

Agreement and Statistical Efficiency in Bayesian Perception Models

Yash Deshpande*

Elchanan Mossel[†]Youngtak Sohn [‡]

May 25, 2022

Abstract

Bayesian models of group learning are studied in Economics since the 1970s and more recently in computational linguistics. The models from Economics postulate that agents maximize utility in their communication and actions. The Economics models do not explain the “probability matching” phenomena that are observed in many experimental studies. To address these observations, Bayesian models that do not formally fit into the economic utility maximization framework were introduced. In these models individuals sample from their posteriors in communication.

In this work we study the asymptotic behavior of such models on connected networks with repeated communication. Perhaps surprisingly, despite the fact that individual agents are not utility maximizers in the classical sense, we establish that the individuals ultimately agree and furthermore show that the limiting posterior is Bayes optimal.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

How do individuals learn from each other?

In this work we are interested in Bayesian models of learning with the goal of bringing together perspectives of theoretical Economics, and experimental and computational psychology. We are interested scenarios where individuals repeatedly observe each other and take actions on a connected graph representing the social network connecting them.

Since the foundational work of Aumann [Aum76], economists have modeled collections of rational individuals as Bayesian agents who learn from each other and take actions as to maximize utility. The network setup was introduced in [GP82] and the results of [Aum76, GP82] establish that agents ultimately agree in their posterior if each action reveals the current individual posterior mean. We will call this the *belief model*. More recent research [DS99, Ost12], see also [MT17, MMST18], establish that assuming that the initial information the agents receive is independent (conditionally given the unknown state of the world), then the posterior is the optimal Bayes posterior given all private information.

Another relevant body of work in Economics involve scenarios where the agents are utility maximizers but their actions do not reveal their posterior exactly. This happens for example if the space of possible actions that agents can take is finite. In this case, which we will call the *action model*, it is known that agents asymptotically agree [GK03, RSV09, MST14]. However, in general, the agents do not reach the optimal posterior given all private signals. Learning results are only established if the number of individuals goes to infinity (with additional conditions) [MST14, MST15].

*This work was conducted while YD was at the Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Supported by ARO MURI W911NF1910217

[†]Department of Mathematics and IDSS, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Supported by Simons-NSF collaboration on deep learning NSF DMS-2031883, by ARO MURI W911NF1910217, by Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship award ONR-N00014-20-1-2826 and by a Simons Investigator Award in Mathematics (622132)

[‡]Department of Mathematics Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Supported by Simons-NSF collaboration on deep learning NSF DMS-2031883, by Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship award ONR-N00014-20-1-2826

Work in psychology, see e.g. the surveys [Mye14, Vul00], found that individuals do not follow the utility maximizing paradigm. Thus their behavior fits neither the action models nor the belief models. Instead, they apply “probability matching” - taking actions based on samples from their posterior rather than based on its mean. This was formalized as a Bayesian model in [GT06, GTFG08, VGGT14] among other works. We call these models *sampling models*. Of course, as is often mentioned in these works averaging a large population of independent individuals then recovers the posterior mean.

There is a large body of work trying to justify various samples and their variants, see e.g. [VATB09, SGN10, VGGT14, KMRB10] and the survey [GHT15]. In this work we *assume* that individuals follow the sample model and discuss the consequences in terms of agreement and learning.

1.2 This work

Consider a network of Bayesian agents. We assume that the agents compute their posterior distribution exactly but only communicate samples to their neighbors. We study the agreement and the asymptotic statistical efficiency of the learning process in this sampling model.

In our main results we prove that *all agents agree asymptotically* and moreover that they *all converge to the optimal Bayes posterior given all the data*. Thus for sampling model, both agreement and in terms of statistical efficiency (“learning”) hold just as for belief models.

Moreover, it is possible to interpret some of our results as providing a new perspective of some advantages of sampling models over action models in cases where agents are limited in their communication.

For simplicity, consider the case where individuals are very limited and can only communicate 0 or 1 to their neighbors at each round and that they do so simultaneously. Suppose furthermore that the unknown quantity (the “state of the world”) is also in $\{0, 1\}$ with uniform prior and that the signal has density $2x$ in $[0, 1]$ if the state of the world is 1 and the density $2 - 2x$ in $[0, 1]$ if it is 0. Each agent receives an independent signal and then they update the posterior according to what they see from their neighbors.

For simplicity assume further that the graph consists of a single edge connecting two individuals.

1. In the action model, assuming a convex loss function that reveals the more likely posterior, agents communicate the more likely state of the world at each round. In this case it is known that the agents will eventually agree on the more likely state [GK03, RSV09]. However, generally they will not agree on what the posterior is and their posteriors will not agree with the true posterior given all the data. To see this consider for example the case where the first agent receives a signal $x_1 > 0.5$, and the second agent receives a signal $x_2 > 0.5$. In this case it is easy to verify that both agents will communicate 1 indefinitely, agent 1 posterior probability for 1 will be $6x_1/(2 + 4x_1)$, agent 2 posterior will be $6x_2/(2 + 4x_2)$ while the true posterior is $x_1x_2/(x_1x_2 + (1 - x_1)(1 - x_2))$.
2. In the sampling model each individual communicates 1 with probability p , where p is its current posterior. Our results imply that in this case both agents will in the limit have the same posterior distribution and moreover it will be the exact posterior given the original signals of both agents, i.e., $x_1x_2/(x_1x_2 + (1 - x_1)(1 - x_2))$.

Thus, it could be argued that as a learning mechanism, sampling models are more efficient than action models. The phenomena in the example is easily generalized to other networks, signal structures and actions as long as the action space is finite.

