in van der Vaart and van Zanten (2009) and Bhattacharya et al. (2014).

Furthermore, the Gaussian process prior in Assumption (b) can be replaced by any nonparametric priors that lead to nearly optimal contraction rate of the mean function under $\|\cdot\|_n$ or a stronger metric, such as random series priors using a wavelet basis (Castillo, 2014) or B-splines (Yoo and Ghosal, 2016).

Theorem 4.1 suggests that the numerator in π_j given by (3) is approximately $\exp(-n\delta_j)$ for large n . Consequently, for $j_1 \neq j_2$, the ratio π_{j_1}/π_{j_2} approximates $\exp\{-n(\delta_{j_1} - \delta_{j_2})\}$. The commonly used Bayes factor between two candidate models has been proven to have the same asymptotic behavior. For any two different models \mathcal{M}_{j_1} and \mathcal{M}_{j_2} , the Bayes factor $\text{BF}(\mathcal{M}_{j_1}, \mathcal{M}_{j_2}) = I_n^{(j_1)}/I_n^{(j_2)}$ is approximately equal to $\exp\{-n(\delta_{j_1} - \delta_{j_2})\}$ under mild conditions (Walker et al., 2004, Theorem 1), suggesting its asymptotic equivalence to the proposed D-probabilities.

D-probabilities can provide evidence of lack of fit of a parametric model under consideration, and the connection with Bayes factors further endows D-probabilities with a scale for strength of evidence (of a lack of fit) by adopting the convention in Bayes factors (Kass and Wasserman, 1995):

D-probability	Strength of evidence (of a lack of fit)
$< 1/150$	very strong
$[1/150, 1/20)$	strong
$[1/20, 1/3)$	positive
$[1/3, 1]$	not worth more than a bare mention

However, unlike Bayes factors which do not allow improper priors on model-specific parameters, D-probabilities are well defined under improper priors as long as the posteriors under each model are proper.

In addition to the pragmatic advantages of the proposed D-Bayes inference framework, our notion of model weights has a connection to a range of concepts. In Section 5, we establish various probabilistic interpretations to justify calibration and coherence.

5 Probabilistic interpretations of model weights

5.1 Relationship to Boltzmann's formulation

We are interested in exploring probabilistic interpretations of (1). We start by considering discrete sample spaces with $\mathcal{Y} = \{\dagger_1, \dots, \dagger_m\}$. The probability mass function f^* under the oracle model

places probability a_l on element \dagger_l , for $l = 1, \dots, m$, while the probability mass function f_j under model \mathcal{M}_j places probabilities b_1, \dots, b_m on these elements. Under the oracle model, the expected number of occurrences of \dagger_l in n trials is na_l , for $l = 1, \dots, m$; we refer to these values as the oracle frequencies. The probability of obtaining these frequencies from n independent observations from f_j is

$$\text{Multinomial}(n, na_1, \dots, na_m; f_j) = \binom{n}{na_1, \dots, na_m} b_1^{na_1} \dots b_m^{na_m}. \quad (13)$$

As commented by Akaike (1985), Boltzmann (1878) derived that the probability in (13) is asymptotically equal to $\exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\}$ up to a multiplicative constant. Since $\text{KL}(f^*, f^*) = 0$,

$$\exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\} = \frac{\exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\}}{\exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f^*)\}} \approx \frac{\text{Multinomial}(n, na_1, \dots, na_m; f_j)}{\text{Multinomial}(n, na_1, \dots, na_m; f^*)}, \quad (14)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The right hand side of (14) is interpretable as the likelihood of obtaining the oracle frequencies under model \mathcal{M}_j relative to the likelihood under the oracle model. As the multinomial likelihood of the oracle frequencies is maximized under the oracle model f^* , the right hand side of (14) is between zero and one, with the value moving closer to one as model \mathcal{M}_j improves relative to the oracle.

Although the Boltzmann (1987) probabilistic interpretation of (1) is specific to discrete distributions, the justification can be extended to continuous sample spaces \mathcal{Y} by first partitioning \mathcal{Y} into bins $\mathcal{Y}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Y}_m$ having $\mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_{l=1}^m \mathcal{Y}_l$ and $\mathcal{Y}_l \cap \mathcal{Y}_{l'} = \emptyset$ for all $l \neq l'$. Then, letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ with bin size $|\mathcal{Y}_l| \rightarrow 0$, one obtains a limiting form of (14). Therefore, we can generally use the exponentiated entropy between a candidate model and true model as a type of absolute probability weight on the candidate model for both discrete and continuous distributions.

5.2 Decision rules, model probabilities and p-values

The proposed model weights can also be obtained by an explicit decision rule in the setting of hypothetical repeated experiments. Suppose we have m repeated experiments ($t = 1, 2, \dots, m$), where the observations $y_t^{(n)} = \{y_{t1}, \dots, y_{tm}\}$ are drawn independently from f^* and the different experiments are independent. Define the likelihood ratio statistic for testing model \mathcal{M}_j against the oracle model using data from experiment t as:

$$T_{jt}^{(n)} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n f_j(y_{ti})}{\prod_{i=1}^n f^*(y_{ti})}.$$

The geometric mean of these likelihood ratio statistics across repeated experiments is $R_{jm} = (\prod_{t=1}^m T_{jt}^{(n)})^{1/m}$. As m increases, $R_{jm} \rightarrow \exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\}$ almost surely according to the strong law of large numbers, so for sufficiently large m , $R_{jm} < 1$ almost surely.

We define a random decision rule in which $Z_{jm} = 1$ corresponds to choosing model \mathcal{M}_j based on the data from m replicated experiments, with $Z_{jm} = 0$ otherwise. Choosing model \mathcal{M}_j is an absolute model selection decision about the merits of model \mathcal{M}_j . Based on data from m repeated experiments, as our decision rule we let

$$Z_{jm} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(R_{jm} \wedge 1),$$

where we take the minimum of R_{jm} and one to remove the possibility of $R_{jm} > 1$ for finite m . This decision rule will tend to set $Z_{jm} = 1$ with high probability if f_j provides an accurate approximation to f^* , with accuracy judged relative to the sample size n ; as sample size becomes larger it is appropriate to ask more of a parametric model. If on average across experiments the information in data having a sample size of n is sufficient to clearly distinguish the parametric and oracle model, then the decision rule will tend to set $Z_{jm} = 0$ with high probability. In such a case, model \mathcal{M}_j would hopefully be assigned a small probability π_j , suggesting that we should continue our search for an adequate parametric model.

