

# General dependence structures for some models based on exponential families with quadratic variance functions

LUIS NIETO-BARAJAS<sup>1</sup> & EDUARDO GUTIÉRREZ-PEÑA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Statistics, ITAM, Mexico*

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Probability and Statistics, IIMAS-UNAM, Mexico*

lnieto@itam.mx and eduardo@sigma.iimas.unam.mx

## Abstract

We describe a procedure to introduce general dependence structures on a set of random variables. These include order- $q$  moving average-type structures, as well as seasonal, periodic and spatial dependences. The invariant marginal distribution can be in any family that is conjugate to an exponential family with quadratic variance functions. Dependence is induced via latent variables whose conditional distribution mirrors the sampling distribution in a Bayesian conjugate analysis of such exponential families. We obtain strict stationarity as a special case.

*Keywords:* Autoregressive process; Conjugate family; exponential family; latent variable; moving average process; stationary process.

## 1 Introduction

Dependence structures on a set of random variables  $\{Y_i\}$  can be modelled in various different ways. For instance, in the analysis of time series, autoregressive (AR) processes of order  $p$  establish a linear dependence of the form

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Y_{i-1} + \cdots + \beta_p Y_{i-p} + Z_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $Z_i$  is a random error such that  $E(Z_i) = 0$  and  $\text{Var}(Z_i) = \sigma^2$ , the  $\beta_i$ 's are coefficients, and the index  $i$  is usually referred to time. Further conditions on the coefficients need be

imposed if we require the process (1) to be stationary (Box and Jenkins, 1970). If the number of elements in the set  $\{Y_i\}$  is finite, conditions for (1) to be strictly stationary for any  $p > 0$  are not available. They do exist for  $p = 1$  and only for the normal case (e.g. Mendoza and Nieto-Barajas, 2006).

On the other hand, moving average (MA) processes of order  $q$  are defined through averages of the lagged errors as

$$Y_i = \gamma_0 + Z_i + \gamma_1 Z_{i-1} + \cdots + \gamma_q Z_{i-q}, \quad (2)$$

where the  $\gamma_i$ 's are coefficients. In this case, the process is always second-order stationary but no general conditions are known for strict stationarity, regardless of whether the set  $\{Y_i\}$  is finite or not.

For spatial models, the most common dependence structure for a set of random variables  $\{Y_i\}$  is induced through conditional autoregressive (CAR) specifications (Besag, 1974). Let  $\partial_i$  be the set of neighbours of region  $i$ ; then a CAR model is defined by

$$Y_i = \sum_{j \in \partial_i} \beta_{ij} Y_j + Z_i, \quad (3)$$

where, as before,  $Z_i$  is a random error such that  $E(Z_i) = 0$  and  $\text{Var}(Z_i) = \sigma_i^2$ , and the  $\beta_{ij}$ 's are coefficients. Here, if the number of elements in the set  $\{Y_i\}$  is finite, and under the assumption that the errors are independent and follow a normal distribution, a symmetry condition on the  $\beta_{ij}$ 's and the  $\sigma_i^2$ 's is required to obtain the joint distribution of the  $Y_i$ 's. However, the resulting joint distribution is improper. To achieve propriety, i.e. a well-defined multivariate normal distribution, an extra parameter with a constrained support is required. Strict second-order stationarity is not possible even in this latter case.

Autoregressive-type processes with marginal distributions other than normal have been studied for the case  $p = 1$ . Lawrance (1982) and Walker (2000) studied the distribution of the innovation term  $Z_i$  that ensures a gamma marginal distribution. In turn, Nieto-Barajas

and Walker (2002) defined order-one dependent stationary processes with beta and gamma marginals by means of a Markov construction via latent variables. This construction was further generalized by Pitt et al. (2002) to more general exponential families.

Conditional autoregressive processes for spatial modelling were also considered for zero-one random variables by Besag (1974) himself, who proposed the so-called autologistic model. Extension to multinomial responses yields the Potts model (e.g. Green and Richardson, 2002). In these two non-normal models, the joint distributions are not explicitly known since the normalising constants are not analytically available. Therefore stationarity conditions are out of the question. More recently, Nieto-Barajas and Bandyopadhyay (2013) proposed a Markov random field with gamma marginal distributions.

The aim of this paper is to propose a way of constructing autoregressive dependence structures of any order  $p > 0$  (which can also accommodate spatial dependence of any order between neighbours) for a class of distributions that are conjugate to exponential families with quadratic variance functions. While our construction can in principle be applied to more general exponential families, those having a quadratic variance function allow a particularly neat treatment because their first and second moments can be calculated in closed form.

In Section 2 we briefly review the theory of exponential families and establish the notation. Section 3 contains our main construction and a discussion its properties. We present some particular cases of our construction in Section 4. Our model is illustrated in Section 5 with the analysis of a time series real data set. We conclude with a discussion in Section 6.

## **2 Preliminaries**

### **2.1 Exponential families**

We start by reviewing some basic concepts concerning exponential family models and introduce notation. Barndorff-Nielsen (1978) presents a comprehensive account of the theory of exponential families.

Let  $\nu$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (typically Lebesgue measure or a counting measure) and consider the family  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$  of probability measures dominated by  $\nu$  such that

$$\frac{dP_\omega(\mathbf{x})}{d\nu} = a(\mathbf{x}) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\omega)' \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}) - M(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\omega))\},$$

where  $a(\cdot)$  is a nonnegative measurable function,  $\mathbf{s}(\cdot) = (s_1(\cdot), \dots, s_k(\cdot))'$  is some measurable vector function. This is the general form of an exponential family and all the exponential family densities that appear in the remainder of this paper are particular cases of this expression.

Now assume that the mapping  $\omega \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}(\omega)$  is one-to-one and let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\}$ , where

$$f(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = a(\mathbf{x}) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}) - M(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}, \quad (4)$$

with  $M(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \int a(\mathbf{x}) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})\} \nu(d\mathbf{x})$  and  $\Theta = \text{int } \Xi$ , where  $\Xi = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^k : M(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is an *exponential family* with *canonical parameter*  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and *canonical statistic*  $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$ . The set  $\Theta$  is called the *canonical parameter space*.

