

On a Global Objective Prior from Score Rules

Leisen, F., Villa, C.*and Walker, S.G.[†]

Abstract

This paper takes a novel look at the construction of objective prior distributions. In particular we use calculus of variation methods to minimise integrals of Langrangians. It is the Langrangian which therefore is the basic construct for the objective prior. This will be based on combinations of functions representing information for density functions. Another key idea is that we think about information contained in a density function (the prior) rather than thinking about the information a density holds for a parameter.

Keywords: Euler-Lagrange equation; Fisher information; Differential entropy; Calculus of variation; Proper scoring rules.

1 Introduction

The construction of objective priors has always been an active area of Bayesian research. From the work of Jeffreys (1961) to the more recent Bernardo (1979), the idea of being able to obtain prior distributions which do not depend on subjective information has intrigued researchers. The aim of this article is to present a novel approach to define objective prior distributions for continuous parameter spaces. Furthermore, we show that the prior is proper, rendering it appealing to being employed in scenarios where current (improper) objective priors fail, such as mixture models.

The starting point of any statistical analysis is a parameter of interest, say $\theta \in \Theta$, indexing a family of probability densities $f(x|\theta)$. The Bayesian framework now requires the specification of a prior on Θ .

The two most common approaches to objective priors are (i) Jeffreys prior, which relies on the information about the parameter contained in the Fisher information, and (ii) the reference prior which aims to maximize the expected difference in information between the prior and the posterior. Both of these require and use aspects of $f(x|\theta)$.

On the other hand, we argue that it is possible to express an objective prior about $\theta \in \Theta$ on the basis of the knowledge of Θ only. For example, let $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+$; if $p(\theta)$ is recognised as a suitable objective prior for the θ in $f(x|\theta) = \theta e^{-x\theta}$, then why not also for the θ in

$$f(x|\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \theta^{1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2\theta}.$$

*School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science, Univesity of Kent, Canterbury, UK. emails: fabrizio.leisen@gmail.com, c.villa-88@kent.ac.uk

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin. email: s.g.walker@math.utexas.edu

An objective prior we therefore argue belongs to a Θ rather than a θ within $f(x|\theta)$. This idea also avoids the thorny issue of what $f(x|\theta)$ is; the true model, a misspecified model, a subjective choice, and hence concerns about what an objective prior using such an $f(x|\theta)$ means as well. So our aim is to provide objective density functions on parameter spaces.

In higher dimensions, where the parameter space is $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)$, we assume prior independence among the components and construct the prior as

$$p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) = \prod_{j=1}^k p_j(\theta_j),$$

where each $p_j(\theta_j)$ is a prior derived with our proposed approach.

While the specification of the sampling distribution is necessary to the inferential process (in updating the initial uncertainty), its choice should not affect the way the prior uncertainty about the true value of θ is represented.

The mathematical construct we use to obtain an objective prior are proper scoring rules. These are loss functions, $S(\theta, p) \in \mathbb{R}$, measuring the quality of a quoted distribution p , for an uncertain quantity θ (Parry et al., 2012). In our context, the uncertain quantity is the parameter and the quoted distribution is the prior $p(\theta)$; where $\theta \in \Theta$.

In a minimally informative situation we should be able to obtain the prior $p(\theta)$ without any input. We propose to achieve this by assuming that the loss associated with any θ , via the scoring rule $S(\theta, p)$, is equal to a constant; i.e. it does not depend on θ . The value of this constant is not important and it is set to 1. That is, we solve $S(\theta, p) = 1$ among $p \in \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ represents the set of all the densities. Given the special nature of a scoring rule, our contention is that if for prior p the score $S(\theta, p)$ depends on θ , some parts of the space Θ are given preference, hence the constant assignment. In addition, we assume that the density p satisfies two properties. The first is based on the idea that if we have no information about the true value of θ , we should not expect to have different losses associated with different values of the quantity. The second aims to remove undesirable characteristics in a prior distribution.

Besides the above mentioned properties of being global (i.e. independent from the sampling distribution) and of being proper, the proposed prior has a nice interpretation in terms of information, which will be discussed in the paper.

The research activity in developing objective priors has been prolific since the work of Jeffreys. The idea is that in a scenario where prior elicitation is not feasible, or not desirable, a prior distribution can be formed through structural or formal rules (Kass and Wasserman, 1996). Although a thorough review of objective Bayesian methods is beyond the scope of this paper, we deem it appropriate to briefly list the most common results. The first approach is due to Laplace (1820) with the principle of insufficient reason. For a finite parameter space, the objective prior is uniform which, however, is affected by the partitioning paradox. Its continuous version, where we would have a flat prior, is not suitable for parameters, besides the location, as it is not invariant under reparametrisation. To overcome the last problem, Jeffreys (1946, 1961) proposed a prior distribution for continuous parameter spaces which is invariant for one-to-one transformations of the parameter space. For example, if we consider the sampling distribution $f(x|\theta)$,