By increasing the number of replicated experiments m and using the geometric mean of the likelihood ratio test statistics, we remove sensitivity to variability across experiments. Let R_j and Z_j denote the random variables corresponding to R_{jm} and Z_{jm} , respectively. In the limit as the number of experiments increases $m \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$\text{pr}(Z_j = 1) = \exp\{-n\text{KL}(f^*, f_j)\} = \pi_j.$$

Hence, the absolute model weights π_j corresponds to the probability of selecting model \mathcal{M}_j based on a randomized decision rule that assesses whether the data in a sample size of n have sufficient information to distinguish the parametric model under consideration from the oracle.

Letting $T_j^{(n)}$ denote the likelihood ratio test statistic based on a single experiment and $t_j^{(n)}$ be the observed value of $T^{(n)}$, Bahadur (1967) shows that under certain regularity conditions π_j is asymptotically the p-value of the likelihood ratio test under the null hypothesis that the data are generated from model \mathcal{M}_j :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P(T_j^{(n)} < t_j^{(n)} \mid H_0) = -\text{KL}(f^*, f_j).$$

Hence, the absolute model weight π_j also has a frequentist testing interpretation.

6 Simulation

In this section, we conduct simulations to investigate the finite sample performance of the proposed D-probabilities, while comparing with usual Bayesian approaches in various settings. We focus initially on a univariate case; Section 7 illustrates comparisons for multivariate cases. Under model (6), we generate the covariate x from the uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$, use $\sigma = 1$ for the noise standard deviation, and let the sample size $n = 100$. We consider the model list $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_F, \mathcal{M}_N\}$, where the full model \mathcal{M}_F is the simple linear regression model and the null model \mathcal{M}_N only has the intercept. We index the two models by $j = F$ and $j = N$. Throughout this section, we use the default prior in (8) with prior precision $\Sigma_j^{-1} = 0$ for the parameters in model \mathcal{M}_j to calculate all D-probabilities. The number of replications is 1000.

We first consider the mean function

$$\mu(x) = 10 + \beta(\gamma)x + \gamma \log x, \tag{15}$$

where $\beta(\gamma) = \{12(e^{1/10} - 1 - \gamma^2/4)\}^{1/2} - 3\gamma$ and γ is some positive constant in $\Gamma = [0, 2(e^{1/10} - 1)^{1/2}]$. According to Lemma 3 in the supplementary material, we can obtain that $\delta_F = \{\log(1 + \gamma^2/4)\}/2$, and the specification of $\beta(\gamma)$ ensures that $\delta_N = 0.05$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Therefore, the

parameter γ controls how the mean function deviates from a linear model. We have the \mathcal{M} -closed situation when $\gamma = 0$, and \mathcal{M} -complete situation when $\gamma > 0$.

In addition to the D-probabilities, we estimate usual Bayesian model probabilities using Zellner g priors for the regression coefficients, with covariance $\Sigma_j^{-1} = (X_j^T X_j)/g$. We consider two choices of g : the unit information prior in which $g = n$ (Kass and Wasserman, 1995), which leads to the Bayesian information criteria for model selection under some conditions, and the hyper- g prior (Liang et al., 2008), which lets $g/(g + 1) \sim \text{Beta}(1, 1/2)$. Both these priors have been implemented in the R package BAS.

We use 20 equal-spaced grid points from 0 to $2(e^{1/10} - 1)^{1/2}$ for γ . Figure 1 plots various estimates versus δ_F . Figure 1 (a) shows that the conditional D-probabilities $\pi_{F,1|\mathcal{M}}$ are between the model probabilities under unit information and hyper- g priors, while the alternative form $\pi_{F,2|\mathcal{M}}$ tends to give larger D-probabilities due to the smaller penalty on model complexity as in (11). Figure 1 (b) presents the inclusion probability of the covariate x . The unit information prior and hyper- g prior are observed to give smaller inclusion probability of x when $\delta_F = \delta_N = 0.05$, compared to D-probabilities. In this case, the mean function is $\mu(x) = 10 - 1.95x + 0.65 \log x$. The covariate x clearly impacts $\mu(x)$ but all model probabilities tend to prefer the null model.

We next compared out-of-sample prediction accuracy based on the root mean squared error: $\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} (\hat{Y}_i - Y_i)^2 / 100\}^{1/2}$ where \mathcal{T} is a validation set. For each method, we calculate the predictive mean under the highest probability model. As shown in Figure 1 (c), all methods have similar predictive performance. A small absolute D-probability, or equivalently a large $\min(\delta_F, \delta_N) = \delta_F$, suggests that the candidate model has poor fit relative to the nonparametric model f_0 . One may conclude that none of the models in \mathcal{M} fit sufficiently well if they all have Kullback-Leibler divergence larger than $-\log(\pi^0)/n$ where π^0 is a threshold on D-probabilities specifying the tolerance of model inadequacy. The cutoffs (1/3, 1/20, 1/150) on π^0 according to the convention in Section 4 translate to $(1.1, 3.0, 5.0) \times 10^{-2}$ on Kullback-Leibler divergence. Figure 1 (c) shows that the nonparametric reference model starts to considerably outperform both \mathcal{M}_F and \mathcal{M}_N when δ_F is around 1.1×10^{-2} , indicating that switching to the nonparametric model when there is ‘positive’ evidence of lack of fit may improve prediction in this case.




Figure 1: Comparison of D-probabilities versus other posterior model probabilities under model (15): conditional D-probabilities $\pi_{F,1|\mathcal{M}}$ (circle), conditional D-probabilities $\pi_{F,2|\mathcal{M}}$ (square), unit information prior (triangle) and hyper g prior (star). Plot (c) presents the out-of-sample root mean squared error or RMSE of the highest probability models selected by each method including the reference model (diamond). Results are based on 1000 replications.

