

bqror: An R package for Bayesian Quantile Regression in Ordinal Models

by Prajwal Maheshwari and Mohammad Arshad Rahman

Abstract This article describes an R package **bqror** that estimates Bayesian quantile regression for ordinal models introduced in [Rahman \(2016\)](#). The paper classifies ordinal models into two types and offers computationally efficient, yet simple, Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms for estimating ordinal quantile regression. The generic ordinal model with 3 or more outcomes (labeled OR_I model) is estimated by a combination of Gibbs sampling and Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Whereas an ordinal model with exactly 3 outcomes (labeled OR_{II} model) is estimated using Gibbs sampling only. In line with the Bayesian literature, we suggest using marginal likelihood for comparing alternative quantile regression models and explain how to compute the same. The models and their estimation procedures are illustrated via multiple simulation studies and implemented in two applications. The article also describes several other functions contained within the **bqror** package, which are necessary for estimation, inference, and assessing model fit.

Keywords: Asymmetric Laplace, Bayesian quantile regression, Gibbs sampling, marginal likelihood, Markov chain Monte Carlo, ordered choice model.

Introduction

Quantile regression defines the conditional quantiles of a continuous dependent variable as a function of the covariates without assuming any error distribution ([Koenker and Bassett, 1978](#)). The method is robust and offers several advantages over least squares regression such as desirable equivariance properties, invariance to monotone transformation of the dependent variable, and robustness against outliers ([Koenker, 2005](#); [Davino et al., 2014](#); [Furno and Vistocco, 2018](#)). The Bayesian approach to quantile regression was proposed by [Yu and Moyeed \(2001\)](#), where they constructed a working likelihood based on an asymmetric Laplace (AL) distribution ([Yu and Zhang, 2005](#)). The approach was further refined and simplified in [Kozumi and Kobayashi \(2011\)](#). Most statistical softwares now have built-in procedures for estimating quantile regression with continuous responses. In R software and the within the Classical approach, the package **quantreg** provides functions for estimating the conditional quantiles of linear and non-linear parametric and non-parametric models ([Koenker, 2021](#)). The R package **lqmm** considers estimation and inference of quantile mixed-effect models ([Geraci and Bottai, 2014](#); [Geraci, 2014](#)). Besides, the R package **SIQR** by [Zu and Yu \(2021\)](#) implements single-index quantile regression models via an iterative local linear approach. In comparison, the R package **bayesQR** adopts the Bayesian approach for estimating quantile regression with cross section data.

Quantile regression with discrete outcomes is more complex because quantiles of discrete data cannot be obtained through a simple inverse operation of the cumulative distribution function (*cdf*). Besides, discrete outcome (binary and ordinal) modeling requires location and scale restrictions to uniquely identify the parameters (see Section 2 for details). [Kordas \(2006\)](#) estimated quantile regression with binary outcomes using simulated annealing, while [Benoit and Van den Poel \(2010\)](#) proposed Bayesian binary quantile regression; the estimation procedure of the latter is available in the **bayesQR** package of R software ([Benoit and Van den Poel, 2017](#)). Some recent works on Bayesian quantile regression with binary longitudinal (panel) outcomes are [Rahman and Vossmeier \(2019\)](#) and [Bresson et al. \(2021\)](#). Extending the quantile framework to ordinal outcomes is more intricate than binary quantile regression due to the difficulty in satisfying the ordering of cut-points while sampling. [Rahman \(2016\)](#) introduced Bayesian quantile analysis of ordinal data and proposed two efficient MCMC algorithms. Since [Rahman \(2016\)](#), ordinal quantile regression has attracted some attention which includes [Alhamzawi \(2016\)](#), [Alhamzawi and Ali \(2018\)](#), [Ghasemzadeh et al. \(2018\)](#), [Rahman and Karnawat \(2019\)](#), [Ghasemzadeh et al. \(2020\)](#), and [Tian et al. \(2021\)](#).

Ordinal outcomes frequently occur in a wide class of applications in economics, finance, marketing, and the social sciences. Here, ordinal regression (e.g. ordinal probit, ordinal logit) is an important tool for modeling, analysis, and inference. Given the prevalence of ordinal models in applications and the recent theoretical developments surrounding ordinal quantile regression, an estimation package is essential so that applied econometricians and statisticians can benefit from a more comprehensive data analysis. The current paper fills this gap and describes the implementation of the **bqror** package (version 1.4.0) for estimating Bayesian ordinal quantile regression. The package offers two MCMC algorithms to exploit the gains in computation. Ordinal model with 3 or more outcomes and a certain identification scheme is referred to as OR_I model¹ and estimated through a combination of

¹In contrast to [Rahman \(2016\)](#), our definition of OR_I model includes an ordinal model with exactly 3 outcomes.

Gibbs sampling (Geman and Geman, 1984; Casella and George, 1992) and Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm (Chib and Greenberg, 1995). The method is implemented in the function **quantregOR1**. For ordinal models with exactly 3 outcomes, an alternative parameter identification scheme can be employed for a simpler and faster algorithm based on Gibbs sampling only. As in Rahman (2016), this is labeled as *OR_{II}* model and implemented in the function **quantregOR2**. Both functions, **quantregOR1** and **quantregOR2**, report the posterior mean, posterior standard deviation, and 95% posterior credible interval of the model parameters. To compare alternative quantile regression models, we recommend the use of marginal likelihood over the deviance information criterion (DIC) as reported in Rahman (2016). This is because the “Bayesian approach” to compare models is via the marginal likelihood (Chib, 1995; Chib and Jeliazkov, 2001). So, the **bqror** package also provides the marginal likelihood with technical details for computation described in this paper. Additionally, the package includes functions to calculate the covariate effects and example codes to produce trace plots of MCMC draws. Lastly, this paper utilizes the **bqror** package to demonstrate the estimation of quantile ordinal models on simulated data and real-life applications from Rahman (2016).

Quantile regression in ordinal models

Ordinal outcomes are common in a wide class of applications in economics, finance, marketing, social sciences, statistics in medicine, and transportation. In a typical study, the observed outcomes are ordered and categorical; so for the purpose of analysis scores/numbers are assigned to each outcome. For example, in a study on public opinion about offshore drilling (Mukherjee and Rahman, 2016), responses may be recorded as follows: 1 for ‘strongly oppose’, 2 for ‘somewhat oppose’, 3 for ‘somewhat support’, and 4 for ‘strongly support’. The numbers have an ordinal meaning but have no cardinal interpretation. We cannot interpret a score of 2 as twice the support compared to a score of 1, or the difference in support between 2 and 3 is the same as that between 3 and 4. With ordinal outcomes, the primary modeling objective is to express the probability of outcomes as a function of covariates. Ordinal models that have been extensively studied and employed in applications include the ordinal probit and ordinal logit models (Johnson and Albert, 2000; Greene and Hensher, 2010), but they only give information about the average probability of outcomes conditional on the covariates.

Quantile regression with ordinal outcomes can be estimated using the monotone equivariance property and provides information on the probability of outcomes at different quantiles. In the spirit of Albert and Chib (1993), the ordinal quantile regression model can be presented in terms of an underlying latent variable z_i as follows:

$$z_i = x_i' \beta_p + \epsilon_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where x_i' is a $1 \times k$ vector of covariates, β_p is a $k \times 1$ vector of unknown parameters at the p -th quantile, ϵ_i follows an AL distribution i.e., $\epsilon_i \sim AL(0, 1, p)$, and n denotes the number of observations. Although z_i is latent (or unobserved), it is related to the observed discrete response y_i through the following relationship,

$$\gamma_{p,j-1} < z_i \leq \gamma_{p,j} \Rightarrow y_i = j, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma_p = (\gamma_{p,0} = -\infty, \gamma_{p,1}, \dots, \gamma_{p,J-1}, \gamma_{p,J} = \infty)$ is the cut-point vector and J denotes the number of outcomes or categories. Typically, the cut-point $\gamma_{p,1}$ is fixed at 0 to anchor the location of the distribution required for parameter identification (Jeliazkov and Rahman, 2012). Given the observed data $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)'$, the likelihood function for the ordinal quantile model can be written as,

$$f(y|\Theta_p) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^J P(y_i = j|\Theta_p)^{I(y_i=j)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^J \left[F_{AL}(\gamma_{p,j} - x_i' \beta_p) - F_{AL}(\gamma_{p,j-1} - x_i' \beta_p) \right]^{I(y_i=j)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Theta_p = (\beta_p, \gamma_p)$, $F_{AL}(\cdot)$ denotes the *cdf* of an AL distribution and $I(y_i = j)$ is an indicator function, which equals 1 if $y_i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

While Bayesian quantile regression formulates a working likelihood by assuming an AL error distribution, working directly with the AL distribution is not convenient for MCMC sampling. Therefore, the latent formulation of the ordinal quantile model (equation 1) is expressed in the normal-exponential mixture form (Kozumi and Kobayashi, 2011) as follows,

$$z_i = x_i' \beta_p + \theta w_i + \tau \sqrt{w_i} u_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4)$$

This was done to address a comment from an anonymous referee that a 3 outcome ordinal model can also be estimated using a combination of Gibbs and MH algorithms. However, we recommend using the Gibbs sampling algorithm for estimating an ordinal model with exactly 3 outcomes since it is faster and more efficient.

where $\epsilon_i = \theta w_i + \tau \sqrt{w_i} u_i \sim AL(0, 1, p)$, $w_i \sim \mathcal{E}(1)$ is mutually independent of $u_i \sim N(0, 1)$, N and \mathcal{E} denotes normal and exponential distributions, respectively; $\theta = (1 - 2p)/[p(1 - p)]$ and $\tau = \sqrt{2}/[p(1 - p)]$. Based on this formulation, we can write the conditional distribution of the latent variable as $z_i | \beta_p, w_i \sim N(x'_i \beta_p + \theta w_i, \tau^2 w_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. This allows access to the properties of normal distribution which helps in constructing efficient MCMC algorithms.

