

Horseshoe Regularization for Machine Learning in Complex and Deep Models

Anindya Bhadra

Department of Statistics, Purdue University, 250 N. University St., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.
bhadra@purdue.edu

Jyotishka Datta

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72704, USA.
jd033@uark.edu

Yunfan Li

Department of Statistics, Purdue University, 250 N. University St., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.
li896@purdue.edu

Nicholas G. Polson

Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, 5807 S. Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, IL 60637, USA.
ngp@chicagobooth.edu

Abstract

Since the advent of the horseshoe priors for regularization, global-local shrinkage methods have proved to be a fertile ground for the development of Bayesian methodology in machine learning, specifically for high-dimensional regression and classification problems. They have achieved remarkable success in computation, and enjoy strong theoretical support. Most of the existing literature has focused on the linear Gaussian case; see [Bhadra et al. \(2019b\)](#) for a systematic survey. The purpose of the current article is to demonstrate that the horseshoe regularization is useful far more broadly, by reviewing both methodological and computational developments in complex models that are more relevant to machine learning applications. Specifically, we focus on methodological challenges in horseshoe regularization in nonlinear and non-Gaussian models; multivariate models; and deep neural networks. We also outline the recent computational developments in horseshoe shrinkage for complex models along with a list of available software implementations that allows one to venture out beyond the comfort zone of the canonical linear regression problems.

Keywords: complex data; deep learning; large scale machine learning; nonlinear; non-Gaussian; shrinkage.

1 Introduction

While Bayesian regularization is achieved through an appropriate choice of prior, many questions arise in designing sparsity priors in high-dimensional problems on both theoretical and computational fronts. Are the resulting posteriors “optimal” in some sense? Although the Bayesian posterior allows probabilistic uncertainty quantification, is it actually feasible to achieve a reasonable computational approximation of the posterior distribution in high dimensions? Fortunately,

at least in the realm of linear Gaussian models, these questions are beginning to be answered in the affirmative over the past decade, thanks in large part due to the success of “global-local” priors, of which the horseshoe (Carvalho et al., 2010) remains a canonical example. Bhadra et al. (2019b) provide a detailed exposition of available results on global-local priors in linear models. They also provide extensive comparisons of global-local regularization with the lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) in linear models, which is perhaps one of the most popular regularization methods. Yet, sparsity as a phenomenon is hardly limited to the prototypical but simplistic domain of the normal means model or the linear regression model with normal errors. Armed with the theoretical results and computational strategies developed for the horseshoe in linear models, what light could one shed, then, on the current state of the art in global-local shrinkage in nonlinear, non-Gaussian models?

The article is organized as follows. The remainder of Section 1 provides a brief historical overview of regularization, dating back to the work of Stein (1956). Section 2 points out the critical differences between global and global-local regularization approaches in linear Gaussian models. Given this background, we proceed to the main focus area of our article: the current state of global-local regularization *beyond* linear Gaussian models. While both Sections 3 and 4 focus on these issues, we reserve the discussion of horseshoe shrinkage in *shallow* models for the former and their more recent emerging uses in *deep* models for the latter. Section 5 describes the computational aspects of horseshoe shrinkage along with available software implementations in complex and deep models. Section 6 concludes with some possible directions for future research.

1.1 Regularization from a Bayesian perspective

Many penalized optimization problems in statistics are of the form

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{l(\theta; y) + \lambda \pi(\theta)\},$$

where $l(\theta; y)$ is a measure of fit of parameter θ to data y (also known as the empirical risk), $\pi(\theta)$ is a penalty function and λ is a tuning parameter. Let $p(y | \theta) \propto \exp\{-l(\theta; y)\}$ and $p(\theta) \propto \exp\{-\lambda \pi(\theta)\}$, where p is a generic density. If $l(\theta; y)$ is proportional to the negative of the log likelihood function under a suitable model, one arrives at a Bayesian interpretation to the regularization problem: that of finding the mode of the posterior density $p(\theta | y)$ under prior density $p(\theta)$ (Polson and Scott, 2016). The prior need not necessarily be proper but the posterior, $p(\theta | y) \propto p(y | \theta)p(\theta)$, may still be proper. This provides an equivalence between regularization and Bayesian methods. Common examples include the equivalence between ridge penalty and a Gaussian prior or the lasso penalty and a double exponential prior, when used in conjunction with a Gaussian likelihood which corresponds to a squared error loss. We distinguish among the three following estimators throughout the paper.

1. $\hat{\theta}_{mle} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} l(\theta; y)$, the maximum likelihood estimator or mle,
2. $\hat{\theta}_{mode} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{l(\theta; y) + \lambda \pi(\theta)\}$, the posterior mode,
3. $\hat{\theta}_{mean} := E(\theta | y)$, the posterior mean.

While they are clearly connected, e.g., the mle is obtained as a special case of posterior mode if the prior is flat, early works in decision theory established only the third is guaranteed to be an

admissible estimator under the squared error loss (at least, if the prior is proper), while the first two, in general, are not admissible.

1.2 Decision theoretic foundations of Bayes regularization and global shrinkage

Wald’s (1950) search for an *optimal* invariant procedure for multi-parameter models, similar in spirit to the UMVUE for single-parameter models, was dealt a major blow by the works of Stein (1956) and James and Stein (1961). Formally, consider independent observations $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ from the model $(y_i | \theta_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, 1)$ where $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$. Then, the James–Stein estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{JS} = \left(1 - \frac{n-2}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2}\right) y, \quad (1)$$

has the property $R(\hat{\theta}_{JS}, \theta) < R(\hat{\theta}_{mle}, \theta)$ for all θ and all $n > 2$, where $R(\delta, \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y|\theta} \|\delta - \theta\|^2$. Thus, the mle of θ , which in this case is just y itself, is inadmissible. The proposed *biased* and *nonlinear* estimator, which *shrinks* the parameter vector to a pre-determined direction, itself turned out to be inadmissible, improved by the positive-part Stein estimator (Baranchik, 1970) and several others since then. More than half a century and countless articles since Stein’s pioneering result, Efron and Hastie (2016, p. 102) assert “the main point here is that at present there is no optimality theory for shrinkage estimation. Fisher provided an elegant theory for optimal unbiased estimation. It remains to be seen whether biased estimation can be neatly codified.” Although settling the question of optimality proved elusive, several researchers examined the far more modest, if not basic, requirement of admissibility, leading to a resurgence in Bayes procedures. Stein’s (1956) risk result is frequentist, and makes no use of a prior. However, an empirical Bayes perspective was provided by Robbins (1956), expanded further by Efron and Morris (1973). Important connections with proper Bayes rules were established by Strawderman (1971), who showed the existence of proper Bayes (hence, admissible) minimax estimators for all dimensions larger than or equal to five, and characterized the associated prior. Detailed decision theoretic perspectives can be found in Berger (1985), whereas a more recent book length treatment for shrinkage methods is by Fourdrinier et al. (2018).

Although the James–Stein estimate strictly dominates the usual estimate y in all dimensions larger than two, its performance can be vastly improved in high dimensions under an assumption of sparsity. More formally, assume again the Gaussian sequence model $(y_i | \theta_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, 1)$, except θ now lies in the set $I_0[p_n] = \{\theta : \#(\theta_i \neq 0) \leq p_n\}$ with $p_n = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the case termed “nearly-black” by Donoho et al. (1992). One example of a nearly-black parameter vector is the r -spike model considered by Johnstone and Silverman (2004), where θ contains r non-zero components or spikes of magnitude $\sqrt{n/r}$, giving $\|\theta\|^2 = n$, with the remaining elements of θ set to zero. Under this model, the risk of the James–Stein estimator $\hat{\theta}_{JS}$ satisfies $R(\hat{\theta}_{JS}, \theta) \geq n/2$, whereas if one is to simply threshold the observed data y at $\sqrt{2 \log n}$, the resulting estimator performs with risk $\sqrt{\log n}$ (Johnstone and Silverman, 2004). To understand this phenomenon more clearly, consider the form of the James–Stein estimator in Equation (1). The term within the parentheses is the factor by which the observed data y are shrunk. It is apparent that the shrinkage factor depends on the data only though the norm $\|y\|^2$ and all terms are shrunk by the *same factor*. Thus, the James–Stein estimator makes no distinction on whether the underlying θ_i is zero, in which case the corresponding unbiased estimate y_i should be aggressively shrunk towards zero to ensure an

improvement in the overall mean squared error, or whether θ_i is non-zero and the corresponding y_i should be shrunk as little as possible. We term this behavior *global shrinkage*. Though this is entirely reasonable for the James–Stein estimate, which operates with no assumption of sparsity in θ , recent interest in sparse models has led to a search for estimators that are more judicious on which terms to shrink.