The canonical statistic  $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$  is sufficient for the family  $\mathcal{F}$ . Under certain regularity conditions, exponential families are essentially the only models admitting a sufficient statistic of a fixed and finite dimension. The exponential representation (4) is said to be *minimal* if  $s_1(\cdot), \dots, s_k(\cdot)$  are affinely independent, and  $k$  is then called the *order* of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Now suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is an exponential family of order  $k$  with minimal representation (4). Then the canonical statistic  $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$  is minimal sufficient. The exponential family  $\mathcal{F}$  is said to be *regular* if  $\Xi$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $(d, k)$ -exponential family whenever explicit reference to the dimensions of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  (in a minimal representation) is required. If  $k = d$  and  $\mathbf{s}(\cdot)$  is the identity mapping then  $\mathcal{F}$  is said to be a *natural exponential family*. The function  $M(\cdot)$  is called the *cumulant transform* of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Given a sample  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$  of i.i.d. observations from  $f(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , the family of distri-

butions of the corresponding sufficient statistic  $\mathbf{S}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{X}_i)$  is a natural exponential family, with densities of the form

$$f(\mathbf{s}_n \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}, n) = b(\mathbf{s}_n, n) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}'\mathbf{s}_n - nM(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}. \quad (5)$$

Suppose now that  $\mathbf{S}$  is a random vector distributed according to (5) with  $n = 1$ . The cumulants of  $\mathbf{S}$  can then be obtained by differentiation of the cumulant transform  $M(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . In particular,

$$E(\mathbf{S} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{d}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

and

$$\text{Var}(\mathbf{S} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{H}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where  $\mathbf{d}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial M(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial^2 M(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}' \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}$  denote the gradient vector and the Hessian matrix of  $M(\cdot)$ , respectively. Consider the transformation  $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = E[\mathbf{S} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}]$  and let  $\Omega = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\Theta)$ . Since  $M(\cdot)$  is convex,  $\mathbf{H}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a positive definite matrix for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ , and hence  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a one-to-one transformation of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Thus  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  provides an alternative parametrization of the family  $\mathcal{F}$ , called the *mean parametrization*. It is often convenient to work in terms of this parametrization instead of the canonical parametrization. In this case (5) can be written as

$$f(\mathbf{s}_n \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\mu}), n) = b(\mathbf{s}_n, n) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu})'\mathbf{s}_n - nM(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}))\}. \quad (6)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$  denotes the inverse of the transformation  $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\cdot)$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{H}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}))$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Omega$ . The function  $\mathbf{V}(\cdot)$  takes values on the space of real symmetric positive-definite  $d \times d$  matrices and is called the *variance function* of the family  $\mathcal{F}$ . It can be shown that

$$\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^{-1} \quad (\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Omega),$$

$\mathbf{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}'}$ , with  $(i, j)$ -th entry  $\left(\frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial \mu_j}\right)$  ( $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ), denotes the Jacobian matrix of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ .

The variance function, together with its domain  $\Omega$ , characterizes the family  $\mathcal{F}$  within the class of all natural exponential families (Morris, 1982). Furthermore, for many common families the variance function takes a very simple form.

Specifically (for the case  $d = k = 1$ ), Morris (1982) describes all real natural exponential families with quadratic variance functions (i.e. a variance function which is a polynomial of order at most 2 in the mean parameter). This class, hereafter denoted NEF-QVF, includes some of the most widely used families of distributions such as the Poisson, binomial, negative binomial, normal and gamma families, as well as the less known hyperbolic-secant family. Our construction will be based on this class of distributions.

## 2.2 Conjugate families

A convenient way of modelling prior knowledge about  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is to use conjugate families. Since their introduction by Raiffa and Schlaifer (1961), conjugate families of distributions have played an important role in Bayesian parametric inference. The main property of these families is that they are closed under sampling, but they often provide prior distributions which are tractable in various other respects.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the family of distributions defined on the Borel sets of  $\Theta$  and with density function (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) of the form

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{s}_0, n_0) = h(\mathbf{s}_0, n_0) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}'\mathbf{s}_0 - n_0M(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  are such that

$$h(\mathbf{s}_0, n_0) = \left\{ \int \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}'\mathbf{s}_0 - n_0M(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right\}^{-1}$$

is well defined. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is conjugate for  $\mathcal{F}$ , meaning that the posterior distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  also belongs to this family.

$\mathcal{C}$  is commonly known as the standard conjugate family of the exponential family  $\mathcal{F}$  (Diaconis and Ylvisaker, 1979). Note that  $\mathcal{C}$  is also an exponential family, in this case with

canonical statistic  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, -M(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$  and canonical parameter  $(\mathbf{s}_0, n_0)$ . See Gutiérrez-Peña and Smith (1997) for an overview of conjugate families for exponential families.

We close this section by noting that the conjugate family for the mean parameter  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  that is induced from  $\mathcal{C}$  has densities of the form

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{\mu} \mid \mathbf{s}_0, n_0) = h(\mathbf{s}_0, n_0) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu})' \mathbf{s}_0 - n_0 M(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}))\} |\mathbf{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})|. \quad (8)$$

Having observed the sample  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$  of i.i.d. observations from  $f(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}))$ , with sufficient statistic  $\mathbf{S}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ , the likelihood for  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  has the form (6), and assuming a prior distribution for  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  with a density of the form (8), the posterior distribution has a density of the form

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{\mu} \mid \mathbf{s}^*, n^*) = h(\mathbf{s}^*, n^*) \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu})' \mathbf{s}^* - n^* M(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}))\} |\mathbf{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})|, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}^* = \mathbf{s}_0 + \mathbf{s}_n$  and  $n^* = n_0 + n$ .

### 3 General framework

Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_i\}$  be a set of variables of interest, and let  $\mathbf{S} = \{S_i\}$  and  $U$  be latent variables. With these three components we will define a hierarchical model with three levels to achieve dependencies in the  $\mathbf{Y}$ . The dependence could be temporal, as illustrated in Figure 1, and/or spatial, as illustrated in Figure 2. On top of this we want to ensure that the marginal distribution of each  $Y_i$  is the same and belongs to the exponential family.