OR_I model

The term ‘‘OR_I model’’ is ascribed to an ordinal model in which the number of outcomes (J) is equal to or greater than 3 (see Footnote 1), location restriction is imposed by setting $\gamma_{p,1} = 0$, and scale restriction is achieved via constant variance (See Rahman (2016); for a given value of p , variance of a standard AL distribution is constant). The location and scale restrictions are necessary to uniquely identify the parameters (see Jeliazkov et al., 2008; Jeliazkov and Rahman, 2012, for further details and a pictorial representation).

In estimation of OR_I model, we need to preserve the ordering of cut-points ($\gamma_{p,0} = -\infty < \gamma_{p,1} < \gamma_{p,2} < \dots < \gamma_{p,J-1} < \gamma_{p,J} = \infty$) during the sampling process. This is achieved by using a monotone transformation from a compact set to the real line. Many such transformations are available (e.g., log-ratios of category bin widths, arctan, arcsin), but the **bqror** package utilizes the logarithmic transformation (Albert and Chib, 2001; Jeliazkov et al., 2008; Rahman, 2016),

$$\delta_{p,j} = \ln(\gamma_{p,j} - \gamma_{p,j-1}), \quad 2 \leq j \leq J - 1. \tag{5}$$

This cut-points ($\gamma_{p,1}, \gamma_{p,2}, \dots, \gamma_{p,J-1}$) can be obtained from a one-to-one mapping to $(\delta_{p,2}, \dots, \delta_{p,J-1})$.

With all the modeling ingredients in place, we employ the Bayes’ theorem and express the joint posterior distribution as proportional to the product of the likelihood and prior distributions. As in Rahman (2016), we employ independent normal priors: $\beta_p \sim N(\beta_{p0}, B_{p0})$, $\delta_p \sim N(\delta_{p0}, D_{p0})$ in the **bqror** package. The augmented joint posterior distribution for the OR_I model can thus be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(z, \beta_p, \delta_p, w | y) &\propto f(y | z, \beta_p, \delta_p, w) \pi(z | \beta_p, w) \pi(w) \pi(\beta_p) \pi(\delta_p), \\ &\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(y_i | z_i, \delta_p) \right\} \pi(z | \beta_p, w) \pi(w) \pi(\beta_p) \pi(\delta_p), \\ &\propto \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^J 1\{\gamma_{p,j-1} < z_i < \gamma_{p,j}\} N(z_i | x'_i \beta_p + \theta w_i, \tau^2 w_i) \mathcal{E}(w_i | 1) \right\} \\ &\quad \times N(\beta_p | \beta_{p0}, B_{p0}) N(\delta_p | \delta_{p0}, D_{p0}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where in the likelihood function of the second line, we use the fact that the observed y_i is independent of (β_p, w) given (z_i, δ_p) . This follows from equation (2) which shows that y_i given (z_i, δ_p) is determined with probability 1. In the third line, we specify the conditional distribution of the latent variable and the prior distribution on the parameters.

The conditional posterior distributions are derived from the augmented joint posterior distribution (i.e. equation 6), and the parameters are sampled as per Algorithm 1. This algorithm is implemented in the **bqror** package. The parameter β_p is sampled from an updated multivariate normal distribution and the latent weight w is sampled element-wise from a generalized inverse Gaussian (GIG) distribution. The cut-point vector δ_p is sampled marginally of (z, w) using a random-walk MH algorithm. Lastly, the latent variable z is sampled element-wise from a truncated normal (TN) distribution.

Algorithm 1: Sampling in OR_I model.

-
- Sample $\beta_p | z, w \sim N(\tilde{\beta}_p, \tilde{B}_p)$, where,

$$\tilde{B}_p^{-1} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i x'_i}{\tau^2 w_i} + B_{p0}^{-1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_p = \tilde{B}_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i (z_i - \theta w_i)}{\tau^2 w_i} + B_{p0}^{-1} \beta_{p0} \right).$$
 - Sample $w_i | \beta_p, z_i \sim GIG(0.5, \tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\eta})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i = \left(\frac{z_i - x'_i \beta_p}{\tau} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\eta} = \left(\frac{\theta^2}{\tau^2} + 2 \right).$$
 - Sample $\delta_p | y, \beta$ marginally of w (latent weight) and z (latent data), by generating δ'_p using a random-walk chain $\delta'_p = \delta_p + u$, where $u \sim N(0_{J-2}, \iota^2 \hat{D})$, ι is a tuning parameter and \hat{D} denotes negative inverse Hessian, obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood with respect to δ_p . Given

the current value of δ_p and the proposed draw δ'_p , return δ'_p with probability,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p, \delta'_p) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{f(y|\beta_p, \delta'_p) \pi(\beta_p, \delta'_p)}{f(y|\beta_p, \delta_p) \pi(\beta_p, \delta_p)} \right\};$$

otherwise repeat the old value δ_p . The variance of u may be tuned as needed for appropriate step size and acceptance rate.

- Sample $z_i|y, \beta_p, \gamma_p, w \sim TN_{(\gamma_{p,j-1}, \gamma_{p,j})}(x'_i\beta_p + \theta w_i, \tau^2 w_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where TN denotes a truncated normal distribution and γ_p is obtained via δ_p using equation (5).

OR_{II} model

The term ‘‘OR_{II} model’’ is used for an ordinal model with exactly 3 outcomes (i.e., $J = 3$) where both location and scale restrictions are imposed by fixing cut-points. Since there are only 2 cut-points and both are fixed at some values, the scale of the distribution needs to be free. Therefore, a scale parameter σ_p is introduced and the quantile ordinal model rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i &= x'_i\beta_p + \sigma_p\epsilon_i = x'_i\beta_p + \sigma_p\theta w_i + \sigma_p\tau\sqrt{w_i}u_i, & \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \gamma_{j-1} < z_i \leq \gamma_j &\Rightarrow y_i = j, & \forall i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, 2, 3, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\sigma_p\epsilon_i \sim AL(0, \sigma_p, p)$, (γ_1, γ_2) are fixed, and recall $\gamma_0 = -\infty$ and $\gamma_3 = \infty$. In this formulation, the conditional mean of z_i is dependent on σ_p which is problematic for Gibbs sampling. So, we define a new variable $v_i = \sigma_p w_i$ and rewrite the model in terms of v_i . In this representation, $z_i|\beta_p, \sigma_p, v_i \sim N(x'_i\beta_p + \theta v_i, \tau^2\sigma_p v_i)$, the conditional mean is free of σ_p and the model is conducive to Gibbs sampling.

The next step is to specify the prior distributions required for Bayesian inference. We follow [Rahman \(2016\)](#) and assume $\beta_p \sim N(\beta_{p0}, B_{p0})$, $\sigma_p \sim IG(n_0/2, d_0/2)$, and $v_i \sim \mathcal{E}(\sigma_p)$; where IG stands for inverse-gamma distribution. These are the default prior distributions in the **bqror** package. Employing the Bayes’ theorem, the augmented joint posterior distribution can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(z, \beta_p, v, \sigma_p|y) &\propto f(y|z, \beta_p, v, \sigma_p) \pi(z|\beta_p, v, \sigma_p) \pi(v|\sigma_p) \pi(\beta_p) \pi(\sigma_p), \\ &\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(y_i|z_i, \sigma_p) \right\} \pi(z|\beta_p, v, \sigma_p) \pi(v|\sigma_p) \pi(\beta_p) \pi(\sigma_p), \\ &\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^3 1(\gamma_{j-1} < z_i < \gamma_j) N(z_i|x'_i\beta_p + \theta v_i, \tau^2\sigma_p v_i) \mathcal{E}(v_i|\sigma_p) \right\} \\ &\quad \times N(\beta_p|\beta_{p0}, B_{p0}) IG(\sigma_p|n_0/2, d_0/2), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the derivations in each step are analogous to those for the OR_I model.

The augmented joint posterior distribution (i.e., equation 8) can be utilized to derive the conditional posterior distributions and the parameters are sampled as presented in Algorithm 2. This involves sampling β_p from an updated multivariate normal distribution and sampling σ_p from an updated IG distribution. The latent weight v is sampled element-wise from a GIG distribution and similarly, the latent variable z is sampled element-wise from a truncated normal distribution.

Algorithm 2: Sampling in OR_{II} model.

- Sample $\beta_p|z, \sigma_p, v \sim N(\tilde{\beta}_p, \tilde{B}_p)$, where,

$$\tilde{B}_p^{-1} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i x'_i}{\tau^2 \sigma_p v_i} + B_{p0}^{-1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_p = \tilde{B}_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(z_i - \theta v_i)}{\tau^2 \sigma_p v_i} + B_{p0}^{-1} \beta_{p0} \right).$$

- Sample $\sigma_p|z, \beta_p, v \sim IG(\tilde{n}/2, \tilde{d}/2)$, where,

$$\tilde{n} = (n_0 + 3n) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{d} = \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - x'_i\beta_p - \theta v_i)^2 / \tau^2 v_i + d_0 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n v_i.$$

- Sample $v_i|z_i, \beta_p, \sigma_p \sim GIG(0.5, \tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\eta})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i = \frac{(z_i - x'_i\beta_p)^2}{\tau^2 \sigma_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\eta} = \left(\frac{\theta^2}{\tau^2 \sigma_p} + \frac{2}{\sigma_p} \right).$$

- Sample $z_i|y, \beta_p, \sigma_p, v_i \sim TN_{(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j)}(x'_i\beta_p + \theta v_i, \tau^2\sigma_p v_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Marginal likelihood

The article by [Rahman \(2016\)](#) employed DIC ([Spiegelhalter et al., 2002](#); [Gelman et al., 2013](#)) for model comparison. However, in the Bayesian framework, alternative models are typically compared using marginal likelihood or Bayes factor ([Poirier, 1995](#); [Greenberg, 2012](#)). Therefore, we prefer using marginal likelihood (or Bayes factor) for comparing two or more regression models at a given quantile.

