

# Graphically dependent and spatially varying Dirichlet process mixtures

XuanLong Nguyen  
*xuanlong@umich.edu*

January 4, 2010

Technical Report 504  
Department of Statistics  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor MI 48109

## Abstract

We consider the problem of clustering grouped and functional data, which are indexed by a covariate, and assessing the dependency of the clustered groups on the covariate. We assume that each observation within a group is a draw from a mixture model. The mixture components and the number of such components can change with the covariate, and are assumed to be unknown a priori. In addition to learning the “local” clusters within each group we also assume the existence of “global clusters” indexed over the covariate domain when the observations across the groups are jointly analyzed. The number of global clusters is also unknown and to be inferred from the data. We propose a nonparametric Bayesian solution to this problem, reposing on the theory of dependent Dirichlet processes, where the dependency among the Dirichlet processes is regulated by a spatial or a graphical model distribution indexed by the covariate. Our proposed model, which we refer to as the graphical Dirichlet process mixture, is capable of joint modeling and inference of both global and local clusters in a flexible and computationally efficient manner. The global clusters are supported by a Dirichlet process, while the local clusters are randomly selected using another hierarchy of Dirichlet processes. We provide an analysis of the model properties, including a stick-breaking and a Pólya-urn scheme characterization. The graphical and spatial dependency are investigated, along with a discussion of the model identifiability. We present MCMC sampling methods, and discuss the computational implications of using a spatial or a graphical model distribution as the base measure in our model. Finally, the model behavior and inference algorithm are demonstrated by several data examples, including a clustering analysis of the progesterone hormone data.

**Keywords:** local clustering, global clustering, mixture models, nonparametric Bayes, Dirichlet process, Gaussian process, graphical model, spatial dependence, Markov chain Monte Carlo, model identifiability

# 1 Introduction

A common and useful practice in statistics is that of separating observations into groups (populations) indexed by some covariate and analyzing the relationship among the groups via their dependence on the covariate information. A particularly fruitful characterization of grouped data is the use of mixture distributions to describe the populations in terms of clusters of similar behaviors. It is of interest to not only cluster the observations within each group, but to also assess how these “local” clusters are related, shared and change – in a sense that needs to be made precise – as the covariate varies across different groups.

As an example that motivates our work, consider the progesterone hormone behaviors in a group of women during their monthly menstrual cycles. At any point during a monthly cycle, the hormone levels are expected to be clustered into typical behaviors. Such local clusters evolve throughout the monthly cycle. Moreover, the effects of possible contraceptive use add another layer of variation. Individuals that use contraceptives may have generally distinct hormone behaviors compared to those that do not, suggesting potential existence of “global” clusters. A global cluster in this case is a monthly hormone curve represented by “typical” woman, while in general each individual hormone curve could be considered as a hybrid curve that select values from any of typical hormone curves at any time point during the monthly cycle. In this example, the covariate indexes the time during the monthly cycle. In general, the covariate needs not encode spatial or temporal information, and the observations from different groups can be of different data types.

In this paper we explore a model-based approach to clustering of grouped data and functional data. The data are subdivided into a collection of groups indexed by a covariate  $u \in V$ , where  $V$  is a set of group indices. Within each group we wish to find local clusters that capture latent structure in the data. The number of clusters within each group is unknown and could vary from one group to another. Between the groups we wish to find how the cluster centers may also vary. In particular, we are also interested in the emergence of global clusters indexed over  $V$ , clusters those that are formed when observations are viewed jointly across the groups.

Because the number of clusters is assumed to be unknown, a natural approach to this problem, also the one that we pursue, is a nonparametric Bayesian approach based on Dirichlet processes and their variants. A Dirichlet process  $DP(\alpha_0, G_0)$  defines a distribution on (random) probability measures, where  $\alpha_0$  is called the concentration parameter, and parameter  $G_0$  denotes the base probability measure or centering distribution (Ferguson, 1973). A random draw  $G$  from the Dirichlet process (DP) is a discrete measure (with probability 1), which admits the well-known “stick-breaking” representation (Sethuraman, 1994):

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\phi_k}, \tag{1}$$

where the  $\phi_k$ ’s are independent random variables distributed according to  $G_0$ ,  $\delta_{\phi_k}$  denotes an atomic distribution concentrated at  $\phi_k$ , and the stick breaking weights  $\pi_k$  are random and depend only on parameter  $\alpha_0$ . Due to the discrete nature of the DP realizations, Dirichlet processes and their variants have become an effective tool in mixture modeling and learning of clustered data. The basic idea is to use the DP as a prior on the mixture components in a mixture model, where

each mixture component is associated with an atom in  $G$ . The posterior distribution of the atoms provides the probability distribution on mixture components, and also yields a probability distribution of partitions of the data. The resultant mixture model, generally known as the Dirichlet process mixture, was pioneered by the work of Antoniak (1974) and subsequently developed by a number of authors (Lo, 1984; Escobar and West, 1995; MacEachern and Muller, 1998).

Suppose that each group of data is modeled using a mixing distribution  $G_u$ , which is distributed according to a Dirichlet process  $\text{DP}(\alpha_u, G_{0;u})$ . Many authors have considered ways of introducing dependencies among the multiple DPs via links among parameters  $\alpha_u$  and  $G_{0;u}$  (e.g., Cifarelli and Regazzini (1978); Muliere and Petrone (1993); Mallick and Walker (1997); Tomlinson (1998); Kleinman and Ibrahim (1998); MacEachern (1999); Carota and Parmigiani (2002); Muller et al. (2004); DeIorio et al. (2004); Ishwaran and James (2001); Tomlinson and Escobar (2003); Teh et al. (2006); Sudderth et al. (2008); Kim and Smyth (2007)). A common theme among the such proposals is to utilize the Bayesian hierarchical modeling framework, where the parameters are linked by introducing a Bayesian hierarchy in which the parameters are assumed conditionally independent draws from a probability distribution.

We highlight an elegant approach by Teh et al (2006), who proposed a fully nonparametric hierarchical framework for linking multiple DP mixtures. To link among the  $G_u$ , they assume that  $G_u|\alpha_0, G_0 \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_0, G_0)$ . Moreover, the base probability measure  $G_0$  is also random, and is distributed according to another DP:  $G_0|\gamma, H \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H)$ . Because  $G_0$  is a discrete probability measure with probability 1, the specification for  $G_u$ 's implies that that the  $G_u$ 's share the same set of atoms that define  $G_0$ . This explicitly allows the different groups to share the same set of mixture components, while the mixture weights vary across the groups. In contrast to Teh et al. (2006) we are interested in modeling the linkage among the groups via their explicit dependence on the covariate  $u$  while relaxing the assumption of exchangeability between groups.

In parametric modeling for multivariate data, a customary method to characterize complex dependency among a group of variables is via a spatial distribution (process), assuming that  $u$  encodes spatial information and that the group-specific distributions are spatially dependent (Cressie, 1993; Banerjee et al., 2004). More generally,  $u$  needs not represent spatial information, and different groups have observations of different data types (e.g., domains and cardinalities). In such scenarios, a versatile modeling method is via graphical models (Lauritzen, 1996; Whittaker, 2009; Jordan, 2004). A graphical model represents a class of joint probability distributions for a given collection of random variables indexed by a graph, and is characterized in terms of conditional independence relations given by the graph's structure. Moreover, graphical models with sparse graphical structure have the virtue of dimensionality reduction, thereby facilitating improved computational efficiency of inference (Jordan, 2004). Technically, we wish to link together a collection of (infinite dimensional) random probability measures in an analogous manner in which a spatial or a graphical model links together a collection of (finite dimensional) random variables. Regardless of our technical tools to be employed, there are a number of modeling issues that play the central roles in determining the modeling strategy. For instance: How do the atoms (local clusters) across groups vary along with the covariate  $u$ ? How do the weights associating with mixture components vary with  $u$ ? How are the atoms across groups shared, given that the number of atoms may change across different groups? What are the roles for global clusters when aggregating data across the

groups? What is the relationship between local clusters and global clusters present in the model?

In one of the first papers that introduced spatially varying (and correlating) mixture distributions, Gelfand et al. (2005) proposed a random distribution over a population of functional data. Their spatial Dirichlet process (SDP) model employs a Dirichlet process using a Gaussian process as the base measure. The model is in effect an infinite mixture of Gaussian process realizations, which yields a collection of marginal distributions  $G_u$ 's indexed by location  $u$  in the spatial domain. These DP-distributed  $G_u$  are spatially varying, because the atoms across locations  $u$  are formed by random draws from the Gaussian process. However, the distributions at each  $u$  share the same weight vectors  $\pi_k$ , and the posterior distributions at each  $u$  generally support the same number of clusters. Thus, Gelfand et al.'s modeling approach supports only the notion of global clustering for functional data, but it cannot account for the variation, say, in the number of local clusters across the index set  $V$ .

In this paper we offer a simple solution to the modeling of both global clusters and spatially varying local clusters, reposing on several elements utilized in the described modeling frameworks of Gelfand et al. (2005) and Teh et al. (2006). The proposed model is easy to describe: For each group indexed by  $u$ , we assume that  $G_u \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, Q_u)$ , where  $Q_u$  is a base measure for the DP associated with  $u$ . To link the  $Q_u$ 's together, we let  $Q_u$  be the marginal distribution at  $u$  of a stochastic process  $Q$  indexed by  $u \in V$ . We force  $Q$  to be discrete and yet have broad support, by assuming that  $Q$  is a random draw from a Dirichlet process  $\text{DP}(\gamma, H)$ . To induce the dependence on the covariate  $u \in V$ ,  $H$  is taken to be a spatial process indexed by  $u \in V$ , or more generally a graphical model defined on the collection of variables indexed by  $V$ . In summary, we obtain the following hierarchical specification:

$$\begin{aligned} Q | \gamma, H &\sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H) \\ G_u | \alpha_u, Q &\sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, Q_u) \text{ for each } u \in V, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which we shall refer to as a graphical Dirichlet process (GDP).

The GDP can be viewed as specific instance of a very general framework for dependent Dirichlet processes outlined by MacEachern (1999) and MacEachern et al. (2001). In this framework the random variables  $\pi_k$  and  $\phi_k$  in (1) are general stochastic processes indexed by  $u \in V$ . That is, each  $G_u$  can be written as (using modified notations):

$$G_u = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_{uk} \delta_{\phi_{uk}}.$$

There are a number of recent work that proposed spatially varying mixture models, mainly starting from the stick-breaking representation given above. Griffin and Steel (2006) proposed the Order-based dependent Dirichlet processes, which incorporate the dependence of  $\pi_{uk}$  on  $u$  by introducing a random permutation process indexed by  $u \in V$ . This permutation process is used to define the weights  $\pi_{uk}$ , thereby inducing their dependence on  $u$ . Dunson and Park (2008) proposed the Kernel stick breaking processes, where  $\pi_{uk}$ 's are also dependent on  $u$ . This is achieved by using an (typically) exponential kernel function to parameterize  $\pi_{uk}$ , so that nearby locations have similar weights with high probability. These works do not support the notion of global clustering, and

as we shall see, the kinds of spatial dependency in these models are very different from the GDP mixture model.

Spatially varying mixture models, especially those arising in nonparametric Bayesian literature are typically motivated from applications to functional data (Duan et al., 2007; Rasmussen and Ghahramani, 2002; Petrone et al., 2009; Rodriguez et al., 2009; Dunson, 2008; Nguyen and Gelfand, 2009). These proposed models for functional data have a desired feature that the marginal distributions at each location  $u$  are spatially correlated. On the other hand, they are significantly more complex in behavior and more computationally demanding than models for dependent measures such those proposed by Dunson and Park (2008); Griffin and Steel (2006), and our proposed GDP. This is due to the fact that models for functional data specify a random distribution for a collection of functions (e.g., curves or surfaces). For instance, in the modeling frameworks of Duan et al. (2007); Rasmussen and Ghahramani (2002); Petrone et al. (2009) a random curve can be viewed as a hybrid curve, which takes in different mixture components associating with different “canonical” curves in different locations. These works offer ways of specifying a prior distribution that encourages the spatial dependency of the mixture component assignment at neighboring locations. If the individual function are expected to admit a high probability of mixture component switching as it goes from one location to another neighboring location, the corresponding prior needs to have a broad support for arbitrarily non-smooth functions. The resultant models are complex, requiring a large amount of data to fit and generally incurring expensive amount of computations. These points were illustrated by Nguyen and Gelfand (2009), who presented an identifiability and posterior consistency analysis for one such model. As a result, although motivated by local clustering aspects in data, the majority of proposed models mentioned above focused mainly on the interpolation and prediction aspects of the functional data analysis, not on the learning of the clusters per se.