2 Horseshoe and the advent of global-local regularization

One of the earliest works to successfully distinguish between shrinking the noise terms while retaining the signal terms is the horseshoe estimator of [Carvalho et al. \(2010\)](#). The estimator, $\hat{\theta}_{HS}$, is defined as the posterior mean of θ under the following hierarchical model (for $\sigma^2 = 1$):

$$(y_i | \theta_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, 1), (\theta_i | \lambda_i, \tau) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_i^2 \tau^2), \lambda_i \sim C^+(0, 1), \tau \sim C^+(0, 1); \quad (2)$$

where $X \sim C^+(0, 1)$ denotes a standard half-Cauchy distributed random variable with density $p(x) = (2/\pi)(1 + x^2)^{-1}$; $x > 0$. The first thing to notice is that in the hierarchical model all priors are proper and hence the resultant Bayes estimator is admissible. Second, the prior on θ_i is a scale mixture of normals with half-Cauchy mixing distributions. The marginal prior on θ_i is unbounded at the origin and has tails that decay polynomially ([Carvalho et al., 2010](#)). The “global” term τ is shared across all dimensions, while the λ_i terms are component-specific, or “local.” The key intuition is that the term τ now adapts to the level of sparsity by typically settling on a small value, while the heavy-tailed λ_i terms still allow the signals terms to escape from being shrunk too much. Along with this informal intuition, several theoretical and computational properties of global-local priors have been established, at least in the linear Gaussian setting. We summarize these properties separately.

2.1 Theoretical properties in linear Gaussian models

Finite sample risk bounds for the horseshoe estimator were established by [Polson and Scott \(2012\)](#) who showed (a) $\hat{\theta}_{HS}$ has a risk profile that is quite similar to the James–Stein estimate $\hat{\theta}_{JS}$ when $\|\theta\|$ is large, and (b) $\hat{\theta}_{HS}$ offers a large benefit over $\hat{\theta}_{JS}$ when $\|\theta\| = 0$. Both (a) and (b) were verified via simulations for various dimensions of θ . When θ is sparse, a detailed theoretical understanding of the improvement over the James–Stein estimate in finite samples is given by [Bhadra et al. \(2019a\)](#), although in the context of prediction risk, rather than estimation risk.

If one turns attention to asymptotic risk, rather than finite sample risk, several more results can be found. Some of the more prominent ones are as follows.

1. [Carvalho et al. \(2010\)](#) studied information-theoretic properties of the horseshoe estimator when the true parameter vector is sparse. They obtained a better upper bound on the asymptotic Kullback–Leibler risk of the posterior predictive density with respect to the true density of the data generating model compared to any other prior density that is bounded above at the origin.
2. [Datta and Ghosh \(2013\)](#) proved that the decision rule induced by the horseshoe estimator is asymptotically Bayes optimal for multiple testing under 0–1 loss up to a multiplicative

constant. This result was generalized to include other global-local priors by Ghosh et al. (2016) and Bai and Ghosh (2018), among others.

3. van der Pas et al. (2014) showed the horseshoe estimator is minimax in ℓ_2 in a nearly-black case up to a constant. Specifically,

$$\sup_{\theta \in I_0[p_n]} \mathbb{E}_{y|\theta} \|\hat{\theta}_{HS}(y) - \theta\|^2 \asymp p_n \log(n/p_n),$$

which is the asymptotic minimax rate when $\theta \in I_0[p_n]$, established by Donoho et al. (1992). Here $a_n \asymp b_n$ denotes $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = c \in (0, \infty)$. The result was expanded by van der Pas et al. (2016) and Ghosh and Chakrabarti (2017) to prove several other priors, such as the horseshoe+ (Bhadra et al., 2017a), the normal-gamma (Griffin and Brown, 2010) and the spike-and-slab lasso (Ročková and George, 2018), also result in asymptotic minimax estimates.

4. Turning attention to uncertainty quantification, van der Pas et al. (2017) proved that the posterior credible intervals under the horseshoe prior also have good frequentist coverage properties in an asymptotic sense, provided the choice of the global shrinkage parameter τ meets certain restrictions.

2.2 Computational properties in linear Gaussian models

Before the widespread popularity of global-local shrinkage approaches, traditional sparse Bayesian models relied on the so-called *spike-and-slab* priors (Mitchell and Beauchamp, 1988) where conditionally i.i.d. θ_i are modeled as

$$\theta_i | p, \psi \sim (1 - p)\delta_{\{0\}} + p\mathcal{N}(0, \psi^2), \quad (3)$$

a two-component mixture, where $\delta_{\{0\}}$ denotes a point mass at zero. The model is in many senses natural; it reflects the prior belief of a Bayesian that a parameter θ_i has non-negligible probability $(1 - p)$ of being zero. The model also has many attractive theoretical properties, including asymptotic optimality in testing under 0-1 loss (Bogdan et al., 2011), and asymptotic minimaxity in estimation under ℓ_2 loss when a Laplace or heavier tailed prior is used for the slab distribution (Castillo and van der Vaart, 2012). Although the spike-and-slab model produces exact zero estimates, the chief difficulty under this prior is in exploring the posterior. While posterior means or quantiles can be found in polynomial time algorithms under a spike-and-slab model (Castillo and van der Vaart, 2012), exploring the entire posterior incurs extreme computational cost, primarily since there is no good way to avoid sampling the binary indicators denoting whether a parameter is zero versus non-zero, and this in turn leads to a combinatorial problem. While significant advances have been made in finding posterior *point estimates* such as posterior modes using an expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm under a relaxed continuous spike-and-slab model (Ročková and George, 2014) or its variants such as the spike-and-slab lasso model (Ročková and George, 2018), comparative studies of full posterior exploration by Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques have indicated that global-local priors offer significant computational benefits over point mass spike-and-slab mixture priors (Li and Pati, 2017). Moreover, posterior modes

under global-local priors are also available using fast EM type algorithms and have been shown to be computationally and statistically quite competitive to frequentist counterparts such as the lasso (Bhadra et al., 2017b). We elaborate further on computational aspects in Section 5, where we also list available software implementations of global-local shrinkage approaches known to us.

3 Horseshoe shrinkage in shallow nonlinear, non-Gaussian models

We define models as shallow where the parameter of interest lies one level below the observed data model, although the prior model for the parameter of interest might itself contain a number of levels of hierarchy. Thus, the normal means model $(y_i | \theta_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, 1)$ and the linear regression model $(y | X, \theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta, 1)$ fall in this framework, regardless of the number of hierarchies used in defining the prior on θ , whereas a deep neural network model does not necessarily fall in this framework. Nevertheless, several advances have been made in shallow models other than the normal means or linear regression models of Section 2, and we point out a few important developments below.