the corresponding Jeffreys' prior is given by

$$p(\theta) \propto \sqrt{I(\theta)},$$

where $I(\theta)$ is the Fisher information. Although in scenarios where there is only one parameter of interest, Jeffreys prior yields sensible posterior distributions. However, in cases where the parameter space has a dimension of two or more, the prior is known to yield posteriors with poor performance (sometimes giving paradoxical results, such as the marginalisation paradox). Although other more general invariance priors have been proposed, such as in Dawid (1983), Hartigan (1964) and Jaynes (1968), the reference prior of Bernardo represents an alternative to Jeffreys prior which yields optimal posteriors in multidimensional cases; at least, in some specific cases. Here the idea is to derive a prior distribution which carries as little information as possible. The prior is identified as the one which maximises the (expected) missing information between the prior and the posterior. The most up-to-date results on reference priors can be found in Berger et al. (2009) and, for an extension to discrete parameter spaces, in Berger et al. (2012). A limitation of reference priors is its sensitivity to the order of importance of parameters; this issue and possible solutions have been discussed in Berger et al. (2015).

Other objective priors proposed include that of Box and Tiao (1973) based on data-translated likelihoods, and maximum entropy priors, see for example in Jaynes (1957, 1968). The first type aims to use uniform priors in models where the likelihood can be translated producing posteriors which, for different samples, have the same shape and differ in location only. As discussed in Kass (1990), these priors turn out to be very restrictive in the range of applications.

Another important class of objective priors are the probability matching priors, first proposed in Welch and Peers (1963). The aim is to obtain a prior distribution under which the posterior probabilities of certain regions coincide with their coverage probabilities, either exactly or approximately. For example, if we consider the model $f(x|\theta)$, and $t(p, \alpha)$ is the α -quantile of the posterior, and

$$P_p\{\theta \leq t(p, \alpha)|x\} = \int_{-\infty}^{t(p, \alpha)} p(\theta|x) d\theta = \alpha,$$

then $p(\theta)$ is a probability matching prior. Recent development of the method can be found in Sweeting et al. (2006) and Sweeting (2008).

A different method, based on information theoretical concepts, has been proposed by Zellner and Min (1993), giving the so called maximal data information prior. Although the method gave rise to some interesting results, such as the derivation of the right-Haar measure for location-scale problems, applications are still limited.

A final consideration is reserved to discrete parameter spaces, which systematic discussion can be seen to be generated by the paper of Rissanen (1983). The lack of general methods, due to the challenges that discreteness imposes, has been filled by Berger et al. (2012) first, and Villa and Walker (2015) later.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the foundations of the proposed prior on the basis of scoring rules and their properties. An interesting aspect of the global prior based on scoring rules is its interpretation in terms of the information content carried by the prior itself. This aspect is explored in Section 3. In Section 4 we present the objective priors concentrating on $\Theta = (0, 1)$, $(0, \infty)$ and $(-\infty, +\infty)$. The implementation of the prior for some specific applications is presented in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 is dedicated to some final remarks.

2 Priors from scoring rules

Let us consider a quantity of interest, θ , which can take values in the space Θ . The fundamental argument behind objective prior distributions is that they should represent a state of actual or alleged prior ignorance about the true value of θ . Several criteria have been proposed to select such a prior, all of which assume that a probabilistic model generating the data (given θ) has been chosen. What we propose is to avoid this choice and derive a prior depending on Θ only. The idea is to measure the quality of the prior p with a proper score function, say $S(\theta, p)$, and assume it to be constant, as discussed in the Introduction.

Definition 1. *A density p with respect to the Lebesgue measure on Θ , is objective (in accordance with commonly accepted meaning of the expression) if*

$$S(\theta, p) = 1, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta,$$

where S is a proper scoring rule.

Our choice of scoring rule is

$$\begin{aligned} S(\theta, p) &= -\log p(\theta) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(\theta) \right\}^2 \\ &= -\log p(\theta) + \frac{p''(\theta)}{p(\theta)} - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{p'(\theta)}{p(\theta)} \right\}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

That this is a proper scoring rule is derived from the fact that it is a sum of two proper scoring rules. We combine them so that it is based on $\log p$ and the first two derivatives of $\log p$. Previously priors have been sought based solely on $\log p$; for example the reference prior, and the math becomes unnatural as a consequence. On the other hand, including higher derivatives yields well defined solutions to optimization procedures. That we set this score to 1 for all θ is done without loss of generality, as we shall see later on. That we understand this to be an objective procedure is evident from the fact that no part of Θ is being given preference; the *loss* at θ for our choice of $p(\theta)$ is the same for all θ . For on the other hand, if $S(\theta, p)$ did depend on θ then we argue that this could only be driven by *information*; i.e. parts of Θ space are preferential to others.

In fact, (1) can be seen as the sum of the two scoring rules, that is the log score

$$S_L(\theta, p) = -\log p(\theta), \quad (2)$$

and the *Hyvärinen scoring rule* (Hyvärinen, 2005)

$$S_H(\theta, p) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(\theta) \right\}^2. \quad (3)$$

An interpretation of exactly how the scoring rules work for us as far as the objective prior is concerned can be found in Section 4.