Indeed, the most distinctive aspect that distinguishes GDP from the existing works mentioned above is that it provides a simple and in our view computationally attractive solution to the modeling of both global and local clusters present in the data. In the first stage, the Dirichlet process using a high-dimensional base measure provides support for *global atoms*, which in turn provide support for *local atoms* for multiple groups in the second stage. A global atom is a realization from the high-dimensional base measure  $H$ . In particular, the DP associating with each group in the second stage randomly selects the corresponding part of the global atoms. The resultant distributions over the local atoms have a number of interesting properties: Mixture distributions associating with different locations may use the support from different subsets of global atoms. Not only could different groups have different number of local atoms (i.e., local clusters), the base measure  $H$  induces the desired dependency so that similar groups (such as those indexed by nearby locations) are more likely to share the same global atoms (global clusters), thereby having more similar local clusters. The role of global atoms in the underlying global clusters is also flexible: each global atom could be viewed as providing a center of a global cluster, but it is not necessary that all components of a global factor vector contribute the support for such global cluster centers. All these properties shall be illustrated and quantified in the main sections of the paper. See, for instance, Figure 2 for an illustration on the relationship between local clusters and global clusters.

Combining aspects of global and local clustering within a single modeling framework has

proved to be a challenging exercise, as evidenced in existing works of Duan et al. (2007); Petrone et al. (2009); Nguyen and Gelfand (2009) for functional data analysis. Although the proposed models in these works can represent both global and local clusters, the complexity of the models requires that in practice the number of local clusters has to be specified upfront. We argue that if there is a high probability of switching among mixture components for each individual curve as one moves from one location  $u$  to another, then it is no longer beneficial to model distribution for individual curves explicitly, due to the model complexity and potentially anomalous behavior of the prior. On the other hand, our model is particularly suitable for such situations, because we bypass the modeling of individual functional curves, focusing instead on the modeling of the underlying global clusters and the random selection of local clusters within each group indexed by  $u$ .

When applied to sequential data (e.g., temporal data), our model offers a fundamentally different approach from several existing works on the infinite hidden Markov models (iHMM) (Beal et al., 2002; Teh et al., 2006; Fox et al., 2009). Although the iHMM can also represent the evolution of spatially varying clusters, our model is arguably more flexible as it is not restricted to a discrete index space  $V$ , nor is it required to satisfy the Markov properties inherent in the iHMM. We must also mention a recent paper on hyper Dirichlet processes (Heinz, 2009), which can be viewed as a graphical models of the DP's. The hyper DPs have some similarity with the SDP of Gelfand et al. (2005), although it is a more restrictive class of models having rather stringent conditions on the base measure.

As described above, our proposed model owes several elements in its construction to two key modeling ideas that have been quite influential in the recent literature of nonparametric Bayesian modeling using Dirichlet processes. The first element, exemplified by Gelfand et al (2005), is the “nesting” of a stochastic process as the base measure for a Dirichlet process to induce dependency on the covariates. The second element is the “sharing” of mixture components by allowing the base measure of the Dirichlet process to be discrete. This is achieved by taking a fully nonparametric hierarchical approach advocated by Teh and Jordan (2010). The proposed GDP model can in turn be viewed as a nontrivial generalization of both the SDP of Gelfand et al, and the HDP of Teh et al. As we shall demonstrate in this paper, the GDP possesses a substantially rich range of behaviors that are particularly conducive to the simultaneous modeling of global and local clustering that most of the existing works are not well equipped for.

To clarify on the connections to both the HDP and the SDP, suppose that the distribution  $H$  is “collapsed” to a distribution of a single element  $\phi_u$ , by insisting that  $\phi_v = \phi_u$  for all  $v \in V$ . Then, the Dirichlet processes  $G_u$ 's become iid conditionally on  $Q$ . The resultant model is exactly the HDP. This generalization, in our view, is significant in broadening the richness and applicability of the hierarchical nonparametric framework, by fusing it with existing multivariate stochastic models for representing complex dependency in high dimensional data. Turning to the connection to the SDP, if we let the concentration parameters  $\alpha_u \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $u \in V$ , each DP realization  $G_u$  tends to  $Q_u$  in distribution. The resultant model can be viewed as the SDP. In addition, our choice of allowing the base measure  $H$  to be an arbitrary graphical model rather than a standard spatial process (such as the Gaussian process in the SDP) is a variation of the same theme, but one that can significantly extend the applicability of the nested framework to problems beyond the domain of spatial statistics, and that allows us to potentially improve the computational efficiency

of inference, by exploiting the rich literature on computational methods that have been developed for probabilistic graphical models in recent years.

In summary, the graphical Dirichlet process that we propose for local and global clustering of grouped data and functional data can be viewed as a canonical example of a dependency model for multiple (and possibly infinite number of) Dirichlet processes, whose dependency is regulated by a multivariate distribution or a stochastic process. It involves a Bayesian hierarchy where the base measures for a collection of Dirichlet processes are marginals of a stochastic process, which itself is distributed according to a Dirichlet process. Because the Dirichlet process can be expressed in a number of equivalent constructions, including the stick-breaking representation and the Pólya urn sampling scheme, this suggests straightforward extensions of the model along different directions that each of these distinct representations can offer to achieve far richer model behaviors.

The paper outline is as follows. Section 2 provides a description of the GDP mixture model, starting with a brief background on the DP mixture in section 2.1, while the model definition is given in section 2.3. Section 3 explores the GDP mixture in more detail. It includes a stick-breaking characterization in section 3.1, an analysis of the underlying graphical and spatial dependency in section 3.2, a Pólya-urn sampling characterization in section 3.3, which also illuminates the roles of global and local clusters captured by the model. The issue of model identifiability is discussed in section 3.4. The alternative representations in the previous sections are crucial in paving way for our presentation of inference methods for the GDP in Section 4. In particular, we describe two MCMC sampling methods: The marginal approach in section 4.1 exploits the Pólya urn characterization, which allows us to integrate out Dirichlet process random measures, as well as the base measure in the model. The conditional approach in section 4.3 exploits the the stick-breaking representation and resorts to sampling parameters under such representation. In both approaches, the implications of using either a spatial or a graphical model as our centering distribution are discussed in detail. Section 5 presents several experiment results. Section 6 concludes the paper. Some additional details are included in the Appendix.

## 2 Model formalization

### 2.1 Dirichlet process mixture

This section provides a brief background of the Dirichlet process. The notations introduced in this section only serve the background purposes, and are independent from the remaining sections in the paper. Let  $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}, G_0)$  be a probability space, and  $\alpha_0 > 0$ . A Dirichlet process  $\text{DP}(\alpha_0, G_0)$  is defined to be the distribution of a random probability measure  $G$  over  $(\Theta, \mathcal{B})$  such that, for any finite measurable partition  $(A_1, \dots, A_r)$  of  $\Theta$ , the random vector  $(G(A_1), \dots, G(A_r))$  is distributed as a finite dimensional Dirichlet distribution with parameters  $(\alpha_0 G_0(A_1), \dots, \alpha_0 G_0(A_r))$ .

Dirichlet processes were introduced by Ferguson (1973), who proved its existence and also showed that probability measures drawn from a Dirichlet process are discrete with probability one. This property is made explicit in the *stick-breaking* construction due to Sethuraman (1994), who

showed that a random measure  $G$  distributed by  $\text{DP}(\alpha_0, G_0)$  has the representation:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\phi_k},$$

where  $(\phi_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are iid draws from  $G_0$ , and  $\delta_{\phi_k}$  denotes an atomic probability measure concentrated at atom  $\phi_k$ . The sequence  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are referred to as “stick-breaking” weights, and can be expressed in terms of independent beta variables:  $\pi_k = \pi'_k \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (1 - \pi'_l)$ , where  $(\pi'_l)_{l=1}^{\infty}$  are iid draws from  $\text{Beta}(1, \alpha_0)$ .

Note that  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  satisfies  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k = 1$  with probability one, and can be viewed as a random probability measure on the positive integers. For notational convenience, we write  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \sim \text{GEM}(\alpha_0)$ , following Pittman (2002).

Another useful viewpoint for the Dirichlet process is given by the Pólya urn scheme, which shows that draws from the Dirichlet process are both discrete and exhibit a clustering property. From a computational perspective, the Pólya urn scheme provides a method for sampling from the random distribution  $G$ , by integrating out  $G$ . More concretely, let atoms  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$  are iid random variables distributed according to  $G$ . Because  $G$  is random,  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$  are exchangeable. Blackwell and MacQueen (1973) showed that the conditional distribution of  $\theta_i$  given  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{i-1}$  has the following form:

$$[\theta_i | \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{i-1}, \alpha_0, G_0] \sim \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{i-1 + \alpha_0} \delta_{\theta_l} + \frac{\alpha_0}{i-1 + \alpha_0} G_0.$$

This expression shows that  $\theta_i$  has a positive probability of being equal to one of the previous draws  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{i-1}$ . Moreover, the more often an atom is drawn, the more likely it is to be drawn in the future, suggesting a clustering property induced by the random measure  $G$ .

A Dirichlet process mixture model utilizes  $G$  as the prior on the mixture component  $\theta$ . Combining with a likelihood function  $P(y|\theta) = F(\theta)$ , the DP mixture model is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_i | G &\sim G, \\ y_i | \theta_i &\sim F(\theta_i). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Such mixture models have been studied in the pioneering work of Antoniak (1974) and subsequently by a number of authors (Lo, 1984; Escobar and West, 1995; MacEachern and Muller, 1998), and provide the basis for the graphical Dirichlet process mixtures that we will introduce in the sequel.

## 2.2 Setting and notations

We are interested in problems where the observations are organized into groups. Although the observations within each group are assumed to be exchangeable, the groups are not. In fact, the groups are indexed by a covariate  $u \in V$ , where  $V$  is a set of indices. To be precise, let  $y_{u1}, y_{u2}, \dots, y_{un_u}$  be the observations obtained within group  $u$ . Assuming that each observation is



drawn independently from a mixture model, and that there is a mixture component associated with each observation.

Let  $(\Theta, \mathcal{B})$  be a measurable space, where  $\Theta = \prod_{u \in V} \Theta_u$ . Let  $\theta_{ui} \in \Theta_u$  denote the parameter specifying the mixture component associated with  $y_{ui}$ . We will refer to the variables  $\theta_{ui}$  as *local factors* indexed by covariate  $u$ . Let  $F(\theta_{ui})$  denote the distribution of observation  $y_{ui}$  given the local factor  $\theta_{ui}$ . Let  $G_u$  denote a prior distribution for the local factors  $(\theta_{ui})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ . We assume that the local factors  $\theta_{ui}$ 's are conditionally independent given  $G_u$ . As a result we have the following model:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{ui}|G_u &\sim G_u \\ y_{ui}|\theta_{ui} &\sim F(\theta_{ui}).\end{aligned}$$

In the sequel we shall also encounter the notion of *global factors*, which are denoted by  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . These are high dimensional vector (or function) whose components are indexed by covariate  $u$ . That is,  $\phi = (\phi_u)_{u \in V}$ , and  $\psi = (\psi_u)_{u \in V}$ . To be clear, we always use  $i$  to denote the numbering index for  $\theta_u$  (so we have  $\theta_{ui}$ ). We always use  $t$  and  $k$  to denote the number index for instances of  $\psi$ 's and  $\phi$ 's, respectively (e.g.,  $\psi_t$  and  $\phi_k$ ). The elements of a vector  $\psi_t$  and a  $\phi_k$  are denoted by  $\psi_{ut}$  and  $\phi_{uk}$ . We may also use letters  $v$  and  $w$  beside  $u$  to denote the group indices.

### 2.3 Graphical Dirichlet process mixtures

We would like to link together the collection of mixture distributions  $G_u$  using a dependency that can be described in terms of the covariate  $u \in V$ . In some applications,  $u$  may describe the spatial information of the groups, and one could envision the spatial dependency among the groups. For instance,  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ , for some natural number  $r$ , and the groups at nearby locations  $u \in V$ 's are expected to have similar clustering behavior. In other applications,  $V$  could be viewed as a finite collection of nodes in a graph, which is endowed with a collection of undirected edges  $E$ . The groups indexed by  $v \in V$  possess conditional independence relations as specified by graphical model  $(V, E)$ . Thus the spatial dependency or graphical dependency can be described by placing a spatial or graphical model distribution on the collection of variables indexed by  $V$ , respectively. Regardless of this modeling detail, we shall often refer to the group index  $u$  as a location, and use the terms “spatial” and “graphical” model interchangeably.