We next consider another four cases with different mean functions: $\mu_1(x) = 10 + 10x$, $\mu_2(x) = 10$, $\mu_3(x) = 10 + \sin(30\pi x)$ and $\mu_4(x) = 10x^5$ where Case i uses the mean function $\mu_i(x)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Case 1 and Case 2 are for the \mathcal{M} -closed situation where the model list \mathcal{M} contains the true model, Case 3 and Case 4 are for the \mathcal{M} -complete situation while Case 3 is close to an \mathcal{M} -open situation as the reference model is expected to fail to detect the high frequency oscillation. We vary the sample size $n = (100, 500)$ and use 1000 replications. While detailed descriptions of this simulation are deferred to the supplementary material, we observe that both $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ quickly converge to the corresponding δ_j in Case 1, 2 and 4. Case 3 corresponds to a subtle cyclic deviation from Case 2; we find in this case that the reference nonparametric model fails to pick up the cyclic deviation so that the estimates of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ are close to Case 2 but deviate from δ_j . However, the estimates of $\delta_N - \delta_F$ are accurate, suggesting robustness of the conditional D-probabilities to performance of the reference model. In Case 1, the D-probability is higher for the true model \mathcal{M}_F in all replications, suggesting model selection uncertainty close to zero. Model \mathcal{M}_F has absolute D-probabilities that are not close to zero, such as 0.3, providing evidence it is an adequate approximation. In Case 2, both models have high D-probabilities as expected. The inclusion probability of the covariate x is either 0.09 using $\pi_{j,1}$ or 0.23 using $\pi_{j,2}$, suggesting preference for the null model, with $\pi_{j,1}$ providing a greater penalty on model complexity. The slight difference in scales between $\pi_{j,1}$ and $\pi_{j,2}$ is observed to be less prominent for conditional D-probabilities. In Case 4, the full model \mathcal{M}_F is assigned probability 1, but the D-probabilities are both close to zero, suggesting lack of fit.

7 Data application: ozone data

As another illustration of the differences between our proposed D-probability based approach and usual Bayesian approaches to variable selection, we focus on ground-level ozone data (Breiman and Friedman, 1985; Casella and Moreno, 2006; Liang et al., 2008). The ozone data, which are available in the R package `faraway`, consist of $n = 330$ daily ozone readings in Los Angeles along with eight meteorological explanatory variables. We rescale each of these explanatory variables x to $[0, 1]$ via the transformation $(x - x_{\min}) / (x_{\max} - x_{\min})$ where x_{\max} and x_{\min} are the observed maximum and minimum values of x , respectively. The description of all variables are given in the supplementary material. The model list \mathcal{M} includes $2^8 = 256$ candidate models corresponding to all possible subsets of explanatory variables.

We first calculate both versions of our D-probabilities, $(\pi_{j,1}, \pi_{j,2})$, for each candidate model following Section 3. Relative to usual Bayesian model probabilities, one of the appealing aspects of D-probabilities is the reduced sensitivity to the choice of prior distribution for model-specific parameters. In fact, we can even use default non-informative priors without the usual pitfalls. To illustrate this, we first considered the default prior in (8) with prior precision $\Sigma_j^{-1} = 0$ for the parameters in model \mathcal{M}_j . In the Bayesian literature on variable selection in linear models, the most broadly used priors for the regression coefficients fall in the Zellner g family, and we consider the unit information prior and hyper- g prior as in Section 6.

Figure 2 plots our conditional D-probabilities $\pi_{j,1|\mathcal{M}}$ for each candidate model under a default prior against other choices, including (a) $\pi_{j,1|\mathcal{M}}$ under a unit information prior, (b) the alternative form for the D-probabilities $\pi_{j,2|\mathcal{M}}$ under a default prior, (c) usual Bayes model probabilities under a unit information prior, and (d) usual Bayes model probabilities under a hyper- g prior. As ex-




Figure 2: Comparison of $\pi_{j,1|M}$ versus other posterior model probabilities: $\pi_{j,1|M}$ with $g = n$, $\pi_{j,2|M}$, unit information and hyper- g prior, from left to right.

pected, we found that D-probabilities were insensitive to slight changes in the prior distribution for the regression coefficients, with the values under the default prior essentially identical to those under a unit information prior. In addition, the two version of conditional D-probabilities were highly correlated. We also found that the D-probabilities were correlated and had similar magnitudes to the usual Bayes model probabilities under a unit-information prior, but differed dramatically from the Bayes model probabilities under a hyper- g prior. In particular, the highest Bayes model probabilities under the hyper- g prior were much larger than the highest D-probabilities. This is also illustrated in Table 1, which presents the model having the highest probability under each of the approaches. The top models based on $\pi_{j,1|M}$ and $\pi_{j,2|M}$ with default priors had probabilities 0.07 and 0.09, respectively. In contrast, the model having the highest usual Bayesian probability under the hyper- g prior was 0.39, compared to a value of only 0.05 under a unit information prior. This serves in part to illustrate again the well known sensitivity of usual Bayesian model probabilities to the prior on the regression coefficients. Each of the four different approaches considered in the Table yielded somewhat different top models. This difference in ordering of top models is not unexpected given that the sample size is only $n = 165$, leaving out half the data to allow cross validation, and there are 256 models under consideration. To gauge the extent to which the data can distinguish between these different top models, we compared out-of-sample prediction accuracy based on the root mean squared error as in Section 6. As shown in the last column of Table 1, all of the models had essentially identical predictive performance. This is consistent with our expectation that the data are not sufficient to select from among a moderate number of top models, suggesting model probabilities in the single digits are more realistic than the 0.39 value produced by the hyper- g prior.