It is to be noted that we have summed the two scores directly without introducing any weighting. If we weighted the two scores we would be attempting to calibrate the two scores, namely $S_L(\theta, p)$ and $wS_H(\theta, p)$. We motivate the choice $w = 1$ in Section 3 when we look at an alternative derivation of the objective prior. For now we simply note that there seems no motive to put a different coefficient for the $\log p$ and $\partial^2 \log p / \partial \theta^2$ terms.

Hence, we see that the objective prior $p(\theta)$ is obtained by solving the following differential equation:

$$\frac{p''(\theta)}{p(\theta)} - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{p'(\theta)}{p(\theta)} \right\}^2 = 1 + \log p(\theta). \quad (4)$$

To derive the solution, we have the following result.

Theorem 1. *The solution to (4) is given by $p(\theta) \propto e^{-u(\theta)}$ with u solving*

$$u'(\theta) = \pm \sqrt{ce^{u(\theta)} - 2\{1 + u(\theta)\}}$$

for some suitable constant c .

Proof. Solving the differential equation (4) is equivalent to solving the following differential equation;

$$u(\theta)'' - \frac{1}{2} \{u(\theta)'\}^2 = u(\theta), \quad (5)$$

where we have $u(\theta) = -\log p(\theta)$. Strictly we have $u'' - \frac{1}{2}(u')^2 = u - 1$ but if u solves this then $u + 1$ solves (5). The 1 here is the same one which appears in the $S(\theta, p) = 1$ and hence confirming the “without loss of generality” in the choice of 1 as a constant. By now letting $v = u'$ we have

$$v \frac{dv}{du} = u + \frac{1}{2}v^2,$$

which has the solution

$$v(\theta) = u'(\theta) = \pm \sqrt{ce^{u(\theta)} - 2\{1 + u(\theta)\}}. \quad (6)$$

for a suitable c . For $u'(\theta)$ to exist we require $c \geq 2(1 + u)e^{-u}$ for all u which occurs when $c \geq 2$, since $(1 + u)e^{-u}$ is upper bounded by 1. $\square$

The missing pieces are c and say $u(0)$. We will see how to complete these when we look at illustrations in Section 4. We also note here that we do not need the normalizing constant for p , as is the case for all prior distributions, and neither do we need to find an explicit solution for u , and p , beyond (6). The reason for this is that we can find an accurate solution via numerical methods; i.e. if we have $u(\theta)$ at a particular θ value, then we can evaluate

$$u(\theta + \varepsilon) = u(\theta) + \varepsilon u'(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 u''(\theta) + R$$

for small ε , and the u' and u'' are available explicitly. Here R denotes the remainder term. From here we can evaluate $p(\theta)$.

3 Variational problems and solutions

Here we provide an alternative derivation of (4) using information theory, specifically entropy information and Fisher information.

The entropy information (negative the entropy) of a density function p is given by

$$I_E(p) = \int p(\theta) \log p(\theta) d\theta,$$

which is related to the Shannon's entropy and is equal to negative the expected self-information loss. In addition to $I_E(p)$, we consider a measure of the information in the density p known as Fisher information,

$$I_F(p) = \int \frac{p'(\theta)^2}{p(\theta)} d\theta = \int p(\theta) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(\theta) \right\}^2 d\theta. \quad (7)$$

See for example Bobkov et al (2014).

Our broad aim is to choose the p which minimizes the information in p . However, neither $I_E(p)$ nor $I_F(p)$ on their own provide a global minimum when using variational methods. On the other hand, this is possible when using $I_E(p) + w I_F(p)$ for some weighting w . Of all the possible weightings, we choose the w so the two pieces of information are calibrated. Our calibration, i.e. setting w , involves insisting that $I_E(p) = w I_F(p)$ when p is standard normal. This results in the choice $w = \frac{1}{2}$. In fact, the inequality $I_E(p) \leq \frac{1}{2} I_F(p)$, with equality when p is standard normal, is known as the log-Sobolev inequality.

Hence, our aim is to find the p which minimizes $I_E(p) + \frac{1}{2} I_F(p)$. To minimise the overall measure of information, using calculus of variations, we define the Lagrangian $L(\theta, p, p')$ and seek such an L for which we can demonstrate a global minimum for the class of priors $\mathcal{P}$. Recalling variational methods (Rustagi, 1976), if we wish to minimise $\int_a^b L(\theta, p, p') d\theta$, a necessary condition for a local extremum of the integral of the Lagrangian $L(\theta, p, p')$ is that

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial p} = \frac{d}{d\theta} \frac{\partial L}{\partial p'}. \quad (8)$$

Minimising $\int_a^b L(\theta, p, p') d\theta$ reduces to the classical calculus of variation problem where we want to extremize the integral of the function

$$L(\theta, p, p') = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p'(\theta)^2}{p(\theta)} + p(\theta) \log p(\theta). \quad (9)$$

The solution to the extremal problem, if it exists, is obtained from the Euler-Lagrange equations, given by (8). According to page 44 of Rustagi (1976), if $L(p, p')$ is strictly convex on $(0, \infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty)$, and p satisfies the Euler equation, then p is a global minimum of $\int_a^b L(\theta, p, p') d\theta$.