3.1 Shallow models with Gaussian errors

Nonlinear function estimation and default Bayes analysis: An early work on the use of horseshoe and horseshoe+ priors in estimating low-dimensional functions of the high-dimensional normal means model of Section 1 is by Bhadra et al. (2016a). They consider the following four one dimensional functions of θ : $\psi_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^2$, $\psi_2 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \theta_i$, $\psi_3 = \theta_1 \theta_2$ and $\psi_4 = \theta_1 / \theta_2$, where for ψ_3 and ψ_4 the remaining θ_i s are nuisance parameters. They demonstrate that using the horseshoe and horseshoe+ priors on θ enables non-informative Bayesian analysis in each of these problems, resolving a long-standing paradox by Efron (1973), who pointed out the difficulty in designing a prior on θ that simultaneously enables non-informative analysis in all four problems. The key contribution of Bhadra et al. (2016a) is to demonstrate the regularly varying tails of global-local horseshoe priors on θ translate to the induced priors in each of the four nonlinearly transformed parameters above, which preserve regular variation of the prior. Bhadra et al. (2016a) then appeal to the relative tail heaviness of the prior and the likelihood considered by Dawid (1973) to explain the non informative Bayes answer. The performance of the global-local priors is quite competitive to the reference priors (Berger and Bernardo, 1992; Bernardo, 1979) for these problems, when the reference priors exist. An added benefit is that the horseshoe priors are proper, thereby circumventing model selection problems encountered with improper reference priors.

Nonparametric function estimation: Shin et al. (2016) consider a standard nonparametric regression model with additive Gaussian noise of the form $Y_i = F(x_i) + \epsilon_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where i.i.d. $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and $F(x) = E(Y | x)$. A natural representation of F is by a basis expansion of the form $f(x) = \phi(x)^T \beta$, appealing to Karhunen–Loève representation, where $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k)$ is a suitable choice of basis functions. The problem is then to estimate $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)^T$. The interpretation of sparsity in β is somewhat more subtle, however. While it is certainly possible to put a sparsity prior such as horseshoe directly on β , it is not clear what a global-local shrinkage of certain basis coefficients exactly achieves. If one possesses a prior belief on the shape of F as

being close to a certain parametric family (e.g., linear or quadratic), perhaps it is more reasonable to shrink toward that shape. Define ϕ_0 to be the column space of the parametric function one desires to shrink to. For example, if the parametric form is assumed to be close to linear then $\phi_0 = \{1, x\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$. To this end, [Shin et al. \(2016\)](#) propose the “functional horseshoe” prior on β , with the prior density given as

$$p(\beta | \tau) \propto (\tau^2)^{-(k-d_0)/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2\tau^2} \beta^T \phi^T (I - Q_0) \phi \beta \right\},$$

$$p(\tau) \propto \frac{(\tau^2)^{b-1/2}}{(1 + \tau^2)^{(a+b)}}; \tau, a, b > 0,$$

where $d_0 = \text{rank}(\phi_0)$ and $Q_0 = \phi_0(\phi_0^T \phi_0)^{-1} \phi_0^T$, is the projection matrix of ϕ_0 . The marginal prior on β can be seen to a normal scale mixture and the prior on τ is half-Cauchy when $a = b = 1/2$. The term $(I - Q_0)$ in the prior inverse covariance enables shrinkage of ϕ towards ϕ_0 . In effect, this formulation imposes a non-informative prior on the coefficients of the base parametric model. [Shin et al. \(2016\)](#) establish consistency of model selection under this prior and demonstrate good empirical results.

Dependent data models: Horseshoe priors have also been considered for dynamic process models for time series data. [Kowal et al. \(2019\)](#) define a log-scale representation of the variance term in Equation (2) as $h_i = \log(\tau^2 \lambda_i^2)$ and point out that the marginal horseshoe hierarchy up to $(\theta_i | \tau)$ is obtained by the following model

$$h_i = \mu + \eta_i, \eta_i \sim Z(1/2, 1/2, 0, 1),$$

where $\mu = \log(\tau^2)$, $\eta_i = \log(\lambda_i^2)$ and Z denotes the Fisher-Z distribution ([Barndorff-Nielsen et al., 1982](#)). Next, they introduce dependence in h_i s using an autoregressive structure as

$$h_i = \mu + \phi(h_{i-1} - \mu) + \eta_i, \eta_i \sim Z(1/2, 1/2, 0, 1),$$

where the model has one additional parameter ϕ , which controls the strength of dependence. For sampling, [Kowal et al. \(2019\)](#) rely on the normal mean-variance mixture representation of Fisher-Z random variables with respect to Pólya-gamma mixing density ([Polson et al., 2013](#)) and derive a computationally efficient Gibbs sampler., with an application in Bayesian trend filtering. A closely related formulation is used by [Bitto and Frühwirth-Schnatter \(2018\)](#), who use a double gamma prior on the variance terms in a dynamic linear model for achieving shrinkage, instead of putting a prior on the log of the variance terms.

Graphical models: Moving away from univariate Gaussian error models, [Li et al. \(2019a\)](#) consider the multivariate Gaussian model $y_i | \Omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega^{-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where Ω is a $p \times p$ inverse covariance matrix such that $p > n$. In this setting, off-diagonal zeros in Ω encode conditional independence among variables ([Lauritzen, 1996](#)). The model is a fundamental building block in network analysis, and has numerous applications in genomics, econometrics and virtually every other field where network data are encountered. To achieve sparsity in $\Omega = \{\omega_{ij}\}; i, j = 1, \dots, p;$

Li et al. (2019a) assume the following prior, which they term the “graphical horseshoe:”

$$\omega_{ii} \propto 1, \omega_{ij,i < j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_{ij}^2 \tau^2), \lambda_{ij,i < j} \sim C^+(0, 1), \tau \sim C^+(0, 1),$$

with the prior mass truncated to the space of positive definite matrices. That is, they assume a non-informative prior on the diagonal ω_{ii} terms and independent horseshoe priors on off-diagonal ω_{ij} terms to induce a sparse graphical structure. The sampling schemes outlined in Wang (2012) and Makalic and Schmidt (2016) are used to design a computationally efficient Gibbs sampler that maintains positive definiteness of the posterior estimate of Ω . The resulting estimate compares favorably with respect to popular alternatives, such as the graphical lasso (Friedman et al., 2008) or the graphical SCAD (Lam and Fan, 2009). It is worth noting similar models have been developed using the spike-and-slab lasso type priors, which rely on fast EM approaches for finding the posterior mode (e.g., Deshpande et al., 2019; Li et al., 2018), but it remains a challenge to perform efficient posterior exploration under these priors.

An alternative approach for sparse inverse covariance estimation is developed by Williams et al. (2018), who use as a starting point the partial regression equations in a multivariate Gaussian model, given for $i = 1, \dots, p$ by

$$y_i = y_{-i} \beta_{-i} + \epsilon_i,$$

where $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \omega_{ii}^{-1})$ and $\omega_{ij}/\omega_{ii} = -\beta_{ij}$. Independent horseshoe priors are then imposed on the β_{ij} terms to enable a sparse estimation of Ω . A potential drawback of this approach is that under independent horseshoe priors on the partial regression coefficients, one does not necessarily obtain a symmetric and positive definite estimate of Ω . Thus, one needs to follow a neighborhood selection approach (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006) to perform covariance selection, followed by a symmetrization step.

Seemingly unrelated regression models: Seemingly unrelated regression models concern regressing multiple correlated responses on multiple predictors, where the error terms display a covariance structure. It is often of interest to simultaneously infer the regression coefficients and the error precision matrix. The model is quite flexible, with the multiple linear regression model and zero mean graphical models as special cases. Li et al. (2019b) consider the linear model $Y_{n \times p} = X_{n \times q} B_{q \times p} + E_{n \times p}$, where the error term is assumed to follow a matrix normal distribution (Dawid, 1981), i.e., $E \sim \text{MN}_{n \times p}(0, I_n, \Omega_{p \times p}^{-1})$. The problem is then a joint estimation of B and Ω . Early works by Zellner (1962) demonstrated one incurs a loss of efficiency if the error covariance structure is not accounted for while estimating B . However, these early results are ill-suited to handle modern applications such as genomic data analysis where both the number of features q and number of responses p routinely exceed the sample size n . To enable a sparse estimation, Li et al. (2019b) assume independent horseshoe priors on B_{ij} and the graphical horseshoe prior of Li et al. (2019a) on Ω . A fully Bayesian estimation algorithm is proposed that is linear in q , and improved statistical performance over competing approaches using spike-and-slab type priors (e.g., Bhadra and Mallick, 2013) is demonstrated in simulations.