Another unique aspect of the D-probability approach is the ability to provide absolute model weights instead of just values conditionally on falling in the list of possible linear models. We find in the ozone application that the absolute D-probabilities are extremely small for all of the candidate models, having a maximum value of only 1.65×10^{-22} . This suggests that linear models provide a poor fit to the data relative to a nonparametric model; indeed, the root mean square error out of sample for the nonparametric reference model was significantly reduced to 4.09 from a minimum value of 4.61 for any of the linear models. Adding quadratic and interaction terms to expand the set of linear models leads to reductions to a range of 4.4 to 4.6 for root mean square errors out of sample (Liang et al., 2008), but there was still a significant gap in performance relative to the reference nonparametric model. This application has illustrated the practical advantages of D-probabilities relative to usual Bayes model probabilities in terms of reducing sensitivity to the

Table 1: Selected variables and the corresponding posterior model probability using various methods on the entire dataset. The last column presents the out-of-sample root mean squared error or RMSE of the highest probability models selected by each method; results are based on 100 replications and the maximum standard errors is 0.02

Method	Variables in the model	Probability	RMSE
$\pi_{j,1 \mathcal{M}}$	vh, humidity, temp, ibh, ibt, vis	0.07	4.61
$\pi_{j,2 \mathcal{M}}$	vh, wind, humidity, temp, ibh, dpg, ibt, vis	0.09	4.61
unit information	humidity, temp, ibh, vis	0.05	4.62
hyper-g prior	humidity, temp, ibh	0.39	4.63

prior and allowing the use of reference priors, while providing evidence of lack of fit of parametric models and producing a nonparametric reference as an alternative.

8 Discussion

Model aggregation (Tsybakov, 2014) makes predictions at new observations by a weighted average $\hat{f}_{\text{new}} = \sum_{j=1}^k w_j \hat{f}_j$, where \hat{f}_j is the prediction from model \mathcal{M}_j and the weights (w_1, \dots, w_k) are to be determined. The exponential weighting (EW) method in Rigollet and Tsybakov (2012) relies on an unbiased estimator of the risk, namely,

$$w_j^{\text{EW}} = \exp \left\{ -\frac{\text{RSS}_j}{4\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{2}(p_j + 1) + \frac{n}{4} \right\},$$

where RSS_j is the residual sum of squares based on least square fits to model \mathcal{M}_j , p_j is the number of covariates in \mathcal{M}_j , and σ_0^2 is the model variance. We apply the two types of conditional D-probabilities $(\pi_{j,1|\mathcal{M}}, \pi_{j,2|\mathcal{M}})$ as well as EW to the ozone data, and calculate the out-of-sample root mean squared error (RMSE) of the aggregated prediction based on 100 replications as in Table 1. We estimate the model variance σ_0^2 by its posterior mean in the nonparametric Gaussian process reference model to favor the method of EW.

Figure 3 (a) clearly shows the better performance of D-probabilities versus EW in model averaging. To further investigate the distribution of model weights, we calculate the effective number of models $1/(\sum_{j=1}^{256} w_j^2)$ to characterize the weight pattern by each method, which is (26.12, 23.99, 1.13) corresponding to $(\pi_{j,1|\mathcal{M}}, \pi_{j,2|\mathcal{M}}, \text{EW})$, respectively. Therefore, model weights in EW are dominated by one or two models on average, but D-probabilities assign non-negligible weights to a larger number of models. This may heuristically explain why D-probability weighting outperforms exponential weighting in this particular application. It is an interesting future topic to explore theoretical explanations for when D-probabilities outperform EW and vice versa, adding to the literature on optimality of EW (Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012; Arias-Castro and Lounici, 2014).

The main hurdle in extending methodology for calculating D-probabilities to broader settings is computational. A very broad variety of cases can be encompassed by using Dirichlet process mixtures (DPMs), and related formulations, as the nonparametric reference model. For example, one may rely on DPMs of Gaussian linear regressions to allow the conditional density $f(y|x)$ to be unknown, potentially multimodal, and changing flexibly with x . In such cases, *local* estimates




Figure 3: Comparison of out-of-sample prediction between two types of D-probabilities (coded as D1 and D2) and EW. Each boxplot is the difference of RMSE from the corresponding method subtracting the RMSE of EW based on 100 replications.

of Kullback-Leibler divergence can be obtained within each mixture component, conditionally on the component allocations and other parameters. By relying on the rich literature on Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) samplers for DPMS to marginalize out the unknowns being conditioned on, one can then estimate the D-probabilities in equation (4). Related MCMC-based approaches can be used in broader settings, including for discrete data.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material includes two lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 4.1, a third lemma to give analytical forms of the divergence δ_j for linear regression models when the true model is (6), additional simulation results and the description of variables in the Ozone data. The R code to implement the proposed methods with demonstration is available at <https://github.com/xylimeng/D-probability>.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 4.1

Throughout this proof, we use the notation $a \lesssim b$ if $a \leq Cb$ for a universal constant, and $a \asymp b$ if $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$. We first view the covariates x_1, \dots, x_n as fixed; for a function $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the empirical norm $\|g\|_n$ by $\|g\|_n = \{\sum_{i=1}^n g^2(x_i)/n\}^{1/2}$.

For the reference model \mathcal{M}_0 , let \mathbb{H}^λ be the reproducing kernel Hilbert space of the Gaussian process prior Π_λ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}^\lambda}$ be the associated norm; see Van Der Vaart and van Zanten (2008) for more technical details about the reproducing kernel Hilbert space. The so-called concentration function $\phi_{\mu_0^*}$ is

$$\phi_{\mu_0^*}(\epsilon) = \inf_{h \in \mathbb{H}^\lambda: \|h - \mu_0^*\|_\infty < \epsilon} \|h\|_{\mathbb{H}^\lambda}^2 - \log P(\mu : \|\mu\|_\infty < \epsilon).$$

Letting $\epsilon_n = \sup\{\epsilon > 0 : \phi_{\mu_0^*}(\epsilon) \geq n\epsilon^2\}$, we have

$$E_{\theta_0^*} \int \|\mu_0 - \mu_0^*\|_n^2 \pi(\mu_0 | X, Y) d\mu_0 \lesssim \epsilon_n^2 \quad (16)$$

uniformly in the design points, in view of Theorem 1 in Van Der Vaart and Van Zanten (2011).

