

Understanding parameter differences between analyses employing nested data subsets

Steven Gratton^{1,2}[★] and Anthony Challinor^{1,2,3}[†]

¹*Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*

²*Kavli Institute for Cosmology Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*

³*DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*

18 November 2019

ABSTRACT

We provide an analytical argument for understanding the likely nature of parameter shifts between those coming from an analysis of a dataset and from a subset of that dataset, assuming differences are down to noise and any intrinsic variance alone. This gives us a measure against which we can interpret changes seen in parameters and make judgements about the coherency of the data and the suitability of a model in describing those data.

Key words: methods: analytical – methods: statistical

1 INTRODUCTION

One would typically expect the posterior distributions of the parameters of a model to change as the datasets used to constrain them are changed. A part of this must be attributable to “scatter”, i.e., noise and any intrinsic variance assumed by the model. However, it could also be an indication of a problem, either in the data (e.g., a systematic error in one of the datasets or an unaccounted-for relative calibration between two datasets) or in the model (i.e., the model is incomplete and unable to well-describe all of the data).

In this paper we provide an analytical argument for understanding the likely nature of parameter differences in the ideal, scatter-only, case. This gives us a measure against which we can interpret changes seen in parameters inferred from using subsets of the data. Thus we can make judgements about the internal coherency of the data and the appropriateness of a model for describing those data.

In an appendix we show how the approach presented here can be used quickly to rederive the result of Wilks (1938) involving the relation between the goodness-of-fits of a standard analysis and one with additional model parameters.

Some of the techniques described in detail in this paper were used in Planck Collaboration et al. (2016a, 2017, 2019). For similarly-motivated work see Raveri & Hu (2019); Lemos et al. (2019).

2 DERIVATION OF MAIN RESULT

Imagine one has a collection of data, denoted by the vector \hat{X} . One has a parametric model in mind to describe these data, depending on a collection of parameters denoted by a vector P . Let us write the probability density for a realisation X of the data under the model as

$$p(X)dX = e^{-S}dX, \quad (1)$$

where S is a function of X and the parameters P and dX is the appropriate multi-dimensional measure on the data.

Let us now assume that the model can indeed describe the data and that the true parameter values are P_0 . Let us expand S to second order in the parameters about P_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_0 + S'^T \delta P + \frac{1}{2} \delta P^T S'' \delta P + \dots \\ &\approx S_0 + S'^T \delta P + \frac{1}{2} \delta P^T \overline{S''} \delta P \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta P + \overline{S''}^{-1} S' \right)^T \overline{S''} \left(\delta P + \overline{S''}^{-1} S' \right) + \text{const.} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here S' denotes the vector of derivatives of S with respect to the parameters, and S'' denotes the matrix of second derivatives. In the second line we have made the (typically-good) approximation of replacing S'' with its average $\overline{S''}$, where here and onwards an overline denotes an ensemble average of the indicated object with respect to data realizations from the assumed model with parameters P_0 . Equation (2) motivates the “maximum-likelihood” estimator for the parameters, and we now briefly recap some of its properties in preparation for what will follow. The fluctuation in parameters around P_0 for any given realisation of the data is given by

$$\delta P = -\overline{S''}^{-1} S', \quad (3)$$

[★] Contact e-mail: stg20@cam.ac.uk

[†] Contact e-mail: a.d.challinor@ast.cam.ac.uk

where S' is evaluated for the realization in question. This can be seen to be unbiased as follows. From Eq. (3) we have $\overline{\delta P} = -\overline{S''^{-1}S'}$. Using Eq. (1) and considering, for example, the i th parameter P^i , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{S_i} &= \int dX S_{i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= - \int dX (e^{-S})_{,i} \\ &= - \left(\int dX e^{-S} \right)_{,i} \\ &= -1_{,i} = 0,\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where $S_i = \partial S / \partial P^i$. In the last line we have used the fact that the probability distribution for X is normalized to unity. It follows that $\overline{\delta P} = 0$.