Now $L(p, p')$ is strictly convex if the matrix

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \partial^2 L / \partial p^2 & \partial^2 L / \partial p \partial p' \\ \partial^2 L / \partial p \partial p' & \partial^2 L / \partial (p')^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive definite.

Theorem 2. *A global minimum satisfying the Euler-Lagrange equations is given by the p solving the differential equation*

$$p' = -p \sqrt{c/(ep) - 2 \log p}$$

for some suitable c .

Proof. Easy calculations give

$$H = \frac{1}{p} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa^2 + 1 & -\kappa \\ -\kappa & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\kappa = p'/p$. This is easily seen to be a positive definite matrix; the eigenvalues are given by

$$\frac{1}{p} \left[\frac{1}{2}(2 + \kappa^2) \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}(2 + \kappa^2)^2 - 1} \right],$$

which are positive.

Equation (8), after some elementary algebra and differentiation, leads to the following differential equation,

$$\frac{p''(\theta)}{p(\theta)} - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{p'(\theta)}{p(\theta)} \right\}^2 = 1 + \log p(\theta). \quad (10)$$

□

This differential equation has the solution derived in the previous section. It is interesting that the Euler–Lagrange equations are solved by precisely the p solving equation (4).

4 Illustrations

To illustrate the proposed method we consider three common parameter spaces. In particular, we consider the space for a parameter representing a probability, that is $\Theta = (0, 1)$, the space $\Theta = (0, \infty)$, usually representing the support of scale parameters and, finally, the support for (location) parameters $\Theta = (-\infty, +\infty)$. As we show, the first case has a trivial solution, while the last one is obtained by symmetrising the solution for $\Theta = (0, \infty)$. Hence, it is this latter Θ which is discussed in detail.

For the $(0, \infty)$ case, we will settle the free parameters, i.e. $u(0)$ and c by demanding that p has certain shapes. For $(0, \infty)$, we ask that $\log p$ is concave and that p is convex. For objectiveness we ask that they are minimally so, so that for at least a single θ_1 and θ_2 we have $p''(\theta_1) = 0$ and $(\log p(\theta_2))'' = 0$.

Case $\Theta = (0, 1)$. In this case, the global objective prior on Θ can be found without recourse to variational methods, as the information $I(p)$ is minimised when $p(\theta) = 1$, i.e. the uniform distribution, since both $I_F(p)$ and $I_E(p)$ are non-negative and are both 0 when we take p to be flat.

Case $\Theta = (0, \infty)$. For a prior defined on the space $(0, \infty)$ we require specific shape properties in order to yield a proper prior. By setting the two free parameters c and $u(0)$ in (6), we obtain a prior distribution p which is (minimally) convex and with $\log p$ (minimally) concave. Both of these are quite standard properties of elementary densities; such as $p(\theta) = e^{-\theta}$.

For the prior to be convex we require $p'' \geq 0$. Now $p' = -u'p$ implying $p'' = p \{(u')^2 - u''\}$. Therefore, p is convex when $(u')^2 \geq u''$. From (5) and (6) we have $(u')^2 = ce^u - 2(1 + u)$ and $u'' = \frac{1}{2}ce^u - 1$ and hence we are interested in the c for which $c \geq 2(1 + 2u)e^{-u}$.

Given that the function $2(1 + 2u)e^{-u}$ is maximum at $u = \frac{1}{2}$, we need $c \geq 4e^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ if $u(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, whereas $c \geq 2(1 + 2u(0))e^{-u(0)}$ if $u(0) > \frac{1}{2}$. Combining these conditions

with $c \geq 2(1+u)e^{-u}$ for relevant u , we have, putting c to be minimal so that p is minimally convex,

$$c = \begin{cases} 4e^{-\frac{1}{2}} & u(0) \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 2(1+2u(0))e^{-u(0)} & u(0) > \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Since $u(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $u \geq u(0)$, we deduce that $p''(\theta) = 0$ when $u(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}$.

For $\log p$ to be concave, we note that $(\log p)'' = -u''$ and $u'' = \frac{1}{2}ce^u - 1$. Since u is increasing and c is already set, for $\log p$ to be minimally concave we require $u(0) = \log(2/c)$. Since $c > 2$, we will have $u(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and so we take $c = 4e^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $u(0) = \frac{1}{2} - \log 2$.

Another important property of the prior p is that it should penalise large values of θ ; i.e. $p \rightarrow 0$ as $\theta \rightarrow \infty$. As such, we require that u' is bounded away from 0, which is proved in the following Lemma, i.e. $u \rightarrow \infty$ as $\theta \rightarrow \infty$. That is, for θ increasing, the (normalised) prior p converges to 0.