Consider a model \mathcal{M}_s with parameter vector Θ_s . Let $f(y|\mathcal{M}_s, \Theta_s)$ be its sampling density, and $\pi(\Theta_s|\mathcal{M}_s)$ be the prior distribution; where $s = 1, \dots, S$. Then, the marginal likelihood for the model \mathcal{M}_s is given by the expression, $m(y) = \int f(y|\Theta_s)\pi(\Theta_s) d\Theta_s$, where for notational simplicity we have suppressed the conditioning on \mathcal{M}_s . The Bayes factor is the ratio of marginal likelihoods. So, for any two models \mathcal{M}_q versus \mathcal{M}_r , the Bayes factor, $B_{qr} = \frac{m(y|\mathcal{M}_q)}{m(y|\mathcal{M}_r)} = \frac{\int f(y|\mathcal{M}_q, \Theta_q)\pi(\Theta_q|\mathcal{M}_q) d\Theta_q}{\int f(y|\mathcal{M}_r, \Theta_r)\pi(\Theta_r|\mathcal{M}_r) d\Theta_r}$, can be easily computed once we have the marginal likelihoods.

[Chib \(1995\)](#) and later [Chib and Jeliazkov \(2001\)](#) showed that a simple and stable estimate of marginal likelihood can be obtained from the MCMC outputs. The approach is based on the recognition that the marginal likelihood can be written as the product of likelihood function and prior density over the posterior density. So, the marginal likelihood $m(y|\mathcal{M}_s)$ for model \mathcal{M}_s is expressed as,

$$m(y|\mathcal{M}_s) = \frac{f(y|\mathcal{M}_s, \Theta_s)\pi(\Theta_s|\mathcal{M}_s)}{\pi(\Theta_s|\mathcal{M}_s, y)}. \tag{9}$$

[Chib \(1995\)](#) refers to equation (9) as the *basic marginal likelihood identity* since it holds for all values in the parameter space, but typically computed at a high density point (e.g., mean, mode) denoted Θ^* to minimize estimation variability. The likelihood ordinate $f(y|\mathcal{M}_s, \Theta^*)$ is directly available from the model and the prior density $\pi(\Theta^*|\mathcal{M}_s)$ is assumed by the researcher. The novel part is the computation of posterior ordinate $\pi(\Theta^*|y)$, which is estimated using the MCMC outputs obtained from conditional posterior densities. Since marginal likelihood is often a large number, it is convenient to express it on the logarithmic scale. An estimate of the logarithm of marginal likelihood is given by,

$$\ln \hat{m}(y) = \ln f(y|\Theta^*) + \ln \pi(\Theta^*) - \ln \hat{\pi}(\Theta^*|y), \tag{10}$$

where, once again, we have dropped the conditioning on \mathcal{M}_s . The following two subsections explain the computation of the marginal likelihood for the OR_I and OR_{II} quantile regression models.

Marginal likelihood for OR_I model

We know from Section 2.1 that the MCMC algorithm for estimating the OR_I model is defined by the following conditional posterior densities: $\pi(\beta_p|z, w)$, $\pi(\delta_p|\beta_p, y)$, $\pi(w|\beta_p, z)$, and $\pi(z|\beta_p, \delta_p, w, y)$. The conditional posteriors for β_p , w , and z have a known form, but that of δ_p is not tractable and is sampled using an MH algorithm. Consequently, we adopt the approach of [Chib and Jeliazkov \(2001\)](#) to calculate the marginal likelihood for the OR_I model.

To simplify the computational process (specifically, to keep the computation over a reasonable dimension), we estimate the marginal likelihood marginally of the latent variables (w, z) . Moreover, we decompose the posterior ordinate as,

$$\pi(\beta_p^*, \delta_p^*|y) = \pi(\delta_p^*|y)\pi(\beta_p^*|\delta_p^*, y),$$

where $\Theta^* = (\beta_p^*, \delta_p^*)$ denotes a high density point. By placing the intractable posterior ordinate first, we avoid the MH step in the *reduced run* – the process of running an MCMC sampler with one or more parameters fixed at some value – of the MCMC sampler. We first estimate $\pi(\delta_p^*|y)$ and then the reduced conditional posterior ordinate $\pi(\beta_p^*|\delta_p^*, y)$.

To obtain an estimate of $\pi(\delta_p^*|y)$, we need to express it in a computationally convenient form. The parameter δ_p is sampled using an MH step, which requires specifying a proposal density. Let $q(\delta_p, \delta'_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)$ denote the proposal density for the transition from δ_p to δ'_p , and let,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p, \delta'_p) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{f(y|\beta_p, \delta'_p)\pi(\beta_p)\pi(\delta'_p)}{f(y|\beta_p, \delta_p)\pi(\beta_p)\pi(\delta_p)} \times \frac{q(\delta'_p, \delta_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)}{q(\delta_p, \delta'_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)} \right\}, \tag{11}$$

denote the probability of making the move. In the context of the model, $f(y|\beta_p, \delta_p)$ is the likelihood given by equation (3), $\pi(\beta_p)$ and $\pi(\delta_p)$ are normal prior distributions (i.e., $\beta_p \sim N(\beta_{p0}, B_{p0})$ and $\delta_p \sim N(\delta_{p0}, D_{p0})$ as specified in Section 2.1), and the proposal density $q(\delta_p, \delta'_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)$ is normal given by $f_N(\delta'_p|\delta_p, \hat{\sigma}^2 \hat{D})$ (see Algorithm 1 in Section 2.1). There are two points to be noted about the proposal density. First, the conditioning on (β_p, w, z, y) is only for generality and not necessary as

illustrated by the use of a random-walk proposal density. Second, since our MCMC sampler utilizes a random-walk proposal density, the second ratio on the right hand side of equation (11) reduces to 1.

We closely follow the derivation in [Chib and Jeliazkov \(2001\)](#) and arrive at the following expression of the posterior ordinate,

$$\pi(\delta_p^*|y) = \frac{E_1\{\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p, \delta_p^*|\beta_p, w, z, y) q(\delta_p, \delta_p^*|\beta_p, w, z, y)\}}{E_2\{\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p^*, \delta_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)\}}, \quad (12)$$

where E_1 represents expectation with respect to the distribution $\pi(\beta_p, \delta_p, w, z|y)$ and E_2 represents expectation with respect to the distribution $\pi(\beta_p, w, z|\delta_p^*, y) \times q(\delta_p^*, \delta_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)$. The quantities in equation (12) can be estimated using MCMC technique. To estimate the numerator, we take the draws $\{\beta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^{(m)}, w^{(m)}, z^{(m)}\}_{m=1}^M$ from the *complete MCMC run* and take an average of the quantity $\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p, \delta_p^*|\beta_p, w, z, y) q(\delta_p, \delta_p^*|\beta_p, w, z, y)$, where $\alpha_{MH}(\cdot)$ is given by equation (11) with δ'_p replaced by δ_p^* , and $q(\delta_p, \delta_p^*|\beta_p, w, z, y)$ is given by the normal density $f_N(\delta_p^*|\delta_p, t^2\hat{D})$.

The estimation of the quantity in the denominator is tricky! This requires generating an additional sample (say of H iterations) from the reduced conditional densities: $\pi(\beta_p|w, z)$, $\pi(w|\beta_p, z)$, and $\pi(z|\beta_p, \delta_p^*, w, y)$, where note that δ_p is fixed at δ_p^* in the MCMC sampling, and thus corresponds to a *reduced run*. Moreover, at each iteration, we generate

$$\delta_p^{(h)} \sim q(\delta_p^*, \delta_p|\beta_p^{(h)}, w^{(h)}, z^{(h)}, y) \equiv f_N(\delta_p|\delta_p^*, t^2\hat{D}).$$

The resulting quadruplet of draws $\{\beta_p^{(h)}, \delta_p^{(h)}, w^{(h)}, z^{(h)}\}$, as required, is a sample from the distribution $\pi(\beta_p, w, z|\delta_p^*, y) \times q(\delta_p^*, \delta_p|\beta_p, w, z, y)$. With the numerator and denominator now available, the posterior ordinate $\pi(\delta_p^*|y)$ is estimated as,

$$\hat{\pi}(\delta_p^*|y) = \frac{M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \{\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^*|\beta_p^{(m)}, w^{(m)}, z^{(m)}, y) q(\delta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^*|\beta_p^{(m)}, w^{(m)}, z^{(m)}, y)\}}{H^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^H \{\alpha_{MH}(\delta_p^*, \delta_p^{(h)}|\beta_p^{(h)}, w^{(h)}, z^{(h)}, y)\}}. \quad (13)$$

The computation of the posterior ordinate $\pi(\beta_p^*|\delta_p^*, y)$ is trivial. We have the sample of H draws $\{w^{(h)}, z^{(h)}\}$ from the reduced run, which are marginally of β_p from the distribution $\pi(w, z|\delta_p^*, y)$. These draws are utilized to estimate the posterior ordinate as,

$$\hat{\pi}(\beta_p^*|\delta_p^*, y) = H^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^H \pi(\beta_p^*|\delta_p^*, w^{(h)}, z^{(h)}, y). \quad (14)$$

Substituting the two density estimates given by equations (13) and (14) into equation (10), an estimate of the logarithm of marginal likelihood for OR_I model is obtained as,

$$\ln \hat{m}(y) = \ln f(y|\beta_p^*, \delta_p^*) + \ln \left[\pi(\beta_p^*) \pi(\delta_p^*) \right] - \ln \left[\hat{\pi}(\beta_p^*|y) \hat{\pi}(\delta_p^*|\beta_p^*, y) \right], \quad (15)$$

where the likelihood $f(y|\beta_p^*, \delta_p^*)$ (see equation 3) and prior densities are evaluated at $\Theta^* = (\beta_p^*, \delta_p^*)$.