The whole idea is based on the notion of conjugacy for the Bayesian analysis of exponential families, as described in Section 2.2. We summarise our construction as follows: first, the desired marginal distribution on the  $Y_i$ 's is assigned to the latent variable  $U$ , and plays the role of the (conjugate) prior distribution; second, latent variables  $S_i$ 's will be conditional independent given  $U$ , and play the role of the observations that give rise to the likelihood function; finally, the variables of interest  $Y_i$ 's are conditionally independent given the  $S_i$ 's, and its distribution will have the form of the corresponding posterior distribution.

Let  $\partial_i$  be the set of “neighbours”, in the broad sense, of individual  $i$ . For a temporal dependence model of order  $q$ ,  $\partial_i$  would be the set of indexes  $\{i - q, \dots, i - 1, i\}$ , whereas in a spatial dependence model,  $\partial_i$  would be the set of actual neighbours of any order plus the current index  $i$ . For a seasonal dependence model of order  $q$ , if the seasonality of the data is  $s$ ,  $\partial_i$  would be the set of indexes  $\{i - qs, \dots, i - q, i\}$ . For a periodic dependence model of orders  $(q_1, \dots, q_s)$ , we define  $i = i(r, m) = (r - 1)s + m$  for  $r = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $m = 1, \dots, s$ . To be specific, for monthly data,  $s = 12$ ,  $r$  denotes year and  $m$  denotes month. In this case  $\partial_i$  would be the set of indexes  $\{i(r, m) - q_m, \dots, i(r, m) - 1, i(r, m)\}$ . Spatio-temporal models can also be defined by an appropriate definition of the set  $\partial_i$  (e.g. Nieto-Barajas, 2020). For instance, if  $i$  denotes location and  $t$  time,  $\partial_{i,t} = \{(i, s) : s \in \{t - q, \dots, t - 1, t\}\} \cup \{(j, t) : j \text{ is neighbour of } i\}$  would define a spatio-temporal dependence model.

Let us start by choosing the desired marginal distribution of  $Y_i$ , which is a member of the exponential family of the form (8). We assign this distribution to the latent variable  $U$ , that is

$$p_u(u \mid s_0, n_0) = h(s_0, n_0) \exp \{ \theta(u) s_0 - n_0 M(\theta(u)) \} |D_\theta(u)|. \quad (10)$$

Now, conditional on  $U$ , the  $S_i$ 's are independent with densities of the form (6); that is

$$f(s_i \mid \theta(u), n_i) = b(s_i, n_i) \exp \{ \theta(u) s_i - n_i M(\theta(u)) \}, \quad (11)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Finally, conditional on  $\mathbf{S}$ , the  $Y_i$ 's are independent with general exponential family distribution of the form (9), i.e.

$$p_y(y_i \mid s_i^*, n_i^*) = h(s_i^*, n_i^*) \exp \{ \theta(y_i) s_i^* - n_i^* M(\theta(y_i)) \} |D_\theta(y_i)|, \quad (12)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with

$$s_i^* = s_0 + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} s_j \quad \text{and} \quad n_i^* = n_0 + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j. \quad (13)$$

We are now ready to state our main result.



**Proposition 1** Let  $\{Y_i\}$  be a set of dependent random variables whose distribution is characterised by equations (10)–(12). Then,

(i) The marginal distribution for each  $Y_i$  is the same as the distribution of  $U$ .

Moreover, let us assume that the distribution of the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}$ , given by (11), belongs to the NEF-QVF class (Morris, 1982). Then,

(ii) For any two random variables  $Y_i$  and  $Y_k$ , the correlation induced by the model is given

by

$$\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k) = \frac{n_0 \left( \sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} n_j \right) + \left( \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j \right) \left( \sum_{j \in \partial_k} n_j \right)}{(n_0 + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j)(n_0 + \sum_{j \in \partial_k} n_j)}$$

if  $i \neq k$ , and  $\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k) = 1$  if  $i = k$ .

**Proof.** To prove (i), we note that expressions (10)–(12) define the Bayesian conjugate analysis described in Section 2.2 with  $p_u(u)$  as the prior,  $f(s_j | \theta(u), n_j)$  as the sampling distribution for  $j \in \partial_i$ , and  $p_y(u | s_i^*, n_i^*)$  as the posterior, where we have replaced  $y_i$  for  $u$  as the argument of the density. Therefore, by construction,  $p_y(u) = p_u(u)$  and thus the marginal distribution of  $Y_i$  is the same as that of  $U$ .

Now, to prove (ii) we first note that quadratic variance functions have the general form  $V(\mu) = \nu_0 + \nu_1\mu + \nu_2\mu^2$ , with specific values for the coefficients  $\nu_0, \nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  for each model in the NEF-QVF class. We will also require expressions for the mean and variance of the densities (10)–(12), these are:  $E(U) = s_0/n_0$  and  $\text{Var}(U) = V(s_0/n_0)/(n_0 - \nu_2)$  (Morris, 1982);  $E(S_i | u) = n_i u$  and  $\text{Var}(S_i | u) = n_i V(u)$ . Note that  $E(Y_i | \mathbf{s})$  and  $\text{Var}(Y_i | \mathbf{s})$  have the same form as the corresponding moments of  $U$  but with  $s_0$  and  $n_0$  replaced by  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$ .