Lemma 1. *It is that $ce^u - 2(1+u) \geq 2\log 2 - 1 \approx 0.39$.*

Proof. The proof is done by considering the two cases $u(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $u(0) > \frac{1}{2}$, separately. For the former, we have that $4e^{u-\frac{1}{2}} - 2(1+u)$ is minimized at $u = \frac{1}{2} - \log 2$. Therefore,

$$4e^{u-\frac{1}{2}} - 2(1+u) \geq -2\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \log 2\right\} = 2\log 2 - 1.$$

For the latter case, i.e. $u(0) > \frac{1}{2}$, we consider

$$2\{1+2u(0)\}e^{u-u(0)} - 2(1+u) \geq 2\{1+u-u(0)\} + 4u(0)e^{u-u(0)} - 2(1+u),$$

since $u \geq u(0)$. The right-hand-side can be written as $u(0)\{2e^{u-u(0)} - 1\}$, and the term inside the curly brackets is bounded below by 1. Since $u(0) > \frac{1}{2} > 2\log 2 - 1$, this completes the proof. $\square$

The result of Lemma 1 has also the implication that p is a proper density function. To show this, we require Gronwall's inequality (Gronwall, 1919). This inequality states that, if f and g are real valued functions on $\Theta = (0, \infty)$, g is differentiable on $\text{int}(\Theta)$, and

$$g'(t) \leq g(t)f(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \Theta$$

then

$$g(t) \leq g(0) \exp \left\{ \int_0^t f(s) ds \right\}.$$

Lemma 2. *If $p(0) < \infty$, it is that*

$$p(\theta) \leq p(0)e^{-\epsilon\theta},$$

and hence p is proper.

Proof. Since $p' = -u'p$ and we have $u' \geq \epsilon = \sqrt{2\log 2 - 1}$, it is that $p' \leq -\epsilon p$. From Gronwall's lemma, with $f(t) = -\epsilon$ and $g = p$, we have that

$$p(\theta) \leq p(0) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\theta \epsilon ds \right\},$$

and hence the proof is complete. $\square$

To have a graphical image for the global prior, in Figure 1 we plot the prior using the approximation available via a numerical solution to the differential equation for p . Note that this is the unnormalised p .




Figure 1: Global prior distribution for the case $\Theta = [0, \infty)$.

Case $\Theta = (-\infty, +\infty)$. A solution here is a symmetric version from 3.2. However, if we ask that p is smooth at the origin, i.e. $p'(0) = 0$, then we need $u'(0) = 0$ and hence $c = 2(1 + u(0))e^{-u(0)}$. For a mode at 0 we need $u''(0) > 0$ from which we need $u(0) > 0$. With this requirement we see that $(1 + u(0))e^{-u(0)}$ is bounded between 0 and 1 and hence, since we need $c \geq 2$, we must take $u(0) = 0$. With this $u \equiv 0$ and $c = 2$ and so p is flat, and hence improper.

5 Applications

Although we do not have an explicit form for $p(\theta)$, we can use (6) to calculate it easily. In particular, if we know $p(\theta)$ then we calculate $p(\theta + \delta\theta)$ for small $\delta\theta$, hence setting up the posterior estimation process via Metropolis–Hastings sampling.

To be specific, suppose we are currently at θ and the proposal value is θ' . The acceptance probability is

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{l(\theta')}{l(\theta)} \frac{p(\theta')}{p(\theta)} \frac{q(\theta|\theta')}{q(\theta'|\theta)} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

where $l(\theta)$ is the likelihood function, and $q(\theta'|\theta)$ is the proposal density. The evaluation of $p(\theta')/p(\theta)$ in equation (11) doesnot represent any particular challenge. In fact, we have $p(\theta')/p(\theta) = \exp\{-[u(\theta') - u(\theta)]\}$, where u is the solution of the differential equation

$$u' = \sqrt{ce^u - 2(1 + u)}. \quad (12)$$

Equation (12) allows us to evaluate $u(\theta') - u(\theta)$ numerically, via

$$u(\theta') = u(\theta) + (\theta' - \theta)u'(\theta) + \frac{(\theta' - \theta)^2}{2}u''(\theta) + \frac{(\theta' - \theta)^3}{6}u'''(\theta) + R$$

where $u'(\theta) = \sqrt{ce^{u(\theta)} - 2(1 + u(\theta))}$, $u''(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}ce^{u(\theta)} - 1$, and

$$u'''(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}ce^{u(\theta)}\sqrt{ce^{u(\theta)} - 2(1 + u(\theta))},$$

and so on. Depending on how far θ' is from θ we can either use the direct approximation just given or otherwise get from θ to θ' using smaller step sizes.

Before showing the results of a thorough simulation study in Section 5.2, we consider the following two applications based on a single i.i.d. sample:

1. $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, where we assume our prior on the unknown parameter $\lambda > 0$, that is a sample space $(0, \infty)$.
2. $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim N(\mu, 1)$, where we assume our prior on the unknown parameter $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, that is a sample space $(-\infty, \infty)$.