To obtain the covariance of the parameters we average the outer product of Eq. (3) over the ensemble. For this we need

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{S_i S_j} &= \int dX S_{i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= - \int dX S_{i,j} (e^{-S})_{,j} \\ &= - \left(\int dX S_{i,j} e^{-S} \right)_{,j} + \int dX S_{i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= 1_{,ij} + \overline{S_{i,j}} \\ &= \overline{S_{i,j}},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

and hence

$$\overline{\delta P \delta P^T} = \overline{S''^{-1} S'' S''^{-1}} = \overline{S''^{-1}},\quad (6)$$

the usual Fisher result.

Now let us imagine splitting our data \hat{X} into two pieces, \hat{X}_1 and \hat{X}_2 , and performing an alternative parameter analysis using \hat{X}_1 alone. The probability distribution we use for X_1 , described by S_1 , must satisfy

$$e^{-S_1} dX_1 = dX_1 \int dX_2 e^{-S} \quad (7)$$

if the two analyses are to be consistent. Hence overlines for quantities involving X_1 alone can equivalently be thought of as referring to averages over realisations of X_1 alone or over the full data X . Corresponding to Eq. (3) we have

$$\delta P_1 = -\overline{S_1''}^{-1} S_1', \quad (8)$$

and corresponding to Eq. (6) we have

$$\overline{\delta P_1 \delta P_1^T} = \overline{S_1''}^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

Now we are in a position to investigate the distribution of parameter *differences*, $\delta P_1 - \delta P$, over the full ensemble. With each term averaging to zero, the parameter differences also average to zero. For the covariance, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{(\delta P_1 - \delta P)(\delta P_1 - \delta P)^T} &= \overline{S_1''}^{-1} \overline{S_1' S_1'^T S_1''}^{-1} \\ &\quad - \overline{S''}^{-1} \overline{S' S_1'^T S_1''}^{-1} \\ &\quad - \overline{S_1''}^{-1} \overline{S_1' S'^T S''}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \overline{S''}^{-1} \overline{S' S'^T S''}^{-1},\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

and we see we need the average of the “mixed” quantity $S_1' S'^T$. This can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{S_{1,i} S_{j,i}} &= \int dX S_{1,i} S_{j,i} e^{-S} \\ &= - \int dX S_{1,i} (e^{-S})_{,j} \\ &= - \int dX (S_{1,i} e^{-S})_{,j} + \int dX S_{1,i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= - \int dX_1 (S_{1,i} \int dX_2 e^{-S})_{,j} + \int dX S_{1,i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= - \left(\int dX_1 S_{1,i} e^{-S_1} \right)_{,j} + \int dX S_{1,i,j} e^{-S} \\ &= 1_{,ij} + \overline{S_{1,i,j}} \\ &= \overline{S_{1,i,j}},\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where we have used the fact that by its definition S_1 must be independent of X_2 . Hence we find

$$\overline{\delta P_1 \delta P^T} = \overline{S''}^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

the same as for $\overline{\delta P \delta P^T}$ itself. Substituting into Eq. (10) gives us the elegant final result

$$\overline{(\delta P_1 - \delta P)(\delta P_1 - \delta P)^T} = \overline{S_1''}^{-1} - \overline{S''}^{-1}, \quad (13)$$

i.e., the covariance of the parameter differences between the partial and full analyses is simply the difference of the covariances.

3 INTERPRETING DIFFERENCES IN MULTIPLE PARAMETERS

For multiple parameters, one can form a “ χ^2 ” for the differences in the parameters between the two analyses. This allows one to treat all parameters fairly, neither focussing on one outlier in particular nor neglecting degeneracies when judging how unlikely multiple shifts are. If we write the parameter shifts as $\Delta = \delta P_1 - \delta P$, in the Gaussian approximation,

$$p(\Delta) d\Delta = \frac{d\Delta}{\left| 2\pi \left(\overline{S_1''}^{-1} - \overline{S''}^{-1} \right) \right|^{1/2}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \Delta^T \left(\overline{S_1''}^{-1} - \overline{S''}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \Delta \right]. \quad (14)$$

If the effective χ^2 (minus twice the exponent) were large then one might begin to worry about the fidelity of some aspect of the data taken as a whole or indeed about the applicability of the model to all of the data. The former would point to systematic effects, the latter to new physics.

4 EXAMPLE

Let us apply the formalism to an example drawn from cosmic microwave background (CMB) analysis in cosmology. Relevant introduction, motivation and definitions of the model parameters may be found in the Planck “cosmological parameters” series of papers (Planck Collaboration et al. 2014, 2016b, 2018).