We next calculate the contraction rate ϵ_n under the assumption that $\mu_0^* \in C^\alpha[0, 1]^d$. According to Lemma 4.2 and 4.3 in Bhattacharya et al. (2014), there exists constants C_1 and C_2 depending only on μ_0^* and a constant C_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \left\{ \|h\|_{\mathbb{H}^\lambda}^2 : \|h - \mu_0^*\|_\infty \leq C_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^{-\alpha_i} \right\} &\leq C_2 \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i, \\ -\log \Pi_\lambda(\mu : \|\mu\|_\infty \leq \epsilon) &\leq C_3 \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \left\{ \frac{\max(\lambda)}{\epsilon} \right\}^{d+1}. \end{aligned}$$

For a sequence $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we equate $\epsilon_n \asymp \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^{-\alpha_i}$ and $\prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i (\log n)^{d+1} \asymp n\epsilon_n^2$. Letting $\lambda_i = \epsilon_n^{-1/\alpha_i}$, we then have $n\epsilon_n^2 \asymp \epsilon_n^{-\alpha_0^{-1}} (\log n)^{d+1}$. Consequently, the optimal choice of λ and the corresponding contraction rate are

$$\lambda_i = n^{\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0\alpha_i + \alpha_i)} (\log n)^{(d+1)\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0\alpha_i + \alpha_i)}, \quad \epsilon_n = n^{-\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)} (\log n)^{(d+1)\alpha_0/(2\alpha_0+1)}.$$

In addition, the standard deviation σ_0 has the same contraction rate ϵ_n , that is

$$E_{\theta_0^*} \int |\sigma_0 - \sigma_0^*| \pi(\sigma_0 | X, Y) \lesssim \epsilon_n, \quad (17)$$

according to Theorem 3.3 in van der Vaart and van Zanten (2008).

For the candidate model \mathcal{M}_j , we shall apply the Bernstein-von Mises theorem under misspecification (Bunke and Milhaud, 1998; Kleijn and van der Vaart, 2012). Model \mathcal{M}_j is a finite-dimensional model with Gaussian noise and the true regression model has a smooth mean function, thus regularity conditions for asymptotic normality are satisfied; for example, see Remark

6 in Bunke and Milhaud (1998). Since $\|\mu_j - \mu_j^*\|_n^2 = (X_j\beta_j - X_j\beta_j^*)^T(X_j\beta_j - X_j\beta_j^*) = (\beta_j - \beta_j^*)^T X_j^T X_j (\beta_j - \beta_j^*)$, we have

$$E_{\theta_0^*} \int \|\mu_j - \mu_j^*\|_n^2 \pi(\beta_j | X, Y) d\beta_j \lesssim n^{-1}, \quad (18)$$

and

$$E_{\theta_0^*} \int |\sigma_j - \sigma_j^*|^2 \pi(\sigma_j | X, Y) d\sigma_j \lesssim n^{-1}, \quad (19)$$

uniformly in the design points (x_1, \dots, x_n) .

Let

$$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\} = \log \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma_0} + \frac{\sigma_0^2 + \|\mu_j - \mu_0\|_2^2}{2\sigma_j^2} - \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$\delta_j^{(n)} = \log \frac{\sigma_j^*}{\sigma_0^*} + \frac{\sigma_0^{*2} + \|\mu_j^* - \mu_0^*\|_2^2}{2\sigma_j^{*2}} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Using the facts that both σ_j and σ_0 have bounded supports and $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\}$ is a continuous function of (σ_0, σ_j) , it is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} |\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j^{(n)}| &= |E[\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1\{f_0(\cdot | \theta_0), f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)\}] - \delta_j^{(n)}| \\ &\lesssim E|\sigma_j - \sigma_j^*| + E|\sigma_0 - \sigma_0^*| + |E\|\mu_j - \mu_0\|_2^2 - \|\mu_j^* - \mu_0^*\|_2^2| \\ &\lesssim E|\sigma_j - \sigma_j^*| + E|\sigma_0 - \sigma_0^*| + E\|\mu_j - \mu_j^*\|_2^2 + E\|\mu_0 - \mu_0^*\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation E is taken with respect to the posterior distributions of the corresponding parameters. Combining equations (16), (17), (18) and (19), we obtain that

$$E_{\theta_0^*} |\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j^{(n)}| \lesssim n^{-1/2} + \epsilon_n + n^{-1} + \epsilon_n^2 \leq c\epsilon_n,$$

for some universal constant c uniformly in the design points $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

For random designs where $x \sim F$, we have

$$\delta_j = \log \frac{\sigma_j^*}{\sigma_0^*} + \frac{\sigma_0^{*2} + \int |\mu_j^*(x) - \mu_0(x)^*|^2 dF}{2\sigma_j^{*2}} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

By a direct application of the central limit theorem and boundedness of $\|\mu_j^* - \mu_0^*\|$, we obtain $E_F |\delta_j^{(n)} - \delta_j| \lesssim n^{-1/2}$. Since $\epsilon_n \gtrsim n^{-1/2}$, the contraction rate of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1$ is still ϵ_n .

For $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$, in view of Lemma 1 in the supplementary material, we have $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j \leq \widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j$ thus $E_{\theta_0^*} \{\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j\} \leq c\epsilon_n$. Equations (16), (17), (18) and (19) imply that $\hat{f}_0 \rightarrow f_0^*$ and $\hat{f}_j \rightarrow f_j^*$, therefore $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{\theta_0^*} \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) \geq \delta_j$ according to Lemma 2 in the supplementary material. It follows that $0 \leq E_{\theta_0^*} \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j) - \delta_j \leq c\epsilon_n$ for sufficiently large n .

References

- Aitkin, M. (1991). Posterior Bayes factors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 53(1):111–142.
- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In Petrov, B. N. and Csaki, F., editors, *Second International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 267–281, Budapest. Akadémiai Kiado.
- Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 19(6):716–723.
- Akaike, H. (1985). Prediction and entropy. In *A Celebration of Statistics*, pages 1–24. Springer, New York.
- Arias-Castro, E. and Lounici, K. (2014). Estimation and variable selection with exponential weights. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):328–354.
- Bahadur, R. R. (1967). An optimal property of the likelihood ratio statistic. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics*, pages 13–26, Berkeley, Calif. University of California Press.
- Barron, A., Birgé, L., and Massart, P. (1999). Risk bounds for model selection via penalization. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 113(3):301–413.
- Barron, A. R. (1998). Information-theoretic characterization of Bayes performance and the choice of priors in parametric and nonparametric problems. In Bernardo, J. M., Berger, J. O., Dawid, A. P., and Smith, A. F. M., editors, *Bayesian Statistics 6*, pages 27–52. Oxford, New York.
- Bernardo, J. M. and Smith, A. F. M. (1994). *Bayesian Theory*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- Bhattacharya, A., Pati, D., and Dunson, D. (2014). Anisotropic function estimation using multi-bandwidth Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(1):352–381.
- Birgé, L. (1986). On estimating a density using Hellinger distance and some other strange facts. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 71(2):271–291.
- Boltzmann, L. (1878). Weitere Bemerkungen über einige Probleme der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Wiener Berichte*, 78:7–46.
- Breiman, L. and Friedman, J. H. (1985). Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80(391):580–598.
- Bu, Y., Zou, S., Liang, Y., and Veeravalli, V. V. (2018). Estimation of KL divergence: optimal minimax rate. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(4):2648–2674.
- Bunke, O. and Milhau, X. (1998). Asymptotic behavior of Bayes estimates under possibly incorrect models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(2):617–644.