Let  $Q$  be a distribution for random vector  $\phi = (\phi_u : u \in V)$  whose components are indexed by  $u \in V$ . Let  $Q_u$  denote the induced marginal distribution of  $\phi_u$ . Our model posits that for each  $u \in V$ ,  $G_u$  is a random measure distributed as a Dirichlet process with concentration parameter  $\alpha_u$ , and base probability measure  $Q_u$ :

$$G_u|\alpha_u, Q \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, Q_u).$$

The distribution  $G_u$  varies around the centering distribution  $Q_u$ , with the amount of variability given by  $\alpha_u$ . Conditioning on  $Q$ , the  $G_u$ 's are independent with spatially varying means  $Q_u$ . The probability measure  $Q$  is random, and distributed as a Dirichlet process with concentration parameter  $\gamma$  and base probability measure  $H$ :

$$Q|\gamma, H \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H).$$

In summary, collecting the above specifications give us a nonparametric Bayesian model for graphically and/or spatially dependent Dirichlet process mixtures, which we term the *graphical Dirichlet process mixture model*:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q|\gamma, H &\sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H). \\
G_u|\alpha_u, Q &\sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, Q_u), \text{ for all } u \in V \\
\theta_{ui}|G_u &\sim G_u \text{ for all } u, i \\
y_{ui}|\theta_{ui} &\sim F(\theta_{ui}) \text{ for all } u, i.
\end{aligned}$$

The hyperparameters for the graphical Dirichlet process consist of the base line probability measure  $H$ , and the concentration parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_u; u \in V$ . Although it is possible to envision a spatial or a graphical model prior on  $(\alpha_u : u \in V)$ , in this paper, we shall place independent gamma priors on  $\gamma$  and the  $\alpha_u$ 's, following Escobar and West (1995). The baseline  $H$  provides the prior distribution for what we refer to as *global factors*  $\phi = (\phi_u : u \in V)$ . The distribution  $Q$  varies around prior  $H$ , with the amount of variability is governed by  $\gamma$ . Moreover,  $Q$  is discrete with probability 1, which can be represented in terms of multivariate atoms that are independent draws from  $H$ .

The global and the local factors provide distinct representations for both global clusters and local clusters that we envision being present in data. Local factors provide the support for local cluster centers at each  $u$ . As we shall see, these local clusters are spatially varying (and correlated). The global factors in turn provide the support for the local clusters, but they also provide the support for global cluster centers in the data, when observations are aggregated across different groups.

Throughout the paper we shall elaborate on the statistical and computational properties of the GDP model by considering the following two specific examples for the base measure  $H$ .

**Example 1 (Spatial model  $H$ ).** Suppose that the observations are collected over a geographical area  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ , for some natural number  $r$ . A customary choice of spatial prior distribution  $H$  that works well for many application is a Gaussian process given by a mean function  $\mu : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a covariance function  $\rho : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (Cressie, 1993; Banerjee et al., 2004). Restricting to locations where observations are available, we obtain that under  $H$ ,  $\phi \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$  for some mean vector  $\mu$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . As we shall see, it is simple to incorporate spatial structure into a Gaussian distribution specification by parameterizing the covariance function  $\rho$  using a metric in  $V$ .

**Example 2 (Graphical model  $H$ ).** Graphical models (also known as Markov random fields for undirected graphs) offer a far richer class of probability distributions for high dimensional data, along with computationally efficient methods for statistical inference (Lauritzen, 1996; Whittaker, 2009; Jordan, 2004). Suppose  $V$  is a finite collection of nodes in a graph  $(V, E)$ , where  $E$  denotes the the collection of undirected edges that connect pairs of nodes in the graph. A graphical model distribution  $H$  for  $\phi = (\phi_u : u \in V)$  is a probability distribution satisfying the conditional independence relations: For  $\phi \sim H$ ,  $\phi_u \perp \phi_w | \phi_v, v \in N(u)$ , where  $N(u)$  denotes the set of  $u$ 's neighbors given by the graph. If the underlying graph is tree-structured (i.e., there is a single path

connecting every pair of nodes in the graph), then the joint probability distribution under  $H$  admits a specially simple representation:

$$p(\phi|H) = \frac{\prod_{(u,v) \in E} p(\phi_u, \phi_v|H)}{\prod_{u \in V} p(\phi_u|H)}.$$

The conditional independence relations specified by the graphical structure imposes a degree of dimensionality reduction in the space of probability distributions, and more crucially, they facilitate a wide array of computationally efficiency inference algorithms which exploit the sparse structure of the graph (Lauritzen, 1996; Jordan, 2004).

### 3 Model properties

#### 3.1 Stick-breaking representation

Given that the multivariate base measure  $Q$  is distributed as a Dirichlet process, it can be expressed using a stick-breaking representation:

$$Q = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k \delta_{\phi_k}.$$

Each atom  $\phi_k$  is multivariate and denoted by  $\phi_k = (\phi_{uk} : u \in V)$ . The  $\phi_k$ 's are independent draws from  $H$ , and  $\beta = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^{\infty} \sim \text{GEM}(\gamma)$ . The  $\phi_k$ 's and  $\beta$  are mutually independent. The marginal induced by  $Q$  at each location  $u \in V$  is:

$$Q_u = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k \delta_{\phi_{uk}}. \quad (4)$$

Since each  $Q_u$  has support at the points  $(\phi_{uk})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ , each  $G_u$  necessarily has support at these points as well, and can be written as:

$$G_u = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_{uk} \delta_{\phi_{uk}}. \quad (5)$$

Let  $\pi_u = (\pi_{uk})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ . Since  $G_u$ 's are independent given  $Q$ , the weights  $\pi_u$ 's are independent given  $\beta$ . Following an argument of Teh et al (2006) it is possible to derive the relationship between  $\pi_u$ 's and the global weights  $\beta$ . In particular, if  $H$  is non-atomic, it is necessary and sufficient for  $G_u$  defined by Eq. (5) satisfies  $G_u \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u Q_u)$  that the following holds:

$$\pi_u \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, \beta).$$

Here, we interpret  $\pi_u$  and  $\beta$  as probability measures on the set of positive integers. If  $H$  is atomic, the above relationship is sufficient, but not necessary.

The relationship between  $\pi_u$  and  $\beta$  can be made more explicit. Recall that the stick-breaking representation for Dirichlet processes defines the variables  $\beta_k$ 's as follows:

$$\beta_k = \beta'_k \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (1 - \beta'_l) \quad \text{where } \beta'_k \sim \text{Beta}(1, \gamma).$$

For the weights  $\pi_{uk}$ 's, we have:

$$\pi_{uk} = \pi'_{uk} \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (1 - \pi'_{ul}) \quad \text{where } \pi'_{uk} \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_u \beta_k, \alpha_u (1 - \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l)).$$

In sum, we obtain an equivalent representation of the graphical Dirichlet process mixtures in terms of the atom and weight variables. As in the Dirichlet process mixture model, since each local factor  $\theta_{ui}$  is distributed according to  $G_u$ , it takes on the value  $\phi_{uk}$  with probability  $\pi_{uk}$ . Let  $z_{ui} \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  be the indicator variable such that  $\theta_{ui} = \phi_{u(z_{ui})}$ . The model can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta | \gamma &\sim \text{GEM}(\gamma) \\ \pi_u | \alpha_u, \beta &\sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, \beta) \\ z_{ui} | \pi_u &\sim \pi_u \\ \phi_k &= (\phi_{uk} : u \in V) \sim H \\ y_{ui} | z_{ui}, (\phi_{uk})_{k=1}^\infty &\sim F(\phi_{u(z_{ui})}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$


From the stick-breaking representation, the global factors  $(\phi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  provide the support for the global cluster centers that underlie the data aggregated across  $u \in V$ . Probability measure  $Q$  is the random distribution over such global factors. Probability measures  $G_u$ 's provide the distribution for the local factors, which play the role of centers for the local clusters at each location  $u$ .

## 3.2 Graphical and spatial dependency

This section explores the statistical dependency between Dirichlet processes  $G_u$  for  $u \in V$ . Figure 1(left) depicts a graphical model representation of the GDP where each unshaded node in the graph is associated with a random distribution. Figure 1(right) depicts a graphical model for the GDP represented in terms of weights and atoms. To avoid cluttering, we exclude the observations  $y_{ui}$ 's from the illustrations.

We shall consider specific examples of the base measure  $H$ . In the first example,  $H$  is a distribution given by a graphical model governed by conditional independence specifications. In the second example,  $H$  is a spatial distribution on a spatial domain  $V$ .

**Example 1 (Graphical model  $H$ ).** For concreteness, we consider a graphical model  $H$  of three variables  $\phi_u, \phi_v, \phi_w$  which are associated with three locations  $u, v, w \in V$ . Moreover, the graphical model is chain-structured in the ordering of  $u, v, w$  so that under  $H$ , there holds  $\phi_u \perp \phi_w | \phi_v$ .



**Figure 1.** Left: The GDP is depicted as a graphical model, where each unshaded nodes represent a random distribution. Right: A graphical model representation of the GDP using the stick-breaking parameterization.

Let  $\psi = (\psi_u, \psi_v, \psi_w)$  be a random draw from  $Q$ . Because  $Q$  is distributed as a Dirichlet process with base measure  $H$ ,  $\psi$  takes values among the global factors  $(\phi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ , which are iid draws from  $H$ . Thus,

$$\psi_u \perp \psi_w | \psi_v.$$

It also follows directly from the definition of Dirichlet processes that at each location  $u \in V$ , the marginal distribution  $Q_u$  of variable  $\psi_u$  is random and  $Q_u | \gamma, H \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H_u)$ . Moreover, in general the  $Q_u$ 's are mutually dependent regardless of any independence relations that  $H$  might confer.

This fact can be easily seen from Eq. (4). With probability 1, all  $Q_u$ 's share the same  $\beta$ . It follows that  $Q_u \perp Q_w | Q_v, \beta$ . Because  $\beta$  is random, the conditional independence relation no longer holds among  $Q_u, Q_w, Q_v$  in general<sup>1</sup>. At first, this seems to be an unwelcoming feature, at least from a computational standpoint. However, as we shall elaborate in Section 4, our inference method does not involve these random measures  $G_u$ 's directly. Rather, it is possible to do inference directly on the space of atoms  $\phi$ 's,  $\psi$ 's and  $\theta_u$ 's for all  $u \in V$ , where the independence relations inherited from  $H$  can provide significant computational savings. From a modeling standpoint, the dependency among the  $Q_u$ 's is actually quite natural for our purpose, as  $Q$  provides the distribution for the global factors associated with global clustering.

Turning now to distributions  $G_u$  for each local factors  $\phi_u$ , we note that  $G_u, G_v, G_w$  are independent given  $Q$ . Moreover, for each  $u \in V$ , the support of  $G_u$  is the same as that of  $Q_u$  (i.e.,  $\theta_{ui}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$  take value among  $(\psi_{ut})_{t=1}^\infty$ ). Integrating over the random  $Q$ , for any measurable

<sup>1</sup>Heinz (2009) explores stringent conditions for  $H$  under which the conditional independence relations continue to hold, e.g.,  $Q_u \perp Q_w | Q_v$ .

partition  $A \subset \Theta_u$ , there holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)|H] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)|Q]|H] = \mathbb{E}[Q_u(A)|H] = H_u(A). \quad (7)$$

In summary, we have shown that the conditional independence relations conferred by the base measure  $H$  are inherited by distribution  $Q$  on global factors  $\psi$ . The  $\psi$ 's take values in the set of  $(\phi_k)_{k=1}^\infty \sim H$ . Moreover, the global factors  $\psi \sim Q$  provide the support set for the local factors  $\phi_u$ 's at each  $u \in V$ . The prior mean of the local factors  $\phi_u$ 's are also derived from the prior mean of the global factors.

**Example 2 (Spatial model  $H$ ).** To quantify more detailed dependency among the Dirichlet mixtures for different groups  $u \in V$ , in the following we shall endow the global factors  $\phi$  with a spatial prior distribution  $H$ . Let  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ .  $H$  is taken to be a second-order stochastic process indexed by  $v \in V$ . A customary choice for  $H$  is a Gaussian process. In effect, we have a prior distribution on  $\phi = (\phi_u : u \in V)$  with mean  $\mu = (\mu_u : u \in V)$ , and covariance matrix whose entries take a standard exponential form:  $\rho(u, v) = \sigma^2 \exp -\{\omega \|u - v\|\}$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be the corresponding covariance matrix for  $\phi \sim H$ . (The spatial prior just described can of course be viewed as a graphical model, whose associated graph is completely connected.)