We will compute the marginal covariance between  $Y_i$  and  $Y_k$  using the “law of total covariance”,  $\text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_k) = E\{\text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_k | \mathbf{S})\} + \text{Cov}\{E(Y_i | \mathbf{S}), E(Y_k | \mathbf{S})\}$ . Note that the first term is zero due to conditional independence, and so  $\text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_k) = \text{Cov}(S_i^*/n_i^*, S_k^*/n_k^*)$ . We split  $\partial_i$  and  $\partial_k$  into two disjoint sets,  $\partial_i = (\partial_i \cap \partial_k) \cup (\partial_i - \partial_k)$  and  $\partial_k = (\partial_i \cap \partial_k) \cup (\partial_k - \partial_i)$ ,

such that  $(\partial_i \cap \partial_k) \cap (\partial_i - \partial_k) \cap (\partial_k - \partial_i) = \emptyset$ . We can thus rewrite the covariance as  $\text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_k) = \{\text{Var}(A) + \text{Cov}(A, C) + \text{Cov}(B, A) + \text{Cov}(B, C)\}/(n_i^* n_k^*)$ , where

$$A = \sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} S_j, \quad B = \sum_{j \in \partial_i - \partial_k} S_j, \quad C = \sum_{j \in \partial_k - \partial_i} S_j.$$

We can now compute each of the elements of the previous sum separately, again using the ‘‘law of total (co)variance’’.

First,  $\text{Var}(A) = \text{E}\{\text{Var}(A \mid U)\} + \text{Var}\{\text{E}(A \mid U)\}$ , which after some algebra becomes  $\text{Var}(A) = \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} n_j\right) \text{E}\{V(U)\} + \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} n_j\right)^2 \text{Var}(U)$ . Substituting the form of the quadratic variance function and taking expectations, after some algebra we obtain  $\text{E}\{V(U)\} = n_0 \text{Var}(U)$ . On the other hand,  $\text{Cov}(A, C) = \text{E}\{\text{Cov}(A, C \mid U)\} + \text{Cov}\{\text{E}(A \mid U), \text{E}(C \mid U)\}$ .

Due to conditional independence the first term vanishes, so that

$$\text{Cov}(A, C) = \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} n_j\right) \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_k - \partial_i} n_j\right) \text{Var}(U).$$

The computations of  $\text{Cov}(B, A)$  and  $\text{Cov}(B, C)$  are analogous. Substituting all these expressions back in the expression for the covariance between  $Y_i$  and  $Y_k$ , we obtain  $\text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_k) = \text{Var}(U)/(n_i^* n_k^*) \left\{ n_0 \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_i \cap \partial_k} n_j\right) + \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j\right) \left(\sum_{j \in \partial_k} n_j\right) \right\}$ . Finally, recalling that  $\text{Var}(U) = \text{Var}(Y_i) = \text{Var}(Y_k)$  we obtain the result.  $\diamond$

Proposition 1 tells us that all the  $Y_i$ ’s have the same marginal distribution, and therefore the same mean and variance. Additionally, the correlation between any two variables, say  $Y_i$  and  $Y_k$  with  $i \neq k$ , is fully characterised and has a simple expression. This correlation can be split into two parts: first, a function of the marginal parameter  $n_0$  and the shared parameters  $n_j$  in the sets  $\partial_i$  and  $\partial_k$ ; and second, a function of the two whole sets of parameters  $n_j$  in the sets  $\partial_i$  and  $\partial_k$ . The sum of these two components is then normalised so it lies in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Moreover, if  $n_i = n$  for all  $i$ , then the set  $\mathbf{Y}$  becomes strictly stationary.

In order to see how the correlation induced by our construction looks like, in Figure 1 we show a temporal dependence model of order  $q = 2$ . A spatial dependence model is shown in

Figure 2.

For the temporal model, the neighbouring sets are  $\partial_1 = \{1\}$ ,  $\partial_2 = \{1, 2\}$ , and  $\partial_i = \{i, i - 1, i - 2\}$  for  $i = 3, 4, \dots$ . We computed  $\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k)$  for  $i = 1$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 16$  and considered several scenarios for the parameters  $n_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ . Specifically, we take fixed values  $n_j = 1$ , for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  and vary  $n_0 \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1, 10\}$ . The correlations induced by these scenarios are shown in the left-hand panel of Figure 3. The correlation starts at one, for  $k = 1$ , and decreases to a constant value, for  $k = 2, 3$ , and decreases again to a lower constant value for  $k = 4, 5, \dots$ . The effect of  $n_0$  is inverse, the correlation decreases as  $n_0$  increases. In the same panel we also include a scenario that shows that the correlation is not necessarily monotonic; this can be achieved, say, by setting  $n_0 = 0.5$  and varying values of  $n_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . The right-hand panel of Figure 1 shows five paths obtained with simulated values of the parameters taken from  $n_0 \sim \text{Un}(0, 2)$  and  $n_j | a, b \sim \text{Ga}(a, b)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 16$ , with  $a \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$  and  $b \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ . These paths confirm the flexibility of the correlation induced by our construction.

For the spatial model, the neighbouring sets are  $\partial_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\partial_2 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\partial_3 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ ,  $\partial_4 = \{3, 4, 5\}$  and  $\partial_5 = \{3, 4, 5\}$ . Again, we computed  $\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k)$  for  $i, k = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ , and considered several scenarios for values of the parameters. The  $5 \times 5 = 25$  correlations are presented as vertical lines in Figures 4 and 5, where, for each value of  $k = 1, \dots, 5$  on the horizontal axis, we include five vertical lines which correspond to  $i = 1, \dots, 5$  and are shown as 5 line types. In Figure 4 we took  $n_j = 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ , and three values  $n_0 \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$  shown in the top left, top right and bottom left panels, respectively. In all cases, region  $k = 3$  is the one with higher correlations, because it is the one with larger number of neighbours. Larger values of  $n_0$  imply smaller correlations. The bottom right panel illustrates the case where  $n_0 = 1$  and different  $n_j$ 's for  $j > 0$ . Figure 5 includes four scenarios, one in each panel, obtained with simulated values of the parameters taken from  $n_0 \sim \text{Un}(0, 2)$  and  $n_j | a, b \sim \text{Ga}(a, b)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ , with  $a \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$  and  $b \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ .

Again, the highest correlations involve region  $k = 3$ , however other regions also show large correlations.

## 4 The NEF-QVF class

According to Morris (1982), there exists six natural exponential families with quadratic variance functions. In this section we derive our construction using each of these families as the distribution at the second level of our three-level hierarchical model; see equation (11).