Factor models: A factor model offers a particular low rank decomposition for modeling a $p \times p$ covariance matrix as $\Sigma = BB^T + \Psi^2$ where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k}$ with $k < p$ is the matrix of factor loadings

and Ψ^2 is a diagonal matrix with non-negative elements. Any covariance matrix allows this decomposition and when $k < p$, the model offers an effective method for low-rank decomposition to facilitate estimation when the sample size is small. Identifiability conditions under this model are well-studied. [Hahn et al. \(2018a\)](#) applied horseshoe priors on the factor loadings and developed an efficient elliptical slice sampler for posterior sampling. The shrinkage achieved by the horseshoe priors allows one to incorporate many instruments into the analysis.

3.2 Shallow models with non-Gaussian errors

Gamma-Poisson glms: The use of global-local priors has also been extended to generalized linear models (glm), a common tool for modeling data distributed according to exponential family distributions, not necessarily Gaussian. An early example is by [Datta and Dunson \(2016\)](#), who use global-local priors in a quasi-sparse gamma-Poisson glm. Their model is:

$$y_i | \theta_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\theta_i), \quad \theta_i | \lambda_i, \tau \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \lambda_i^2 \tau^2),$$

with heavy-tailed prior densities on λ_i and τ , where half-Cauchy is one choice. This parameterization encourages both an abundance of zero and small non-zero counts, as well as large counts; an analog to sharp spike at zero and heavy tails for real-valued data in the usual implementation of the horseshoe prior. The method proved successful in detecting rare mutations in a massive genetic sequencing data set, where the observations are counts; and signals, indicating presence of mutations, are rare.

Classification using probit and logistic models: An important application of multi-class classification in machine learning is in topic modeling, where given a text, one tries to map it into belonging to one of several pre-defined set of topics or classes. [Magnusson et al. \(2016\)](#) combine the diagonal orthant (DO) probit model of [Johndrow et al. \(2013\)](#) with latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) ([Blei et al., 2003](#); [Pritchard et al., 2000](#)), resulting in a method they call DOLDA. Here the horseshoe prior is used to achieve shrinkage of the coefficients in the probit model and results in substantially better accuracy of topic prediction over standard approaches in topic modeling. Some theoretical support for using shrinkage priors on regression coefficients is provided by [Wei and Ghosal \(2017\)](#), who derive posterior contraction rate similar to that of point mass mixture priors ([Atchadé, 2017](#)), which are shown to be better than the Bayesian lasso or non-informative normal priors on the regression coefficients. Notable computational success is achieved by [Terenin et al. \(2019\)](#), who point out the latent variables in a probit model are conditionally independent of each other, and consequently, can be sampled in parallel in a massively multithreaded environment, such as using a graphics processing unit (GPU). They use a case study of the horseshoe probit regression where a million data points in several thousand dimensions are classified in several minutes of running time.

Arbitrary glms via Gaussian approximation: Another approach is developed by [Piironen and Vehtari \(2017\)](#) for arbitrary glms, where inference proceeds via dynamic Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and is implemented in the probabilistic programming language Stan ([Carpenter et al., 2017](#)). To set the global scale parameter τ , the method estimates the number of non-zero components in the

model by approximating the glm likelihood function via a Gaussian likelihood, where the first two moments of the Gaussian approximation are calculated via score matching using a second order Taylor approximation of the actual glm likelihood. The success of this method, of course, depends in part on the appropriateness of the Gaussian approximation of the likelihood function while estimating the number of zero components. [Piironen and Vehtari \(2017\)](#) demonstrate good empirical performance in classification problems under a logistic model using four different real data sets.

4 Horseshoe shrinkage in deep models

The use of horseshoe and other regularizing priors have also made their way into *deep* models, where the parameters of interest share multiple levels of hierarchy below the level of the observed data. Yet, to our knowledge, the literature here is far more sparse compared to the use of global-local shrinkage in *shallow* models, described in Section 3. Indeed, this is surprising, since many prototypical deep models, such as deep neural networks, are heavily overparameterized with respect to what is actually observed and therefore, deep models should be a fertile ground for the application sparsifying priors. The chief difficulty appears to be computational. Nonetheless, the goal of the current section is to summarize the existing works.

Horseshoe shrinkage in deep neural networks: [Ghosh and Doshi-Velez \(2017\)](#) and [Ghosh et al. \(2018\)](#) apply horseshoe priors for model selection in deep Bayesian neural networks. A related work is by [Louizos et al. \(2017\)](#) who use group horseshoe priors for regularizing the weights in a deep neural network. A unifying feature of these works is that they deploy Bayesian alternatives to the successful “dropout” mechanism ([Srivastava et al., 2014](#)) for regularizing highly overparameterized deep neural networks. Dropout involves introducing multiplicative Bernoulli distributed noise variables into the hidden layers of a deep neural network in order to *zero out* certain weight parameters, thereby encouraging sparsity. The connection between dropout and structured shrinkage regularization (including horseshoe) in deep models is established by [Nalisnick et al. \(2018\)](#), who show the two forms of regularization can be obtained from each other via reparameterization. An important difference with shallow models is that full Bayesian computational inference via MCMC is considerably more challenging in deep models. Consequently, inference usually proceeds using a variational approximation to the true posterior, with the approximating distribution usually being normal or belonging to some other family for which the parameters can be optimized efficiently. We provide some technical details below.

Given a set of weights W_1, \dots, W_L , a set of biases b_1, \dots, b_L and input \mathbf{x} , the output of a deep neural network with $L - 1$ hidden layers is characterized by

$$\mathbf{y} = (f_{W_1, b_1} \odot \dots \odot f_{W_L, b_L})(\mathbf{x}),$$

where \odot denotes the composition operation and $f_{W_l, b_l}(\mathbf{x}) = f(b_l + W_l \mathbf{x})$, for a nonlinear activation function $f(\cdot)$. Thus, the network repeatedly applies a linear transformation to the inputs at each layer, before passing it through a nonlinear activation function. For the purpose of this article, we omit the bias terms henceforth. Here W_l is a matrix of size $K_l \times K_{l+1}$, where K_l is the number of units in layer l , with the final layer denoting the output layer. In this formulation, [Ghosh and](#)

Doshi-Velez (2017) and Ghosh et al. (2018) assume horseshoe priors on the networks weights of the form

$$(w_{kl} \mid \lambda_{kl}, \tau_l) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_{kl}^2 \tau_l^2 \mathbb{I}), \lambda_{kl} \sim C^+(0, 1), \tau_l \sim C^+(0, 1); \quad (4)$$

where w_{kl} is a vector of all weights connected to unit k in layer l and \mathbb{I} denotes the identity matrix. This formulation allows different global shrinkage parameters τ_l for different layers, while still admitting the usual global-local shrinkage of network weights within the same layer.

Nalisnick et al. (2018) point out that the scale mixture representation in Equation (4) can also be written as

$$(w_{kl} \mid \lambda_{kl}, \tau_l) \sim \lambda_{kl} \tau_l \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}), \quad (5)$$

with the same prior distributions on λ_{kl} and τ_l . This closely parallels the dropout formulation of (Srivastava et al., 2014), where the multiplicative terms to the weights are binary indicators, causing some w_{kl} terms to be exactly zero. In this sense, the horseshoe regularization can be understood to provide a continuous relaxation to exact sparsity in deep models, closely paralleling the situation with global-local versus spike-and-slab priors in linear models.