A common critique of the results on action and belief models on networks is that these results assume all individuals know the exact structure of the network. Our models make the same assumption. However, unlike many of the results in learning on networks, our results are of interest for any network, no matter how simple. Thus, we encourage the reader to focus on the case where the graph is a single edge as above. In this case, the assumption that the individuals know the network structure is perfectly reasonable. This assumption may also be reasonable for other small simple networks (e.g. a path of length 2). Since the proofs apply for all connected networks, they are given in the more general setting.

Related Work: We are not aware of previous work considering sampling model on networks. In the majority of works, there is a single individual who interacts with the environment (and this is repeated many

times). Our result analyze the asymptotic behavior of a sampling model involving *multiple* individuals. In prior work, there are some sophisticated works involving the sampling model with a single individual. For example, the result of [SG07] analyze a sampling model involving a single individual, which converges to the prior distribution. In [SG07], individuals do not change their distribution during the process. Instead the process is used to learn what is the prior distribution.

1.3 Acknowledgment

Our interest in sampling models is partially motivated by group of the working group for MURI on Unified Decision Theory (ARO MURI W911NF1910217). We thank Omer Tamuz for interesting discussions.

2 Model and main results

We consider the following Bayesian model for social learning on a network. There is an unknown state $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ drawn from a common prior ν on \mathbb{R}^d . Agents live at the vertices of a network $G = (V, E)$, where we identify $V \equiv [n]$ and obtain initial private signals $S_i \sim \mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, conditionally independent given θ .

The agents then exchange messages with their neighbors as follows. At time $t = 0$, let $\nu_i(0) := \text{Law}(\theta | S_i)$ be the posterior distribution of θ given the initial information $\mathcal{H}_i(0) := \sigma(S_i)$ agent i has seen. Agent i then samples $Y_i(0) \sim \nu_i(0)$ given $\mathcal{H}_i(0)$, conditionally independent of other agents, and communicates $Y_i(0)$ to all of it's neighbor $j \in \partial i \subseteq V$. More generally, at time $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{H}_i(t) := \sigma(S_i, (Y_j(s))_{j \in \partial i, s < t})$ be the information agent i has seen at time t . Then, at time t , agent i samples $Y_i(t) \sim \nu_i(t) := \text{Law}(\theta | \mathcal{H}_i(t))$ given $\mathcal{H}_i(t)$, conditionally independent of all other information, and communicates $Y_i(t)$ to it's neighbors.

We consider the following social learning questions:

1. Do the posterior beliefs $\nu_i(t)$ converge to a common posterior $\nu(\infty)$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, independently of i ?
2. If so, does the common posterior belief $\nu(\infty)$ coincide with the optimal Bayes posterior given all private information $\text{Law}(\theta | S_1, \dots, S_n)$?

Our first theorem establishes the positive answer to the first question under the natural assumption that the network G is connected.

Theorem 2.1. *For every agent $i \in V$, the sequence of it's (random) posterior distribution $\nu_i(t)$ converges weakly to $\nu_i(\infty) := \text{Law}(\theta | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))$, almost surely. Moreover, if agents i and j are connected that $\nu_i(\infty) = \nu_j(\infty)$, almost surely. Therefore, provided G is connected, all agents in G agree asymptotically.*

Observe that by the nature of the model, the agents $i, j \in V$ do not communicate with each other if i and j are not connected in G . Thus, when G is not disconnected, we can apply the theorem above to every connected component in G , and conclude that agents asymptotically agree in each connected components.

Next, we show that the answer to the second question is also positive under mild assumptions on the signal structure $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)\}_{i \in V}$, which we now state.

Definition 2.2 (Signal structure satisfying the Bayes law). We say $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)\}_{i \in V}$ satisfies the Bayes law if there exists a deterministic $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that for every borel measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A) \in (0, 1)$ and conditionally independent signals $S_i | \theta \sim \mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_1, \dots, S_n) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A)^{n-1}} \cdot f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (1)$$

Definition 2.3 (Signal structure with finite information). We say $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)$ has finite information if for every borel measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A) \in (0, 1)$ and conditionally independent signals $S_i | \theta \sim \mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_i)} \right) \right| < \infty, \quad (2)$$

where the expectation is over marginal distribution over S_i . We say $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)\}_{i \in V}$ has finite information if for every agent $i \in V$, $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)$ has finite information.

The two aforementioned conditions for the signal structure $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)\}_{i \in V}$ might seem strange at first sight, especially the condition (2). However, the following lemma gives a sufficient condition for both conditions, which are rather mild. The proof of Lemma 2.4 is given in the Appendix.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that there exist σ -finite regular borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d (for it's definition, see for e.g. Definition 2.5.12 of [BC09]) $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in V}$ such that the $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_i for every $\theta \in \text{supp}(\nu)$ and $i \in V$. Then, $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)\}_{i \in V}$ satisfies the Bayes law in Definition 2.2. Moreover, for every $i \in V$, the posterior $\text{Law}(\theta|S_i)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior ν , \mathbb{P}_{S_i} -a.s., where \mathbb{P}_{S_i} denote the marginal law of S_i . Denote $p_i(x|S_i)$ by it's the Radon-Nikodym derivative. Then, if for every $i \in V$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \log(p_i(x|S_i)) \right| \nu(dx) < \infty, \quad (3)$$

then $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)\}_{i \in V}$ has finite information.

Indeed, we show in Section 4 that when the signal structures are Gaussian, then they satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 2.4. Finally, we establish statistically efficient learning for signal structures which satisfy Bayes law and have finite information.