As pointed out in Section 1, while our construction can in principle be applied to more general exponential families, those having a quadratic variance function allow a particularly neat treatment because their first and second moments can be calculated in closed form.

### 4.1 Normal

Let  $N(\mu, \tau)$  denote a normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and precision  $\tau$ , so its density function is given by

$$f(y) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{\tau}\right)^{-1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau}{2}(y - \mu)^2\right\} I_{\mathbb{R}}(y). \quad (14)$$

When  $\tau$  is known, the standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is also normal. Let us take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim N(n_i u, 1/n_i)$ , which based on (14) has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = (2\pi n_i)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{s_i^2}{2n_i} + u s_i - \frac{n_i}{2} u^2\right).$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = (2\pi n_i)^{-1/2} \exp\{-s_i^2/(2n_i)\}$  and

$$\theta(u) = u, \quad M(\theta(u)) = \frac{u^2}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad D_\theta(u) = 1. \quad (15)$$

We now assign the marginal distribution  $U \sim N(s_0/n_0, n_0)$  to the latent variable  $U$ . Again, from (14), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{n_0}\right)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{s_0^2}{2n_0} + u s_0 - \frac{n_0}{2} u^2\right),$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $h(s_0, n_0) = (2\pi/n_0)^{-1/2} \exp\{-s_0^2/(2n_0)\}$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_\theta(u)$  as in (15). Finally, we define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

In summary, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with normal marginal distribution  $N(\mu, \tau)$ , we take  $\mu = s_0/n_0$  and  $\tau = n_0$ . Then our three level hierarchical model is defined by

$$U \sim N(s_0/n_0, n_0), \quad [S_i | U] \sim N(n_i u, 1/n_i) \quad \text{and} \quad [Y_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim N(s_i^*/n_i^*, n_i^*), \quad (16)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

An alternative expression for the normal construction (16) can be obtained if we define  $S_i = n_i Z_i$ . In terms of  $Z_i$ , the three-level hierarchical model then becomes:  $U \sim N(\mu, \tau)$ ,  $[Z_i | U] \sim N(u, n_i)$  and  $[Y_i | \mathbf{Z}] \sim N\left(\frac{\tau\mu + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j z_j}{\tau + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j}, \tau + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j\right)$ . Written in this form, it is easier to see that the correlation of the process, given in Proposition 1, is given in terms of the marginal precision  $\tau$  and the precisions  $n_i$  of the latent variables  $Z_i$ 's.

## 4.2 Poisson

Let  $\text{Po}(\mu)$  denote a Poisson model with mean  $\mu$ , so its density function is given by

$$f(x) = e^{-\mu} \frac{\mu^x}{x!} I_{\{0,1,\dots\}}(x). \quad (17)$$

The standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is the gamma family, denoted by  $\text{Ga}(\alpha, \beta)$ , with density functions of the form

$$f(y) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} y^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta y} I_{(0,\infty)}(y). \quad (18)$$

Let us take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{Po}(n_i u)$ , which based on (17) has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = \frac{n_i^{s_i}}{s_i!} \exp(s_i \log(u) - n_i u).$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = n_i^{s_i}/s_i!$  and

$$\theta(u) = \log(u), \quad M(\theta(u)) = u, \quad \text{and} \quad D_\theta(u) = \frac{1}{u}. \quad (19)$$

We now assign the marginal distribution  $U \sim \text{Ga}(s_0, n_0)$  to the latent variable  $U$ . From (18), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = \frac{n_0^{s_0}}{\Gamma(s_0)} \frac{1}{u} \exp(s_0 \log u - n_0 u),$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $b(s_0, n_0) = n_0^{s_0}/\Gamma(s_0)$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_\theta(u)$  as in (19). Finally, we define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

Thus, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with gamma marginal distribution  $\text{Ga}(\alpha, \beta)$ , we take  $\alpha = s_0$  and  $\beta = n_0$ . Then the three-level hierarchical model is defined by

$$U \sim \text{Ga}(s_0, n_0), \quad [S_i | U] \sim \text{Po}(n_i u) \quad \text{and} \quad [Y_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim \text{Ga}(s_i^*, n_i^*), \quad (20)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

### 4.3 Gamma

Let  $\text{Ga}(\alpha, 1/\mu)$  denote a gamma distribution with density function of the form (18) and mean  $\alpha\mu$ . The standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is the inverse gamma family, denoted by  $\text{IGa}(\alpha, \beta)$ , with density functions of the form

$$f(y) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} y^{-(\alpha+1)} e^{-\beta/x} I_{[0, \infty)}(x). \quad (21)$$

Let us take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{Ga}(n_i, 1/u)$ , which based on (18), has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = \frac{s_i^{n_i-1}}{\Gamma(n_i)} \exp\left(-\frac{s_i}{u} - n_i \log(u)\right).$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = s_i^{n_i-1}/\Gamma(n_i)$  and

$$\theta(u) = -\frac{1}{u}, \quad M(\theta(u)) = \log(u), \quad \text{and} \quad D_\theta(u) = \frac{1}{u}. \quad (22)$$

We now assign the marginal distribution  $U \sim \text{IGa}(n_0, s_0)$  to the latent variable  $U$ . From (21), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = \frac{s_0^{n_0}}{\Gamma(n_0)} \frac{1}{u} \exp\left(-\frac{s_0}{u} - n_0 \log(u)\right),$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $h(s_0, n_0) = s_0^{n_0}/\Gamma(n_0)$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_\theta(u)$  as in (22). We define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

Similar to the previous cases, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with inverse gamma marginal distribution  $\text{IGa}(\alpha, \beta)$ , we take  $\alpha = n_0$  and  $\beta = s_0$ . Then the three-level hierarchical model is defined by

$$U \sim \text{IGa}(n_0, s_0), \quad S_i | U \sim \text{Ga}(n_i, 1/u) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i | \mathbf{S} \sim \text{IGa}(n_i^*, s_i^*), \quad (23)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