Here one takes maps of the microwave sky and compares




Figure 1. Two-dimensional marginalised posterior distributions for a full (blue; smaller contours) and a partial (red; larger contours) analysis of a simulated CMB dataset.

them to predictions from a parameterized model, which we take here to be a standard six-parameter Λ CDM cosmology. The model does not predict the actual pattern of fluctuations of the CMB, only their statistical properties. The primordial fluctuations in the early Universe are assumed to be Gaussianly-distributed, with a 3D power spectrum that changes smoothly with scale, giving an intrinsic “cosmic variance” to observations. In addition to temperature, “T”, or intensity fluctuations, the linear polarization of the light also varies across the sky. In the simplest Λ CDM models that we shall consider here, this polarization can be described with the help of an additional scalar field, “E”. From the T and E fields, there are three angular power spectra we can construct, the two auto-spectra \hat{C}_ℓ^{TT} and \hat{C}_ℓ^{EE} and the cross-spectrum \hat{C}_ℓ^{TE} (ℓ denoting the angular multipole number). Neglecting Galactic and extra-galactic contamination, and assuming the full sky is observed with no instrument noise, the negative of the log-likelihood of the observed spectra is

deducible to be

$$-\ln L = (l + 1/2) \left[\text{tr} \left(\mathbf{C}_\ell^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_\ell \right) + \ln \frac{|\mathbf{C}_\ell|}{|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_\ell|} - 1 \right], \quad (15)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{C}_\ell^{\text{TT}} & \hat{C}_\ell^{\text{TE}} \\ \hat{C}_\ell^{\text{TE}} & \hat{C}_\ell^{\text{EE}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

and \mathbf{C}_ℓ is defined similarly but with the theory spectra.

Now it might be that an experiment is such that the polarization is observable only on larger angular scales (lower ℓ), whereas temperature measurements are possible down to finer angular scales (higher ℓ). So we shall here investigate the shifts anticipated between a “full” measurement with TT, TE and EE spectra for angular multipoles $2 \leq \ell \leq 800$ and a “partial” one retaining the range $2 \leq \ell \leq 800$ for TT but only $2 \leq \ell \leq 29$ for TE and EE. (While somewhat arbitrary, these choices for the limits have been chosen to correspond to, e.g., the investigation of dependence of the parameters on

multipole cuts in [Efstathiou & Gratton 2019](#).) This makes for a good test of our formalism since theory predicts the temperature and polarization signals to be correlated with each other.

We generate a fiducial power spectrum from a “best-fit” model of the Planck 2015 analysis ([Planck Collaboration et al. 2016b](#)) using the `CAMB` ([Lewis et al. 2000](#)) software. Next, we generate a realization of the TT, TE and EE spectra from this model by first drawing Gaussian realizations of the T and E multipoles and forming their auto- and cross-power spectra. Finally, we perform Markov-chain Monte-Carlo (MCMC) analyses on both the full set of spectra and the partial set and find best-fit models in both cases using the `CosmoMC` ([Lewis & Bridle 2002](#)) software. Parameter means, standard deviations and best-fits are listed in [Table 1](#) and 2D marginalised posterior distributions are illustrated in [Fig. 1](#).

The `CosmoMC` software also provides estimates of the covariance matrices for the posterior distributions derived from the MCMC chains. Using these in [Eq. \(13\)](#), we can derive standard deviations for the *shifts* in parameters between the full and partial analyses. We list in [Table 2](#) these standard deviations, along with the measured shifts in both the best-fits and the means in terms of these standard deviations.

Considering more than one parameter at a time, one might perform a singular-value-decomposition of [Eq. \(13\)](#) to identify the “most likely” shifts one should expect to see. One can also use the entire covariance of [Eq. \(13\)](#) as discussed in [Sec. 3](#) to compute an overall “goodness-of-fit” for the shifts in all of the parameters. We obtain a χ^2 of 9.84 for the shifts in the means (11.3 for shifts in best-fits) for our six degrees of freedom, a value greater than which would be expected about 13% (8%) of the time under the distribution in [Eq. \(14\)](#).