Theorem 2.5 (Statistically efficient learning). *Suppose that $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot|\theta)\}_{i \in V}$ satisfies the Bayes law (Definition 2.2) and has finite information (Definition 2.3). Assuming that the graph G is connected, in the limit, every agent learns as well as if they learned all agents' private information. That is, the common limiting posterior $\nu(\infty) = \nu_i(\infty)$ coincides with $\text{Law}(\theta|S_1, \dots, S_n)$, almost surely.*

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.5

The proof of the first claim of Theorem 2.1 is an application of the martingale convergence theorem, which is a standard tool in social learning theory: for $i \in V$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, denote the distribution function of $\nu_i(t)$ by $F_{it}(u) := \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u | \mathcal{H}_i(t))$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Here, we denoted $a \leq b$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if coordinate-wise $a_i \leq b_i, 1 \leq i \leq d$ holds. Note that by Lévy's upward theorem (see for e.g. Theorem 4.6.8 of [Dur19]), for fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$F_{it}(u) \rightarrow F_{i\infty}(u) := \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \text{ a.s. and in } L^1.$$

Since \mathbb{Q}^d is countable, the convergence above holds simultaneously for $u \in \mathbb{Q}^d$: almost surely, we have

$$F_{it}(u) \rightarrow F_{i\infty}(u) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \text{ for every } u \in \mathbb{Q}^d. \quad (4)$$

Then, it is standard to argue that on the a.s. event that (4) happens, $\nu_i(t) \xrightarrow{w} \nu_i(\infty)$ holds. We include the argument in the Appendix for completeness. For the proof of the second claim of Theorem 2.1 regarding agreement, we use the following easy claim whose proof is also given in the appendix:

Lemma 3.1. *Consider two random variables Z_1, Z_2 , with finite second moments. If their average $Z(\lambda) = \lambda Z_1 + (1 - \lambda)Z_2$ satisfies $\min_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[Z(\lambda)^2] = \mathbb{E}[Z_1^2] = \mathbb{E}[Z_2^2]$ then $Z_1 = Z_2$ almost surely.*

The proof of agreement is based on following idea: suppose that $F_{i\infty}(u)$ and $F_{j\infty}(u)$ disagree with positive probability for some $u \in \mathbb{Q}^d$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, there exists an average $\lambda F_{i\infty}(u) + (1 - \lambda)F_{j\infty}(u)$ for $0 < \lambda < 1$, which strictly improve the mean squared error of $F_{i\infty}(u)$ for estimating $\mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$. On the other hand, after sufficiently long time T , agent i can learn the empirical average $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u)$, which approximates $F_{j\infty}(u)$ in arbitrary precision because of the conditionally independent sampling mechanism and the convergence of $\nu_j(t)$ to $\nu_j(\infty)$. However $F_{i\infty}(u)$ is the posterior mean of $\mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$ under $\mathcal{H}_i(\infty)$ and therefore must be the best (i.e. lowest mean squared error) estimate of $\mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$, which yields a contradiction. The full detail is given below.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 For simplicity, abbreviate $F_i(u) \equiv F_{i\infty}(u) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))$. Then, it suffices to show that for $u \in \mathbb{Q}^d$, $F_i(u) = F_j(u)$ almost surely. Having Lemma 3.1 in mind, denote $Z_1 := F_i(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$ and $Z_2 := F_j(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$, which are bounded random variables. We now aim to show $\min_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}(\lambda Z_1 + (1-\lambda)Z_2)^2 \geq \mathbb{E}Z_1^2$. Note that if we establish this, then we have that by symmetry $\min_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}(\lambda Z_1 + (1-\lambda)Z_2)^2 \geq \mathbb{E}Z_2^2$ holds, so by Lemma 3.1, $Z_1 = Z_2$ almost surely. To this end, assume by contradiction that there exists some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda F_i(u) + (1-\lambda)F_j(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right] < \mathbb{E} \left[(F_i(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right] - \varepsilon. \quad (5)$$

Then, we argue that we can find a $\mathcal{H}_i(\infty)$ -measurable estimator of $\mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u)$ such that it is unbiased and has mean squared error smaller than $\mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u) | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))] = \mathbb{E}(F_i(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2$, which is a contradiction. Indeed, for $T \geq 1$, define

$$Z_1(T) := \lambda F_i(u) + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u). \quad (6)$$

Then, because agent i receives from agent j the information $Y_j(t)$ at time t , $Z_1(T)$ is $\mathcal{H}_i(\infty)$ -measurable. Moreover, it is unbiased since by tower property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_1(T)] &= \lambda \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u) + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(Y_j(t) \leq u | \mathcal{H}_j(t))] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u) + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u | \mathcal{H}_j(t))] = \mathbb{P}(\theta \leq u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(Z_1(T) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[(F_i(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right]. \quad (7)$$

We now show that (7) contradicts (5) for large enough T : note that

$$Z_1(T) = \lambda F_i(u) + (1-\lambda)F_j(u) + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u) - F_{jt}(u)) + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u)).$$