As before, global factor  $\psi = (\psi_u : u \in V)$  is a random draw from  $Q$ , which inherits the spatial dependency given by  $H$ . In particular,  $\psi$  is a Gaussian vector with mean  $\mu$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . Moreover, the  $\psi_t$ 's provide support for Dirichlet process mixture  $G_u$  at each location  $u \in V$ . For any measurable partition  $A \subset \Theta_u$ , we also have the property expressed by Eq. (7). We are interested in expressions for variation and correlation measures. Bringing in another measurable partition  $B \subset \Theta_v$ , let  $H_{uv}(A, B) := p(\phi_u \in A, \phi_v \in B|H)$ . For the weight vector  $\beta \sim \text{GEM}(\gamma)$ , we define

$$g(\gamma) := \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma + 1}.$$

Applying stick-breaking representation in Eq. (4), it is simple to derive that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q_u(A)Q_v(B)|H] &= g(\gamma)H_{uv}(A, B) + (1 - g(\gamma))H_u(A)H_v(B) \\ \mathbb{E}[Q_u(A)^2|H] &= g(\gamma)H_u(A) + (1 - g(\gamma))H_u(A)^2 \\ \text{Cov}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)|H) &= g(\gamma)(H_{uv}(A, B) - H_u(A)H_v(B)) \\ \text{Var}(Q_u(A)|H) &= g(\gamma)(H_u(A) - H_u(A)^2), \end{aligned}$$

so that for any pair of distinct locations  $(u, v)$ , there holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)) &:= \frac{\text{Cov}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)|H)}{\text{Var}(Q_u(A)|H)^{1/2}\text{Var}(Q_v(B)|H)^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{(H_{uv}(A, B) - H_u(A)H_v(B))}{(H_u(A) - H_u(A)^2)^{1/2}(H_v(B) - H_v(B)^2)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

It is worth noting that the expected correlation between  $Q_u(A)$  and  $Q_u(B)$  depends only on base measure  $H$ , and not on concentration parameter  $\gamma$ . For any pair of locations  $u, v \in V$ ,

if  $\|u - v\| \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that  $\rho(u, v) = \text{Cov}(\phi_u, \phi_v|H) \rightarrow 0$ . Due to standard properties of Gaussian variables,  $\phi_u$  and  $\phi_v$  become less dependent of each other, and  $H_{uv}(A, B) - H_u(A)H_v(B) \rightarrow 0$ , so that  $\text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)) \rightarrow 0$ . On the other hand, let if  $u \rightarrow v$ , we obtain that  $\text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(A)) \rightarrow 1$ , as desired.

Turning to distributions  $G_u$ 's for the local factors, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)G_v(B)|H] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)G_v(B)|Q]|H] = \mathbb{E}[Q_u(A)Q_v(B)|H],$$

where the second equality is due to the fact that  $G_u \perp G_v|Q$ . As derived above, this expression depends only on base measure  $H$  and the (global) concentration parameter  $\gamma$ . However, the variation at each location  $u$  depends on both  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_u$  (along with  $H$ ). Let  $g(\alpha_u) = 1/(\alpha_u + 1)$ . Because  $G_u|Q \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, Q_u)$ , as before we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)|Q] &= Q_u(A) \\ \text{Var}(G_u(A)|Q) &= g(\alpha_u)(Q_u(A) - Q_u(A)^2),\end{aligned}$$

so that,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(G_u(A)|H) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(G_u(A)|Q)|H] + \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[G_u(A)|Q]|H) \\ &= g(\alpha_u)(H_u(A) - \mathbb{E}[Q_u(A)^2|H]) + \text{Var}(Q_u(A)|H) \\ &= (g(\gamma) + g(\alpha_u) - g(\gamma)g(\alpha_u))(H_u(A) - H_u(A)^2).\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

Eq. (9) exhibits an interesting decomposition of variance. Comparing with  $\text{Var}(Q_u(A)|H)$ , we observe that  $g(\gamma)$  plays the role as a coefficient in the variance of  $Q_u(A)$ . For  $G_u(A)$ , the coefficient can be expressed as  $g(\gamma) + g(\alpha_u)(1 - g(\gamma))$ . It is then clear that

$$\text{Var}(G_u(A)|H) \geq \text{Var}(Q_u(A)|H).$$

That is, at any location the variation of local factors is greater than that of the global factor evaluated at the same location. The extra variation is governed by concentration parameter  $\alpha_u$ . If  $\alpha_u \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $g(\alpha_u) \rightarrow 0$ , the local variation at  $u$  disappears, with the remaining variation contributed by the global factors only. On the other hand, if  $\alpha_u \rightarrow 0$  so that  $g(\alpha_u) \rightarrow 1$ , the local variation contributed by  $G_u$  completely dominates the global variation contributed by  $Q_u$ .


Finally, we compare the correlation measures for distributions in the two stages in our hierarchical model:

$$\text{Corr}(G_u(A), G_v(B)) = \frac{g(\gamma)\text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)|H)}{(g(\gamma) + g(\alpha_u) - g(\gamma)g(\alpha_u))^{1/2}(g(\gamma) + g(\alpha_v) - g(\gamma)g(\alpha_v))^{1/2}}.\tag{10}$$

It is simple to see that

$$\text{Corr}(G_u(A), G_v(B)|H) \leq \text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B)|H).$$

This is a natural property – the correlation across the locations in  $V$  among the distributions  $G_u$ 's of the local factors are bounded from above than the correlation among the distribution  $Q_u$ 's for



**Figure 2.** Illustration of the assignments of mixture component membership via global and local factor variables for two groups indexed by  $u$  and  $v$ .

the global factors. Note that  $\text{Corr}(G_u(A), G_v(B))$  vanishes as  $\|u - v\| \rightarrow \infty$ . Note also the dependence on concentration parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_u$ . The correlation measure increases as either  $\alpha_u$  or  $\alpha_v$  increases. The dependence on  $\gamma$  is quite interesting. As  $\gamma$  ranges from 0 to  $\infty$  so that  $g(\gamma)$  decreases from 1 to 0, and as a result the correlation measure ratio  $\text{Corr}(G_u(A), G_v(B))/\text{Corr}(Q_u(A), Q_v(B))$  decreases from 1 to 0.

The described properties demonstrate the important role of the Bayesian hierarchy in the GDP model, as they bring about the needed and rich distinctions in behaviors for the distributions of the global and the local factors.

### 3.3 Pólya-urn characterization

A valuable property of the GDP mixture model is that it fully retains the Pólya-urn characterization of the canonical Dirichlet process mixtures. This is useful in highlighting both local clustering and global clustering aspects that are present naturally in our model, and in suggesting a simple Gibbs sampling algorithm.

The Pólya-urn characterization is given as a sampling scheme for both the global and local factors by integrating out random measures  $Q$  and  $G_u$ 's. Recall that the global factors  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$  are i.i.d. random variables distributed according to  $H$ . Each  $\phi_k$  is multivariate, and can be expressed in vector form  $\phi_k = (\phi_{uk})_{u \in V}$ . We also introduced random vectors  $\psi_t = (\psi_{ut})_{u \in V}$  which are i.i.d. draws from  $Q$ . Finally, for each location  $u \in V$ , we have local factor variables  $\theta_{ui}$  which are distributed according to  $G_u$ .



Note that each  $\psi_t$  is associated with one  $\phi_k$ , and each  $\theta_{ui}$  is associated with one  $\psi_{ut}$ . Let  $t_{ui}$  be the index of the  $\psi_{ut}$  associated with the local factor  $\theta_{ui}$ , and  $k_t$  be the index of the  $\phi_k$  associated with the global factor  $\psi_t$ . Let  $K$  be the present number of distinct global factors  $\phi_k$ . The sampling process starts with  $K = 0$  and increases  $K$  as needed. We also need notations for counts. We use notation  $n_{ut}$  to denote the present number of local factors  $\theta_{ul}$  taking value  $\psi_{ut}$ .  $n_u$  denotes the number of local factors at group  $u$  (which is also the number of observations at group  $u$ ).  $n_{u,k}$  is the number of local factors at  $u$  taking value  $\phi_{uk}$ . Let  $m_u$  denote the number of factors  $\psi_t$  that provide supports for group  $u$ . The notation  $q_k$  denotes the number of global factors  $\psi_t$ 's taking value  $\phi_k$ , while  $q$  denotes the total number of global factors  $\psi_t$ 's. To be clear, these count variables are related by the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{ut} &= \sum_i \mathbb{I}(t_{ui} = t); & n_{u,k} &= \sum_t n_{ut} \mathbb{I}(k_t = k); & n_u &= \sum_t n_{ut}; \\ m_u &= \sum_t \mathbb{I}(n_{ut} > 0); & q_k &= \sum_t \mathbb{I}(k_t = k); & q &= \sum_k q_k. \end{aligned}$$

First, consider the conditional distribution for  $\theta_{ui}$  given  $\theta_{u1}, \theta_{u2}, \dots, \theta_{u,i-1}$ , and  $Q$ , where the  $G_u$  is integrated out:

$$\theta_{ui} | \theta_{u1}, \dots, \theta_{u,i-1}, \alpha_u, Q \sim \sum_{t=1}^{m_u} \frac{n_{ut}}{i-1 + \alpha_u} \delta_{\psi_{ut}} + \frac{\alpha_u}{i-1 + \alpha_u} Q_u. \quad (11)$$

This is a mixture, and a realization from this mixture can be obtained by drawing from the terms on the right-hand side with probabilities given by the corresponding mixing proportions. If a term the first summation is chosen, then we set  $\theta_{ui} = \psi_{ut}$  for the chosen  $t$ , and let  $t_{ui} = t$ , and increment  $n_{ut}$ . If the second term is chosen, then we increment  $m_u$  by one, draw  $\psi_{um_u} \sim Q_u$ . In addition, we set  $\theta_{ui} = \psi_{um_u}$ , and  $t_{ui} = m_u$ .

Now we proceed to integrate out  $Q$ . Since  $Q$  appears only in its role as the distribution of the variable  $\psi_t$ , we only need to draw sample  $\psi_t$  from  $Q$ . Note that  $Q$  is distributed according to a Dirichlet process, the samples from  $Q$  can be obtained via conditional distribution of  $\psi_t$  as follows:

$$\psi_t | \{\psi_l\}_{l \neq t}, \gamma, H \sim \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{q_k}{q + \gamma} \delta_{\phi_k} + \frac{\gamma}{q + \gamma} H. \quad (12)$$

If we draw  $\psi_t$  via choosing a term in the summation on the right-hand side of this equation, we set  $\psi_t = \phi_k$ , and let  $k_t = k$  for the chosen  $k$ , and increment  $q_k$ . If the second term is chosen then we increment  $K$  by one, draw  $\phi_K \sim H$  and set  $\psi_t = \phi_K$ ,  $k_{jt} = K$ , and  $q_K = 1$ .

To summarize, we can obtain samples for global and local factors as follows: For each location  $u \in V$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , draw sample  $\theta_{ui}$  using Eq. (11). If a sample from  $Q_u$  is needed, we use Eq. (12) to obtain a new sample  $\psi_{ut}$ . From this equation, the marginal distribution of  $\psi_{ut}$  has the form:

$$\psi_{ut}|\{\psi_l\}_{l \neq t}, \gamma, H \sim \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{q_k}{q. + \gamma} \delta_{\phi_{uk}} + \frac{\gamma}{q. + \gamma} H_u. \quad (13)$$

Note, however, that we actually draw the full vector  $\psi_t$  of which  $\psi_{ut}$  is a component. If  $\psi_t$  takes value among existing  $\phi_k$  for some  $k \leq K$ , then  $\psi_{ut}$  takes on value  $\phi_{uk}$  for the chosen  $k$  (with  $q_k$  being incremented); otherwise, we increment  $K$  and a new sample vector  $\phi_K$  is drawn from  $H$ .

Samples for  $\theta_{ui}$  for different choices of  $u$  can be obtained sequentially in any order. Due to the sampling mechanism given by Eq. (11), if a global factor  $\psi_t$  is not associated with a group  $u$  when it is first generated, then the probability that  $\psi_t$  is re-assigned to any member of group  $u$  is 0 (because  $n_{ut} = 0$ ). This implies that the set of  $\psi_t$ 's can be subdivided into disjoint subsets, each of which is associated with a group index  $u$ . The “sharing” of global factors across indices  $u$  can be seen by noting that the “pool” of present global factors  $\{\psi_l\}$  has support in the discrete set of global factor values  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$ . Figure 2 provides an illustration of the relationship between the local and global factors.

The Pólya-urn scheme is often characterized using a colorful culinary metaphor known as the Chinese restaurant process, a stochastic process that generates random partitions of a collection of atoms. We cannot resist the temptation to provide an interpretation in a similar vein. Suppose that there are three groups indexed by  $u, v$  and  $w$ . Think of a global factor  $\phi_k$ 's as a typical meal where each  $\phi_{uk}, \phi_{vk}$  and  $\phi_{wk}$  are associated with three category groups – appetizer, main entrees and dessert dishes – respectively. In an eclectic eatery such as a university cafeteria, the dishes are prepared as packs of typical meals by the way of various ethnic cuisines. The students buy the meal packs based on its popularity, and then freely share them together. They sample each other's food in a manner that individual dishes are chosen at the frequency based on their popularity (within each dish's category). Although the described process may indicate a wasteful way of using resources, it brings out the clear distinction between global clusters from the viewpoint of the food provider, and local clusters from the viewpoint of the food consumers.