In the first illustration we sample $n = 100$ observations from a Poisson distribution with mean value $\lambda = 2.5$. The Metropolis–Hastings has been run with c and $u(0)$ set as in discussed in Section 4, and the results for 100,000 iterations are shown in Figure 2 (posterior sample) and in Figure 3 (posterior histogram). Both figures show a good mixing and a posterior distribution that accumulates around the true parameter value. For the second illustration we have sampled $n = 100$ observations




Figure 2: Posterior chain for λ of a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda = 2.5$.

from a normal density with mean $\mu = 5$ and (known) variance equal to one. Here, for a total of 100,000 iterations, we had the results in Figure 4 (posterior sample) and Figure 5 (posterior histogram). In this case too the results are satisfactory, and the sensitivity analysis has again shown no noticeable impact from the initial choices.




Figure 3: Posterior histogram for λ of a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda = 2.5$.




Figure 4: Posterior chain for μ of a normal density with mean $\mu = 5$.

5.1 Mixture models

In this section we discuss the application of the proposed method to a scenario where objective priors have been notoriously challenging. If we consider mixture models, it is well known that the use of objective priors (Grazian and Robert, 2015) has to be done carefully, as this type of model is subject to issues related to non-identifiability, unbounded likelihoods, etc. The fact is that improper priors may not be appropriate as we might not observe outcomes from every component of the mixture (Titterington et al., 1985). For example, Grazian and Robert (2015) show that Jeffreys prior is suitable for mixtures of normal densities only in some certain circumstances; that is when the unknown parameters are the weights. If the unknown parameters are the means or the variances, then using Jeffreys prior leads to improper posteriors. In particular, if the unknown parameters are the means only, we need at most two components to have proper posteriors; while, if the unknown parameters are the variance or the mean and the variances, then Jeffreys priors are not suitable for inference. The authors also generalise the result to any type of mixture.

Given that the objective prior we propose is proper, it allows to make inference on the parameters of a mixture density as the yielded posteriors will be proper. As an illustration, we consider the same examples discussed in Grazian and Robert (2015), that is a mixture of three normal densities, assuming the weights and the variances known. In particular, we sample $n = 100$ observations from the following




Figure 5: Posterior histogram for μ of a normal density with mean $\mu = 5$.

model

$$0.25N(\mu_1, 1) + 0.65N(\mu_2, 0.5) + 0.10N(\mu_3, 5),$$

where we chose $\mu_1 = -10$, $\mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_3 = 15$. The prior will have the form $p(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = p(\mu_1)p(\mu_2)p(\mu_3)$, and the posterior will be obtained by implementing the Metropolis sampling defined above within a Gibbs sampler. Using the same initial settings of c and $u(0)$ as above, for a total of 100,000 iterations, we obtain the results in Figure 6 (posterior traces) and Figure 7 (posterior histograms). The plots show clear convergence of the posterior chains, with a variance which is roughly proportional to the corresponding component in the mixture. In Figures




Figure 6: Posterior traces for the mixture means: first component $N(-10, 1)$ (bottom blue), second component $N(0, 0.5)$ (middle red) and third component $N(15, 5)$ (top cyan).

8 and 9 we see traces and histograms, respectively, of the posterior samples for a mixture of three normal densities with weights and variances as above, but with closer means, that is $\mu_1 = -1$, $\mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_3 = 2$. In this case the simulation has been run for 100,000 iterations, but the results again show convergence and reasonable estimates. In this case, we need to take into considerations that the




Figure 7: Posterior traces for the mixture means: first component $N(-10, 1)$ (left blue), second component $N(0, 0.5)$ (middle red) and third component $N(15, 5)$ (right cyan).

parameters are harder to be distinguished and that we are using noninformative priors.




Figure 8: Posterior traces for the mixture means: first component $N(-1, 1)$ (bottom blue), second component $N(0, 0.5)$ (middle red) and third component $N(2, 5)$ (top cyan).

5.2 Simulation study

For objective priors, it is common practice to analyse some frequentist properties of the yielded posteriors. Furthermore, when available, the performance is compared to the one of other objective priors. We consider two frequentist indexes: the coverage of the 95% credible interval of the posterior distribution and the square root of the mean squared error (MSE) from the posterior mean. Note that, for scale parameters the MSE is computed relatively to the parameter value; that is $\sqrt{MSE(\theta)}/\theta$. This is necessary to have a more realistic quantification of the




Figure 9: Posterior traces for the mixture means: first component $N(-1, 1)$ (left blue), second component $N(0, 0.5)$ (middle red) and third component $N(2, 5)$ (right cyan).

estimation accuracy, as one would expect the uncertainty to increase as the value of the parameter increases. The study compares the performances of the proposed prior with the ones of the appropriate Jeffreys' prior, which can be considered as commonly accepted benchmark of reference.