Thus, Minkowski's inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(Z_1(T) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right]^{1/2} &\leq A + B + C, \quad \text{where} \\ A &:= \mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda F_i(u) + (1-\lambda)F_j(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ B &:= \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u) - F_{jt}(u)) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ C &:= \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^T (F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u)) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Recall that $A \leq \left(\mathbb{E}(F_i(u) - \mathbf{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 - \varepsilon \right)^{1/2}$ by (5). To this end, we aim to bound B and C . To start with B , note that $\{\mathbf{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u) - F_{jt}(u)\}_{t \geq 0}$ are uncorrelated at different times by the sampling mechanism

of the agents. That is, for $0 \leq t_1 < t_2$, we have by tower property,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_1) \leq u) - F_{jt_1}(u) \right) \left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_2) \leq u) - F_{jt_2}(u) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_1) \leq u) - F_{jt_1}(u) \right) \left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_2) \leq u) - F_{jt_2}(u) \right) \mid \mathcal{H}_j(t_2) \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_1) \leq u) - F_{jt_1}(u) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t_2) \leq u) - F_{jt_2}(u) \mid \mathcal{H}_j(t_2) \right] \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can calculate and bound B by

$$B = \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbb{1}(Y_j(t) \leq u) - F_{jt}(u) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}. \quad (9)$$

For C , recall that by Lévy's upward theorem that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{jt}(u) = F_j(u)$ almost surely. Since $F_{jt}(u), t \geq 0$ are bounded, dominated convergence theorem shows $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[(F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u))^2 \right] = 0$. Thus, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $T_0(\delta)$ such that if $t \geq T_0(\delta)$, then $\mathbb{E} \left[(F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u))^2 \right] < \delta$. Thus, Minkowski's inequality shows

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{T_0} (F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u)) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} + \frac{1-\lambda}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[(F_{jt}(u) - F_j(u))^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{T_0(\delta)}{T} + \delta^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus, plugging in the obtained bounds for A, B, C (i.e. (5), (9), (10)) in (8) gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(Z_1(T) - \mathbb{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(F_i(u) - \mathbb{1}(\theta \leq u))^2 \right] - \varepsilon \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{T_0(\delta)}{T} + \delta^{1/2}.$$

Thus, first taking $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small compared to ε and then taking T to be large enough, the equation above contradicts (7). \square

The proof of Theorem 2.5 is based on a proof for the signal case in [MST11]. The paper [MST11] deals with The Economics signal model and it assumes a binary state. Here we are dealing with a sampling model. Another major difference is that we have to deal with arbitrary prior distribution ν , and in particular ν can have *unbounded* support. To deal with this issue, we consider log-likelihood ratio for estimating $\mathbb{1}(\theta \in A)$, and apply Bayes rule as suggested in Definition 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.5 We claim that for every borel measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_1, \dots, S_n)$ holds almost surely, which obviously achieves our goal by considering sets of the form $A = \prod_{i=1}^d (-\infty, q_i]$ for $q = (q_1, \dots, q_d) \in \mathbb{Q}^d$. To this end, fix A such that $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A) \in (0, 1)$ since otherwise, our claim trivially holds. First, observe that using Bayes law (1) twice for A and A^c and dividing the two equations to eliminate f gives

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_1, \dots, S_n)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c \mid S_1, \dots, S_n)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c \mid S_i)} \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A)} \right)^{n-1}. \quad (11)$$

Note that in (11), the denominators may be zero which is problematic. However, our assumption that the signal structure has finite information, i.e. (2), assures that $\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c \mid S_i)} \in (0, \infty)$ holds a.s.. Note that this

also implies that $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_1, \dots, S_n) > 0$ almost surely because $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) > 0$ holds in (1). To this end, let

$$Z := \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \quad \text{where} \quad Z_i := \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_i)} \in (-\infty, +\infty).$$

Thus, by (11), we have

$$W := \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_1, \dots, S_n) = \frac{\beta e^Z}{1 + \beta e^Z}, \quad \text{where} \quad \beta = \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A)} \right)^{n-1} > 0. \quad (12)$$

Now, denote $X := \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))$. Then, by tower property, we have

$$X = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_1, \dots, S_n, \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)) \mid \mathcal{H}_i(\infty) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_1, \dots, S_n) \mid \mathcal{H}_i(\infty) \right],$$

where the second equality holds because conditional on the private signals S_1, \dots, S_n , further conditioning on $\mathcal{H}_i(\infty)$ does not change the posterior. Thus, we have

$$X = \mathbb{E}[W | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)] = \mathbb{E}[W | X], \quad (13)$$

where the second inequality is due to tower property. Note that Z_i is $\mathcal{H}_i(\infty)$ -measurable and our assumption (2) guarantees that Z_i is integrable for $i \leq n$. Thus, we have by tower property,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_i W | X] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[Z_i W | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)] \mid X \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Z_i \mathbb{E}[W | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty)] \mid X \right] = \mathbb{E}[Z_i | X] \cdot \mathbb{E}[W | X],$$

where the last equality holds because of (13). Summing the equation above for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and plugging in the expression (12) for W gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z \cdot \frac{\beta e^Z}{1 + \beta e^Z} \mid X \right] = \mathbb{E}[Z | X] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\beta e^Z}{1 + \beta e^Z} \mid X \right]. \quad (14)$$

Now, observe that $x \rightarrow \frac{\beta e^x}{1 + \beta e^x}$ is strictly increasing. Thus, (14) gives the equality condition for Chebyshev's sum inequality, which implies $Z = Z(X)$ is $\sigma(X)$ -measurable. Thus, $W = \frac{\beta e^Z}{1 + \beta e^Z}$ is $\sigma(X)$ -measurable and by (13), $X = W$ holds a.s.. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_1, \dots, S_n) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))$ holds a.s..

□

4 Gaussian Models

In this section, we consider the sampling model with Gaussian environments, namely the model in Section 2 with prior $\nu = \mathbf{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ and the signal structure given by $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta) = \mathbf{N}(\langle a_i, \theta \rangle, \Sigma_i)$. For simplicity, we only consider when $d = 1$ and $\mu = 0, \Sigma = \Sigma_i = 1$, but all of our discussion carries through the general case with little modification.