Marginal likelihood for OR_{II} model

We know from Section 2.2 that the OR_{II} model is estimated by Gibbs sampling and hence we follow [Chib \(1995\)](#) to compute the marginal likelihood. The Gibbs sampler consists of four conditional posterior densities given by $\pi(\beta_p|\sigma_p, \nu, z)$, $\pi(\sigma_p|\beta_p, \nu, z)$, $\pi(\nu|\beta_p, \sigma_p, z)$, and $\pi(z|\beta_p, \sigma_p, \nu, y)$. However, the variables (ν, z) are latent. So, we integrate them out and write the posterior ordinate as $\pi(\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*|y) = \pi(\beta_p^*|y) \pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y)$, where the terms on the right hand side can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\beta_p^*|y) &= \int \pi(\beta_p^*|\sigma_p, \nu, z, y) \pi(\sigma_p, \nu, z|y) d\sigma_p d\nu dz, \\ \pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y) &= \int \pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, \nu, z, y) \pi(\nu, z|\beta_p^*, y) d\nu dz, \end{aligned}$$

and $\Theta^* = (\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*)$ denotes a high density point, such as the mean or median.

The posterior ordinate $\pi(\beta_p^*|y)$ can be estimated as the ergodic average of the conditional posterior density with the posterior draws of (σ_p, ν, z) . Therefore, $\pi(\beta_p^*|y)$ is estimated as,

$$\hat{\pi}(\beta_p^*|y) = G^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^G \pi(\beta_p^*|\sigma_p^{(g)}, \nu^{(g)}, z^{(g)}, y). \quad (16)$$

The term $\pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y)$ is a reduced conditional density ordinate and can be estimated with the help of a *reduced run*. So, we generate an additional sample (say another G iterations) of $\{v^{(g)}, z^{(g)}\}$ from $\pi(v, z|\beta_p^*, y)$ by successively sampling from $\pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, v, z)$, $\pi(v|\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*, z)$, and $\pi(z|\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*, v, y)$, where note that β_p is fixed at β_p^* in each conditional density. Next, we use the draws $\{v^{(g)}, z^{(g)}\}$ to compute,

$$\hat{\pi}(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y) = G^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^G \pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, v^{(g)}, z^{(g)}, y). \quad (17)$$

which is a simulation consistent estimate of $\pi(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y)$.

Substituting the two density estimates (equations 16 and 17) into equation (10), we obtain an estimate of the logarithm of marginal likelihood,

$$\ln \hat{m}(y) = \ln f(y|\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*) + \ln [\pi(\beta_p^*)\pi(\sigma_p^*)] - \ln [\hat{\pi}(\beta_p^*|y) \hat{\pi}(\sigma_p^*|\beta_p^*, y)], \quad (18)$$

where the likelihood function and prior densities are evaluated at $\Theta^* = (\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*)$. Here, the likelihood function has the expression,

$$f(y|\beta_p^*, \sigma_p^*) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^3 \left[F_{AL} \left(\frac{\gamma_j - x_i' \beta_p^*}{\sigma_p^*} \right) - F_{AL} \left(\frac{\gamma_{j-1} - x_i' \beta_p^*}{\sigma_p^*} \right) \right]^{I(y_i=j)},$$

where the cut-points γ are known and fixed for identification reasons as explained in Section 2.2.

Simulation studies

This section explains the data generating process for simulation studies, the functions offered in the R package **bqror**, and how to use these functions for estimation of ordinal quantile models on the simulated data.

OR_J model: data, functions, and estimation

Data Generation: The simulated data for estimation of OR_J model is generated from the regression model: $z_i = x_i' \beta + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta = (-4, 5, 6)$, $(x_2, x_3) \sim U(0, 1)$, and $\epsilon_i \sim AL(0, \sigma = 1, p)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here, U and AL denote a uniform and an asymmetric Laplace distributions, respectively. The z values are continuous and are classified into 4 categories based on the cut-points $(0, 2, 4)$ to generate ordinal discrete values of y , the outcome variable. We follow the above procedure to generate 3 data sets each with 500 observations (i.e., $n = 500$). The 3 data sets correspond to the quantile p equaling 0.25, 0.50, and 0.75, and are stored as `data25j4`, `data50j4`, and `data75j4`, respectively. Note that the last two letters in the name of the data (i.e., `j4`) denote the number of unique outcomes in the y variable.

Functions and Estimation: We now describe the major functions for Bayesian quantile estimation of OR_J model, demonstrate their usage, and note the inputs and outputs of each function.

quantregOR1

The function **quantregOR1** is the primary function for estimating Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal models with 3 or more outcomes (i.e., OR_J model) and implements Algorithm 1. In the code snippet below, we first read the data and then do the following: define the ordinal response variable (y) and covariates (x), specify the number of covariates (k) and number of outcomes (J), and set the prior means and covariances for β_p and δ_p . We then call the **quantregOR1** function and specify the following inputs: ordinal outcome variable (y), covariate matrix including a column of ones (`xMat`), prior mean (`b0`) and prior covariance matrix (`B0`) for the regression coefficients, prior mean (`d0`) and prior covariance matrix (`D0`) for the transformed cut-points, burn-in size (`burn`), post burn-in size (`mcmc`), quantile (`p`), and the tuning factor (`tune`) to adjust MH acceptance rate. The last input `verbose`, when set to `(FALSE) TRUE` will (not) print the outputs.

In the code below, we use a sufficiently diffuse normal prior $\beta_p \sim N(0_k, 10 * I_k)$ where 0_k is a zero vector and I_k is an identity matrix of dimension $k \times k$. The prior distribution can be further diffused (i.e., less informative) by increasing 10 to say 100. Besides, the prior variance for δ_p needs to be small, such as $0.25 * I_{J-2}$ since the distribution is on the transformed cut-points. If there is a need for prior elicitation, one approach is to estimate the model on a training sample and then use the results to design prior distributions (See Greenberg, 2012, for examples).

```
R> library('bqror')
R> data("data25j4")
```

```
R> y <- data25j4$y
R> xMat <- data25j4$x
R> k <- dim(xMat)[2]
R> J <- dim(as.array(unique(y)))[1]
R> b0 <- array(rep(0, k), dim = c(k, 1))
R> B0 <- 10*diag(k)
R> d0 <- array(0, dim = c(J-2, 1))
R> D0 <- 0.25*diag(J - 2)
R> modelORI <- quantregOR1(y = y, x = xMat, b0, B0, d0, D0,
+                          burn = 1125, mcmc = 4500, p = 0.25, tune = 1,
+                          verbose = TRUE)
```

```
[1] Number of burn-in draws: 1125
[1] Number of retained draws: 4500
[1] Summary of MCMC draws:
```

	Post Mean	Post Std	Upper Credible	Lower Credible
beta_1	-3.7244	0.4249	-2.9322	-4.6169
beta_2	4.9349	0.5368	6.0444	3.9346
beta_3	6.1428	0.5858	7.2996	5.0465
delta_1	0.7326	0.1090	0.9380	0.5086
delta_2	0.7632	0.0888	0.9363	0.5795

```
[1] MH acceptance rate: 32.16%
[1] Log of Marginal Likelihood: -545.5
[1] DIC: 1080.16
```

The output summarizes the MCMC draws through the posterior mean, posterior standard deviation, and 95% posterior credible (or probability) interval for the quantile regression coefficients β and transformed cut-points δ . The output also displays the MH acceptance rate for δ (preferred acceptance rate is around 30 percent), the logarithm of marginal likelihood, and the DIC. For two competing models at the same quantile, the model with a higher (lower) log marginal likelihood (DIC) provides a better model fit. Besides, after estimation, one may also use the command `modelORI$summary` to extract and print the summary output.

covEffectOR1

The function `covEffectOR1` computes the average covariate effect, marginally of the parameters and the remaining covariates, for different outcomes of OR_l model at specified quantiles. While a demonstration of this function is best understood in a real-life study and is presented in the application section, here we present the mechanics behind the computation of average covariate effect.

Suppose, we want to compute the average covariate effect when the l -th covariate $\{x_{i,l}\}$ is set to the values a and b , denoted as $\{x_{i,l}^a\}$ and $\{x_{i,l}^b\}$, respectively. We split the covariate and parameter vectors as follows: $x_i^a = (x_{i,l}^a, x_{i,-l})$, $x_i^b = (x_{i,l}^b, x_{i,-l})$, and $\beta = (\beta_{p,l}, \beta_{p,-l})$, where $-l$ in the subscript denotes all covariates (parameters) except the l -th covariate (parameter). We are interested in the distribution of the difference $\{\Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^b) - \Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^a)\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq J$, marginalized over $\{x_{i,-l}\}$ and (β_p, δ_p) , given the data $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)'$. We marginalize the covariates using their empirical distribution and integrate the parameters based on the posterior distributions.