- Campbell, L. L. (1966). Exponential entropy as a measure of extent of a distribution. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 5(3):217–225.
- Casella, G. and Moreno, E. (2006). Objective Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(473):157–167.
- Castillo, I. (2014). On Bayesian supremum norm contraction rates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(5):2058–2091.
- Claeskens, G. and Hjort, N. L. (2008). *Model Selection and Model Averaging*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Clyde, M. A. and Iversen, E. S. (2013). Bayesian model averaging in the M-open framework. In Damien, P., Dellaportas, P., Polson, N. G., and Stephens, D. A., editors, *Bayesian Theory and Applications*, pages 483–498. Oxford University Press.
- Fazel, M., Hindi, H., and Boyd, S. P. (2003). Log-det heuristic for matrix rank minimization with applications to Hankel and Euclidean distance matrices. In *American Control Conference, 2003. Proceedings of the 2003*, volume 3, pages 2156–2162.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(2):209–230.
- Geisser, S. and Eddy, W. F. (1979). A predictive approach to model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(365):153–160.
- Gelfand, A. E. and Dey, D. K. (1994). Bayesian model choice: asymptotics and exact calculations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 501–514.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gutiérrez-Peña, E., Rueda, R., and Contreras-Cristán, A. (2009). Objective parametric model selection procedures from a Bayesian nonparametric perspective. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(12):4255–4265.
- Gutiérrez-Peña, E. and Walker, S. G. (2005). Statistical decision problems and Bayesian nonparametric methods. *International Statistical Review*, 73(3):309–330.
- Hjort, N. L., Holmes, C., Müller, P., and Walker, S. G., editors (2010). *Bayesian Nonparametrics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hoeting, J. J. A., Madigan, D., Raftery, A. E. A., and Volinsky, C. T. (1999). Bayesian model averaging: A tutorial. *Statistical Science*, 14(4):382–401.
- Hoffmann, M. and Lepski, O. (2002). Random rates in anisotropic regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(2):325–358.
- Ikeda, S. (1960). A remark on the convergence of Kullback-Leibler’s mean information. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 12(1):81–88.

- Kass, R. E. and Wasserman, L. (1995). A reference Bayesian test for nested hypotheses and its relationship to the Schwarz criterion. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(431):928–934.
- Kleijn, B. J. K. and van der Vaart, A. W. (2012). The Bernstein-Von-Mises theorem under misspecification. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:354–381.
- Lee, Y. K. and Park, B. U. (2006). Estimation of Kullback-Leibler divergence by local likelihood. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 58(2):327–340.
- Leonenko, N., Pronzato, L., and Savani, V. (2008). A class of Rényi information estimators for multidimensional densities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(5):2153–2182.
- Liang, F., Paulo, R., Molina, G., Clyde, M. A., and Berger, J. O. (2008). Mixtures of g priors for Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(481):410–423.
- Pérez-Cruz, F. (2008). Kullback-leibler divergence estimation of continuous distributions. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory - Proceedings*, pages 1666–1670. IEEE.
- Rasmussen, C. E. and Williams, C. K. I. (2006). *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rigollet, P. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2012). Sparse Estimation by Exponential Weighting. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):558–575.
- Schwartz, L. (1965). On Bayes procedures. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 4(1):10–26.
- Shen, W. and Ghosal, S. (2015). Adaptive Bayesian procedures using random series priors. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 42(4):1194–1213.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2014). Aggregation and minimax optimality in high-dimensional estimation. In *Proceedings of the International Congress Mathematicians*, pages 225–246.
- van der Laan, M. J., Polley, E. C., and Hubbard, A. E. (2007). Super Learner. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 6(1). Article 25.
- Van Der Vaart, A. and Van Zanten, H. (2011). Information rates of nonparametric Gaussian process methods. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2095–2119.
- Van Der Vaart, A. and van Zanten, J. (2008). Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of Gaussian priors. In *Pushing the Limits of Contemporary Statistics: Contributions in Honor of Jayanta K. Ghosh*, volume 3, pages 200–222. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, Ohio, USA.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and van Zanten, J. H. (2008). Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on Gaussian process priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(3):1435–1463.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and van Zanten, J. H. (2009). Adaptive Bayesian estimation using a Gaussian random field with inverse Gamma bandwidth. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5B):2655–2675.

- Viele, K. (2007). Nonparametric estimation of Kullback-Leibler information illustrated by evaluating goodness of fit. *Bayesian Analysis*, 2(2):239–280.
- Walker, S., Damien, P., and Lenk, P. (2004). On priors with a Kullback–Leibler property. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(466):404–408.
- Yoo, W. W. and Ghosal, S. (2016). Supremum norm posterior contraction and credible sets for nonparametric multivariate regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):1069–1102.

Supplementary material for “Comparing and weighting imperfect models using D-probabilities”

Meng Li¹ and David B. Dunson²

¹Department of Statistics, Rice University

²Department of Statistical Science, Duke University

1 Technical lemmas

The following Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 1.2 are used to convert the contraction rate of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ to $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ in Theorem 4.1. Both lemmas are established under a general setting without requiring model (6) or Assumptions (a), (b) and (c). The proof of Lemma 1.1 uses the convexity of the Kullback-Leibler divergence and Jensen’s inequality. Lemma 1.2 is a generalized result of Lemma 8.2 in Kleijn and Van Der Vaart (2006) and we allow both arguments in $\text{KL}(\cdot, \cdot)$ to depend on the sample size n .