4.1 Analysis of the posterior distribution

Denote $H_i(t) := (S_i, (Y_j(s))_{j \in \partial_i, s < t})$ by the collection of messages agent i has received up to time t . Then, it is straightforward to inductively deduce that $\{H_i(t)\}_{i \in V}$ is jointly Gaussian conditional on θ . Moreover, the mean and the covariance can be computed iteratively.




Figure 1: A realization of posterior means $(X_i(t))_{0 \leq t \leq 500}$, $i = 1, 2$, when G is a single edge with Gaussian environment. Left: $(X_i(t))_{0 \leq t \leq 500}$, $i = 1, 2$, at the scale of $[-1, 1]$, whose scale matches the variance of the signals. Right: the same plot, but zoomed in so that the fluctuations are better seen. Blue line correspond to the first agent with signal strength $a_1 = 1$ and red line corresponds to the second agent with signal strength $a_2 = 2$. Here, θ drawn from $\mathbf{N}(0, 1)$ was $\theta \approx -0.502$ and the S_1, S_2 drawn respectively from $\mathbf{N}(\theta, 1)$ and $\mathbf{N}(2\theta, 1)$ was $S_1 \approx -0.371$ and $S_2 \approx -1.08$. Note that at time $t = 0$, the posterior mean is $X_1(0) = S_1/a_1 \approx -0.371$ and $X_2(0) = S_2/a_2 \approx -0.542$. Horizontal dashed line is the mean of the Bayes posterior $\mathbb{E}[\theta | S_1, S_2] = \frac{a_1 S_1 + a_2 S_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + 1} \approx -0.423$. At time $t = 500$, $X_1(500) \approx -0.406$ and $X_2(500) \approx -0.407$.

Lemma 4.1 (Explicit formula for the Gaussian case). *For any $t \geq 0$, conditional on θ , $\{H_i(t)\}_{i \in V}$ is jointly Gaussian with mean $\mathbb{E}[H_i(t) | \theta] = \theta \mu_i(t)$ for some $\mu_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{t \cdot |\partial i| + 1}$. Denote the covariance matrices by $\Sigma_{ij}(t) := \text{Cov}(H_i(t), H_j(t) | \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{(t \cdot |\partial i| + 1) \times (t \cdot |\partial j| + 1)}$. Then, the posterior of agent i at time t is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_i(t) &= \mathbf{N}(X_i(t), \sigma_i(t)), \quad \text{where} \\ X_i(t) &:= \frac{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} H_i(t)}{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_i(t) := \frac{1}{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Moreover, $\mu_i(t+1)$ and $\Sigma_{ij}(t+1)$ can be calculated from $\mu_i(t)$ and $\Sigma_{ij}(t)$ as follows. Note that by definition, $H_i(t+1) = (H_i(t), (Y_j(t))_{j \in \partial i})$. Thus, in order to calculate $\mu_i(t+1)$ and $\Sigma_{ij}(t+1)$ from the previous time, it suffices to calculate the mean and the covariance structure for the samples $\{Y_i(t)\}_{i \in V}$ and history $\{H_i(t)\}_{i \in V}$, whose formula is given as follows: for $i, j \in V$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(t) | \theta] &= \frac{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t)}{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1}, \\ \text{Cov}(H_i(t), Y_j(t) | \theta) &= \frac{\Sigma_{ij}(t) \Sigma_{jj}(t)^{-1} \mu_j(t)}{\mu_j(t)^\top \Sigma_{jj}(t)^{-1} \mu_j(t) + 1}, \\ \text{Cov}(Y_i(t), Y_j(t) | \theta) &= \frac{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \Sigma_{ij}(t) \Sigma_{jj}(t)^{-1} \mu_j(t)}{(\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1) (\mu_j(t)^\top \Sigma_{jj}(t)^{-1} \mu_j(t) + 1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{1}(i = j)}{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is given in the appendix. Note that the Gaussian signal structure under consideration easily verifies the condition for Lemma 2.4 with $\mu_i \equiv \mu$, $i \in V$, where μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} , since we can simply bound

$$\left| \log(p_i(x | S_i)) \right| = \left| \log \frac{d\text{Law}(\theta | S_i)}{d\mu}(x) - \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(x) \right| \leq C(x^2 + S_i^2),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on a_i . Thus, the condition (3) holds, so by Lemma 2.4, the Gaussian signal structure has finite information and satisfies the Bayes law. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 and




Figure 2: Posterior variances for the cases where G is a clique or a cycle with 7 agents with Gaussian environment up to time $t = 20$. Here, signal structure is taken to be $a_i = i, 1 \leq i \leq 7$. Blue line corresponds to the first agent in the fully connected network and orange line corresponds to the first agent in the cycle network. Horizontal dashed line is the variance of the Bayes posterior $(\sum_{i=1}^7 i^2 + 1)^{-1} \approx 0.0071$.