In computing the standard deviations of parameter shifts shown in [Table 2](#) and associated χ^2 values, we have used the covariances estimated from the MCMC chains, in a similar manner to what one would need to do in a real problem. In our simulation here, however, we know what the underlying model is and so can calculate \overline{S}_{ij} and $\overline{S}_{1,ij}$ analytically in terms of derivatives of the fiducial spectra with respect to the model parameters (these derivatives being evaluated numerically). Using these matrices the standard deviations of the shifts change very little, but the χ^2 of the shift in the means changes to 8.93 and the χ^2 of the shift in the best-fits changes to 9.93.

We go on to generate 100 further realizations of the power spectra, and find their best-fitting parameter values under the full and partial treatments. We compare the shifts between the analyses to predictions from [Eq. \(13\)](#) in [Fig. 2](#). We plot a histogram of the χ^2 s of the shifts, using the analytic covariances, in [Fig. 3](#). In order to obtain the good agreement with expectation shown, note that we had to add terms to the covariance to account for the 0.05-sigma tolerances in the minimization procedure used. We did this by adding 0.05^2 times the diagonals of each of the full and partial covariances back to the covariance of the difference; without these terms a small number of the realizations appeared to have very unlikely shifts. Thus it would seem prudent to consider the potential effect of including similar terms if ini-




Figure 2. Representative plots showing shifts in pairs of parameters between the partial and full analyses of 100 simulated CMB datasets (large blue filled circles), compared to those expected from [Eq. \(13\)](#) (illustrated via 500 Gaussian realizations displayed with small red open circles).

Table 1. Cosmological parameter constraints from a full and partial analysis of a simulated CMB data set (the posterior distributions are shown in Fig. 1).

	Full analysis			Partial analysis		
	best fit	mean	std. dev.	best fit	mean	std. dev.
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02221	0.02222	0.00012	0.02219	0.02224	0.00032
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.12013	0.12011	0.00083	0.11844	0.11804	0.00267
$100\Theta_{\text{MC}}$	1.04070	1.04071	0.00025	1.03886	1.03895	0.00118
τ	0.07255	0.07265	0.00183	0.07337	0.07365	0.00254
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	3.07673	3.07689	0.00399	3.07529	3.07498	0.00522
n_s	0.96030	0.96040	0.00335	0.96384	0.96522	0.00937

Table 2. Expected standard deviations of the shifts in best-fitting parameters between the partial and full analyses of the simulated CMB dataset reported in Table 1 (first column; computed from Eq. 13) compared to the measured shifts in best-fitting parameters (in units of the expected standard deviation of the shift; second column) and the measured shifts in posterior means (third column).

	std. dev. of shift	$\Delta(\text{best fit})$ in shift std. dev.'s	$\Delta(\text{mean})$ in shift std. dev.'s
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.00030	-0.10	-0.06
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.00254	-0.67	-0.82
$100\Theta_{\text{MC}}$	0.00115	-1.59	-1.53
τ	0.00175	+0.47	+0.57
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	0.00337	-0.43	-0.56
n_s	0.00875	+0.40	+0.55




Figure 3. Normalized histogram showing the effective χ^2 from Eq. (14) evaluated for the difference between the partial and full analyses of 100 simulated CMB datasets, using analytic covariances computed around the fiducial model (including terms accounting for tolerances in the minimization procedure), compared to a χ^2 distribution for six degrees of freedom.

tially faced with a high χ^2 from parameter shifts estimated from either best-fits or means in some analysis.

5 COMMENTS AND EXTENSIONS

Our result Eq. (13) should have a wide applicability, enabling one to compare analyses with differing combinations

of datasets, e.g., to illuminate tensions between late-time measurements of the expansion rate of the Universe (see, e.g., Riess et al. 2018) and inferences from the Λ CDM framework with Planck (see, e.g., the discussion in Planck Collaboration et al. 2018), as well as comparing subsets of data taken with the same experiment.

We can understand generic features of parameter shifts from the form of Eq. (13). For example, if large parameter degeneracies that exist using the partial data set are broken using the full data set, then one would expect parameter differences to lie along those parameter degeneracies also.