### 3.4 Model identifiability and complexity

This section investigates the GDP mixture's inferential behavior, including issues related to the model identifiability. It is useful to recall that a DP mixture model is that it can be viewed as the infinite limit of finite mixture models (Neal, 1992; Green and Richardson, 2001; Ishwaran and Zarepour, 2002b). The GDP can also be viewed as the limit of a finite mixture counterpart. Indeed, consider the following finite mixture model:<sup>2</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \beta|\gamma \sim \text{Dir}(\gamma/L, \dots, \gamma/L) \quad \pi_u|\alpha_u, \beta \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_u \beta) \quad \phi_k \sim H \\ Q^L = \sum_{k=1}^L \beta_k \delta_{\phi_k} \quad G_u^L = \sum_{k=1}^L \pi_{uk} \delta_{\phi_{uk}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Within this section, with a bit abuse of notation, we use  $\pi$  to denote the mixture proportions for the finite mixture model. This is closely related to but are not the same as the  $\pi$ 's used in infinite dimensional stick-breaking representation.

It is a known fact that as  $L \rightarrow 0$  that  $Q^L \Rightarrow Q$  weakly, in the sense that for any function real-valued bounded and continuous function  $g$ , there holds  $\int g dQ^L \rightarrow \int g dQ$  in distribution (Muliere and Secchi, 1995).<sup>3</sup> Because for each  $u \in V$ , there holds  $G_u^L \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u Q^L)$ , it also follows that  $G_u^L \Rightarrow G_u$  weakly. The above characterization provides a convenient means of understanding the behavior of the GDP mixture by studying the behavior of its finite mixture counterpart with  $L$  global mixture components, as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Information denseness of GDP prior.** For concreteness in this section we shall assume that for any  $u \in V$  the likelihood  $F(y_u|\phi_u)$  is specified by the normal distribution whose parameters such as mean and variance are represented by  $\phi_u$ . Write  $\phi_u = (\mu_u, \sigma_u^2) \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ . Recall that conditionally on  $Q$ ,  $G_u$ 's are independent across  $u \in V$ . Given  $G_u$ , the marginal distribution on observation  $y_u$  has the following density:

$$f_u(y_u|G_u) = \int F(y_u|\phi_u)dG_u(\phi_u). \quad (15)$$

Thus, each  $f_u$  is the density of a location-scale mixture of normal distribution. The  $f_u$ 's are random due to the randomness of  $G_u$ 's. In other words, the GDP places a prior distribution, which we denote by  $\Pi$ , over the collection of random measures  $(G_u)_{u \in V}$ . This in turn induces a prior over the joint density of  $\mathbf{y} := (y_u)_{u \in V}$ , which we call  $\Pi$  as well. Replacing the mixing distributions  $Q$  and  $G_u$  by the finite mixture  $Q^L$  and  $G_u^L$ 's (as specified by Eq. (14)), we obtain the corresponding marginal density:

$$f_u^L(y_u|G_u) = \int F(y_u|\phi_u)dG_u^L(\phi_u). \quad (16)$$

Let  $\Pi_L$  to denote the induced prior distribution for  $\{f_u^L\}_{u \in V}$ . From the above,  $\Pi_L \Rightarrow \Pi$  weakly.

We shall show that for each  $u \in V$  the prior  $\Pi_L$  is information dense in the space of finite mixtures as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . More formally, for any group index  $u$ , consider any finite mixture of normals  $f_{u,0}$  associating with mixing distributions  $Q_0$  and  $G_{u,0}$ . Suppose that the base measure  $H$  places positive probability on a rectangle containing the support of  $Q_0$ . It can be shown that the prior  $\Pi_L$  places a positive probability in arbitrarily small Kullback-Leibler neighborhood of  $f_{u,0}$  for  $L$  sufficiently large. That is for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there holds:

$$\Pi_L(f_u : D(f_{u,0}||f_u) < \epsilon) > 0$$

for any sufficiently large  $L$ . At a high level, this result implies that the GDP provides a prior over the space of mixture distributions that is “well spread” in the Kullback-Leibler topology. A proof of this property is deferred to the Appendix.

An immediate consequence of the information denseness property is the weak consistency of the posterior distribution of  $y_u$  for any  $u \in V$ , thanks to the theory of Schwartz (1965). Moreover, under additional conditions on the base measure  $H$ , strong consistency results can be obtained, using standard techniques that have been developed for analyzing standard mixture models and Dirichlet process mixture models (e.g., Ghosal et al. (1999); Barron et al. (1999); Ishwaran and Zarepour (2002a)).

---

<sup>3</sup>A stronger result was obtained by Ishwaran and Zarepour (2002b), in which convergence holds for any  $g$  integrable function with respect to  $H$ .

**Identifiability of factors  $\phi$ .** The above results are desirable from the viewpoint of density estimation (for the joint vector  $\mathbf{y}$ ). From a clustering viewpoint, however, we are also interested in the ability of the GDP prior in recovering the underlying local factors  $\phi_{uk}$ 's, as well as the global factors  $\phi_k$ 's for the global clusters. An in-depth theoretical treatment of this important issue is beyond the scope of the present paper, but we shall provide a partial answer that gives hints about the identifiability behavior of GDP mixture. This is done by studying the identifiability of the finite mixtures that lie in the union of the support of  $\Pi_L$  for all  $L < \infty$ . This is the set of all densities  $(f_u^L)_{u \in V; L < \infty}$  whose corresponding mixing distributions are given by Eq. (14).

Recall that each marginal  $f_u^L$  is a normal mixture, and the  $L$  mixture components are parameterized by mean and variance: for any  $k = 1, \dots, L$ ,  $\phi_{uk} = (\mu_{uk}, \sigma_{uk}^2)$ . Again, let  $f_{u,0}$  be the “true” marginal density of a mixture distribution for group  $u$  that has  $d$  mixture components, and the associating mixing distributions are given by Eq. (27). The parameter for the  $k$ -th component for each  $k = 1, \dots, d$  is denoted by  $\phi_{uk,0} = (\mu_{uk,0}, \sigma_{uk,0}^2)$ .

Suppose that for any  $u \in V$ ,

$$f_u(y_u) = f_{u,0}(y_u) \text{ for almost all } y_u.$$

In addition, the mixing distributions  $G_u^L$  satisfies the following condition:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left(\frac{\mu_u^2}{2(\sigma_u^* - \sigma_u)}\right) G_u^L(d\phi_u) < \infty,$$

for any  $u \in V$ , where  $\sigma_u^* = \min\{\sigma_{u1,0}, \dots, \sigma_{uk,0}\}$  then by Theorem 2 of Ishwaran and Zarepour (2002a), we have:

$$G_u = G_{u,0} \text{ for all } u \in V.$$

In other words, it is possible to identify all local clusters specified by  $\phi_{uk}$  and  $\pi_{uk}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, d$ , up to the ordering of the mixture component index  $k$ .

A more substantial issue is concerned with the identifiability of global factors. Under additional conditions of “true” global factors  $\phi_{k,0}$ 's, and that of the measure for global factors  $Q^L$ , the identification of global factors  $\phi_{k,0}$ 's is possible. Viewing a global factor  $\phi_k = (\phi_{uk})_{u \in V}$  (likewise,  $\phi_{k,0}$ ) as a function of  $u \in v$ , a trivial example is that when  $\phi_{k,0}$  are constant functions, and that base measure  $H$  (and consequentially  $Q^L$ ) places probability 1 on such set of functions. Then the identifiability of local factors implies the identifiability of global factors. A nontrivial condition is that the “true” global factors  $\phi_{k,0}$  as a function of  $u$  can be parameterized by a small number of parameters (e.g. a linear function, or an appropriately defined smooth function in  $u \in V$ ). Then, it is reasonable to expect that the identifiability of local factors also implies the identifiability of global factors.

The above observations suggest a number of prudent guidelines for prior specifications (via the base measure  $H$ ). To ensure good inferential behavior for the local factors  $\phi_u$ 's, it is essential that the base measure  $H_u$  place sufficiently small tail probabilities on both  $\mu_u$  and  $\sigma_u$ . In addition, if it is believed there exists underlying global factors that are smooth function in the domain  $V$ , one should not expect that placing a very vague prior  $H$  over the global factors (such as a factorial distribution  $H = \prod_{u \in V} H_u$  by assuming the  $\phi_u$  are independent across  $u \in V$ ) would do the job. Instead, an appropriate base measure  $H$  that puts most of its mass on smooth functions is needed. Indeed, these observations are also confirmed by our empirical experiments.

## 4 Inference

In this section we shall describe posterior inference methods for the graphical Dirichlet process mixture. Recall that at each group indexed by  $u \in V$  we have  $n_u$  observations  $y_{u1}, \dots, y_{un_u}$ . Each  $y_{ui}$  is assumed to arise as a draw from a distribution  $F(\theta_{ui})$ . We are interested in particular the posterior distributions of the parameters representing both global and local clusters in our mixture model. We shall describe two different sampling approaches. The first approach falls in the class of so-called ‘‘marginal approaches’’, which highlights the Pólya urn characterization of our model, by integrating out of the random measures that are distributed according to Dirichlet processes. The second method falls in the class of ‘‘conditional approaches’’ where the stick-breaking representation is exploited and sampling is done with respect to associating parameters in this representation. Due to the hierarchical aspects of our model, we borrow the basic features of the sampling methods developed by Teh et al. (2006) for their hierarchical Dirichlet process mixtures. The unique aspect for our model is that in addition to sampling about the mixture membership variables, we also need to integrate over or sample the global factors  $\phi \sim H$  which typically have very high dimension.

We repeat key notations and introduce a few more for the sampling algorithms.  $t_{ui}$  is the index of the  $\psi_{ut}$  associated with the local factor  $\theta_{ui}$ , i.e.,  $\theta_{ui} = \psi_{ut_{ui}}$ ; and  $k_t$  is the index of the  $\phi_k$  associated with the global factor  $\psi_t$ , i.e.,  $\psi_t = \phi_{k_t}$ . In other words, the local and global atoms are related by  $\theta_{ui} = \psi_{ut_{ui}} = \phi_{uk_{t_{ui}}}$ . Let  $z_{ui} = k_{t_{ui}}$  denote the mixture component associated with observation  $y_{ui}$ . Turning to count variables,  $n_{ut}$  denotes the number of local atoms  $\theta_{ul}$ ’s that are associated with  $\psi_t$ ;  $n_{ut}^{-ui}$  is defined the same way, but excluding the atom  $\theta_{ui}$ .  $n_{u \cdot k}^{-ui}$  denotes the number of local atoms  $\theta_{ul}$  that such that  $z_{ul} = k$ , leaving out  $\theta_{ui}$ .  $\mathbf{t}^{-ut}$  denotes the vector of all  $t_{ul}$ ’s leaving out element  $t_{ui}$ . Likewise,  $\mathbf{k}^{-t}$  denotes the vector of all  $k_r$ ’s leaving out element  $k_t$ .

### 4.1 Marginal approach

The Pólya-urn characterization suggests a simple Gibbs sampling algorithm to obtain posterior distributions for random variables of interest, namely, the local factors  $\theta_{ui}$ ’s and the global factors  $\psi_t$ ’s, by integrating out random measures  $Q$  and  $G_u$ ’s. Under this approach, the overall model can be described by the joint distribution of the described random variables:

$$\prod_{u \in V} \prod_{i=1}^{n_u} [y_{ui} | \theta_{ui}] \times \prod_{u \in V} \prod_{i=1}^{n_u} [\theta_{ui} | \alpha_u, \{\psi_t\}_t] \times [\{\psi_t\}_t | \gamma, H].$$

Instead of dealing with the  $\theta_{ui}$ ’s and  $\psi_t$  directly, we shall sample their index variables  $t_{ui}$  and  $k_t$  instead. The  $\theta_{ui}$ ’s and  $\psi_t$ ’s can be reconstructed from the index variables and the  $\phi_k$ ’s. This representation is generally thought to make the MCMC sampling more efficient (Neal, 2000; Teh et al., 2006). Thus, we construct a Markov chain on the space of  $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{k}\}$ . Although the number of variables is in principle unbounded, only finitely many are actually associated to data and represented explicitly.

A quantity that plays an important role in the computation of conditional probabilities in this approach is the conditional density of a selected collection of data items, given the remaining data.