2.5, we have that for agent i , almost surely,

$$\nu_i(t) \xrightarrow{w} \text{Law}(\theta | S_1, \dots, S_n) = \mathbf{N}(X(\infty), \sigma(\infty)), \quad (17)$$

$$X(\infty) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 + 1} \text{ and } \sigma(\infty) := \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 + 1},$$

where $\nu_i(t)$ takes the explicit form (15). In particular, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_i(t) = \sigma(\infty)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_i(t) = X(\infty)$, a.s.. Now, observe that $(X_i(t))_{t \geq 0} = \{\mathbb{E}[\theta | \mathcal{H}_i(t)]\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Doob martingale with variance $\text{Var}(X_i(t)) = \sigma_i(t)(1 - \sigma_i(t))$ from its definition (15). Thus, $(X_i(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a L^2 bounded martingale and by martingale convergence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *For every agent $i \in V$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_i(t) = \sigma(\infty)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_i(t) = X(\infty)$, a.s. and in L^2 .*

4.2 Numerical experiments

In this section, we examine the convergence of $X_i(t)$ and $\sigma_i(t)$ in Corollary 4.2 by numerically simulating the sampling model on various graphs. First, we consider the simplest case possible when there are 2 agents communicating with each other. Figure 1 below reports a realization of the posterior means $\{X_i(t)\}_{t \geq 0}, i = 1, 2$, when the signal strengths are $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = 2$. Indeed, after $t = 500$, we see that the posterior means for both of the agents are close to the Bayes posterior mean $X(\infty)$.

Next, we compare the cases where G is a clique or a cycle with $n = 7$ agents. We take the signal structure to be $a_i = i, 1 \leq i \leq 7$. For the cycle case, we assume that the agent i is connected to agents $i - 1$ and $i + 1$ (here, the numbers are calculated mod 7). Figure 2 reports the posterior variances for times up to $t = 20$, which are recursively computed by equations (15) and (16). Note that posterior variances monotonically decrease, and this is expected from (15) since $\{X_i(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ being a martingale has increasing variance, so

$\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_i i(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t)$ is increasing in $t \geq 0$. Moreover, as one would expect, the fully connected network has faster rate of convergence to the variance of the Bayes posterior $\sigma(\infty)$.

5 Future Research Directions

Our work naturally leads to a number of fascinating future research directions:

- It is natural to ask what is the convergence rate of the sampling models studied here.
- To what extent can the result be extended if instead of exact sampling from the posterior some approximate sampling is used? The study of approximate Bayesian inference includes many such approximations, see e.g. [GHT15] and it is fascinating to explore to what extent do our results carry over these models.
- A large body of experimental research supports sampling models or “probability matching”. It is fascinating to design an experiment to test if sampling models are good model of human interaction of multiple individuals who communicate with each other.

References

- [Aum76] Robert J. Aumann, *Agreeing to disagree*, The Annals of Statistics **4** (1976), no. 6, 1236–1239.
- [BC09] John J. Benedetto and Wojciech Czaja, *Integration and modern analysis*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts Basler Lehrbücher, Birkhäuser Boston, 2009.
- [DS99] Peter DeMarzo and Costis Skiadas, *On the uniqueness of fully informative rational expectations equilibria*, Economic Theory **13** (1999), no. 1, 1–24.
- [Dur19] Rick Durrett, *Probability: theory and examples*, Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [GHT15] Samuel J Gershman, Eric J Horvitz, and Joshua B Tenenbaum, *Computational rationality: A converging paradigm for intelligence in brains, minds, and machines*, Science **349** (2015), no. 6245, 273–278.
- [GK03] Douglas Gale and Shachar Kariv, *Bayesian learning in social networks*, Games and Economic Behavior **45** (2003), no. 2, 329–346.
- [GP82] John D Geanakoplos and Heraklis M Polemarchakis, *We can’t disagree forever*, Journal of Economic theory **28** (1982), no. 1, 192–200.
- [GT06] Thomas L Griffiths and Joshua B Tenenbaum, *Optimal predictions in everyday cognition*, Psychological science **17** (2006), no. 9, 767–773.
- [GTFG08] Noah D Goodman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, Jacob Feldman, and Thomas L Griffiths, *A rational analysis of rule-based concept learning*, Cognitive science **32** (2008), no. 1, 108–154.
- [KMRB10] Wouter Kool, Joseph T McGuire, Zev B Rosen, and Matthew M Botvinick, *Decision making and the avoidance of cognitive demand.*, Journal of experimental psychology: general **139** (2010), no. 4, 665.
- [MMST18] Elchanan Mossel, Manuel Mueller-Frank, Allan Sly, and Omer Tamuz, *Social learning equilibria*, Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Ithaca, NY, USA, June 18-22, 2018, 2018, p. 639.
- [MST11] E. Mossel, A. Sly, and O. Tamuz, *From agreement to asymptotic learning*, Arxiv preprint 1105.4765, 2011.

- [MST14] ———, *Asymptotic learning on bayesian social networks*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **158** (2014), no. 1-2, 127–157.
- [MST15] ———, *Strategic learning and the topology of social networks*, Econometrica **83** (2015), no. 5, 1755–1794.
- [MT17] E. Mossel and O. Tamuz, *Opinion exchange dynamics*, Probability Surveys **14** (2017), 155–204.
- [Mye14] Jerome L Myers, *Probability learning and sequence learning*, Handbook of Learning and Cognitive Processes, ed. WK Estes (2014), 171–205.
- [Ost12] Michael Ostrovsky, *Information aggregation in dynamic markets with strategic traders*, Econometrica **80** (2012), no. 6, 2595–2647.
- [RSV09] Dinah Rosenberg, Eilon Solan, and Nicolas Vieille, *Informational externalities and emergence of consensus*, Games and Economic Behavior **66** (2009), no. 2, 979–994.
- [Sch95] Mark J. Schervish, *Theory of statistics*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer New York, 1995.
- [SG07] Adam Sanborn and Thomas Griffiths, *Markov chain monte carlo with people*, Advances in neural information processing systems **20** (2007).
- [SGN10] Adam N Sanborn, Thomas L Griffiths, and Daniel J Navarro, *Rational approximations to rational models: alternative algorithms for category learning.*, Psychological review **117** (2010), no. 4, 1144.
- [VATB09] Ed Vul, George Alvarez, Joshua Tenenbaum, and Michael Black, *Explaining human multiple object tracking as resource-constrained approximate inference in a dynamic probabilistic model*, Advances in neural information processing systems **22** (2009).
- [VGGT14] Edward Vul, Noah Goodman, Thomas L Griffiths, and Joshua B Tenenbaum, *One and done? optimal decisions from very few samples*, Cognitive science **38** (2014), no. 4, 599–637.
- [Vul00] Nir Vulkan, *An economist’s perspective on probability matching*, Journal of economic surveys **14** (2000), no. 1, 101–118.