Note that in order to obtain the simple result of Eq. (13), we had to look at differences between one data combination and another “nested” within it. No such simple result exists in general for parameter differences between, say, two non-nested datasets X_1 and X_2 . If the data sets happen to be independent, then our method does yield

$$\overline{(\delta P_1 - \delta P_2)(\delta P_1 - \delta P_2)^T} = \overline{S_1''^{-1}} + \overline{S_2''^{-1}}, \quad (17)$$

with uncertainties now adding in quadrature as expected.

By applying Eq. (13) to multiple nested subsets, one can build up a “grand” covariance matrix for expectations of the parameter differences between all the analyses. Let parameters P_2 come from an analysis involving a subset of the data that yielded parameters P_1 , itself from an analysis involving a subset of the data that yielded parameters P . By considering appropriate conditional distributions associated with this covariance matrix, certain properties of the parameters obtained may be understood. For example, using Eqs. (6) and (12) we can compute the joint covariance of the differences $P_1 - P$ and $P_2 - P$ to compare their behaviour to expectation.

Knowing the joint distribution for the fluctuations in parameters from the truth (i.e. the δP , δP_1 , \dots , themselves), we can understand certain properties of the behaviour of the parameters by considering the associated conditional distributions. For example, given δP , one’s best estimate for δP_1 is just δP , whereas given δP_1 , one should expect δP to be $CC_1^{-1}\delta P_1$ (with the C s denoting respective covariance matrices). For a single parameter this reduces to σ^2/σ_1^2 times δP_1 ; as more data is added and uncertainties reduce, parameters are most likely to move monotonically closer to the truth. Given P and P_2 , one can show that P_1 should peak around an intermediate value between the two. We can also gain some intuition about how the χ^2 of fits should behave. Focusing on a single parameter for simplicity, given some δP_1 with a $\chi_1^2 = \delta P_1^2/\sigma_1^2$, we should conditionally expect the fuller analysis to have a χ^2 of $\sigma^2 \chi_1^2/\sigma_1^2 + (\sigma_1^2 - \sigma^2)/\sigma_1^2$; if additional

data is added that significantly reduces uncertainties, the significance of an outlier should decrease.

Finally, one can generalise the argument of Sec. 2 to include Gaussian priors on the parameters. However, the result is not as easily expressed in terms of the covariance matrices involved as it was in Eq. (13).

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this note we have presented arguments aimed to help the understanding of relations between inferences using full and partial amounts of data and, in the appendix, between inferences using standard and extended models.

Our work provides some insight into the sorts of posterior variations one might expect when comparing related Bayesian parameter estimations. A “rule of thumb” for a parameter that is well-constrained by the data (so that any effect of priors may be neglected) is as follows: when more data is added, a significant change in the width of the posterior distribution will be accompanied by a difference in the most likely parameter value that can be a significant fraction of the larger width. If the posteriors have similar widths then there should be little shift in the peak position.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank George Efstathiou, Antony Lewis and the Planck Parameters and Likelihood teams for helpful comments and discussions over the development of this work.

Our MCMC analyses were performed using the Cambridge Service for Data Driven Discovery (CSD3) operated by the University of Cambridge Research Computing Service (<http://www.csd3.cam.ac.uk/>), provided by Dell EMC and Intel using Tier-2 funding from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, and DiRAC funding from the Science and Technology Facilities Council (www.dirac.ac.uk).

SG and AC acknowledge support from the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council (grant numbers ST/N000927/1 and ST/S000623/1).

APPENDIX A: WILKS’ THEOREM

Imagine we fit a model with n_a parameters to our data, and then fit an extended model with an additional n_b parameters. In the case where the first model is the correct one, i.e., the additional parameters are not required, by how much should we expect the extended model to improve the goodness of fit by chance? For a cosmological example, one might allow the amplitude of the 3D power spectrum of primordial gravitational waves to vary in the extended model when they are actually negligible. Wilks’ Theorem (Wilks 1938) leads one to expect the improvement in the log-likelihood for the wider analysis over the more specific one to be χ^2 -distributed with a number of degrees of freedom equal to the number of additional parameters the wider analysis has compared to the more specific one (i.e., n_b).

Equations (2) and (3) can be used to rederive this result.

Here we need to keep track of the constant to evaluate S at the best-fit model:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{bf}} &\approx S_0 - \frac{1}{2} S'^T \overline{S''}^{-1} S' \\ &= S_0 - \frac{1}{2} \delta P^T \overline{S''} \delta P, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where we understand the parameter shifts δP in the second line here to be the difference between the best-fit model of the class considered and the underlying one.