When the output of the neural network is binary, further data augmentation is needed to leverage the global-local priors. A notable work is by Gan et al. (2015) who used the three parameter beta shrinkage (Armagan et al., 2011) in a deep sigmoidal belief network. The Pólya–gamma data augmentation scheme was used for augmenting the logistic likelihood in a sigmoidal belief network resulting in conjugate models for efficient sampling, using the strategy identified by Polson et al. (2013) for shallow logistic regression models. Wang et al. (2019) expand upon this line of work, identifying data augmentation strategies for deep neural networks under different choices of nonlinear activation functions, such as ReLU, logistic and hinge loss. A notable feature of Wang et al. (2019) is that they specify a completely simulation-based strategy for optimizing the parameters in a deep neural network (at least, for the output layer), following the MCMC-MLE technique of Jacquier et al. (2007), thereby bypassing the need for gradient-based training methods.

Nalisnick and Hernández-Lobato (2018) use the horseshoe prior to regularize both the number of hidden units per layer and the number of layers in a deep neural network, giving rise to the Automatic Relevance Detection–Automatic Depth Determination (ARD–ADD) prior. Their prior hierarchy is the same as in Equation (4), except they use the improper prior $p(\tau_l) \propto 1/\tau_l$, which offers a stronger pull towards zero compared to a half-Cauchy prior on τ_l . Inference proceeds via a variational EM algorithm and performance of the horseshoe prior is shown to be quite competitive to other traditional regularization mechanisms, such as dropout.

Progress has also been made in designing sparsity-inducing priors inspired by neural network architectures. A recent example is by Shin and Liu (2018), who introduce “neuronized priors.” Their priors on θ_j for the Gaussian sequence model are of the form

$$\theta_j = T(\alpha_j - \alpha_0)w_j,$$

where α_0 is a constant, $\alpha_j \sim N(0, 1)$, $w_j \sim N(0, \tau_w^2)$ and T is a non-decreasing activation function. Shin and Liu (2018) show that certain choices of activation functions correspond to special cases of sparsity priors. For example, with the ReLU activation, i.e., $T(x) = \max(x, 0)$, the induced

prior on θ_j is the discrete spike-and-slab prior. Similarly, the horseshoe prior arises through another suitable choice of $T(\cdot)$. An advantage of this formulation is that a unified MCMC sampling strategy and fast EM algorithms for exploring the posterior mode can be built for a broad class of priors.

Horseshoe shrinkage in deep glms: The output of a traditional deep neural network is either real valued, when used in regression problems; or categorical, when the neural network is trained to perform classification. Deep models have also been proposed for glms, which is a flexible technique for modeling data distributed according to exponential family distributions, and can model a large class of response variables, including real-valued, categorical or counts. [Tran et al. \(2018\)](#) develop flexible versions for glms using the output of a feedforward neural network. With responses y and predictors X , a conventional glm models $E(y | X) = g(X\beta)$, where β are the regression coefficients and $g(\cdot)$ is the link function. Thus, the conditional mean of the responses is a linear function of X , transformed through the link function g . This linearity assumption is often restrictive and a natural way to introduce nonlinearity is by replacing X with the output of a multi-layer feedforward neural network that has X as input and consequently, whose output is a nonlinear function of X . [Tran et al. \(2018\)](#) term this model DeepGLM. Similar to deep neural networks, a variational approximation to the log likelihood is used for training the model and global-local priors are used for inducing sparsity on β .

5 Computational aspects and software implementations

The existing implementations of horseshoe shrinkage for the models described in the previous two sections can be broadly categorized as fully Bayesian and approximately Bayesian. While exploring the entire posterior might be desirable viewed through a lens of Bayesian orthodoxy, the computational burden is often great enough to compel a researcher to explore suitable alternatives. At present, this effect is particularly acute for deep models, and almost all approaches attempting a Bayesian analysis for such models that are known to us rely on variational approximation or point estimation techniques. Nevertheless, we summarize fully and approximately Bayesian approaches for some important models in this section, along with a list of available software implementations. The associated issue of hyper-parameter selection is discussed at length in Section 5 of [Bhadra et al. \(2019b\)](#).

5.1 Fully Bayesian approaches in linear models

Fully Bayesian approaches are more computation-intensive compared to point estimation approaches almost by design, since the focus is typically on approximating the full posterior. As a starting point, consider the linear regression model $y = X\beta + \epsilon$ where $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. Assume one decides to use the horseshoe prior on β , i.e., $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_i^2 \tau^2)$. The full conditional posterior of β under this model is $\beta | \text{rest} \sim \mathcal{N}((X'X + \Lambda^{-2}\tau^{-2})^{-1}X'y, (X'X + \Lambda^{-2}\tau^{-2})^{-1})$, where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_i)$. The computational bottleneck is in inverting the $p \times p$ matrix $(X'X + \Lambda^{-2}\tau^{-2})$, with complexity $O(p^3)$, which is prohibitive when p is large. Thus, posterior exploration even under this very simple model is challenging. A breakthrough is by [Bhattacharya et al. \(2016\)](#), who

designed an exact algorithm for sampling from this model with complexity $O(n^2p)$, an improvement by two orders of magnitude when $n \sim o(p^{0.5})$, a situation which is commonly encountered in many high-dimensional applications. The key to their innovation is to replace the matrix inversion step by the solution to a system of linear equations. A more recent work by [Johndrow et al. \(2017\)](#) claims to reduce the complexity further to $O(\min\{s^3, sn\})$, where $s = \#\{i : \tau^2 \lambda_i^2 > \delta\}$ for some pre-defined threshold δ . The algorithm is not exact but is demonstrated to have good empirical performance and enjoys some theoretical support. The advantage here is that s is typically much smaller than p . [Nishimura and Suchard \(2018\)](#) discuss the use of conjugate gradient methods with appropriate pre-conditioning for the same problem, with the focus again being on avoiding a costly matrix inversion.

While the strategies above focus on the posterior sampling of β , the global and local shrinkage parameters λ_i and τ also need to be sampled. The early works in global-local shrinkage (e.g., [Carvalho et al., 2010](#); [Scott, 2010](#)) relied on slice sampling approaches. A more recent elliptical slice sampling approach for horseshoe priors, but on a transformed coordinate system (i.e., polar rather than Cartesian) is by [Hahn et al. \(2018b\)](#). However, [Makalic and Schmidt \(2016\)](#) established that fully conjugate sampling of all parameters is possible in a linear regression model, with horseshoe priors on β . The key to their innovation is the observation that if $X^2 \mid a \sim \text{IG}(1/2, 1/a)$ and $a \sim \text{IG}(1/2, 1/k^2)$ then marginally, $X \sim C^+(0, k)$. Here $\text{IG}(\alpha, \beta)$ denotes an inverse gamma random variable with shape parameter α and scale parameter β . The inverse gamma distribution is conjugate to itself, and to the variance parameter in a linear regression model with normal errors. Thus, this data augmentation strategy applied to λ_i and τ allows for conjugate updates, thereby aiding the design of a Gibbs sampler, with the benefits of automatic tuning and no sample rejection. This augmentation strategy also plays a key role in the development of variational Bayes approaches, discussed in Section 5.3.