For a single observation  $i$ -th at location  $u$ , define the conditional probability of  $y_{ui}$  under a mixture component  $\phi_{uk}$ , given  $\mathbf{t}$ ,  $\mathbf{k}$  and all data items except  $y_{ui}$ :

$$f_{uk}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) = \frac{\int F(y_{ui}|\phi_{uk}) \prod_{u'i' \neq ui; z_{u'i'}=k} F(y_{u'i'}|\phi_{u'k}) H(\phi_k) d\phi_k}{\int \prod_{u'i' \neq ui; z_{u'i'}=k} F(y_{u'i'}|\phi_{u'k}) H(\phi_k) d\phi_k}. \quad (17)$$

For a collection of observations of all data  $y_{ui}$  such that  $t_{ui} = t$  for a chosen  $t$ , which we denote by vector  $\mathbf{y}_t$ , the conditional probability of  $\mathbf{y}_t$  under the mixture component  $\phi_k$ , given  $\mathbf{t}$ ,  $\mathbf{k}$  and all data items except  $\mathbf{y}_t$  is defined as:

$$f_k^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t) = \frac{\int \prod_{ui:t_{ui}=t} F(y_{ui}|\phi_{uk}) \prod_{u'i':t_{u'i'} \neq t; z_{u'i'}=k} F(y_{u'i'}|\phi_{u'k}) H(\phi_k) d\phi_k}{\int \prod_{u'i':t_{u'i'} \neq t; z_{u'i'}=k} F(y_{u'i'}|\phi_{u'k}) H(\phi_k) d\phi_k}. \quad (18)$$

**Sampling  $t$ .** Exploiting the exchangeability of the  $t_{ui}$ 's within the group of observations indexed by  $u$ , we treat  $t_{ui}$  as the last variable being sampled in the group. To obtain the conditional posterior for  $t_{ui}$ , we combine the conditional prior distribution for  $t_{ui}$  given by Eq. (11) with the likelihood of generating data  $y_{ui}$ .

Using (11), the prior probability that  $t_{ui}$  takes on a particular previously used value  $t$  is proportional to  $n_{ut}^{-ui}$ , while the probability that it takes on a new value  $t^{\text{new}} = m_u + 1$  is proportional to  $\alpha_u$ . The likelihood due to  $y_{ui}$  given  $t_{ui} = t$  for some previously used  $t$  is  $f_{uk}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui})$ . Here,  $k = k_t$ . The likelihood for  $t_{ui} = t^{\text{new}}$  can be calculated by integrating out the possible values of  $k_{t^{\text{new}}}$  using Eq. (12):

$$p(y_{ui}|\mathbf{t}^{-ui}, t_{ui} = t^{\text{new}}, \mathbf{k}, \text{Data}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{q_k}{q. + \gamma} f_{uk}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) + \frac{\gamma}{q. + \gamma} f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}), \quad (19)$$

where  $f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) = \int F(y_{ui}|\phi_u) H_u(\phi_u) d\phi_u$  is the prior density of  $y_{ui}$ . As a result, the conditional distribution of  $t_{ui}$  takes the form

$$p(t_{ui} = t|\mathbf{t}^{-ui}, \mathbf{k}, \text{Data}) \propto \begin{cases} n_{ut}^{-ui} f_{uk_t}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) & \text{if } t \text{ previously used} \\ \alpha_u p(y_{ui}|\mathbf{t}^{-ui}, t_{ui} = t^{\text{new}}, \mathbf{k}) & \text{if } t = t^{\text{new}}. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

If the sampled value of  $t_{ui}$  is  $t^{\text{new}}$ , we need to obtain a sample of  $k_{t^{\text{new}}}$  by sampling from Eq. (19):

$$p(k_{t^{\text{new}}} = k|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{k}^{-t^{\text{new}}}, \text{Data}) \propto \begin{cases} q_k f_{uk}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) & \text{if } k \text{ previously used,} \\ \gamma f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) & \text{if } k = k^{\text{new}}. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

If as a result of updating  $t_{ui}$  some index  $t$  becomes unoccupied, i.e.,  $n_{ut} = 0$ , then the probability that this index will be reoccupied in the future will be zero, since this is always proportional to  $n_{ut}$ . As a result, we may delete the corresponding  $k_t$  from the data structure. If as a result of deleting  $k_{ut}$  some mixture component  $\phi_k$  become unallocated, we delete this mixture component as well.

**Sampling  $k$ .** As with the local factors within each group, the global factors  $\psi_t$ 's are also exchangeable. Thus we can treat  $\psi_t$  for a chosen  $t$  as the last variable sampled in the collection of global factors. Note that changing index variable  $k_t$  actually changes the mixture component membership for relevant data items (across all groups  $u$ ) that are associated with  $\psi_t$ , the likelihood obtained by setting  $k_t = k$  is given by  $f_k^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t)$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_t$  denotes the vector of all data  $y_{ui}$  such that  $t_{ui} = t$ . So, the conditional probability for  $k_t$  is:

$$p(k_t = k | \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{k}^{-t}, \text{Data}) \propto \begin{cases} q_k f_k^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t) & \text{if } k \text{ previously used,} \\ \gamma f_{k^{\text{new}}}^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t) & \text{if } k = k^{\text{new}}, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where  $f_{k^{\text{new}}}^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t) = \int \prod_{ui:t_{ui}=t} F(y_{ui} | \phi_u) H(\phi) d\phi$ .

## 4.2 Computation of conditional density of data

A major computational bottleneck in the described sampling method is the computation of conditional densities given by Eq. (17) and (18). In general,  $\phi$  is very high dimensional, and integrating over  $\phi \sim H$  is intractable. However it is possible to exploit the structure of  $H$  to alleviate this situation. As an example, if  $H$  is conjugate to  $F$ , the computation of these conditionals can be achieved in closed form, even if the possibility of dealing with high dimensional statistics (e.g., covariance matrices) may still be daunting. A useful scenario is that  $H$  is specified as a graphical model where conditional independence assumptions can be exploited, so that efficient inference methods in graphical models can be brought to bear on our computational problem. We shall elaborate in the sequel.

**Example 1.** Suppose that the likelihood function  $F$  is given by a Gaussian distribution, i.e.,  $y_{ui} | \theta_{ui} \sim N(\theta_{ui}, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$  for all  $u, i$ , and that the prior  $H$  is conjugate, i.e.,  $H$  is also a Gaussian distribution:  $\phi_k \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)$ . Due to conjugacy, the computations in Eq. (17) and (18) are readily available in closed forms. Specifically, the density in Eq. (17) takes the following expression:

$$f_{uk}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2} \sigma_\epsilon} \frac{|\mathbf{C}_{k+}|}{|\mathbf{C}_k|} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} y_{ui}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k+}^{-uiT} \mathbf{C}_{k+}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k+}^{-ui} - \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^{-uiT} \mathbf{C}_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^{-ui}\right), \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{k+}^{-1} &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \text{diag}(n_{1 \cdot k}^{-ui}, \dots, 1 + n_{u \cdot k}^{-ui}, \dots, n_{M \cdot k}^{-ui}), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k+}^{-ui} &= \mathbf{C}_{k+} \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left[ \dots \sum_{i': z_{u'i'}=k} y_{u'i'} + y_{ui} \mathbb{I}(ui = u'i') \dots \right]^T \right), \\ \mathbf{C}_k^{-1} &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \text{diag}(n_{1 \cdot k}^{-ui}, \dots, n_{u \cdot k}^{-ui}, \dots, n_{M \cdot k}^{-ui}), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^{-ui} &= \mathbf{C}_k \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left[ \dots \sum_{i': z_{u'i'}=k; u'i' \neq ui} y_{u'i'} \dots \right]^T \right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It is straightforward to obtain required expressions for  $f_k^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t)$ ,  $f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{-y_{ui}}(y_{ui})$ , and  $f_{k^{\text{new}}}^{-\mathbf{y}_t}(\mathbf{y}_t)$ .

**Example 2.** If  $H$  is a chain-structured model, the conditional densities defined by Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) are not available in closed forms, but we can still obtain exact computation using an algorithm that is akin to the well-known alpha-beta algorithm in the Hidden Markov model (Rabiner, 1989). The running time of such algorithm is proportional to the size of the graph (i.e.,  $|V|$ ). More generally, if  $H$  is a tree-structured graphical model, one can apply the (deterministic) sum-product algorithm, which also has running time linear in  $|V|$ . For graphical models with cycles, one can invoke variational approximation methods for the required computations (Wainwright and Jordan, 2008).

### 4.3 Conditional approach

Instead of integrating out  $Q$ , which is a random distribution of high-dimensional global factors, we consider a modified approach, in which  $Q$  is instantiated and sampled from. Likewise, we also consider not integrating over the base measure  $H$ , which is the prior over the high-dimensional global factors. As such, we essentially replace the computationally intensive step within Gibbs updates described in the previous section with the sampling of the global factors and the associated proportion vectors. In general, the Markov chain underlying this approach probably takes relatively longer time to converge, but the algorithm implementation is substantially simpler.

Recall that a priori  $Q \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H)$ . Due to a standard property of the posterior of a Dirichlet process, conditioning on the global factors  $\phi_k$ 's and the index vector  $\mathbf{k}$ ,  $Q$  is distributed as  $\text{DP}(\gamma + \mathbf{q}, \frac{\gamma H + \sum_{k=1}^K q_k \delta_{\phi_k}}{\gamma + \mathbf{q}})$ . Note that vector  $\mathbf{q}$  can be computed directly from  $\mathbf{k}$ . Thus, an explicit representation of  $Q$  is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k \delta_{\phi_k} + \beta_{\text{new}} Q^{\text{new}}, \quad \text{where} \\ \beta &= (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_K, \beta_{\text{new}}) \sim \text{Dir}(q_1, \dots, q_K, \gamma) \\ Q^{\text{new}} &\sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H), \\ \phi_1, \dots, \phi_K &\sim [\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K | \text{Data}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t}]. \end{aligned}$$

Conditioning on  $Q$ , or equivalently conditioning on  $\beta, \phi_k$ 's in the stick breaking representation, the distributions  $G_u$ 's associating with different locations  $u \in V$  are decoupled (independent). In particular, the posterior of  $G_u$  given  $Q$  and  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t}$  and the  $\phi_k$ 's is distributed as  $\text{DP}(\alpha_u + n_u, \frac{\alpha_u Q_u + \sum_{k=1}^K n_{u \cdot k} \delta_{\phi_{uk}}}{\alpha_u + n_u})$ . Thus, an explicit representation of the conditional distribution of  $G_u$  is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_u &= \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{uk} \delta_{\phi_{uk}} + \pi_{u\text{new}} G_u^{\text{new}}, \quad \text{where} \\ \pi_u &= (\pi_{u1}, \dots, \pi_{uK}, \pi_{u\text{new}}) \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_u \beta_1 + n_{u \cdot 1}, \dots, \alpha_u \beta_K + n_{u \cdot K}, \alpha_u \beta_{\text{new}}) \\ G_u^{\text{new}} &\sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u \beta_{\text{new}}, Q_u^{\text{new}}). \end{aligned}$$

In the previously described sampling approach, each local factor  $\phi_{ui}$  is associated with a global factor  $\psi_t$  where  $t = t_{ui}$ ; while each global factor  $\psi_t$  is associated with the global atom  $\phi_k$ , where



$k = k_{t_{ui}}$ . We consider sampling directly in the mixture component variable  $z_{ui} = k_{t_{ui}}$ , and in doing so we bypass the sampling steps involving  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{t}$ . Note that the likelihood of the data involves only the  $z_{ui}$  variables and the global atoms  $\phi_k$ 's. The mixture proportion vector  $\beta$  involves only count vectors  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_K)$ . It suffices to construct a Markov chain on the space of  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{q}, \beta, \phi)$ .

**Sampling  $\beta$ .** As mentioned above,  $\beta|\mathbf{q} \sim \text{Dir}(q_1, \dots, q_K, \gamma)$ .

**Sampling  $\mathbf{z}$ .** Recall that a priori  $z_{ui}|\pi_u, \beta \sim \pi_u$  where  $\pi_u|\beta, \alpha_u \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_u, \beta)$ . Let  $n_{u \cdot k}^{-ui}$  denotes the number of data items in the group  $u$ , except  $y_{ui}$ , associating with the mixture component  $k$ . This can be readily computed from the vector  $\mathbf{z}$ .

$$p(z_{ui} = k | \mathbf{z}^{-ui}, \mathbf{q}, \beta, \phi_k, \text{Data}) = \begin{cases} (n_{u \cdot k}^{-ui} + \alpha_u \beta_k) F(y_{ui} | \phi_{uk}) & \text{if } k \text{ previously used} \\ \alpha_u \beta_{\text{new}} f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) & \text{if } k = k^{\text{new}}, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where  $f_{uk^{\text{new}}}^{y_{ui}}(y_{ui}) = \int F(y_{ui} | \phi_u) H_u(\phi_u) d\phi_u$  is the prior density of  $y_{ui}$ .

**Sampling  $\mathbf{q}$ .** To clarify the distribution for vector  $\mathbf{q}$ , we recall an observation at the end of Section 3.3 that the set of global factors  $\psi_t$ 's can be organized into disjoint subsets  $\Psi_u$ , each of which is associated with a location  $u$ . More precisely,  $\psi_t \in \Psi_u$  if and only if  $n_{ut} > 0$ . Within each group  $u$ , let  $m_{uk}$  denote the number of  $\psi_t$ 's taking value  $\phi_k$ . Then,  $q_k = \sum_{u \in V} m_{uk}$ .