To obtain draws from the distribution $\{\Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^b) - \Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^a)\}$, we use the method of composition (See [Chib and Jeliazkov, 2006](#); [Jeliazkov et al., 2008](#); [Rahman and Vossmeier, 2019](#); [Bresson et al., 2021](#), for additional details). In this process, we randomly select an individual, extract the corresponding sequence of covariate values, draw a value (β_p, δ_p) from their posterior distributions, and finally evaluate $\{\Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^b, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p, \delta_p) - \Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^a, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p, \delta_p)\}$, where

$$\Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,l}^q, \beta_p, \delta_p) = F_{AL}(\gamma_{p,j} - x_{i,l}^q \beta_{p,l} - x'_{i,-l} \beta_{p,-l}) - F_{AL}(\gamma_{p,j-1} - x_{i,l}^q \beta_{p,l} - x'_{i,-l} \beta_{p,-l}),$$

for $q = b, a$ and $1 \leq j \leq J$. This process is repeated for all remaining individuals and other MCMC draws from the posterior distribution. Finally, the average covariate effect (ACE) for outcome j ($1 \leq j \leq J$) is calculated as the mean of the difference in pointwise probabilities,

$$ACE_{y=j} \approx \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,j}^b, x_{i,-j}, \beta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^{(m)}) - \Pr(y_i = j | x_{i,j}^a, x_{i,-j}, \beta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^{(m)}) \right], \quad (19)$$

where $(\beta_p^{(m)}, \delta_p^{(m)})$ is an MCMC draw of (β_p, δ_p) , M is the number of post burn-in MCMC draws.

logMargLikeOR1

The logarithm of marginal likelihood for OR_I model is computed using MCMC outputs from the complete and reduced runs as explained in Section 3. It is reported as a part of the model output, but can also be obtained by calling the model output as shown below. In addition, the package provides `logLik.bqrorOR1`, an extractor function for displaying the log of marginal likelihood for OR_I models. This function is built over the generic function `logLik` of **stats**.

```
R> modelORI$logMargLike
```

```
[1] -545.56
```

devianceOR1

The function **devianceOR1** computes the DIC, the effective number of parameters denoted p_D , and the deviance (at the posterior mean) for Bayesian quantile regression in OR_I model. Additional details on the three quantities can be found in [Gelman et al. \(2013\)](#).

As shown in the code below, the function requires the following inputs: observed ordinal outcomes (y), covariate matrix including a column of ones ($xMat$), MCMC draws of β_p (`betadraws`) and δ_p (`deltadraws`), posterior means of β_p (`postMeanbeta`) and δ_p (`postMeandelta`), burn-in size (`burn`), post burn-in size (`mcmc`), and the quantile (p).

```
R> data("data25j4")
R> y <- data25j4$y
R> xMat <- data25j4$x
R> p <- 0.25
R> mcmc <- 4500
R> burn <- 0.25*mcmc
R> nsim <- burn + mcmc
R> deltaxdraws <- modelORI$deltadraws
R> betadraws <- modelORI$betadraws
R> postMeanbeta <- modelORI$postMeanbeta
R> postMeandelta <- modelORI$postMeandelta
R> allQuantDIC <- devianceOR1(y, xMat, betadraws, deltaxdraws,
+                             postMeanbeta, postMeandelta, burn, mcmc, p)
R> allQuantDIC$DIC
```

```
[1] 1080.159
```

```
R> allQuantDIC$pd
```

```
[1] 9.5463
```

```
R> allQuantDIC$devpostmean
```

```
[1] 1061.066
```

qrnegLogLikensumOR1

The function **qrnegLogLikensumOR1**, as shown in the code below, requires the following inputs: ordinal outcome variable (y), covariate matrix including a column of ones ($xMat$), a single draw of β_p (`betaOne`) and δ_p (`deltaOne`), and the quantile (p). The outputs from this function are negative of the log-likelihood for each individual and negative of the sum log-likelihood. The latter when evaluated at `postMeanbeta` and `postMeandelta` is used to calculate DIC and may also be utilized to calculate the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC).

```
R> data("data25j4")
R> y <- data25j4$y
R> xMat <- data25j4$x
R> p <- 0.25
R> betaOne <- c(0.3990094, 0.8168991, 2.8034963)
R> deltaOne <- c(-0.002570995, 1.044481071)
R> output <- qrnegLogLikensumOR1(y, xMat, betaOne, deltaOne, p)
R> output$negsumlogl
```

[1] 663.5475

infactorOR1

The function **infactorOR1** utilizes the batch-means method to compute the inefficiency factor of (β_p, δ_p) based on the MCMC samples (Greenberg, 2012). Inefficiency factor measures the efficiency of MCMC algorithm and indicates the cost of working with correlated samples. For example, an inefficiency factor of 3 implies that it takes 3 correlated draws to get one independent draw. As such, low inefficiency factor indicates better mixing and a more efficient MCMC algorithm.

The code below displays the usage of the function. The inputs are covariate matrix including a column of ones (xMat), MCMC draws of β_p (betadraws) and δ_p (deltadraws), cut-off value (typical values used are 0.05 or 0.10) to determine the lag length and form batches, and the verbose option, which prints the output when set to TRUE (else set to FALSE). Note that if xMat contains names of covariates, then they appear in the summary output; else the summary displays the parameters with numbers in the subscript (such as below).

```
R> betadraws <- modelORI$betadraws
R> deltdraws <- modelORI$deltadraws
R> inefficiency <- infactorOR1(xMat, betadraws, deltdraws, 0.3,
  verbose=TRUE)
```

[1] Summary of Inefficiency Factor:

	Inefficiency
beta_1	2.8711
beta_2	2.9982
beta_3	3.7465
delta_1	5.0465
delta_2	2.5527

trace plots

Trace plots are useful for assessing the convergence of MCMC draws. The codes below illustrate how to obtain the trace plots of MCMC draws for (β_p, δ_p) .

```
R> mcmc <- 4500
R> burn <- round(0.25*mcmc)
R> nsim <- mcmc + burn
R> par(mar = c(2,5,2,5), mfrow = c(3,2))
R> layout(matrix(c(1,2,3,4,5,6), nrow = 3,ncol = 2, byrow = TRUE),
  +         widths=c(10,10,10), heights=c(10,10,10,10,10))
R> plot(modelORI$betadraws[1,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
  +     xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[1])))
R> plot(modelORI$betadraws[2,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
  +     xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[2])))
R> plot(modelORI$betadraws[3,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
  +     xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[3])))
R> plot(modelORI$deltadraws[1,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
  +     xlab = '', main = expression(paste(delta[1])))
R> plot(modelORI$deltadraws[2,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
  +     xlab = '', main = expression(paste(delta[2])))
```

OR_{II} model: data, functions, and estimation

Data Generation: The data generation process for the OR_{II} model closely resembles that of OR_I model. In particular, 500 observations are generated for each value of p from the regression model: $z_i = x_i' \beta + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta = (-4, 6, 5)$, $(x_2, x_3) \sim U(0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_i \sim AL(0, \sigma = 1, p)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. The continuous values of z are classified based on the cut-points (0, 3) to generate 3 discrete values for y , the outcome variable. Once again, we choose p equal to 0.25, 0.50, and 0.75 to generate three samples from the model, which are referred to as data25j3, data50j3, and data75j3, respectively. The last two letters in the names of the data (i.e., j3) denote the number of unique outcomes in the y variable.

quantregOR2

The function **quantregOR2** implements Algorithm 2 and is the main function and for estimating Bayesian quantile regression in OR_{II} model i.e., an ordinal model with exactly 3 outcomes.

In the code snippet below, we first read the data, define the required quantities, and then call the **quantregOR2** for estimating the quantile model. The inputs to the function are as follows: the ordinal outcome variable (y), covariate matrix including a column of ones ($xMat$), prior mean ($b0$) and prior covariance matrix ($B0$) for β_p , prior shape ($n0$) and scale ($d0$) parameters for σ_p , second cut-point ($\gamma2$), burn-in size ($burn$), post burn-in size ($mcmc$), quantile (p), and the verbose option which when set to (**FALSE**) **TRUE** will (not) print the outputs. Once again, in the code below, we use relatively diffuse prior distributions on (β_p, σ_p) to allow the data to speak for itself.

```
R> library('bqror')
R> data("data25j3")
R> y <- data25j3$y
R> xMat <- data25j3$x
R> k <- dim(xMat)[2]
R> b0 <- array(rep(0, k), dim = c(k, 1))
R> B0 <- 10*diag(k)
R> n0 <- 5
R> d0 <- 8
R> modelORII <- quantregOR2(y = y, x = xMat, b0, B0, n0,
+                           d0, gamma2 = 3, burn = 1125, mcmc = 4500,
+                           p = 0.25, verbose = TRUE)
```

```
[1] Number of burn-in draws: 1125
[1] Number of retained draws: 4500
[1] Summary of MCMC draws:
```

	Post Mean	Post Std	Upper Credible	Lower Credible
beta_1	-3.9418	0.4690	-3.1029	-4.9207
beta_2	5.8494	0.5150	6.8679	4.8611
beta_3	4.7777	0.5359	5.9270	3.7950
sigma	0.8977	0.0761	1.0551	0.7576

```
[1] Log of Marginal Likelihood: -404.57
[1] DIC: 790.41
```

The summary output, as displayed above, are the posterior mean, posterior standard deviation, and 95% posterior credible (or probability) interval for (β_p, σ_p) . The output also exhibits the logarithm of marginal likelihood and the DIC. After estimation, one may also use the command `modelORII$summary` to extract and print the summary output.

covEffectOR2

The function **covEffectOR2** computes the average covariate effect, marginally of the parameters and remaining covariates, for the 3 outcomes of OR_{II} model at the specified quantiles. Its usage is demonstrated in the application section; however, below we explain the process for computing the average covariate effect. The underlying principle is identical to that of OR_I model.