5.2 Fully Bayesian approaches in multivariate and Non-Gaussian models

[Li et al. \(2019a\)](#) consider i.i.d. observations from the p -variate normal model $y_i \mid \Omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega^{-1})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and assume the following hierarchy, which they term the graphical horseshoe (GHS):

$$\omega_{ii} \propto 1, \omega_{ij, i < j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_{ij}^2 \tau^2), \lambda_{ij, i < j} \sim C^+(0, 1), \tau \sim C^+(0, 1).$$

Estimation of the inverse covariance matrix presents the additional complication that the estimate needs to be symmetric and positive definite. This is accomplished by combining the variable transformation technique first identified in the context of the Bayesian graphical lasso by [Wang \(2012\)](#) with the data augmentation scheme of [Makalic and Schmidt \(2016\)](#). Let $S = Y'Y$ and partition the matrices Ω, S and Λ as:

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{(-p)(-p)} & \omega_{(-p)p} \\ \omega'_{(-p)p} & \omega_{pp} \end{pmatrix}, S = \begin{pmatrix} S_{(-p)(-p)} & \mathbf{s}_{(-p)p} \\ \mathbf{s}'_{(-p)p} & s_{pp} \end{pmatrix}, \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{(-p)(-p)} & \lambda_{(-p)p} \\ \lambda'_{(-p)p} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $(-p)$ denotes the set of all indices except for p , and $\Lambda_{(-p)(-p)}$ and $\lambda_{(-p)p}$ have entries λ_{ij}^2 . Diagonal elements of $\Lambda_{(-p)(-p)}$ can be arbitrarily set to 1. The key contribution of [Wang \(2012\)](#) is to show under the reparameterization $\beta = \omega_{(-p)p}$ and $\gamma = \omega_{pp} - \omega'_{(-p)p} \Omega_{(-p)(-p)}^{-1} \omega_{(-p)p}$, the full conditional posteriors of β and γ are available in closed form as a multivariate normal

and a univariate gamma random variable, respectively. Moreover, this reparameterization also maintains positive definiteness of the posterior estimate. Combining this observation with the Makalic and Schmidt (2016) scheme establishes all required conditional in the GHS model either as normal, gamma or inverse gamma, resulting in a Gibbs sampler. The computational complexity is $O(p^3)$.

Li et al. (2019b) take this approach a step further to consider the seemingly unrelated regression model $(y_i | X_i, \beta, \Omega) \sim \mathcal{N}(X_i\beta, \Omega^{-1})$ where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and both $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$ and $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ are unknown. Horseshoe and graphical horseshoe priors are used on β and Ω respectively and once again, combining the methods of Bhattacharya et al. (2016), Makalic and Schmidt (2016) and Li et al. (2019a), all updates are in closed form and the method only requires sampling from a multivariate normal or univariate gamma distributions. The computational complexity is $O(n^2qp^3)$, making this the first fully Bayesian estimation algorithm in a joint mean–covariance estimation problem with a complexity linear in q , the number of covariates.

Computational approaches for some other nonlinear problems, such as the functional horseshoe prior of Shin et al. (2016) proceed similarly to the linear regression case, with the covariates X replaced by the basis functions. Similarly, the estimation of latent factors by Hahn et al. (2018a) also relies on the slice sampling technique developed for linear models. We do not discuss them in detail. Computational approaches for glms are also similar to the linear models, except one now has to account for the link function. A standard technique is to use a data augmentation scheme for conjugate sampling in the posterior, which may be used in conjunction with global-local priors on regression coefficients. Examples include augmentation by a latent Pólya-gamma random variable for logistic regression models (Polson et al., 2013), or by a latent Gaussian random variable for probit models (Albert and Chib, 1993), with a unified framework for data augmentation for global-local priors described by Bhadra et al. (2016b). A similar technique for non-Gaussian regression using normal mean-variance mixtures is described by Polson and Scott (2013) and the proposed approach has recently found use in modeling the nonlinearly transformed output layer in a multi-layer feedforward neural network (Wang et al., 2019). When used in conjunction with a sparsifying prior such as the horseshoe, these data augmentation techniques act as fully Bayesian analogs to the successful dropout mechanism for regularizing deep neural networks. Nevertheless, even with efficient Gibbs sampling schemes, fully Bayesian MCMC approaches are still computationally prohibitive, especially in deep models, where the number of parameters increases exponentially as a function of depth. This has led researchers to seek out computationally scalable alternatives, which we describe next.

5.3 Variational Bayes and point estimation approaches

Variational Bayes methods work by replacing the true posterior distribution by an approximating distribution where the approximating distribution typically belongs to a simple parametric family that is easy to optimize. The best approximating distribution, within its class, is chosen by minimizing some measure of divergence (usually, the Kullback–Leibler divergence) with respect to the true density one is trying to approximate. This offers the added benefit that the normalizing constant for the approximating density is usually available in closed form, whereas it might be intractable for the true posterior. The downside of course is that variational Bayes methods can result in inconsistent estimates, even in relatively simpler settings such as state space models (Wang

and Titterton, 2004). Nevertheless, the considerable computational benefit of these approaches has proved very popular in the machine learning community, especially for deep models.

An early work to outline a successful strategy for mean field variational Bayes approach for horseshoe priors in linear models is by Neville et al. (2014). The key contribution is to identify the approximating densities in closed form and to outline strategies for their numerical evaluations. Variational inference under horseshoe priors has since been successfully used for regularizing deep neural networks (Ghosh and Doshi-Velez, 2017; Ghosh et al., 2018; Louizos et al., 2017), where full Bayesian inference appears computationally infeasible at present. Ingraham and Marks (2017) developed the “fadeout” procedure for variational inference under horseshoe priors in undirected graphical models, completely circumventing the need for MCMC. The deep-GLM model of Tran et al. (2018) also applies a variational inference procedure for regularizing the weights in a deep neural network whose output is then fed to a glm.

A key idea that facilitates variational Bayes inference in these models is again the fact that if $X^2 | a \sim \text{IG}(1/2, 1/a)$ and $a \sim \text{IG}(1/2, 1/k^2)$ then marginally, $X \sim C^+(0, k)$. Thus, it is possible to write the hierarchical model for the horseshoe prior density on the weight terms w_{kl} in Equation (4) as a product of normal and inverse gamma densities. The major difficulty in inference in deep models is the fact that the likelihood of the observed data is very hard to characterize analytically, which stems from the use of nonlinear transformations in each layer. To circumvent this difficulty, the variational assumption made by Ghosh and Doshi-Velez (2017) and Ghosh et al. (2018) is that a posteriori, the weight terms w_{kl} follow univariate normal distributions and the scale terms λ_{kl} and τ_l follow log-normal distributions. Moreover, the variational posterior factorizes as the product of these univariate posteriors. These works also point out that the formulation of Equation (5), which they term the non-centered parameterization, offers critical computational advantages to the statistically equivalent formulation in Equation (4), chiefly because it allows the use of the so-called “reparameterization trick” first described by Kingma and Welling (2013) for effectively computing the gradients, which is needed for optimizing the parameters in the variational approximation.

While variational approaches at least try to approximate the true posterior in some sense, in certain situations one may choose to focus simply on point estimates, such as posterior modes. Bhadra et al. (2017b) outlined expectation-maximization and local linear approximation strategies to quickly identify the posterior mode in linear models under a close approximation of the horseshoe prior. These approaches work well when the model is shallow, i.e., when there is only one layer of latent variables. But their uses in deep models appear less appealing. Li et al. (2019a) and Li et al. (2019b) mentioned the possibility of deploying the iterated conditional modes algorithm of Besag (1986) to identify the maximum pseudo posterior estimate. This strategy is typically feasible whenever a Gibbs sampler is available and the conditional modes are easy to calculate. Nevertheless, neither paper investigated these strategies either numerically or theoretically.