Conditioning on  $\mathbf{z}$  we can collect all data items in group  $u$  that are associated with mixture component  $\phi_k$ , i.e., item indices  $ui$  such that  $z_{ui} = k$ . There are  $n_{u \cdot k}$  such items. Following an observation of Teh et al (2006), the collection of the  $n_{u \cdot k}$  items are distributed according to a Dirichlet process with concentration parameter  $\alpha_u \beta_k$ . The count variable  $m_{uk}$  corresponds to the number of mixture components formed by the  $n_{u \cdot k}$  items. It was shown by Antoniak (1974) that the distribution of  $m_{uk}$  has the form:

$$p(m_{uk} = m | \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{m}^{-uk}, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_u \beta_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_u \beta_k + n_{u \cdot k})} s(n_{u \cdot k}, m) (\alpha_u \beta_k)^m,$$


where  $s(n, m)$  are unsigned Stirling number of the first kind. By definition,  $s(0, 0) = s(1, 1) = 1$ ,  $s(n, 0) = 0$  for  $n > 0$ , and  $s(n, m) = 0$  for  $m > n$ . For other entries, there holds  $s(n+1, m) = s(n, m-1) + ns(n, m)$ .

**Sampling  $\phi$ .** The sampling of  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  follows from the following conditional probabilities, for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ :

$$p(\phi_k | \mathbf{z}, \text{Data}) \propto H(\phi_k) \prod_{ui: z_{ui}=k} F(y_{ui} | \phi_{uk}).$$

Let us index the set  $V$  by  $1, 2, \dots, M$ , where  $|V| = M$ . We return to our two examples.

As the first example, suppose that  $\phi_k$  is distributed by the Gaussian distribution, i.e., under  $H$ ,  $\phi_k \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)$ , and that the likelihood  $F(y_{ui} | \theta_{ui})$  is given as well by the Gaussian distribution



**Figure 3.** Left: Data set A illustrates a simulated problem of tracking particles organized into clusters, which move in smooth paths. Right: Data set B illustrates simulated bifurcating trajectories. In both cases, the data are given not as trajectories, but only as individual points denoted by circles at each  $u$ .

$N(\theta_{ui}, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ , then the posterior distribution of  $\phi_k$  is also Gaussian with mean  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  and variance  $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ , where:

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{-1} = \Sigma_k^{-1} + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \text{diag}(n_{1 \cdot k}, \dots, n_{M \cdot k}),$$

$$\tilde{\mu}_k = \tilde{\Sigma}_k \left( \Sigma_k^{-1} \mu_k + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left[ \sum_i y_{1i} \mathbb{I}(z_{1i} = k) \dots \sum_i y_{Mi} \mathbb{I}(z_{Mi} = k) \right]^T \right). \quad (26)$$


For the second example, we assume that  $\phi_k$  is very high dimensional, and whose prior distribution  $H$  is not tractable (e.g., a Markov random field). Direct computation is no longer possible. A simple solution is to Gibbs sample each component of vector  $\phi_k$ . Suppose that under a Markov random field model  $H$ , the conditional probability  $H(\phi_{uk} | \phi_k^{-u})$  is simple to compute. Then, for any  $u \in V$ ,

$$p(\phi_{uk} | \phi_k^{-u}, \mathbf{z}, \text{Data}) \propto H(\phi_{uk} | \phi_k^{-u}) \prod_{i: z_{ui}=k} F(y_{ui} | \phi_{uk}).$$


## 5 Data illustrations

### 5.1 Simulated data


To illustrate the behavior of our proposed model and the performance of our inference algorithm, we generate two data sets of spatially varying (and correlated) clustered populations. For data set A, we set  $V = \{1, \dots, 15\}$ . We generated  $K = 5$  global factors  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_5$  from a Gaussian




**Figure 4.** Data set A. Left: Posterior distribution of the number of global clusters (atoms). Right: Posterior distributions of the global atoms. Dash lines denote the mean curve and the (.05,.95) credible intervals.




**Figure 5.** Effects of vague prior for  $H$  results in weak identifiability of global clusters, even as the local clusters are identified reasonably well.




**Figure 6.** Data set B. Left: Posterior distribution of the number of global clusters (atoms). Right: Posterior distributions of the global atoms. Dash lines denote the mean curve and the (.05,.95) credible intervals.




**Figure 7.** Data set B: Posterior distribution of the number of local clusters associating with different group index (location)  $u$ .



**Figure 8.** Left: Progesterone hormone curves. Right: Mean and credible intervals of global clusters (in dash) are compared to sample mean curves of the contraceptive group and no contraceptive group in black solid with square markers.



**Figure 9.** Top left panel shows the posterior distribution of the number of global clusters, while remaining panels show the the number of local clusters associating with different group index (location)  $u$ .



**Figure 10.** Pairwise comparison of individual hormone curves. Each entry in the heatmap depicts the posterior probability that the two curves share the same *local* clusters, averaged over a fixed interval ([1,21] in the left, and [21,24] in the right figure) in the menstrual cycle.

process with mean function  $\mu(u) = \beta_\mu u$ , a covariance function  $\rho(u, v) = \sigma^2 \exp -\omega \|u - v\|^2$ , where  $\sigma = 1$ ,  $\omega = 0.01$ ,  $\beta_\mu \sim \text{Unif}(-0.2, 0.2)$ . These global factors provide support for 15 spatially varying mixture of normal distributions, each of which has 5 mixture components. The likelihood  $F(\theta_{ui})$  is given by a normal distribution with variance  $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.1$ . For each  $u$  we generated independently 100 samples from the corresponding mixture (20 samples from each mixture components). See Figure 3 for the illustration of this data set, where each circle denotes a data sample. This kind of data can be encountered in tracking problems. The samples associating with each covariate  $u$  can be viewed as a snapshot of the locations of moving particles at time point  $u$ . The particles move in clusters. They could switch clusters at any time, but the clusters themselves move in relatively smoother paths. Moreover, the number of clusters is not known. It is of interest to estimate the cluster centers, as well as their moving paths.

For data set B, to illustrate the variation in the number of local clusters at different locations, we generate a number of global factors that simulate the bifurcation behavior in a collection of longitudinal trajectories. Here a trajectory corresponds to a global factor. We set  $V = \{1, \dots, 15\}$ . Starting at  $u = 1$  there is one global factor, which is a random draw from a relatively smooth Gaussian process with mean function  $\mu(u) = \beta_\mu u$ , where  $\beta_\mu \sim \text{Unif}(-0.2, 0.2)$  and the exponential covariance function parameterized by  $\sigma = 1$ ,  $\omega = 0.05$ . At  $u = 5$ , the global factor split into two, with the second one also an independent draw from the same Gaussian process, which is re-centered so that its value at  $u = 4$  is the same as the value of the previous global factor at  $u = 4$ . At  $u = 10$ , the second global factor split once more in the same manner. As before, these three global factors provide support for the local clusters at each  $u \in V$ . The likelihood  $F(\theta_{ui})$  is given a a normal distribution with variance  $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.2$ . At each  $u$  we generated 30 independent samples from the associating mixture distribution. See Fig. 3.

We fit the GDP mixture model for both data sets using essentially the same prior specifi-

cation. Specifically, the concentration parameters are given prior as  $\gamma \sim \text{Gamma}(5, .1)$  and  $\alpha \sim \text{Gamma}(20, 20)$ .  $H$  is taken to be a mean-0 Gaussian process using  $(\sigma, \omega) = (1, 0.01)$  for data set A, and  $(1, 0.05)$  for data set B. The variance for the gaussian likelihood  $\sigma_\epsilon^2$  is endowed with prior  $\text{InvGamma}(5, 1)$ . Of the two described MCMC sampling methods we implemented the conditional approach. The MCMC algorithm is run for 10000 iterations. Examinations of running traces suggest very fast mixing; we use the last 8000 MCMC samples to summarize the relevant posterior distributions. The results for data set A are illustrated by Fig. 4 while data set B by Fig. 6. With both data sets, the number global clusters are estimated almost exactly. It is interesting to study the evolution of the posterior distributions on the number of local clusters, especially for data set B in Fig. 7. We observe that a clear trend of increase in the number of local clusters as  $u$  is taken from 1 to 15. For  $u \in [1, 4]$ , the number of local cluster is most likely to be 1 or 2. For  $u \in [5, 10]$ , it is most likely to be 2. For  $u \in [11, 15]$ , the number of local cluster is 3 with probability close to one.

Fig. 4 and 6 illustrate the estimates of the local and global factors. We shall comment specifically on Fig. 6, which is more interesting because the number of local clusters is varying with time. Note that for  $u \in [11, 15]$ , the data are support by all three global factors (as evidenced by the histograms in Fig. 7). Accordingly the (0.05,0.95) credible interval estimates for the local clusters for  $u \in [11, 15]$  are good – they are tightly concentrated around the true curves. For  $u \in [1, 10]$ , although the mean estimates are good for all global factors, only one global factor has tight credible band (in blue color), suggesting that this global factor is used to support local clusters for all  $u \in [1, 10]$  with very high probability. The other two global factors have large credible bands, suggesting that they do not support local clusters with high probabilities. In fact, for  $u \in [5, 10]$  for instance, these two global factors alternate the role of supporting local clusters. This is related to the standard issue of label switching that could happen in the local clusters. Note that this is not an issue in either the estimation of the number of local clusters, the pairwise comparison analysis, or the interpolation and prediction problem.

In Section 3.4 we discussed the implications of prior specifications of the base measure  $H$  for the identifiability of global factors. We have performed a sensitive analysis for data set A, for both  $\sigma$  and  $\omega$  and found that within ranges of  $\sigma \in [0.5, 2.5]$  and  $\omega \in [0.01, 0.1]$  the inference for global factors is robust. For  $\omega = 0.5$ , for instance, which implies that  $\phi_u$  are weakly dependent across  $u$ 's, we are not able to identify the desired global factors (see Fig. 5), despite the fact that local factors are still estimated reasonably well.

## 5.2 Progesterone hormone data

We turn to an application of the GDP mixture model to a clustering analysis of Progesterone data (cf. Brumback and Rice (1998)). See Fig. 8 for the illustration. This data set records the natural logarithm of the progesterone metabolite, measured by urinary hormone assay, during a monthly cycle for 51 female subjects. Each cycle ranges from -8 to 15 (8 days pre-ovulation to 15 days post-ovulation). After removing obviously outlying hormone curves, we have a total of 69 cycles; the first 52 cycles belong to non-contraceptive group, the remaining 17 cycles belong to the contraceptive group. These two “clusters” are of course *unknown* to our analysis. Nor do we know the number of clusters. Moreover, we take as input to our analysis only groups of hormone levels

indexed by day numbers in the menstrual cycle, completely disregarding the functional aspect of the data. The latter information is used only when we perform a pairwise comparison of hormone curves.

A clustering analysis for this data set was performed by Nguyen and Gelfand (2009), but in that work the number of clusters was specified a priori. Here we are interested in learning both the number of global clusters and local clusters using the GDP mixture. For prior specifications, we set  $\gamma \sim \text{Gamma}(5, 0.1)$ , and  $\alpha_u = 1$  for all  $u$ . Let  $\sigma_\epsilon \sim \text{InvGamma}(2, 1)$ . For  $H$ , we set  $\mu = 0$ ,  $\sigma = 1$  and  $\omega = 0.05$ . We found that the MCMC sampler mixes very fast. Fig. 9 illustrates the posterior distribution of the number of global clusters, as well as the number of local clusters at each day in the cycle. It is found that there are 2 global clusters with probability close to 1. Examining the local clusters, we find that there is a significant probability of having 1 local cluster during the first 20 days. Between day 21 and 24 the number of local clusters is 2 with probability close to 1. Fig. 8 (Right) illustrates the estimate of the global cluster centers (atoms), and compares them with the sample mean curves and the (0.05,0.95) credible intervals from the contraceptive group and the no-contraceptive group. It is found that the mean estimate of global clusters match very well with the sample means from the two groups of women.

It is quite illuminating to examine in more detail the local clustering behavior of the hormone levels by performing a pairwise comparison analysis, now taking into account the functional aspect of our data. For every two hormone curves, we estimate the posterior probability that they share the same local cluster on a given day, and then take average of these probabilities over days in a given interval. It is found that during the first 20 days the hormone levels among these women are almost indistinguishable. Every pair shares the same local cluster with probability in the range of 75% or above. However, in the last 4 days, the hormone curves are grouped into two distinct regimes. The pairwise cluster-sharing probability among the first 52 cycles or among the remaining 17 clusters continue to be in the high 80%, but for cluster-sharing probability between a curve from the first group, and another from the second group are dropped to the low 30%. This clustering result agrees well with the contraceptive/no-contraceptive grouping information given about this data set.

## 6 Discussions

We have described a nonparametric approach to clustering analysis of grouped and functional data. We proposed a nonparametric Bayesian solution to this problem, by introducing a graphically dependent and spatially varying and correlated Dirichlet mixture model. This model has the virtue of simultaneous modeling of both local clusters and global clusters present in the data. The global clusters are supported by a Dirichlet process, using a stochastic process as its base measure (centering distribution). The local clusters are supported by the global clusters. Moreover, the local clusters are randomly selected using another hierarchy of Dirichlet processes. As a result, we obtain a collection of local clusters which are spatially varying, whose spatial dependency is regulated by an underlying spatial or a graphical model.