Suppose, we are interested in computing the average covariate effect for the l -th covariate $\{x_{i,l}\}$ for two different values a and b , and split the covariate and parameter vectors as: $x_i^a = (x_{i,l}^a, x_{i,-l})$, $x_i^b = (x_{i,l}^b, x_{i,-l})$, $\beta = (\beta_{p,l}, \beta_{p,-l})$. We are interested in the distribution of the difference $\{\Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^b) - \Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^a)\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq J = 3$, marginalized over $\{x_{i,-l}\}$ and (β_p, σ_p) , given the data $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)'$. We again employ the method of composition i.e., randomly select an individual, extract the corresponding sequence of covariate values, draw a value (β_p, σ_p) from their posterior distributions, and lastly evaluate $\{\Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^b, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p, \sigma_p) - \Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^a, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p, \sigma_p)\}$, where

$$\Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^a, \beta_p, \sigma_p) = F_{AL} \left(\frac{\gamma_{p,j} - x_{i,l}^a \beta_{p,l} - x'_{i,-l} \beta_{p,-l}}{\sigma_p} \right) - F_{AL} \left(\frac{\gamma_{p,j-1} - x_{i,l}^a \beta_{p,l} - x'_{i,-l} \beta_{p,-l}}{\sigma_p} \right)$$

for $q = b, a$, and $1 \leq j \leq J = 3$. This process is repeated for other individuals and remaining Gibbs draws to compute the ACE for outcome $j = 1, 2, 3$ as below,

$$ACE_{y=j} \approx \frac{1}{G} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^b, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p^{(g)}, \sigma_p^{(g)}) - \Pr(y_i = j|x_{i,l}^a, x_{i,-l}, \beta_p^{(g)}, \sigma_p^{(g)}) \right], \quad (20)$$

where $(\beta_p^{(g)}, \sigma_p^{(g)})$ is a Gibbs draw of (β_p, σ_p) and G is the number of post burn-in Gibbs draws.

logMargLikeOR2

The logarithm of marginal likelihood for OR_{II} model is computed using Gibbs outputs from the complete and reduced runs as explained in Section 3. It is reported as a part of the model output, but can also be obtained by calling the model output as shown below. For two or more models at the same quantile, the model with a higher log marginal likelihood indicates a better model fit.

```
R> modelORII$logMargLike
```

```
[1] -404.57
```

devianceOR2

The function **devianceOR2** computes the DIC, the effective number of parameters denoted p_D , and the deviance (at the posterior mean) for Bayesian quantile regression in OR_{II} model. Additional details on the three quantities can be found in [Gelman et al. \(2013\)](#).

The code below shows the implementation and inputs to the function which are as follows: observed ordinal outcomes (y), covariate matrix including a column ones ($xMat$), Gibbs draws of β_p ($betadraws$), Gibbs draws of σ_p ($sigmadraws$), cut-point vector ($gammaCp$) including $(-\infty, \infty)$, posterior mean of β_p ($postMeanbeta$) and σ_p ($postMeansigma$), burn-in size ($burn$), post burn-in size ($mcmc$), and quantile (p).

```
R> library('bqror')
R> data("data25j3")
R> y <- data25j3$y
R> xMat <- data25j3$x
R> p <- 0.25
R> betadraws <- modelORII$betadraws
R> sigmadraws <- modelORII$sigmadraws
R> gammaCp <- c(-Inf, 0, 3, Inf)
R> postMeanbeta <- modelORII$postMeanbeta
R> postMeansigma <- modelORII$postMeansigma
R> allQuantDIC <- devianceOR2(y, xMat, betadraws, sigmadraws, gammaCp,
+                             postMeanbeta, postMeansigma,
+                             burn = 500, mcmc = 4500, p)
R> allQuantDIC$DIC
```

```
[1] 790.5451
```

```
R> allQuantDIC$pd
```

```
[1] 3.926267
```

```
R> allQuantDIC$devpostmean
```

```
[1] 782.6926
```

qrnegLogLikeOR2

The function **qrnegLogLikeOR2** computes the negative sum of log-likelihood for the OR_{II} model assuming the errors follow $AL(0, \sigma_p, p)$. As shown in the code below, the inputs to the function are: observed ordinal outcomes (y), covariate matrix including a column ones ($xMat$), cut-point vector ($gammaCp$) including $(-\infty, \infty)$, a single draw of β_p ($betaOne$) and σ_p ($sigmaOne$), and quantile (p). When evaluated at posterior means (i.e., $postMeanbeta$ and $postMeansigma$), the output (i.e., negative sum of the log-likelihood) is utilized in calculation of DIC and may also be used to compute the AIC and BIC.

```
R> library('bqror')
R> data("data25j3")
R> y <- data25j3$y
R> xMat <- data25j3$x
R> p <- 0.25
R> gammaCp <- c(-Inf, 0, 3, Inf)
R> betaOne <- c(1.7201671, 1.9562172, 0.8334668)
R> sigmaOne <- 0.9684741
R> output <- qrnegLogLikeOR2(y, xMat, gammaCp, betaOne, sigmaOne, p)
R> output
```

[1] 567.2358

infactorOR2

The function **infactorOR1** utilizes the batch-means method to compute the inefficiency factor of (β_p, σ_p) based on the Gibbs draws (Greenberg, 2012).

The code below displays the usage of the function, where the inputs are covariate matrix including a column of ones (`xMat`), MCMC draws of β_p (`betadraws`) and σ_p (`sigmadraws`), cut-off value (typical values used are 0.05 or 0.10) to determine the lag length and form batches, and the verbose option, which prints the output when set to TRUE (else set to FALSE). Note that if `xMat` contains names of covariates, then they appear in the summary output; else the summary displays the parameters with numbers in the subscript (such as below).

```
R> betadraws <- modelORII$betadraws
R> sigmadraws <- modelORII$sigmadraws
R> inefficiency <- infactorOR2(xMat, betadraws, sigmadraws, 0.1,
+                             verbose=TRUE)
```

[1] Summary of Inefficiency Factor:

	Inefficiency
beta_1	3.3937
beta_2	3.0315
beta_3	3.1486
sigma	3.4146

trace plots

Trace plots are useful for assessing the convergence of MCMC draws and the codes below show how to get the trace plots for (β_p, σ_p) .

```
R> mcmc <- 4500
R> burn <- round(0.25*mcmc)
R> nsim <- mcmc + burn
R> par(mar = c(2,5,2,5), mfrow = c(2,2))
R> layout(matrix(c(1,2,3,4), nrow = 2, ncol = 2, byrow = TRUE),
+         widths=c(10,10,10), heights=c(10,10,10,10,10))
R> plot(modelORII$betadraws[1,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
+      xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[1])))
R> plot(modelORII$betadraws[2,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
+      xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[2])))
R> plot(modelORII$betadraws[3,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
+      xlab = '', main = expression(paste(beta[3])))
R> plot(modelORII$sigmadraws[1,(burn+1):nsim], type = 'l', ylab = '',
+      xlab = '', main = expression(paste(sigma[1])))
```

Applications

To illustrate the usage of **bqror** package on real data applications, we estimate and recreate the results for the educational attainment and tax policy applications presented in Rahman (2016). While the educational attainment study displays the implementation of ordinal quantile regression in OR_I model, the tax policy study highlights the use of ordinal quantile regression in OR_{II} model. Data for both the applications are included as a part of the **bqror** package.

Educational attainment

In this application, we study the effect of family background, individual level variables, and age cohort on educational attainment of 3923 individuals using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY, 1979) (Jeliaskov et al., 2008; Rahman, 2016). The dependent variable in the model, education degrees, has four categories: (i) *Less than high school*, (ii) *High school degree*, (iii) *Some college or associate's degree* and (iv) *College or graduate degree*. A frequency distribution of educational attainment is presented in Figure 1. The independent variables in the model include intercept, square root of family income, mother's education, father's education, mother's working status, gender, race,




Figure 1: Frequency distribution for educational attainment. The four categories, denoted by Cat 1, Cat 2, Cat 3, and Cat 4 correspond to less than high school, high school degree, some college or associate's degree, and college or graduate degree, respectively. For each vertical bar, the number inside the box (at the top) denote the number of observations (percentage) for that category.

indicator variables to point whether the youth lived in an urban area or South at the age of 14, and three indicator variables to indicate the individual's age in 1979 (serves as a control for age cohort effects).