A Omitted proofs

Proposition A.1 (Convergence). *The sequence of (random) probability measures $(\nu_i(t))_{t \geq 0}$ converges weakly to (random) law $\nu_i(\infty) := \text{Law}(\theta | \mathcal{H}_i(\infty))$, almost surely, i.e. for every $i \in V$, we have*

$$\nu_i(t) \xrightarrow{w} \nu_i(\infty), \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (18)$$

Proof. We have already shown that (4) happens. Now, assume that (4) happens and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the continuity point of $F_{i\infty}(\cdot)$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $y_1 < x < y_2$ holds (here, $a < b$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes coordinate-wise $a_i < b_i, i \leq d$), and

$$F_{i\infty}(x) - \varepsilon < F_{i\infty}(y_1) \leq F_{i\infty}(y_2) < F_{i\infty}(x) + \varepsilon.$$

Since \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in \mathbb{R}^d and $y_1 < x < y_2$ holds, there exists $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ such that $y_1 < q_1 < x < q_2 < y_2$. Since $F_{i\infty}(\cdot)$ is a distribution function, it is monotonically increasing in each coordinate. Thus, the above inequality shows

$$F_{i\infty}(x) - \varepsilon < F_{i\infty}(q_1) \leq F_{i\infty}(q_2) < F_{i\infty}(x) + \varepsilon.$$

Note that by (4), we have $|F_{it}(q_1) - F_{i\infty}(q_1)| \vee |F_{it}(q_2) - F_{i\infty}(q_2)| < \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large t . Moreover, $F_{it}(\cdot)$ is also monotonically increasing in each coordinate. Thus, we have

$$F_{i\infty}(x) - 2\varepsilon < F_{it}(q_1) \leq F_{it}(x) \leq F_{it}(q_2) < F_{i\infty}(x) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we have shown that $F_{it}(x) \rightarrow F_{i\infty}(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ holds on the continuity points of $F_{i\infty}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.1 We aim to show that $\mathbb{E}(Z_1 - Z_2)^2 = 0$. Let $M = (M_{i,j})_{i,j \leq 2}$ denote the 2×2 matrix encoding the second moment of the random vector (Z_1, Z_2) , i.e. $M_{ii} = \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2]$, $M_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[Z_i Z_j]$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. The second moment of $Y(\lambda)$ can be expanded in terms of the entries of M as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z(\lambda)^2] &= [\lambda \quad 1 - \lambda] \cdot M \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ 1 - \lambda \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \lambda^2(M_{11} + M_{22} - 2M_{12}) + 2\lambda(M_{12} - M_{22}) + M_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

Being a quadratic function in λ , the above is minimized at both $\lambda = 0, 1$ if and only if it is a constant function. Thus, $M_{11} = M_{12} = M_{22} \equiv m$ holds and we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(Z_1 - Z_2)^2] = M_{11} + M_{22} - 2M_{12} = 0. \quad \square$$

We now prove Proposition 2.4. It is proved via 2 separate lemmas, namely Lemmas A.2 and A.3 below:

Lemma A.2 (A sufficient condition for Bayes law). *Suppose that there exists σ -finite regular borel measures $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in V}$ such that the $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_i for every $\theta \in \text{supp}(\nu)$ and $i \in V$. Then, $\{\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)\}_{i \in V}$ satisfies the Bayes law in Definition 2.2.*

Proof. Denote \mathbb{P}_S by the joint distribution of (S_1, \dots, S_n) . Then, for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_S)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we have by conditional independence of S_i given θ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n) \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i) \mid \theta \in A)}{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i)) \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i))}{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A)^{-n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_\varepsilon(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the L^2 ball with radius ε around z . We now argue that sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives our goal (1). First, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i = x_i, \forall i \leq n), \quad \mathbb{P}_S\text{-a.s } x,$$

because if we consider the measure $\nu_A(B) := \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A, S \in B)$ for borel measurable $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{dn}$, then $\nu_A \ll \mathbb{P}_S$ holds, so (generalized) Lebesgue differentiation theorem on Euclidean space (see e.g. Theorem 8.4.6 of [BC09]) shows that for \mathbb{P}_S -a.s. x ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nu_A\left(\prod_{i=1}^n B_\varepsilon(x_i)\right)}{\mathbb{P}_S\left(\prod_{i=1}^n B_\varepsilon(x_i)\right)} = \frac{d\nu_A}{d\mathbb{P}_S}(x) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i = x_i, \forall i \leq n),$$

where the last equality holds by the definition of regular conditional probability distribution. By the same argument, we have for every $i \leq n$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i)) = \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A \mid S_i = x_i), \quad \mathbb{P}_{S_i}\text{-a.s } x_i.$$