The first study considers the Poisson as sampling distribution. We repeat the procedure introduced in Section 5 on 500 samples generated from a Poisson with $\theta = 1, 2, \dots, 10$. The sample sizes considered are $n = 30$ and $n = 100$. Recalling that, if $x \sim \text{Poisson}(\theta)$, then the Jeffreys' prior is $\pi_J(\theta) \propto \theta^{-1/2}$, Figure 10 shows the coverage of the 95% credible interval and the square root of the MSE relative to θ . It is clear that there is no appreciable difference in the frequentist performances of the proposed global prior with respect to the Jeffreys' prior. The coverage is in line with the behaviour one would expect from a minimally informative prior, and the MSE is larger for $n = 30$ than for $n = 100$ due to the lesser information contained in the data. A similar conclusion can be drawn for the second simulation study, where a normal with known variance is considered. In this case, with observations from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ (where σ^2 is assumed to be known), where $\mu = \{-5, -4, \dots, 0, \dots, 4, 5\}$, Jeffreys' prior is $\pi_J(\mu) \propto 1$. The reported results have been obtained for $\sigma^2 = 1$ as there is no impact of the variance on the prior performances. By inspecting Figure 11, we do not notice any sensible difference, in terms of frequentist performance, between the two priors.

6 Discussion

In this paper we have introduced a new class of objective priors derived by considering scoring rules. The scoring rules have been chosen so to have a prior p which is differentiable as many times as it is desirable; in particular, twice differentiable. Doing so, we have been able to represent both the global and the local behaviour of the prior by setting up the scoring rule as the sum of two pieces of loss: one related to p and one to its sensitivity to variations in θ . A remarkable aspect is that we have been able to show that the same result can be achieved via the rigorous




Figure 10: Poisson model. Coverage of the 95% credible interval of the posterior for $\theta = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ for $n = 30$ (a) and for $n = 100$ (c), and MSE from the mean for $n = 30$ (b) and for $n = 100$ (d). Each graph shows the results for the proposed prior (blue square) and the Jeffreys' prior (red diamond).

of calculus of variations, by finding objective priors which provide global extremum to integrals of the type

$$\int L(\theta, p, p') d\theta.$$

For if we can establish suitable choices of $L(\theta, p, p')$ which can be motivated and satisfy conditions for the existence of global extremum, then new classes of objective prior can be sought. The case we have considered, which we acknowledge is a first step, is to use a combination of two well known measures of information in a prior density function; i.e.

$$L(\theta, p, p') = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p'(\theta)^2}{p(\theta)} + p(\theta) \log p(\theta)$$

with $p \in \mathcal{P} = \{p : p \text{ convex \& } \log p \text{ concave}\}$.

The global objective priors here defined have two desirable properties. The first is that they are somewhat detached from the choice of the sampling distribution and be dependent on the sample space only. in other words, the information required to derive the prior is limited to the range of values that the quantity of interest can take. The undoubted advantage is that a layer of objectivity has been removed, as




Figure 11: Normal model. Coverage of the 95% credible interval of the posterior for $\theta = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ for $n = 30$ (a) and for $n = 100$ (c), and MSE from the mean for $n = 30$ (b) and for $n = 100$ (d). Each graph shows the results for the proposed prior (blue square) and the Jeffreys' prior (red diamond).

current methods consider objectivity to start *after* the sampling distribution has been chosen (Bernardo, 1997).

The second property is that the prior is proper. Besides the advantage of not having to check properness of the posterior, operation necessary any time an improper is used, it allows to exploit the prior in scenarios where improper objective priors have been challenging. For example, as illustrated in Section 5.1, the global prior is used to estimate the means of a mixture of normal densities with three components. Another potential application, not discussed in this paper, is in model selection. In particular, the global objective prior may be used to represent minimal information on the parameters that are not common to two models. In fact, the Bayes factor used to compare two models is sensible to the proportionality constant of improper priors. While for common parameters the constant will cancel out, this is not the case if the parameter is either at the numerator or at the denominator of the ratio. Hence, the necessity of having a proper prior assigned to this kind of parameters.

The simulation study, aimed to compare the frequentist performances of the proposed prior with the ones of the Jeffreys' prior, has shown no appreciable differences. This, of course, is an expected and reassuring result supporting the objectivity of the global prior.