To estimate a Bayesian ordinal quantile model on educational attainment data, we load the **bqror** package, prepare the required inputs and feed them into the **quantregOR1** function. Specifically, we define the outcome variable, covariate matrix (with covariates in order as in [Rahman, 2016](#)), specify the prior distributions on (β_p, δ_p) , burn-in size, number of post burn-in MCMC iterations, and choose a quantile ($p = 0.5$ for this illustration).

```
R> library(bqror)
R> data("Educational_Attainment")
R> data <- na.omit(Educational_Attainment)

R> data$fam_income_sqrt <- sqrt(data$fam_income)
R> cols <- c("mother_work", "urban", "south",
+           "father_educ", "mother_educ", "fam_income_sqrt", "female",
+           "black", "age_cohort_2", "age_cohort_3", "age_cohort_4")
R> x <- data[cols]
R> x$intercept <- 1
R> xMat <- x[,c(12,6,5,4,1,7,8,2,3,9,10,11)]
R> k <- dim(xMat)[2]
R> y0rd <- data$dep_edu_level
R> J <- dim(as.array(unique(y0rd)))[1]

R> b0 <- array(rep(0, k), dim = c(k, 1))
R> B0 <- 1*diag(k)
R> d0 <- array(0, dim = c(J-2, 1))
R> D0 <- 0.25*diag(J - 2)
R> p <- 0.5
R> EducAtt <- quantregOR1(y = y0rd, x = xMat, b0, B0,
+                       d0, D0, burn = 1125, mcmc = 4500, p, tune=1, TRUE)
```

```
[1] Number of burn-in draws: 1125
[1] Number of retained draws: 4500
[1] Summary of MCMC draws:
```

	Post Mean	Post Std	Upper Credible	Lower Credible
intercept	-3.2231	0.2276	-2.7795	-3.6797
fam_income_sqrt	0.2796	0.0258	0.3321	0.2300
mother_educ	0.1219	0.0189	0.1601	0.0855
father_educ	0.1858	0.0154	0.2166	0.1565
mother_work	0.0697	0.0798	0.2231	-0.0913
female	0.3493	0.0788	0.5066	0.1992




Figure 2: Trace plots of the MCMC draws in the educational attainment study.

black	0.4372	0.1021	0.6367	0.2406
urban	-0.0826	0.0951	0.1046	-0.2728
south	0.0819	0.0874	0.2542	-0.0865
age_cohort_2	-0.0365	0.1229	0.1998	-0.2777
age_cohort_3	-0.0500	0.1260	0.1988	-0.2874
age_cohort_4	0.5005	0.1328	0.7493	0.2343
delta_1	0.8979	0.0286	0.9596	0.8434
delta_2	0.5455	0.0346	0.6105	0.4776

```
[1] MH acceptance rate: 27%
[1] Log of Marginal Likelihood: -4925.14
[1] DIC: 9788.14
```

The posterior results² from the MCMC draws are summarized above. In the summary, we report the posterior mean and posterior standard deviation of the parameters (β_p, δ_p), and their 95% posterior credible interval. Additionally, the summary displays the MH acceptance rate of δ_p , the logarithm of marginal likelihood, and the DIC. Figure 2 presents the trace plots of the MCMC, which can be obtained using codes similar to those demonstrated in the simulation studies.

Next, we utilize the `covEffectOR1` function to compute the average covariate effect for a \$10,000 increase in family income on the four categories of educational attainment. In general, the calculation of average covariate effect requires creation of either one or two new covariate matrices depending

²The results reported here are slightly different from those presented in [Rahman \(2016\)](#). This difference in results, aside from lesser number of MCMC draws, is due to a different approach in sampling from the GIG distribution. [Rahman \(2016\)](#) employed the ratio of uniforms method to sample from the GIG distribution ([Dagpunar, 2007](#)), while the current paper utilizes the `rgig` function in the `GIGrvg` package that overcomes the disadvantages associated with sampling using the ratio of uniforms method (see `GIGrvg` documentation for further details). Also, see [Devroye \(2014\)](#) for an efficient sampling technique from a GIG distribution.

whether the covariate is continuous or indicator (binary), respectively. If the covariate is continuous (such as family income and lets assume this is the l th variable), then a modified covariate matrix is created by adding \$10,000 to each observation of family income. This is our $xMod2$ in the code snippet below and corresponds to the notation $x_{i,l}^b$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ in Subsection 4.1. While the matrix $xMod1$ (in the code below) is simply the covariate or design matrix $xMat$ (no change here) and so with reference to Subsection 4.1, $x_{i,l}^a = x_{i,l}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. When the covariate of interest is an indicator variable, then the $xMod1$ requires modification as explained in the tax policy application.

We then call the `covEffectOR1` function and supply the inputs to get the results.

```
R> xMat1 <- xMat
R> xMat2 <- xMat
R> xMat2$fam_income_sqrt <- sqrt((xMat1$fam_income_sqrt)^2 + 10)
R> EducAttCE <- covEffectOR1(EducAtt, yOrd, xMat1, xMat2, p = 0.5, verbose = TRUE)
```

[1] Summary of Covariate Effect:

	Covariate Effect
Category_1	-0.0315
Category_2	-0.0132
Category_3	0.0179
Category_4	0.0268

The results shows that for a \$10,000 increase in family income, at the 50th quantile the probability of obtaining *less than high school (high school degree)* decreases by 3.15 percent (1.32 percent), while the probability of achieving *some college or associate's degree (College or graduate degree)* increases by 1.79 percent (2.68 percent).

Tax policy

In this application, the objective is to analyze the factors that affects public opinion on the proposal to raise federal taxes for couples (individuals) earning more than \$250,000 (\$200,000) per year in the United States (US). The background of this proposal was to extend the "Bush Tax" cuts for the lower and middle income classes, but restore higher rates for the richer class. Such a policy is considered "pro-growth," since the motivation is to promote growth in the US economy by augmenting consumption among the low-middle income families. After extensive debate, the proposed policy received a two year extension and formed a part of the "Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010".

The data for the study was taken from the 2010-2012 American National Election Studies (ANES) on the Evaluations of Government and Society Study 1 (EGSS 1) and contains 1,164 observations. The dependent variable in the model, individual's opinion on tax increase, has 3 categories: *Oppose*, *Neither favor nor oppose*, and *Favor* (See Figure 3). The covariates included in the model are the intercept, indicator variables for income above \$75,000, bachelors' degree, post-bachelors' degree, computer ownership, cell phone ownership, and white race.




Figure 3: Frequency distribution for individual's opinion on tax increase. The 3 categories, denoted by Cat 1, Cat 2, and Cat 3, correspond to oppose, neither favor nor oppose, and favor the tax increase. For each vertical bar, the number inside the box (at the top) denote the number of observations (percentage) for that category.

To fit a Bayesian ordinal quantile model on public opinion about federal tax increase, we load the **bqror** package, prepare the data, and provide the inputs into the **quantregOR2** function. Specifically, we define the outcome variable, covariate matrix (with covariates in order as in [Rahman, 2016](#)), specify the prior distributions for (β_p, σ_p) , choose the second cut-off value, burn-in size, number of post burn-in MCMC iterations, and quantile value ($p = 0.5$ for this illustration).

```
R> library(bqror)
R> data("Policy_Opinion")
R> data <- na.omit(Policy_Opinion)

R> cols <- c("Intercept", "AgeCat", "IncomeCat",
+           "Bachelors", "Post.Bachelors", "Computers", "CellPhone",
+           "White")
R> x <- data[cols]
R> k <- dim(x)[2]
R> xMat <- x[,c(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8)]
R> yOrd <- data$y
```

The results (See Footnote 2) from the MCMC draws are summarized below. In the summary, we report the posterior mean, posterior standard deviation, and the 95% posterior credible interval of the parameters (β_p, σ_p) . Additionally, the summary displays the logarithm of marginal likelihood and the DIC. Figure 4 presents the trace plots of the MCMC draws, which can be obtained using codes similar to those presented in the simulation studies.

```
R> b0 <- array(rep(0, k), dim = c(k, 1))
R> B0 = 1*diag(k)
R> n0 <- 5
R> d0 <- 8
R> FedTax <- quantregOR2(y = yOrd, x = xMat, b0, B0,
+                       n0, d0, gamma2 = 3, burn = 1125, mcmc = 4500,
+                       p = 0.5, TRUE)
```

```
[1] Number of burn-in draws : 1125
[1] Number of retained draws : 4500
[1] Summary of MCMC draws :
```

	Post Mean	Post Std	Upper Credible	Lower Credible
Intercept	1.9869	0.4454	2.8546	1.0936
AgeCat	0.2477	0.2980	0.8481	-0.3401
IncomeCat	-0.4968	0.3364	0.1492	-1.1767
Bachelors	0.0684	0.3678	0.7790	-0.6423
Post.Bachelors	0.4726	0.4646	1.4041	-0.4232
Computers	0.7204	0.3653	1.4561	0.0005
CellPhone	0.8595	0.4010	1.6283	0.0606
White	0.0814	0.3762	0.8093	-0.6704
sigma	2.2268	0.1434	2.5164	1.9497

```
[1] Log of Marginal Likelihood: -1173.97
[1] DIC: 2334.76
```

Finally, we utilize the **covEffectOR2** function to demonstrate the calculation of average covariate effect within the OR_{II} framework. Below, we compute the average covariate effect for computer ownership (assume this is the l th variable) on the 3 categories of public opinion about the tax policy. Here, the covariate is an indicator variable since you may either own a computer (coded as 1) or not (coded as 0). So, we need to create two modified covariate matrices. In the code snippet below, the first matrix $xMat1$ and the second matrix $xMat2$ are created by replacing the column on computer ownership with a column of zeros and ones, respectively. With reference to notations in Subsection 4.1 and Subsection 4.2, $x_{i,l}^a = 0$ and $x_{i,l}^b = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We then call the **covEffectOR2** function and supply the inputs to get the results.

```
R> xMat1 <- xMat
R> xMat1$Computers <- 0
R> xMat2 <- xMat
R> xMat2$Computers <- 1
R> FedTaxCE <- covEffectOR2(FedTax, yOrd, xMat1, xMat2, gamma2 = 3, p = 0.5,
```




Figure 4: Trace plots for the MCMC draws in the tax policy study.

```
+ verbose = TRUE)
```

```
[1] Summary of Covariate Effect:
```

```

Covariate Effect
Category_1      -0.0397
Category_2      -0.0330
Category_3       0.0727

```

The results on covariate effect shows that at the 50th quantile, ownership of computer decreases probability for the first category *Oppose (Neither favor nor oppose)* by 3.97 percent (3.30 percent), and increases the probability for the third category *Favor* by 7.27 percent.