Thus, by the 4 equations in the display above, proof is done if we show $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i))}{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n)}$ exists in

$(0, \infty)$ for \mathbb{P}_S -a.s. x . Here, we will use our assumption that $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot \mid \theta) \ll \mu_i$. Denote it's Radon-Nikodym derivative by $f_i(x \mid \theta) := \frac{d\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot \mid \theta)}{d\mu_i}(x)$. Then, for any borel measurable $B_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we have by Toninelli theorem,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta) = \int_{B_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta) \mu_i(dx).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{P}_{S_i} \ll \mu_i$ holds with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{S_i}}{d\mu_i}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta)$. In particular, we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta) \in (0, \infty)$ for \mathbb{P}_{S_i} -a.s. x . Moreover, again by Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i))}{\mu_i(B_\varepsilon(x_i))} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta), \quad \mathbb{P}_{S_i}\text{-a.s } x_i. \quad (19)$$

By conditional independence of S_i 's given θ , the same argument gives that we have that $\mathbb{P}_S \ll \otimes_{i=1}^n \mu_i$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mathbb{P}_S}{d\otimes_{i=1}^n \mu_i}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta) \in (0, \infty)$, \mathbb{P}_S -a.s. x . Lebesgue differentiation theorem again gives

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n)}{\prod_{i=1}^n \mu_i(B_\varepsilon(x_i))} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta), \quad \mathbb{P}_S\text{-a.s } x. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, by (19) and (20) we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i))}{\mathbb{P}(S_i \in B_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i \leq n)} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(x_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i \mid \theta) \nu(d\theta)} \in (0, \infty) \quad \mathbb{P}_S\text{-a.s } x,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma A.3 (A sufficient condition for finite information). *For $i \in V$, let \mathbb{P}_{S_i} denote the marginal law of S_i . Under the same assumptions as in Lemma A.2, \mathbb{P}_{S_i} -a.s., the posterior $\text{Law}(\theta \mid S_i)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior ν . Denote $p_i(x \mid S_i)$ by it's the Radon-Nikodym derivative. Then, if*

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \log(p_i(x \mid S_i)) \right| \nu(dx) < \infty,$$

then $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot \mid \theta)$ has finite information in the sense of Definition 2.3.

Proof. For the first claim, if there exists a σ -finite μ_i such that $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta) \ll \mu_i$ for every $\theta \in \text{supp}(\nu)$, then classical Bayes' theorem (see for e.g. Theorem 1.31 of [Sch95]) shows that \mathbb{P}_{S_i} -a.s., $\text{Law}(\theta | S_i) \ll \nu$.

For the second claim, take borel measurable A such that $0 < \nu(A) < 1$. First, note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_i)} \right) \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_i) \right],$$

thus to prove $\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot | \theta)$ has finite information, it suffices to show $\mathbb{E}[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)] < \infty$. We can express

$$\mathbb{E} \left[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[-\log \left(\nu(A)^{-1} \int_A p_i(x | S_i) \nu(dx) \right) \right] + \mathbb{E}[-\log \nu(A)]$$

Since $x \rightarrow -\log x$ is convex, we can use Jensen's inequality to bound the first piece in the RHS above:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[-\log \left(\nu(A)^{-1} \int_A p_i(x | S_i) \nu(dx) \right) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\nu(A)^{-1} \int_A -\log(p_i(x | S_i)) \nu(dx) \right] \\ &\leq \nu(A)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \log(p_i(x | S_i)) \right| \nu(dx) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\nu(A) \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{E}[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A | S_i)] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[-\log \mathbb{P}(\theta \in A^c | S_i)] < \infty$ hold, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.1 To begin with, recall that $\theta \in \mathbb{N}(0, 1)$ and consider a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ whose distribution is given by $X | \theta \sim \mathbb{N}(\theta v, \Sigma)$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Denote the conditional density of $\theta | X$ with respect to Lebesgue measure μ by $p(\theta | X) := \frac{d\text{Law}(\theta | X)}{d\mu}$. The densities $p(\theta | X), p(\theta)$ are similarly defined. Then, by Bayes rule,

$$p(\theta | X) \propto p(X | \theta) \cdot p(\theta) \propto \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (X - \theta v)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (X - \theta v) - \frac{\theta^2}{2} \right).$$

Thus, completing squares, we have that $\theta | X$ is normally distributed:

$$\text{Law}(\theta | X) = \mathbb{N} \left(\frac{v^\top \Sigma^{-1} X}{v^\top \Sigma^{-1} v + 1}, \frac{1}{v^\top \Sigma^{-1} v + 1} \right). \quad (21)$$

Therefore, since $H_i(t) \sim \mathbb{N}(\theta \mu_i(t), \Sigma_{ii}(t))$ by our assumption, the expression for $\nu_i(t) \equiv \text{Law}(\theta | H_i(t))$ in (15) is immediate from (21). Moreover, recall that agent i samples $Y_i(t) | H_i(t) \sim \nu_i(t) = \mathbb{N}(X_i(t), \sigma_i(t))$ conditionally independent of all other random variables at time t . Thus, we can write

$$Y_i(t) = X_i(t) + \sqrt{\sigma_i(t)} Z_i(t) = \frac{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} H_i(t)}{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1} + \frac{Z_i(t)}{\sqrt{\mu_i(t)^\top \Sigma_{ii}(t)^{-1} \mu_i(t) + 1}}, \quad (22)$$

where $Z_i(t)$ is fresh i.i.d standard normal independent of all other random variables. From (22), it is straightforward to see (16). \square