References

- Berger, J. O. (2006). The case for objective Bayesian analysis. *Bayesian Analysis*, **1**, 1–17.
- Berger, J. O., Bernardo, J. M. and Sun, D. (2009). The formal definition of reference priors. *Annals of Statistics*, **37**, 905–938.
- Berger, J. O., Bernardo, J. M. and Sun, D. (2012). Objective priors for discrete parameter spaces. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **107**, 636–648.
- Berger, J. O., Bernardo, J. M. and Sun, D. (2012). Overall objective priors (with discussion). *Bayesian Analysis*, **10**, 189–221.
- Bernardo, J. M. (1979). Reference posterior distributions for Bayesian inference (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **41**, 113–147.
- Bernardo, J. M. (1979). Noninformative Priors Do Not Exist: A Discussion with José M. Bernardo. *J. Statist. Planning and Inference*, **65**, 159–189.
- Bernardo, J. M. and Smith, A. F. M. (1994). *Bayesian Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA. doi: 10.1002/9780470316870.ch1.
- Bhattacharyya, A. K. (1943). On a measure of divergence between two statistical populations defined by their probability distribution. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, **35**, 99–109.
- Bobkov, S. G., Gozlan, N., Roberto, C. and Samson, P. M. (2014). Bounds on the deficit in the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **267**, 4110–4138.
- Box, G. E. P. and Tiao, G. C. (1973). *Bayesian Inference in Statistical Analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Clarke, B. and Sun, D. (1997). Reference priors under the chi-square distance. *Sankhyā A*, **59**, 215–231.
- Clarke, B. and Sun, D. (1999). Asymptotics of the expected posterior. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **51**, 163–185.
- Clarke, B. and Wasserman, L. (1993). Noninformative priors and nuisance parameters. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **88**, 1472–1432.
- Clarke, B. and Wasserman, L. (1995). Information trade-off. *TEST*, **4**, 19–38.
- Dawid, A. P. (1983). Invariant prior distributions. In *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, eds. S. Kotz and N. L. Johnson, New York: John Wiley.
- Ghosh, M. (2011). Objective Priors: An introduction for frequentists. *Statistical Science*, **26**, 187–202.
- Ghosh, J. K., Delampady, M. and Samanta, T. (2006). *An Introduction to Bayesian Analysis*. Springer, New York.

- Ghosh, M., Mergel, V. and Liu, R. (2011). A general divergence criterion for prior selection. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **63**, 43–58.
- Ghosh, M. and Mukerjee, R. (1992). Non-informative priors. *Bayesian Statistics 4*, eds. J. M. Bernardo, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid and A. F. M. Smith, Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press.
- Grazian, C. and Robert, C. P. (2015). Jeffreys Priors for Mixture Estimation. *Bayesian Statistics from Methods to Models and Applications*, **126**, 37–48
- Gronwall, T. H. (1919). Note on the derivatives with respect to a parameter of the solutions of a system of differential equations. *Annals of Mathematics*, **20**, 292–296.
- Hartigan, J. A. (1964). Invariant prior distributions. *Annals of Mathematical Statist.*, **35**, 836–845.
- Hyvärinen, A. (2005). Estimation of non-normalized statistical models by score matching. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, **6**, 695–709.
- Kass, R. E. (1990). Data-translate likelihood and and Jeffreys’s rule. *Biometrika*, **77**, 107–114.
- Kass, R. E. and Wasserman, L. (1996). The selection of prior distributions by formal rules. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **91**, 1343–1370.
- Jaynes, E. T. (1957). Information theory and statistical mechanics I, II. *Physical review*, **106**, 620–630; **108**, 171–190.
- Jaynes, E. T. (1968). Prior probabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, **SSC-4**, 227–241.
- Jeffreys, H. (1946). An invariant form for the prior probability in estimation problems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Ser. A*, **186**, 453–461.
- Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of Probability and Inference*, 3rd ed. Cambridge Univ. Press, London.
- Laplace, P. S. (1820). *Essai Philosophique sue les Probbailités*.
- Merhav, N. and Feder, M. (1998). Universal prediction. *IEEE Trans. Neur. Net.*, **20**, 1087–1101.
- Parry, M., Dawid, A. P. and Lauritzen S. (2012). Proper local scoring rules. *Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 561–592.
- Rissanen, J. (1983). A universal prior for integers and estimation by minimum description length. *The Annals of Statistics*. **11**, 416–431.
- Rustagi, J.S. (1976). *Variational Methods in Statistics*. Academic Press.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, **27**, 379–423.

- Sweeting, T. J. (2008). On predictive probability matching priors. *IMS Collections: Pushing the Limits of Contemporary Statistics: Contributions in Honor of Jayanta K. Ghosh*, eds. B. Clarke and S. Ghosal. **3**, 46-59.
- Sweeting, T. J. (2011). Invited discussion of M. Ghosh : Objective priors: an introduction for frequentists. *Statistical Science* **26**, 206-209.
- Sweeting, T. J., Datta, G. S. and Ghosh, M. (2006). Nonsubjective priors via predictive relative entropy loss. *Ann. Statist.* **34**, 441-468.
- Titterton, D., Smith, A. and Makov, U. (1985). *Statistical Analysis of Finite Mixture Distributions*. John Wiley, New York.
- Villa, C. and Walker, S. G. (2015). An objective approach to prior mass functions for discrete parameter spaces. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **110**, 1072–1082.
- Walker, S. G. (2016). Bayesian information in an experiment and the Fisher information distance. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **112**, 5–9.
- Welch, B. L. and Peers, H. W. (1963). On formulae for confidence points based on integrals of weighted likelihoods. *J. Roy Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, **35**, 318–329.
- Zellner, A. and Min, C. (1993). Bayesian analysis model selection and prediction. In *Physics and Probability: Essays in honour of Edwin T. Jaynes*, eds. W. T. Grandy, Jr. and P. W. Milonni, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.