Lemma 1.1. *For $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ in (4) and $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ in (5), the inequalities $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) \geq \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ hold for any sample size.*

Proof of Lemma 1.1. We first assert that for univariate densities $g_1(x | w)$, $g_2(x)$ and $\pi(w)$, we have

$$\int \text{KL}\{g_1(\cdot | w), g_2\}\pi(w)dw \geq \text{KL}(\widehat{g}_1, g_2), \quad \int \text{KL}\{g_2, g_1(\cdot | w)\}\pi(w)dw \geq \text{KL}(g_2, \widehat{g}_1),$$

where $\widehat{g}_1(x) = \int g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dw$ and all $\text{KL}(\cdot, \cdot)$ are well defined. The proof of this assertion is obtained by the convexity of the Kullback-Leibler divergence and Jensen’s inequality, which is detailed below. Applying Jensen’s inequality, we obtain that

$$\int g_1(x | w) \log g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dw \geq \widehat{g}_1(x) \log \widehat{g}_1(x),$$

and

$$\int -\log g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dw \geq -\log \int g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dw = -\log \widehat{g}_1(x).$$

for any x , since both functions $s \mapsto s \log s$ and $s \mapsto -\log s$ are convex. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \text{KL}\{g_1(\cdot | w), g_2\}\pi(w)dw &= \int \int g_1(x | w) \log \frac{g_1(x | w)}{g_2(x)}\pi(w)dxdw \\ &= \int \int g_1(x | w) \log g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dxdw - \int \int g_1(x | w) \log g_2(x)\pi(w)dxdw \\ &= \int \int g_1(x | w) \log g_1(x | w)\pi(w)dxdw - \int \widehat{g}_1(x) \log g_2(x)dx \\ &\geq \widehat{g}_1(x) \log \widehat{g}_1(x)dx - \int \widehat{g}_1(x) \log\{g_2(x)\}dx = \text{KL}(\widehat{g}_1, g_2). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \text{KL}\{g_2, g_1(\cdot | w)\} \pi(w) dw = \int \int g_2(x) \log \frac{g_2(x)}{g_1(x | w)} \pi(w) dx dw \\
& = \int \int g_2(x) \log\{g_2(x)\} \pi(w) dw dx - \int \int g_2(x) \log\{g_1(x | w)\} \pi(w) dw dx \\
& \geq \int g_2(x) \log\{g_2(x)\} dx - \int g_2(x) \log\{\widehat{g}_1(x)\} dx = \text{KL}(g_2, \widehat{g}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any given parameter in $f_0(\cdot | \theta_0)$ and $f_j(\cdot | \theta_j)$ holding other parameters fixed, the value of Kullback-Leibler divergence decreases if that parameter is integrated out inside the operation $\text{KL}(\cdot, \cdot)$ rather than outside. Since $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ uses the posterior predictive densities for all parameters, it follows that $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j) \geq \widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$ by applying the assertion iteratively over the parameter space. \square

Lemma 1.2. *If $p_n, q_n, p_\infty, q_\infty$ are probability densities such that $p_n \rightarrow p_\infty$ and $q_n \rightarrow q_\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\liminf \text{KL}(p_n, q_n) \geq \text{KL}(p_\infty, q_\infty)$.*

Proof of Lemma 1.2. Let $g_n = p_n \log(q_n/p_n) = g_n I(q_n/p_n > 1) + g_n I(q_n/p_n \leq 1)$ where $I(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function, and $g_\infty = p_\infty \log(q_\infty/p_\infty)$. The function $g_n I(q_n/p_n > 1)$ is nonnegative and is bounded by q_n , since $0 \leq (\log x)I(x > 1) \leq x$ if $x > 0$. Therefore, $g_n I(q_n/p_n > 1)$ is uniformly integrable and thus $\int g_n I(q_n/p_n > 1) \rightarrow \int g_\infty I(q_\infty/p_\infty > 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the dominated convergence theorem. The function $g_n I(q_n/p_n \leq 1) \leq 0$, and an application of Fatou's lemma gives $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n I(q_n/p_n \leq 1) \leq \int g_\infty I(q_\infty/p_\infty \leq 1)$. Consequently, we obtain that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \leq \int g_\infty$ and thus $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int -g_n \geq \int -g_\infty$. \square

The following Lemma (1.3) gives analytical forms of the divergence δ_j for linear regression models when the true model is (6).

Lemma 1.3 (Evaluation of δ_j). *Consider random designs where the covariate x is random and suppose Assumptions (a), (b) and (c) hold. and a linear model \mathcal{M}_j where the mean function $\mu_j(x; \beta_j) = (1, x_j^T) \beta_j$ and x_j is a p_j -dimensional sub-vector of x . If β_j and σ_j follow prior distributions with support being \mathbb{R}^{p_j+1} and \mathbb{R}^+ , then the divergence δ_j is*

$$\delta_j = \frac{1}{2} \log \left[1 + \frac{\text{var}\{\mu(x)\} - \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}^T \{\text{var}(x)\}^{-1} \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}}{\sigma^2} \right]. \quad (1)$$

Proof of Lemma 1.3. The conditional Kullback-Leibler divergence between $N\{\mu(x), \sigma^2\}$ and $N\{\mu_j(x; \beta_j), \sigma_j^2\}$ given x is

$$\log \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma^2 + \{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2}{2\sigma_j^2} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Applying the chain rule of the Kullback-Leibler divergence, we obtain the minimal Kullback-Leibler divergence δ_j by taking the expectation with respect to x , namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_j &= \inf_{\theta_j \in \Theta_j} E \left[\log \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma^2 + \{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2}{2\sigma_j^2} - \frac{1}{2} \right] \\
&= \inf_{\sigma_j \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\log \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma^2 + \inf_{\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j+1}} E\{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2}{2\sigma_j^2} - \frac{1}{2} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For linear model \mathcal{M}_j , we have $\mu_j(x) = (1, x^T) \beta_j = \beta_{j,1} + x^T \beta_{j,-1}$ where $\beta_{j,1}$ is the intercept coefficient and $\beta_{j,-1}$ is the slope coefficient. It is easy to see that the expectation $E\{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2$ is minimized when $\beta_{j,1} = E\{\mu(x) - x^T \beta_{j,-1}\}$ at which $E\{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2 = \beta_{j,-1}^T \text{cov}(x, x) \beta_{j,-1} -$

$2\beta_{j,-1}^T \text{cov}\{x, \mu(x)\} + \text{var}\{\mu(x)\}$. This is a quadratic form of $\beta_{j,-1}$ achieving its minimum $\text{var}\{\mu(x)\} - \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}^T \{\text{var}(x)\}^{-1} \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}$ at $\beta_{j,-1} = \{\text{var}(x)\}^{-1} \text{cov}\{x, \mu(x)\}$.