5.4 Available software implementations

We list some publicly available software implementations for horseshoe and other global-local shrinkage methods for nonlinear and non-Gaussian models in Tables 1 and 2, which focus on shallow and deep models respectively. Direct hyperlinks to the code repositories are provided, along with the relevant papers and brief descriptions of the application areas. This complements the list in Table 5 of Bhadra et al. (2019b), which focuses on implementations of horseshoe shrinkage in

linear Gaussian models. Most available implementations are in high level interpreted languages such as Python, MATLAB or R, although some implementations do make calls to compiled C or C++ shared libraries to ease the computational burden.

| Software with hyperlinked github URL | Relevant Papers | Brief Description of Functionality |
|---|--|---|
| MATLAB code: GHS | Li et al. (2019a) | Precision matrix estimation in GGMs |
| MATLAB code: HS-GHS | Li et al. (2019b) | Joint mean-covariance estimation in SUR models |
| Scala code using CUDA: GPUHorseshoe | Terenin et al. (2019) | GPU accelerated Gibbs sampling in probit models |
| R package: GGMprojpred | Williams et al. (2018) | Projection predictive estimation of GGMs |
| R package: dsp | Kowal et al. (2019) | Dynamic shrinkage processes |

Table 1: Implementations of horseshoe shrinkage for shallow nonlinear and non-Gaussian models.

| Software with hyperlinked github URL | Relevant Papers | Brief Description of Functionality |
|---|--|--|
| MATLAB & R code: DeepGLM | Tran et al. (2018) | Fitting DeepGLMs with horseshoe regularization |
| Python code: HS-BNN | Ghosh and Doshi-Velez (2017) | Horseshoe regularization for Bayesian neural nets |
| MATLAB code: dsbn | Gan et al. (2015) | Global-local shrinkage in deep sigmoid belief nets |
| Python code: Bayesian Compression | Louizos et al. (2017) | Bayesian compression for deep learning |

Table 2: Implementations of horseshoe shrinkage for deep nonlinear and non-Gaussian models.

6 Conclusions

Global-local shrinkage approaches have proved vastly successful regularizing models of practical interest in machine learning applications. Most existing works have focused on the linear, Gaussian case. The current paper complements the existing literature by providing a summary of the important theoretical, methodological and computational developments in horseshoe shrinkage *beyond* linear, Gaussian models. Several questions remain open and we end with some possible directions for future investigation.

1. *Theory.* We summarized the theoretical optimality properties of global-local priors in linear models in Section 2.1. While all the methodological papers in Section 3 and 4 contain varying levels of theoretical support, corresponding notions of optimality in nonlinear and non-Gaussian models are yet to be properly defined and explored. The problem is perhaps more acute for deep and densely connected nonlinear models, such as deep neural networks. It appears intuitive that sparsifying priors such as the horseshoe will lead to theoretically desirable properties in regularizing such models. However, at present this remains a conjecture, despite the empirical success demonstrated by papers listed in Section 4.

2. *Computation.* A notable feature in the current development of horseshoe shrinkage for complex or deep models has been the proliferation of variational Bayes and point estimation approaches. Given the extent of computing power at present and the complexity of deep models, this trend is understandable. Yet, Bayesian theory, and indeed Bayesian philosophy, calls for the exploration of the full posterior. Development of computationally scalable fully Bayesian shrinkage methodology for deep models is an open problem at present that deserves more attention. Early

empirical works suggest a promising approach in terms for computational scalability of Bayesian inference in deep neural networks is the use of stochastic gradient MCMC methods (e.g., Yao et al., 2019). In terms of software availability, a basic implementation of the horseshoe is available in the TensorFlow platform (Abadi et al., 2016) with a Python interface at: https://www.tensorflow.org/probability/api_docs/python/tfp/distributions/Horseshoe, which should facilitate integration with large scale machine learning techniques for complex and deep models under a unified framework. At present, most available codes for such models (as reported in Table 2) appear to be standalone implementations.

Acknowledgements

We thank the AE and two anonymous referees for many helpful comments. Bhadra and Polson are supported by Grant No. DMS-1613063 by the US National Science Foundation.

References

- Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard, M., et al. (2016). Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 16)*, pages 265–283.
- Albert, J. H. and Chib, S. (1993). Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 88(422):669–679.
- Armagan, A., Clyde, M., and Dunson, D. B. (2011). Generalized beta mixtures of Gaussians. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 523–531.
- Atchadé, Y. A. (2017). On the contraction properties of some high-dimensional quasi-posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):2248–2273.
- Bai, R. and Ghosh, M. (2018). Large-scale multiple hypothesis testing with the normal-beta prime prior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02421*.
- Baranchik, A. J. (1970). A family of minimax estimators of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41:642–645.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Kent, J. T., and Sørensen, M. (1982). Normal variance-mean mixtures and z distributions. *International Statistical Review*, 50:145–159.
- Berger, J. O. (1985). *Statistical decision theory and Bayesian analysis*. Springer, New York.
- Berger, J. O. and Bernardo, J. M. (1992). On the development of reference priors. *Bayesian statistics*, 4(4):35–60.
- Bernardo, J. M. (1979). Reference posterior distributions for Bayesian inference (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 41:113–147.
- Besag, J. (1986). On the statistical analysis of dirty pictures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 48(3):259–279.

- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Li, Y., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2019a). Prediction risk for the horseshoe regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(78):1–39.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2016a). Default Bayesian analysis with global-local shrinkage priors. *Biometrika*, 103(4):955–969.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2016b). Global-Local Mixtures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07487*.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2017a). The Horseshoe+ Estimator of Ultra-Sparse Signals. *Bayesian Analysis*, 12(4):1105–1131.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2017b). Horseshoe Regularization for Feature Subset Selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07400*.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N. G., and Willard, B. (2019b). Lasso meets horseshoe: a survey. *Statistical Science*, 34(3):405–427.
- Bhadra, A. and Mallick, B. K. (2013). Joint high-dimensional Bayesian variable and covariance selection with an application to eQTL analysis. *Biometrics*, 69(2):447–457.
- Bhattacharya, A., Chakraborty, A., and Mallick, B. K. (2016). Fast sampling with gaussian scale mixture priors in high-dimensional regression. *Biometrika*, 103:985–991.
- Bitto, A. and Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (2018). Achieving shrinkage in a time-varying parameter model framework. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y., and Jordan, M. I. (2003). Latent Dirichlet allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022.
- Bogdan, M., Chakrabarti, A., Frommlet, F., and Ghosh, J. K. (2011). Asymptotic Bayes-optimality under sparsity of some multiple testing procedures. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(3):1551–1579.
- Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M. D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M., Guo, J., Li, P., and Riddell, A. (2017). Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 76(1):1–32.
- Carvalho, C. M., Polson, N. G., and Scott, J. G. (2010). The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals. *Biometrika*, 97:465–480.
- Castillo, I. and van der Vaart, A. (2012). Needles and straw in a haystack: Posterior concentration for possibly sparse sequences. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(4):2069–2101.
- Datta, J. and Dunson, D. B. (2016). Bayesian inference on quasi-sparse count data. *Biometrika*, 103(4):971–983.
- Datta, J. and Ghosh, J. K. (2013). Asymptotic properties of Bayes risk for the horseshoe prior. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(1):111–132.
- Dawid, A. P. (1973). Posterior expectations for large observations. *Biometrika*, 60(3):664–667.

- Dawid, A. P. (1981). Some matrix-variate distribution theory: notational considerations and a bayesian application. *Biometrika*, 68(1):265–274.
- Deshpande, S. K., Ročková, V., and George, E. I. (2019). Simultaneous variable and covariance selection with the multivariate spike-and-slab lasso. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, to appear.
- Donoho, D. L., Johnstone, I. M., Hoch, J. C., and Stern, A. S. (1992). Maximum entropy and the nearly black object. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 54:41–81.
- Efron, B. (1973). Discussion of “Marginalization paradoxes in Bayesian and structural inference” by A. P. Dawid, M. Stone, and J. V. Zidek. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 35:219.
- Efron, B. and Hastie, T. (2016). *Computer Age Statistical Inference*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Efron, B. and Morris, C. (1973). Stein’s estimation rule and its competitors—an empirical Bayes approach. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 68(341):117–130.
- Fourdrinier, D., Strawderman, W. E., and Wells, M. T. (2018). *Shrinkage Estimation*. Springer, New York.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2008). Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441.
- Gan, Z., Henao, R., Carlson, D., and Carin, L. (2015). Learning deep sigmoid belief networks with data augmentation. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 268–276.
- Ghosh, P. and Chakrabarti, A. (2017). Asymptotic optimality of one-group shrinkage priors in sparse high-dimensional problems. *Bayesian Analysis*, 12(4):1133–1161.
- Ghosh, P., Tang, X., Ghosh, M., and Chakrabarti, A. (2016). Asymptotic properties of Bayes risk of a general class of shrinkage priors in multiple hypothesis testing under sparsity. *Bayesian Analysis*, 11(3):753–796.
- Ghosh, S. and Doshi-Velez, F. (2017). Model selection in Bayesian neural networks via horseshoe priors. In *Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) Workshop on Bayesian Deep Learning*.
- Ghosh, S., Yao, J., and Doshi-Velez, F. (2018). In Dy, J. and Krause, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1744–1753, Stockholm, Sweden. PMLR.
- Griffin, J. E. and Brown, P. J. (2010). Inference with normal-gamma prior distributions in regression problems. *Bayesian Analysis*, 5(1):171–188.
- Hahn, P. R., He, J., and Lopes, H. (2018a). Bayesian factor model shrinkage for linear IV regression with many instruments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 36(2):278–287.