## 4.4 Binomial

Let  $\text{Bin}(m, \mu)$  denote a binomial distribution with number of trials  $m$  and success probability  $\mu$ , so its density function is given by

$$f(x) = \binom{m}{x} \mu^x (1 - \mu)^{m-x} I_{\{0,1,\dots,m\}}(x). \quad (24)$$

The standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is the beta family, denoted by  $\text{Be}(\alpha, \beta)$ , with density functions of the form

$$f(y) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} y^{\alpha-1} (1 - y)^{\beta-1} I_{(0,1)}(y). \quad (25)$$

Let us take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{Bin}(n_i, u)$ , which based on (24) has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = \binom{n_i}{s_i} \exp\left\{s_i \log\left(\frac{u}{1-u}\right) + n_i \log(1-u)\right\},$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = \binom{n_i}{s_i}$  and

$$\theta(u) = \log\left(\frac{u}{1-u}\right), \quad M(\theta(u)) = -\log(1-u), \quad \text{and} \quad D_\theta(u) = \frac{1}{u(1-u)} \quad (26)$$

We now assign the marginal distribution  $U \sim \text{Be}(s_0, n_0 - s_0)$  to the latent variable  $U$ . From (25), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = \frac{\Gamma(n_0)}{\Gamma(s_0)\Gamma(n_0 - s_0)} \frac{1}{u(1-u)} \exp\left\{s_0 \log\left(\frac{u}{1-u}\right) + n_0 \log(1-u)\right\},$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $h(s_0, n_0) = \Gamma(n_0)/\{\Gamma(s_0)\Gamma(n_0 - s_0)\}$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_\theta(u)$  as in (26). We define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

Hence, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with beta marginal distribution  $\text{Be}(\alpha, \beta)$ , we take  $\alpha = s_0$  and  $\beta = n_0 - s_0$ . The three-level hierarchical model is then defined by

$$U \sim \text{Be}(s_0, n_0 - s_0), \quad S_i | U \sim \text{Bin}(n_i, u) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i | \mathbf{S} \sim \text{Be}(s_i^*, n_i^* - s_i^*), \quad (27)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

## 4.5 Negative Binomial

Let  $\text{NB}(m, p)$  denote a negative binomial distribution with number of ‘success’ trials  $m$  and success probability  $p$ , so its density function is given by

$$f(x) = \binom{m+x-1}{x} p^m (1-p)^x I_{\{0,1,\dots\}}(x). \quad (28)$$

For this family, the mean parameter is given by  $\mu = (1-p)/p$ , and the standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is the inverse beta family (also known as beta prime or beta of the second kind).

It is denoted by  $\text{IBe}(\alpha, \beta)$ , and has density functions of the form

$$f(y) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} y^{\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1}{y+1}\right)^{\alpha+\beta} I_{(0,\infty)}(y). \quad (29)$$



Let us take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{NB}(n_i, 1/(u+1))$ , which based on (28) has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = \binom{n_i + s_i - 1}{s_i} \exp \left\{ s_i \log \left( \frac{u}{u+1} \right) - n_i \log(u+1) \right\},$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = \binom{n_i + s_i - 1}{s_i}$  and

$$\theta(u) = \log \left( \frac{u}{u+1} \right), \quad M(\theta(u)) = \log(u+1), \quad \text{and} \quad D_\theta(u) = \frac{1}{u(u+1)} \quad (30)$$

We now assign the latent variable  $U$  the marginal distribution  $U \sim \text{IBe}(s_0, n_0 + 1)$ . From (29), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = \frac{\Gamma(s_0 + n_0 + 1)}{\Gamma(s_0)\Gamma(n_0 + 1)} \frac{1}{u(u+1)} \exp \left\{ s_0 \log \left( \frac{u}{u+1} \right) - n_0 \log(u+1) \right\},$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $h(s_0, n_0) = \Gamma(s_0 + n_0 + 1)/\{\Gamma(s_0)\Gamma(n_0 + 1)\}$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_\theta(u)$  as in (30). Finally, we define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

Summing up, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with inverse beta marginal distribution  $\text{IBe}(\alpha, \beta)$ , we take  $\alpha = s_0$  and  $\beta = n_0 + 1$ . Then the three-level hierarchical model is defined by

$$U \sim \text{Be}(s_0, n_0 + 1), \quad [S_i | U] \sim \text{NB}(n_i, 1/(u+1)) \quad \text{and} \quad [Y_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim \text{Be}(s_i^*, n_i^* + 1), \quad (31)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

## 4.6 Generalised Hyperbolic Secant

Let  $\text{GHS}(\alpha, \mu)$  denotes a generalised hyperbolic secant distribution (Morris, 1982), whose density function is given by

$$f(x) = \frac{2^{\alpha-2}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\{ 1 + \frac{x^2}{(\alpha + 2j)^2} \right\}^{-1} e^{x \tan^{-1}(\mu)} (1 + \mu^2)^{-\alpha/2}. \quad (32)$$

The standard conjugate family for  $\mu$  is the scaled Student  $t$  family, denoted by  $\text{SSt}(\mu_0, m)$  and with density functions of the form

$$f(y) = k(\mu_0, m) e^{m\mu_0 \tan^{-1}(y)} (1 + y^2)^{-(m+2)/2} I_{\mathbb{R}}(y) \quad (33)$$

(Morris, 1983), where  $k(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a normalising constant,  $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $m$  is an integer.