It is easy to see that

$$\inf_{\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}} E\{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2 = \text{var}\{\mu(x)\} - \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}^T \{\text{var}(x)\}^{-1} \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}.$$

If σ_j follows a prior distribution with support being the positive line, then δ_j is minimized when $\sigma_j^2 = \sigma^2 + \inf_{\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}} E\{\mu(x) - \mu_j(x; \beta_j)\}^2$, which concludes that

$$\delta_j = \frac{1}{2} \log \left[1 + \frac{\text{var}\{\mu(x)\} - \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}^T \{\text{var}(x)\}^{-1} \text{cov}\{x_j, \mu(x)\}}{\sigma^2} \right].$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 1.4. If the covariate x_j is univariate, the divergence δ_j in (1) can be simplified as

$$\delta_j = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{\text{var}\{\mu(x)\}}{\sigma^2} [1 - \rho^2\{x_j, \mu(x)\}] \right),$$

where $\rho\{x_j, \mu(x)\}$ is the correlation between x_j and $\mu(x)$.

2 Additional simulation results

In this section, we provide details of additional simulation results using the four cases in the simulation section. The four cases with different mean functions are given in Figure 1. Case 1 and Case 2 are for the \mathcal{M} -closed situation where the model list \mathcal{M} contains the true model, while Case 3 and Case 4 are for the \mathcal{M} -open situation. The oracle divergence δ_j between model \mathcal{M}_j and the true model is reported in Table 1, which is calculated using Lemma 3 in the supplementary material. Table 1 also presents the estimates $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$ and $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$. We can see that both $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ quickly converge to the corresponding δ_j in Case 1, 2 and 4. Case 3 corresponds to a subtle cyclic deviation from Case 2; we find in this case that the reference nonparametric model fails to pick up the cyclic deviation so that the estimates of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ are close to Case 2 but deviate from δ_j . However, the estimates of $\delta_N - \delta_F$ are accurate, suggesting robustness of the conditional D-probabilities to performance of the reference model.

Figure 3 plots histograms of D-probabilities $\pi_{j,t}$ for all four cases when $n = 100$. We select the model with the maximum D-probability in each replication and calculate the model selection probability across 1000 replications. In Case 1, the D-probability is high for the true model \mathcal{M}_F in all replications, suggesting model selection uncertainty close to zero. Model \mathcal{M}_F has absolute D-probabilities that are not close to zero, such as 0.3, providing evidence it is an adequate approximation. In Case 2, both models have high D-probabilities as expected. The inclusion probability of the covariate x is either 0.09 using $\pi_{j,1}$ or 0.23 using $\pi_{j,2}$, suggesting preference for the null model, with $\pi_{j,1}$ providing a greater penalty on model complexity as in (11). The slight difference in scales between $\pi_{j,1}$ and $\pi_{j,2}$ is less prominent for conditional D-probabilities as shown in Figure 2. In Case 4, the full model \mathcal{M}_F is assigned probability 1, but the D-probabilities are both close to zero, suggesting lack of fit.




Figure 1: Mean functions for the four cases.




Figure 2: Conditional D-probabilities $\pi_{F,1|\mathcal{M}}$ and $\pi_{F,2|\mathcal{M}}$ of the full model in Case 2 and 3.

Table 1: Comparison of $\widetilde{\text{KL}}_t(f_0, f_j)$ and δ_j for $t = 1, 2$. In each case, we report the estimates for \mathcal{M}_F , \mathcal{M}_N and their differences in the row $N - F$, averaged across 1000 replications. The last column reports the maximum standard errors of the estimates in each row. All estimates and standard errors are multiplied by 100.

(Case, \mathcal{M}_j)	δ_j	$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_1(f_0, f_j)$		$\widetilde{\text{KL}}_2(f_0, f_j)$		SE
Sample Size		100	500	100	500	
(1, \mathcal{M}_F)	0	3.79	0.76	1.50	0.30	0.02
(1, \mathcal{M}_N)	111.68	112.16	111.86	111.01	111.62	0.26
(1, $N - F$)	111.68	108.37	111.10	109.51	111.32	0.26
(2, \mathcal{M}_F)	0	2.94	0.58	1.28	0.25	0.02
(2, \mathcal{M}_N)	0	2.44	0.48	1.34	0.26	0.03
(2, $N - F$)	0	-0.5	-0.1	0.05	0.01	0.11
(3, \mathcal{M}_F)	20.23	2.96	0.61	1.27	0.27	0.02
(3, \mathcal{M}_N)	20.27	2.49	0.54	1.38	0.31	0.03
(3, $N - F$)	0.05	-0.46	-0.07	0.11	0.05	0.26
(4, \mathcal{M}_F)	55.94	56.35	55.93	53.87	55.41	0.27
(4, \mathcal{M}_N)	99.48	99.28	99.41	97.23	98.98	0.36
(4, $N - F$)	43.54	42.94	43.48	43.36	43.57	0.11




Figure 3: Histograms of D-probabilities for all four cases when $n = 100$. The two numbers (p_1, p_2) in the middle of each histogram are the average D-probability and the selection probability among 1000 replications.

3 Description of variables in Ozone data

ozone	Daily maximum of the hourly average ozone concentrations in Upland, CA
vh	500 millibar pressure height, measured at the Vandenberg air force base
wind	Wind speed in mph at LAX airport
humidity	Humidity in percent at LAX
temp	Sandburg Air Force Base temperature in degrees Fahrenheit
ibh	Temperature inversion base height in feet
dpg	Pressure gradient from LAX to Daggert in mm Hg
ibt	Inversion base temperature at LAX in degrees Fahrenheit
vis	Visibility at LAX in miles

References

Kleijn, B. J. K. and Van Der Vaart, A. W. (2006). Misspecification in infinite-dimensional Bayesian statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(2):837–877.