We split our δP into two parts, δP_a and δP_b , corresponding to the usual parameters and the additional parameters, respectively, of lengths n_a and n_b . For the restricted analysis, we have

$$\delta P_a^{\text{R}} = -\overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} S'_a, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where we have partitioned S' and S'' as

$$S' = \begin{pmatrix} S'_a \\ S'_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$S'' = \begin{pmatrix} S''_{aa} & S''_{ab} \\ S''_{ba} & S''_{bb} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Introducing an n -by- n_a projection matrix M (with $n = n_a + n_b$, corresponding to the total number of parameters varied in the wider analysis),

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A5})$$

we can express $S_{\text{bf}} - S_0$ for the usual model as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{abf}} - S_0 &= -\frac{1}{2} (\delta P_a^{\text{R}})^T \overline{S''_{aa}} \delta P_a^{\text{R}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} S'_a{}^T \overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} S'_a \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} S'^T M \overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} M^T S'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Subtracting this from the same quantity evaluated for the extended model yields

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{bf}} - S_{\text{abf}} &= -\frac{1}{2} S'^T \left(\overline{S''}^{-1} - M \overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} M^T \right) S' \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \delta P^T \left(\overline{S''} - \overline{S''} M \overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} M^T \overline{S''} \right) \delta P \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

(δP here being the shift from the underlying model to the extended best-fit model). Using Eq. (A4) the bracketed term becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{S''_{bb}} - \overline{S''_{ba}} \overline{S''_{aa}}^{-1} \overline{S''_{ab}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \left(\overline{S''}^{-1} \right)_{bb}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Hence

$$S_{\text{bf}} - S_{\text{abf}} = -\frac{1}{2} \delta P_b^T \left(\overline{S''}^{-1} \right)_{bb}^{-1} \delta P_b, \quad (\text{A9})$$

which we note only depends on the additional parameters δP_b . So to understand how this is distributed, we need to know how the δP_b are distributed.

From Eq. (6), we see that the δP have covariance $\overline{S''}^{-1}$, and hence the δP_b have covariance $\overline{S''}^{-1}_{bb}$, the same matrix as appears in the right-hand side of Eq. (A9). So, to the extent that the parameter shifts may be approximated as Gaussians about the fiducial model, we can immediately

recognize $-2(S_{\text{bf}} - S_{\text{abf}})$ to be χ^2 -distributed with n_b degrees of freedom as in Wilks (1938).

We may use some of the above to investigate the distribution of shifts between parameters between the extended and standard analysis. Let us set

$$\Delta = \delta P - \begin{pmatrix} \delta P_a^R \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

i.e., the difference in parameters between the two analyses, and see how Δ is distributed. One finds

$$\Delta = - \left(\overline{S''}^{-1} - M \left(M^T \overline{S''} M \right)^{-1} M^T \right) S' \quad (\text{A11})$$

and hence, using Eq. (6), we have

$$\overline{\Delta \Delta^T} = \overline{S''}^{-1} - M \left(M^T \overline{S''} M \right)^{-1} M^T. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The right-hand side of Eq. (A12) is not full rank, constraining Δ to lie in a subspace of dimension n_b ; from Eq. (A11) it is evident that Δ is a projection of δP .

REFERENCES

- Efstathiou G., Gratton S., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1910.00483](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.00483)
- Lemos P., Köhlinger F., Handley W., Joachimi B., Whiteway L., Lahav O., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1910.07820](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07820)
- Lewis A., Bridle S., 2002, *Phys. Rev. D*, **66**, 103511
- Lewis A., Challinor A., Lasenby A., 2000, *ApJ*, **538**, 473
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2014, *A&A*, **571**, A16
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2016a, *A&A*, **594**, A11
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2016b, *A&A*, **594**, A13
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2017, *A&A*, **607**, A95
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2018, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1807.06209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06209)
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1907.12875](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.12875)
- Raveri M., Hu W., 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, **99**, 043506
- Riess A. G., et al., 2018, *ApJ*, **855**, 136
- Wilks S. S., 1938, *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **9**, 60

This paper has been typeset from a TeX/L^AT_EX file prepared by the author.