We take the conditional distribution of  $S_i$  given  $U$  to be  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{GHS}(n_i, u)$ , which based on (32) has a density function of the form

$$f(s_i | u) = \frac{2^{n_i-2}}{\Gamma(n_i)} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\{ 1 + \frac{s_i^2}{(n_i + 2j)^2} \right\}^{-1} \exp \left[ s_i \tan^{-1}(u) + n_i \log \left\{ \cos(\tan^{-1}(u)) \right\} \right].$$

This has the exponential representation (11) with  $b(s_i, n_i) = \frac{2^{n_i-2}}{\Gamma(n_i)} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\{ 1 + \frac{s_i^2}{(n_i + 2j)^2} \right\}^{-1}$  and

$$\theta(u) = \tan^{-1}(u), \quad M(\theta(u)) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + u^2) \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\theta}(u) = (1 + u^2)^{-1}, \quad (34)$$

since  $\cos(\tan^{-1}(u)) = (1 + u^2)^{-1/2}$ . We now assign the marginal distribution  $U \sim \text{SSt}(s_0/n_0, n_0)$  to the latent variable  $U$ . From (33), the density of  $U$  can be written as

$$f(u) = k(s_0/n_0, n_0) (1 + u^2)^{-1} \exp \left\{ s_0 \tan^{-1}(u) - \frac{n_0}{2} \log(1 + u^2) \right\},$$

which has the exponential form (10) with  $h(s_0, n_0) = k(s_0/n_0, n_0)$  and functions  $\theta(\cdot)$ ,  $M(\cdot)$  and  $D_{\theta}(u)$  as in (34). We define  $f(y_i | \mathbf{s})$ , the conditional distribution of  $Y_i$  given the latent variables  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , to have the same form as  $f(u)$  but with  $(s_0, n_0)$  replaced by  $(s_i^*, n_i^*)$ .

In summary, if we want to construct a process  $\mathbf{Y}$  with scaled Student  $t$  marginal distribution  $\text{SSt}(\mu, m)$ , we take  $\mu = s_0/n_0$  and  $m = n_0$ . The three-level hierarchical model is then defined by

$$U \sim \text{SSt}(s_0/n_0, n_0), \quad [S_i | U] \sim \text{GHS}(n_i, u) \quad \text{and} \quad [Y_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim \text{N}(s_i^*/n_i^*, n_i^*), \quad (35)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with  $s_i^*$  and  $n_i^*$  given in (13).

If we rewrite (35) in terms of the original parameters  $\mu$  and  $m$ , then we get the following three-level hierarchical model:  $U \sim \text{N}(\mu, m)$ ,  $[S_i | U] \sim \text{GHS}(n_i, u)$  and  $[Y_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim$

$\text{SSt} \left( \frac{m\mu + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} s_j}{m + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j}, m + \sum_{j \in \partial_i} n_j \right)$ . Note that this resembles the construction (16) for the normal case when written in terms of  $\mathbf{Z}$ . Moreover, the correlation between any two random variables  $Y_i$  and  $Y_k$  (given in Proposition 1) would be expressed in terms of the  $n_i$ 's and  $m$ .

## 5 Illustration

The Mexican National Institute of Statistics and Geography carries out a nation-wide continuous survey to study the occupation and employment of the population. They define the unemployment rate as the percentage of people, 15 years or older, who are looking for a job and have not been able to find it. Here we model the monthly unemployment rates ( $Y_i$ ) from January 2006 to September 2019, that is, for  $i = 1, \dots, 165$ . The data are shown as solid lines in the second to fourth panels of Figure 6.

We propose to model the data with a inverse gamma-gamma model, that is, a temporal dependence model with a  $\text{IGa}(\alpha, \beta)$  marginal distribution and with latent variables  $S_i$  coming from a gamma distribution, as in (23). Temporal dependence was defined with neighbouring sets  $\partial_i = \{i - q, \dots, i - 1, i\}$ , and with  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, 14\}$  for comparison purposes. We implemented a Bayesian analysis with independent prior distributions  $\alpha \sim \text{Ga}(0.1, 0.1)$  and  $\beta \sim \text{Ga}(0.1, 0.1)$ ; the hierarchical prior for the  $n_i$ 's was defined as  $n_i \mid n_0 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Ga}(1, n_0)$  and  $n_0 \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ .

Posterior inferences were obtained via a Gibbs sampler. We ran two chains with 15,000 iterations, a burn-in period of 5,000 iterations, and a thinning of 5 iterations to reduce the autocorrelation within each chain. Since the involved distributions that define our model are all of standard form, inference can be done in R through the JAGS software (Plummer, 2018).

We assessed the model fit by computing the deviance information criterion (DIC) originally introduced by Spiegelhalter et al. (2002). Smaller values of DIC are preferred. These values for varying  $q \in \{1, \dots, 14\}$  are shown in the top-left panel of Figure 6. The largest

improvement in the DIC scale is given from the model with  $q = 0$  (exchangeability) to the model with  $q = 1$ . The values continue to fall until  $q = 11$  (best model) and then increase for  $q \geq 12$ .

The impact on the fit for some choices of  $q$  can be seen in the second to fourth panels of Figure 6. Point predictions (thick solid lines) and 95% credible intervals (dotted lines) are shown. For  $q = 0$  the  $Y_i$ 's become exchangeable with the same marginal distribution so the prediction is constant, whereas for a temporal dependence of order  $q = 1$ , the predictions follow the path of the data closely but with a somewhat larger uncertainty (wider credible intervals). However, for the best-fitting model, obtained with  $q = 11$ , the point predictions are smoother and with considerably less uncertainty (narrower credible intervals).

## 6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have described a general procedure to introduce dependence structures on a set of random variables whose distribution belongs to a class of models which are conjugate to natural exponential families with quadratic variance functions. Such dependence is induced by means of a set of latent variables within a three-level hierarchical model, and is fully characterised via the correlation function.

This general construction is based on the well-known Bayesian notion of conjugacy. We used the conjugate prior distribution of the mean parameter in the first level of the hierarchy, a sampling model in the NEF-QVF class for the second level, and the corresponding (conjugate) posterior in the third level. While we focused on the important NEF-QVF class written in terms of the mean parametrisation (a class that contains some of the most commonly used models), the same conjugate construction can be used with other parametrisations and other exponential families.

Consider, for instance, the inverse gamma-gamma model (20). If we took  $U' = 1/U$  and

$Y'_i = 1/Y_i$ , then the model would be rewritten as

$$U' \sim \text{Ga}(n_0 + 1, s_0), \quad [S_i | U'] \sim \text{Ga}(n_i, u') \quad \text{and} \quad [Y'_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim \text{Ga}(n_i^* + 1, s_i^*).$$

Similarly, the inverse beta-negative binomial model (31) could be rewritten if we applied the same transformations as above to obtain

$$U' \sim \text{Be}(n_0 + 1, s_0), \quad [S_i | U'] \sim \text{NB}(n_i, u') \quad \text{and} \quad [Y'_i | \mathbf{S}] \sim \text{Be}(n_i^* + 1, s_i^*).$$

These transformations yield alternative representations of the marginal gamma and marginal beta processes, respectively. However, in these cases the correlation between any two random variables may not be available in closed form.