- Hahn, P. R., He, J., and Lopes, H. F. (2018b). Efficient sampling for Gaussian linear regression with arbitrary priors. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–13.
- Ingraham, J. B. and Marks, D. S. (2017). Bayesian Sparsity for Intractable Distributions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Jacquier, E., Johannes, M., and Polson, N. (2007). MCMC maximum likelihood for latent state models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 137(2):615–640.
- James, W. and Stein, C. (1961). Estimation with quadratic loss. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, volume 1, pages 361–379.
- Johndrow, J., Dunson, D., and Lum, K. (2013). Diagonal orthant multinomial probit models. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 29–38.
- Johndrow, J. E., Orenstein, P., and Bhattacharya, A. (2017). Scalable MCMC for Bayes shrinkage priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00841*.
- Johnstone, I. M. and Silverman, B. W. (2004). Needles and straw in haystacks: Empirical Bayes estimates of possibly sparse sequences. *Annals of Statistics*, 32:1594–1649.
- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. (2013). Auto-encoding variational Bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*.
- Kowal, D. R., Matteson, D. S., and Ruppert, D. (2019). Dynamic shrinkage processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, to appear.
- Lam, C. and Fan, J. (2009). Sparsistency and rates of convergence in large covariance matrix estimation. *Annals of Statistics*, 37(6B):4254–4278.
- Lauritzen, S. L. (1996). *Graphical models*, volume 17. Clarendon Press.
- Li, H. and Pati, D. (2017). Variable selection using shrinkage priors. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 107:107–119.
- Li, Y., Craig, B. A., and Bhadra, A. (2019a). The graphical horseshoe estimator for inverse covariance matrices. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 28(3):747–757.
- Li, Y., Datta, J., Craig, B. A., and Bhadra, A. (2019b). Joint mean-covariance estimation via the horseshoe with an application in genomic data analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.06768*.
- Li, Z. R., McCormick, T. H., and Clark, S. J. (2018). Bayesian joint spike-and-slab graphical lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.07051*.
- Louizos, C., Ullrich, K., and Welling, M. (2017). Bayesian compression for deep learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3288–3298.
- Magnusson, M., Jonsson, L., and Villani, M. (2016). DOLDA—a regularized supervised topic model for high-dimensional multi-class regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.00260*.

- Makalic, E. and Schmidt, D. F. (2016). A simple sampler for the horseshoe estimator. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 23(1):179–182.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006). High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(3):1436–1462.
- Mitchell, T. J. and Beauchamp, J. J. (1988). Bayesian Variable Selection in Linear Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83(404):1023–1032.
- Nalisnick, E. and Hernández-Lobato, J. M. (2018). Automatic depth determination for Bayesian ResNets. In *Third workshop on Bayesian Deep Learning (NeurIPS 2018)*.
- Nalisnick, E., Hernández-Lobato, J. M., and Smyth, P. (2018). Dropout as a Structured Shrinkage Prior. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1810.04045.
- Neville, S. E., Ormerod, J. T., Wand, M., et al. (2014). Mean field variational Bayes for continuous sparse signal shrinkage: pitfalls and remedies. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):1113–1151.
- Nishimura, A. and Suchard, M. A. (2018). Prior-preconditioned conjugate gradient for accelerated Gibbs sampling in “large n & large p ” sparse Bayesian regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12437*.
- Piironen, J. and Vehtari, A. (2017). On the Hyperprior Choice for the Global Shrinkage Parameter in the Horseshoe Prior. In Singh, A. and Zhu, J., editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 905–913, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA. PMLR.
- Polson, N. G. and Scott, J. G. (2012). On the half-Cauchy prior for a global scale parameter. *Bayesian Analysis*, 7(4):887–902.
- Polson, N. G. and Scott, J. G. (2013). Data augmentation for non-Gaussian regression models using variance-mean mixtures. *Biometrika*, 100(2):459–471.
- Polson, N. G. and Scott, J. G. (2016). Mixtures, envelopes and hierarchical duality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 78:701–727.
- Polson, N. G., Scott, J. G., and Windle, J. (2013). Bayesian inference for logistic models using Pólya-gamma latent variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 108(504):1339–1349.
- Pritchard, J. K., Stephens, M., and Donnelly, P. (2000). Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data. *Genetics*, 155(2):945–959.
- Robbins, H. (1956). An empirical Bayes approach to statistics. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, pages 157–163, Berkeley, Calif. University of California Press.
- Ročková, V. and George, E. I. (2014). EMVS: The EM approach to Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(506):828–846.

- Ročková, V. and George, E. I. (2018). The spike-and-slab lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):431–444.
- Scott, J. G. (2010). Parameter expansion in local-shrinkage models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1010.5265*.
- Shin, M., Bhattacharya, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2016). Functional horseshoe priors for subspace shrinkage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05021*.
- Shin, M. and Liu, J. S. (2018). Neuronized priors for Bayesian sparse linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00141*.
- Srivastava, N., Hinton, G., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Salakhutdinov, R. (2014). Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1929–1958.
- Stein, C. (1956). Inadmissibility of the usual estimator for the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, volume 1, pages 197–206.
- Strawderman, W. E. (1971). Proper Bayes minimax estimators of the multivariate normal mean. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42(1):385–388.
- Terenin, A., Dong, S., and Draper, D. (2019). GPU-accelerated Gibbs sampling: a case study of the horseshoe probit model. *Statistics and Computing*, 29:301–310.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 58:267–288.
- Tran, M.-N., Nguyen, N., Nott, D., and Kohn, R. (2018). Bayesian deep net glm and glmm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10157*.
- van der Pas, S., Kleijn, B., and van der Vaart, A. (2014). The horseshoe estimator: Posterior concentration around nearly black vectors. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8:2585–2618.
- van der Pas, S., Salomond, J.-B., and Schmidt-Hieber, J. (2016). Conditions for Posterior Contraction in the Sparse Normal Means Problem. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10:976–1000.
- van der Pas, S., Szabó, B., and van der Vaart, A. (2017). Uncertainty quantification for the horseshoe (with discussion). *Bayesian Analysis*, 12(4):1221–1274.
- Wald, A. (1950). *Statistical Decision Functions*. Wiley, New York.
- Wang, B. and Titterton, D. (2004). Lack of consistency of mean field and variational Bayes approximations for state space models. *Neural Processing Letters*, 20(3):151–170.
- Wang, H. (2012). Bayesian graphical lasso models and efficient posterior computation. *Bayesian Analysis*, 7(4):867–886.
- Wang, Y., Polson, N. G., and Sokolov, V. O. (2019). Scalable data augmentation for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.09668*.

- Wei, R. and Ghosal, S. (2017). Contraction properties of shrinkage priors in logistic regression. *Technical report, Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University.*
- Williams, D. R., Piironen, J., Vehtari, A., and Rast, P. (2018). Bayesian estimation of Gaussian graphical models with predictive covariance selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.05725.*
- Yao, J., Pan, W., Ghosh, S., and Doshi-Velez, F. (2019). Quality of uncertainty quantification for Bayesian neural network inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09686.*
- Zellner, A. (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 57(298):348–368.