Conclusion

A wide class of applications in economics, finance, marketing, and the social sciences have dependent variables which are ordinal in nature (i.e., they are discrete and ordered) and are characterized by an underlying continuous variable. Modeling and analysis of such variables have been typically confined to ordinal probit or ordinal logit models, which offers information on the conditional mean of the outcome variable given the covariates. However, a recently proposed method by Rahman (2016) allows Bayesian quantile modeling of ordinal data and thus presents the tool for a more comprehensive analysis and inference. The prevalence of ordinal responses in applications is well known and hence a software package that allows Bayesian quantile analysis with ordinal data will be of immense interest to applied researchers from different fields, including economics and statistics.

The current paper presents an implementation of the **bqror** package – the only package available for estimation and inference of Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal models. The package offers two MCMC algorithms for estimating ordinal quantile models. An ordinal quantile model with 3 or more outcomes is estimated by a combination of Gibbs sampling and MH algorithm, while estimation of an ordinal quantile model with exactly 3 outcomes utilizes a simpler and computationally faster algorithm that relies solely on Gibbs sampling. For both forms of ordinal quantile models, the **bqror** package also provides functions to calculate the covariate effects (for continuous as well as binary regressors) and measures for model comparison – marginal likelihood and the DIC. The paper explains how to compute the marginal likelihood from the MCMC outputs and recommends its use over the DIC for model comparison. In addition, this paper demonstrates usage of all the functions for estimation and analysis of Bayesian quantile regression with ordinal data on simulation studies, and the educational attainment and tax policy applications from Rahman (2016).

Bibliography

- J. Albert and S. Chib. Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88(422):669–679, 1993. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1993.10476321>. [p2]
- J. Albert and S. Chib. Sequential ordinal modeling with applications to survival data. *Biometrics*, 57: 829–836, 2001. doi: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3068422>. [p3]
- R. Alhamzawi. Bayesian model selection in ordinal quantile regression. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 103:68–78, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2016.04.014>. [p1]
- R. Alhamzawi and H. T. M. Ali. Bayesian quantile regression for ordinal longitudinal data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 45(5):815–828, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02664763.2017.1315059>. [p1]
- D. F. Benoit and D. Van den Poel. Binary quantile regression: A Bayesian approach based on the asymmetric Laplace distribution. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27(7):1174–1188, 2010. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.1216>. [p1]
- D. F. Benoit and D. Van den Poel. bayesqr: A Bayesian approach to quantile regression. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 76(7), 2017. URL <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/bayesQR/index.html>. R package version 2.3. [p1]
- G. Bresson, G. Lacroix, and M. A. Rahman. Bayesian panel quantile regression for binary outcomes with correlated random effects: An application on crime recidivism in Canada. *Empirical Economics*, 60(1):227–259, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-020-01893-5>. [p1, 8]
- G. Casella and E. I. George. Explaining the Gibbs sampler. *The American Statistician*, 46(3):167–174, 1992. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1992.10475878>. [p2]
- S. Chib. Marginal likelihood from the Gibbs output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(432):1313–1321, 1995. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1995.10476635>. [p2, 5, 6]
- S. Chib and E. Greenberg. Understanding the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. *The American Statistician*, 49:327–335, 1995. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1995.10476177>. [p2]
- S. Chib and I. Jeliazkov. Marginal likelihood from the Metropolis-Hastings output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(453):270–281, 2001. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214501750332848>. [p2, 5, 6]
- S. Chib and I. Jeliazkov. Inference in semiparametric dynamic models for binary longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(474):685–700, 2006. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214505000000871>. [p8]
- J. Dagpunar. *Simulations and Monte Carlo: With Applications in Finance and MCMC*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., UK, 2007. doi: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9780470061336>. [p15]
- C. Davino, M. Furno, and D. Vistocco. *Quantile Regression: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2014. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118752685>. [p1]
- L. Devroye. Random variate generation for the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(2):239–246, 2014. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-012-9367-z>. [p15]
- M. Furno and D. Vistocco. *Quantile Regression: Estimation and Simulation*. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118863718>. [p1]
- A. Gelman, J. B. Carlin, H. S. Stern, D. B. Dunson, A. Vehtari, and D. B. Rubin. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. Chapman & Hall, New York, 2013. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1201/b16018>. [p5, 9, 12]
- S. Geman and D. Geman. Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 6(6):721–741, 1984. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.1984.4767596>. [p2]
- M. Geraci. Linear quantile mixed models: The lqmm package for Laplace quantile regression. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 57(13), 2014. URL <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/lqmm/index.html>. R package version 1.5.5. [p1]
- M. Geraci and M. Bottai. Linear quantile mixed models. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(461-479), 2014. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-013-9381-9>. [p1]

- S. Ghasemzadeh, M. Ganjali, and T. Baghfalaki. Bayesian quantile regression for analyzing ordinal longitudinal responses in the presence of non-ignorable missingness. *METRON*, 76(3):321–348, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40300-018-0136-4>. [p1]
- S. Ghasemzadeh, M. Ganjali, and T. Baghfalaki. Bayesian quantile regression for joint modeling of longitudinal mixed ordinal continuous data. *Communications in Statistics – Simulation and Computation*, 49(2):1375–1395, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2018.1484482>. [p1]
- E. Greenberg. *Introduction to Bayesian Econometrics*. 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2012. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808920>. [p5, 7, 10, 13]
- W. H. Greene and D. A. Hensher. *Modeling Ordered Choices: A Primer*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845062>. [p2]
- I. Jeliazkov and M. A. Rahman. Binary and ordinal data analysis in economics: Modeling and estimation. In X. S. Yang, editor, *Mathematical Modeling with Multidisciplinary Applications*, pages 123–150. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New Jersey, 2012. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118462706.ch6>. [p2, 3]
- I. Jeliazkov, J. Graves, and M. Kutzbach. Fitting and comparison of models for multivariate ordinal outcomes. *Advances in Econometrics: Bayesian Econometrics*, 23:115–156, 2008. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0731-9053\(08\)23004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0731-9053(08)23004-5). [p3, 8, 13]
- V. E. Johnson and J. H. Albert. *Ordinal Data Modeling*. Springer, New York, 2000. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/b98832>. [p2]
- R. Koenker. *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.15.4.143>. [p1]
- R. Koenker. *quantreg: Quantile Regression*, 2021. URL <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/quantreg/index.html>. R package version 5.85. [p1]
- R. Koenker and G. Bassett. Regression quantiles. *Econometrica*, 46(1):33–50, 1978. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1913643>. [p1]
- G. Kordas. Smoothed binary regression quantiles. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 21(3):387–407, 2006. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.843>. [p1]
- H. Kozumi and G. Kobayashi. Gibbs sampling methods for Bayesian quantile regression. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 81(11):1565–1578, 2011. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00949655.2010.496117>. [p1, 2]
- D. Mukherjee and M. A. Rahman. To drill or not to drill? an econometric analysis of US public opinion. *Energy Policy*, 91:341–351, 2016. doi: [10.1016/j.enpol.2015.11.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.11.023). [p2]
- D. J. Poirier. *Intermediate Statistics and Econometrics*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1995. [p5]
- M. A. Rahman. Bayesian quantile regression for ordinal models. *Bayesian Analysis*, 11(1):1–24, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-BA939>. [p1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18]
- M. A. Rahman and S. Karnawat. Flexible Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal models. *Advances in Econometrics*, 40B:211–251, 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0731-90532019000040B011>. [p1]
- M. A. Rahman and A. Vossmeier. Estimation and applications of quantile regression for binary longitudinal data. *Advances in Econometrics*, 40B:157–191, 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0731-90532019000040B009>. [p1, 8]
- D. J. Spiegelhalter, N. G. Best, B. P. Carlin, and A. Van Der Linde. Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society – Series B*, 64(4):583–639, 2002. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00353>. [p5]
- Y.-Z. Tian, M.-L. Tang, W.-S. Chan, and M.-Z. Tian. Bayesian bridge-randomized penalized quantile regression for ordinal longitudinal data, with application to firm’s bond ratings. *Computational Statistics*, 36:1289–1319, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-020-01037-4>. [p1]
- K. Yu and R. A. Moeed. Bayesian quantile regression. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 54(4):437–447, 2001. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7152\(01\)00124-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7152(01)00124-9). [p1]
- K. Yu and J. Zhang. A three parameter asymmetric Laplace distribution and its extensions. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 34(9-10):1867–1879, 2005. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610920500199018>. [p1]

T. Zu and Y. Yu. SIQR: An R package for single-index quantile regression. *The R Journal*, 2021. doi: 10.32614/RJ-2021-092. URL <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2021/RJ-2021-092/index.html>. R package version 2.3. [p1]

Prajual Maheshwari

Quantative Analyst, Dolat Capital, India

B.S. (Economics, 2016-20), Department of Economic Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India

prajual1391@gmail.com

Mohammad Arshad Rahman

Associate Professor, College of Business

Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

mohammadarshad.rahman@zu.ac.ae

&

Associate Professor, Department of Economic Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8434-0042>

marshad@iitk.ac.in, arshadrahman25@gmail.com