We close by noting that the procedure described in this paper can also be applied beyond exponential family settings, as long as a conjugate structure is available. For example, Nieto-Barajas and Huerta (2017) defined a spatio-temporal model with Pareto marginal distributions using a Pareto distribution in the first level, an inverse Pareto for the second, and another Pareto for the third.

## Acknowledgements

Most of this work was carried out while the second author was visiting the Department of Statistics at ITAM. He is very grateful to this institution for their hospitality. Partial support from the Mexican National System of Researchers is gratefully acknowledged. The first author also acknowledges support from *Asociación Mexicana de Cultura, A.C.*

## References

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. (1978) *Information and Exponential Families in Statistical Theory*. Chichester: Wiley.

- Besag, J. (1974). Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **36**, 192–236.
- Box, G.E.P. and Jenkins, G.M. (1970). *Times series analysis. Forecasting and control*. San Francisco: Holden-Day.
- Brown, L.D. (1986) *Fundamentals of Statistical Exponential Families, with Applications in Statistical Decision Theory*. Lecture Notes, **9**. Hayward: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Diaconis, P. and Ylvisaker, D. (1979). Conjugate priors for exponential families. *Annals of Statistics* **7**, 269–281.
- Diaconis, P. and Ylvisaker, D. (1979) Conjugate Priors for Exponential Families. *The Annals of Statistics*, **7**, 269-281.
- Green, P.J. and Richardson, S. (2002). Hidden Markov models and disease mapping. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **97**, 1055–1070.
- Gutiérrez-Peña, E. and Smith, A.F.M. (1997). Exponential and Bayesian conjugate families: Review and extensions. *Test*, **6**, 1–90 (with discussion).
- Jara, A., Nieto-Barajas, L.E. and Quintana, F. (2013). A time series model for responses on the unit interval. *Bayesian Analysis* **8**, 723–740.
- Lawrance, A.J. (1982). The innovation distribution of a gamma distributed autoregressive process. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **9**, 234–236.
- Mendoza, M. and Nieto-Barajas, L.E. (2006). Bayesian solvency analysis with autocorrelated observations. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, **22**, 169–180.

- Morris, C.N. (1982). Natural Exponential Families with Quadratic Variance Functions. *The Annals of Statistics*, **10**, 65–80.
- Morris, C.N. (1983). Natural Exponential Families with Quadratic Variance Functions: Statistical Theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, **11**, 515–529.
- Nieto-Barajas, L.E. (2020). Bayesian regression with spatio-temporal varying coefficients. *Biometrical Journal*. To appear.
- Nieto-Barajas, L.E. and Bandyopadhyay, D. (2013). A zero-inflated spatial gamma process model with applications to disease mapping. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics* **18**, 137–158.
- Nieto-Barajas, L.E. and Huerta, G. (2017). Spatio-temporal pareto modelling of heavy-tail data. *Spatial Statistics* **20**, 92–109.
- Nieto-Barajas, L.E. and Walker, S.G. (2002). Markov beta and gamma processes for modelling hazard rates. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **29**, 413–424.
- Plummer, M. (2018). rjags: Bayesian Graphical Models using MCMC. *R package version*, 4–8.
- Pitt, M.K., Chatfield, C. and Walker, S.G. (2002). Constructing first order stationary autoregressive models via latent processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **29**, 657–663.
- Raiffa, H. and Schlaifer, R. (1961) *Applied Statistical Decision Theory*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Spiegelhalter, D.J., Best, N.G., Carlin, B.P. and van der Linde, A. (2002). Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **64**, 583–639.

Walker, S.G. (2000). A note on the innovation distribution of a gamma distributed autoregressive process. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **27**, 575–576.




Figure 1: Graphical representation of temporal dependence of order  $q = 2$ .




Figure 2: Graphical representation of first-order spatial dependence for a five-area region.






Figure 3: Correlation function  $\text{Corr}(Y_1, Y_k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 16$  for the temporal dependence model of Figure 1. Left panel:  $n_j = 1 \forall j > 0$ ,  $n_0 = 0.01$  (solid line),  $n_0 = 0.1$  (dashed line),  $n_0 = 1$  (dotted line),  $n_0 = 10$  (dotted-dashed line);  $\mathbf{n} = \{1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 2, 2, 2, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 5, 5, 5, 1\}$  and  $n_0 = 0.5$  (long dashed line). Right panel: five simulated paths from  $n_0 \sim \text{Un}(0, 2)$ ,  $n_j \mid a, b \sim \text{Ga}(a, b)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 16$  with  $a \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$  and  $b \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ .




Figure 4: Correlation function  $\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k)$ ,  $i, k = 1, \dots, 5$  for the spatial dependence model of Figure 2.  $n_j = 1 \forall j > 0$ ,  $n_0 = 0.1$  (top left),  $n_0 = 1$  (top right),  $n_0 = 10$  (bottom left);  $\mathbf{n} = \{0.5, 0, 1, 0.1, 2\}$  and  $n_0 = 1$  (bottom right).




Figure 5: Correlation function  $\text{Corr}(Y_i, Y_k)$ ,  $i, k = 1, \dots, 5$  for the spatial dependence model of Figure 2. Four simulated scenarios from  $n_0 \sim \text{Un}(0, 2)$ ,  $n_j \mid a, b \sim \text{Ga}(a, b)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 5$  with  $a \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$  and  $b \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ .




Figure 6: Unemployment data. DIC values (top-left panel). Model fit for  $q = 0$  (top-right),  $q = 1$  (bottom-left) and  $q = 11$  (bottom-right). Original data (solid line), point predictions (thick solid line) and 95% credible intervals (dotted lines).