We provided an analysis of the model properties, including a stick-breaking and a Pólya-urn scheme characterization, which are inherited from the properties of the canonical Dirichlet processes. The graphical and spatial dependency were investigated, along with a discussion of model



identifiability. We presented two MCMC sampling methods, and discussed the computational implications of using a graphical model distribution and a spatial distribution as the base measure in the GDP model.

The canonical aspects of the GDP (because of its use of the Dirichlet processes) suggest straightforward extensions to accomodate richer behaviors using Poisson-Dirichlet processes (also known as the Pittman-Yor processes), where they have been found to be particularly suitable for certain applications, and where our analysis and inference methods can be easily adapted. It would also be interesting to consider a multivariate version of the GDP model. Finally, the manner in which global and local clusters are combined in the GDP mixture model is suggestive of ways of direct and simultaneous global and local clustering for functional and other structured data types.

## 7 Appendix

### 7.1 Proof of information denseness property.

We borrow the same technique from a proof of Ishwaran and Zarepour (2002), who proved the KL dense property for the standard finite normal mixture models. Let  $Q_0$  and  $G_{u,0}$ 's are the associated mixing distributions that define  $f_{u,0}$ . In particular, they have the following form:

$$Q_0 = \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_{k,0} \delta_{\phi_{k,0}}, \quad G_{u,0} = \sum_{k=1}^d \pi_{uk,0} \delta_{\phi_{uk,0}}, \quad (27)$$

where  $d$  is a natural number,  $(\beta_{k,0})_{k=1}^d$  and  $(\pi_{uk,0})_{k=1}^d$  form  $d$  dimensional probability simplices, and  $(\phi_{k,0})_{k=1}^d$  are global atoms which lie in the support of  $H$ . The KL divergence between  $f_{u,0}$  and  $f_u$  takes the following form:

$$D(f_{u,0} || f_u) = \sum_{u \in V} \int f_{u,0}(y_u) \log \frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \pi_{uk,0} F(y_u, \phi_{uk,0})}{\sum_{k=1}^L \pi_{uk} F(y_u, \phi_{uk})} \leq \sum_{u \in V} \int f_{u,0}(y_u) \log \frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \pi_{uk,0} F(y_u, \phi_{uk,0})}{\sum_{k=1}^d \pi_{uk} F(y_u, \phi_{uk})}. \quad (28)$$

Note that  $\sum_{k=1}^d \pi_{uk,0} = 1$ . Due to Lipschitz property of density function  $F$ , the RHS can be made smaller than  $\epsilon > 0$  if  $|\pi_{uk,0} - \pi_{uk}| \leq \eta_1(\epsilon)$  and  $|\phi_{uk,0} - \phi_{uk}| < \eta_1(\epsilon)$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $u \in V$  for some small  $\eta_1(\epsilon) > 0$ . The condition on  $\phi_{uk}$  can be achieved with probability bounded away from 0 for any  $u \in V$  and  $k = 1, \dots, d$ . Regarding the  $\pi_{uk}$ 's, note that given  $\beta$ ,  $\pi_{uk}$ 's are Dirichlet random variables, and can be written in terms of independent gamma variables as  $\pi_{uk} = \xi_{uk} / \sum_{k=1}^L \xi_{uk}$ , where  $\xi_{uk} \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_u \beta_k)$ . Thus, the condition on  $\pi_{uk}$  can be achieved if there holds:

$$|\xi_{uk} - \pi_{uk,0}| < \eta_2(\epsilon) \quad \sum_{k=d+1}^L \xi_{uk} \leq \eta_2(\epsilon), \quad (29)$$

for some small  $\eta_2(\epsilon)$  for all  $u \in V$  and all  $k = 1, \dots, d$ . We need to show that (29) can be achieved with positive probability. Using facts about gamma densities, we have:

$$p\left(\sum_{k=d+1}^L \xi_{uk} < \eta_2(\epsilon) \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \Gamma\left(\sum_{k=d+1}^L \alpha_u \beta_k, \eta_2(\epsilon)\right),$$

$$p(|\xi_{uk} - \pi_{uk,0}| < \eta_2(\epsilon) \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}) \sim O(\beta_k) \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Here  $\Gamma(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the incomplete gamma function  $\Gamma(s, x) = \int_0^x y^{s-1} e^{-y} dy$ . Recall that  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is distributed as  $\text{Dir}(\gamma/L, \dots, \gamma/L)$ . It suffices to show that there is a positive probability of choosing  $d$  random variables  $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^d$  that are bounded by  $d$  arbitrarily small and strictly positive intervals. (Conditioning on this event, it is clear that the incomplete gamma function values is also bounded away from 0 for any sufficiently large  $L$ , so that the proof is complete.) To see this, again, write  $\beta_k$ 's for  $k = 1, \dots, L$  in terms of  $L$  independent gamma variables  $(\tilde{\xi}_k)_{k=1}^L$ , and note that the probability that any  $d$  components of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  to be bounded in any arbitrarily small and strictly positive intervals is at least  $O(L^{-d})$ . Moreover, there are  $\binom{L}{d}$ , or at least  $O(L^d)$  ways of choosing them, so that the overall probability is bounded away from 0.

## 7.2 Sampling of hyperparameters

**Sampling of  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$ .** We follow the method of auxiliary variables developed by Escobar & West (1995). Endow  $\gamma$  with a  $\text{Gamma}(a_\gamma, b_\gamma)$  prior. At each sampling step, we draw  $\eta \sim \text{Beta}(\gamma + 1, q)$ . Then the posterior of  $\gamma$  is can be obtained as a gamma mixture, which can be expressed as  $\pi_\gamma \text{Gamma}(a_\gamma + K, b_\gamma - \log(\eta)) + (1 - \pi_\gamma) \text{Gamma}(a_\gamma + K - 1, b_\gamma - \log(\eta))$ , where  $\pi_\gamma = (a_\gamma + K - 1) / (a_\gamma + K - 1 + q \cdot (b_\gamma - \log(\eta)))$ . The procedure is the same for each  $\alpha_u$ , which  $n_u$  and  $m_u$  playing the role of  $q$  and  $K$ , respectively. Alternatively, one can force all  $\alpha_u$  be equal and endow it with a gamma prior, as in Teh et al. (2006).

**Sampling  $\sigma_\epsilon$ .** This is the variance for the likelihood  $F(y_{ui} \mid \phi_{ui})$  given by a normal distribution with mean  $\phi_{ui}$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_\epsilon$  (for all  $u$  and  $i$ ). Place an inverse gamma prior  $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \sim \text{Inv-Gamma}(a_\epsilon, b_\epsilon)$ . Then the posterior update is given by  $\text{Inv-Gamma}(\tilde{a}_\epsilon, \tilde{b}_\epsilon)$ , where  $\tilde{a}_\epsilon = a_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_u n_u$  and  $\tilde{b}_\epsilon = b_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u,k} \sum_{i:z_{ui}=k} (y_{ui} - \phi_{uk})^2$ .

**Sampling of  $\sigma^2$  and  $\omega$ .**  $\sigma^2$  can be endowed with a gamma prior, and  $\omega$  an uniform prior within a bounded interval, and whose posterior distributions can be obtained by Metropolis-Hasting sampling steps. Gelfand et al. (2005) provides guidelines on these prior specifications.

## References

Antoniak, C. (1974), "Mixtures of Dirichlet Processes with Applications to Bayesian Nonparametric Problems," *Annals of Statistics*, 2, 1152–1174.

- Banerjee, S., Carlin, B., and Gelfand, A. (2004), *Hierarchical Modeling and Analysis for Spatial Data*, Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Barron, A., Schervish, M., and Wasserman, L. (1999), “The consistency of posterior distributions in nonparametric problems,” *Ann. Statist.*, 27, 536–561.
- Beal, M., Ghahramani, Z., and Rasmussen, C. (2002), “The Infinite Hidden Markov Model,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 14, p. 577584.
- Blackwell, D. and MacQueen, J. (1973), “Ferguson Distributions via Polya Urn Schemes,” *Annals of Statistics*, 1, 353355.
- Brumback, B. and Rice, J. (1998), “Smoothing spline models for the analysis of nested and crossed samples of curves,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 93, 961–980.
- Carota, C. and Parmigiani, G. (2002), “Semiparametric Regression for Count Data,” *Biometrika*, 89, 265281.
- Cifarelli, D. and Regazzini, E. (1978), “Problemi Statistici Non Parametrici in Condizioni di Scambiabilit' a Parziale e Impiego di Medie Associative,” Tech. rep., Quaderni Istituto Matematica Finanziaria dell'Universit'a di Torino.
- Cressie, N. (1993), *Statistics for Spatial Data*, Wiley, NY.
- DeIorio, M., Muller, P., Rosner, G., and MacEachern, S. (2004), “An ANOVA model for dependent random measures,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 99, 205–215.
- Duan, J., Guindani, M., and Gelfand, A. (2007), “Generalized spatial Dirichlet processes,” *Biometrika*, 94, 809–825.
- Dunson, D. (2008), “Kernel local partition processes for functional data,” Tech. Rep. 26, Department of Statistical Science, Duke University.
- Dunson, D. and Park, J.-H. (2008), “Kernel stick-breaking processes,” *Biometrika*, 95, 307–323.
- Escobar, M. and West, M. (1995), “Bayesian Density Estimation and Inference Using Mixtures,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90, 577–588.
- Ferguson, T. (1973), “A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems,” *Ann. Statist.*, 1, 209–230.
- Fox, E., Sudderth, E., Jordan, M. I., and Willsky, A. (2009), “The sticky HDP-HMM: Bayesian nonparametric hidden Markov models with persistent states,” Tech. Rep. P-2777, MIT LIDS.
- Gelfand, A., Kottas, A., and MacEachern, S. (2005), “Bayesian nonparametric spatial modeling with Dirichlet process mixing,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 100, 1021–1035.

- Ghosal, S., Ghosh, J. K., and Ramamoorthi, R. V. (1999), “Posterior consistency of Dirichlet mixtures in density estimation,” *Ann. Statist.*, 27, 143–158.
- Green, P. and Richardson, S. (2001), “Modelling Heterogeneity with and without the Dirichlet Process,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 28, 355–377.
- Griffin, J. and Steel, M. (2006), “Order-based dependent Dirichlet processes,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 101, 179–194.
- Heinz, D. (2009), “Building hyper Dirichlet processes for graphical models,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3, 290–315.
- Ishwaran, H. and James, L. (2001), “Gibbs sampling methods for stick-breaking priors,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 96, 161–173.
- Ishwaran, H. and Zarepour, M. (2002a), “Dirichlet prior sieves in finite normal mixtures,” *Statistica Sinica*, 12, 941–963.
- (2002b), “Exact and Approximate Sum-Representations for the Dirichlet Process,” *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 30, 269–283.
- Jordan, M. (2004), “Graphical models,” *Statistical Science*, Special Issue on Bayesian Statistics (19), 140–155.
- Kim, S. and Smyth, P. (2007), “Hierarchical dirichlet processes with random effects,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 19.
- Kleinman, K. and Ibrahim, J. (1998), “A Semi-parametric Bayesian Approach to Generalized Linear Mixed Models,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 17, 2579–2596.
- Lauritzen, S. (1996), *Graphical models*, Oxford University Press.
- Lo, A. (1984), “On a class of Bayesian nonparametric estimates I: Density estimates,” *Annals of Statistics*, 12, 351–357.
- MacEachern, S. (1999), “Dependent Nonparametric Processes,” in *Proceedings of the Section on Bayesian Statistical Science*, American Statistical Association.
- MacEachern, S., Kottas, A., and Gelfand, A. (2001), “Spatial Nonparametric Bayesian models,” Tech. Rep. 01-10, Institute of Statistics and Decision Sciences, Duke University.
- MacEachern, S. and Muller, P. (1998), “Estimating Mixture of Dirichlet Process Models,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 7, 223–238.
- Mallick, B. and Walker, S. (1997), “Combining Information from Several Experiments with Nonparametric Priors,” *Biometrika*, 84, 697–706.

- Muliere, P. and Petrone, S. (1993), “A Bayesian Predictive Approach to Sequential Search for an Optimal Dose: Parametric and Nonparametric Models,” *Journal of the Italian Statistical Society*, 2, 349364.
- Muliere, P. and Secchi, P. (1995), “A note on a proper Bayesian bootstrap,” Tech. Rep. 18, Dipartimento di Economia Politica e Metodi Quantitativi, Universita degli Studi di Pavia.
- Muller, P., Quintana, F., and Rosner, G. (2004), “A Method for Combining Inference Across Related Nonparametric Bayesian Models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 66, 735749.
- Neal, R. (1992), “Bayesian Mixture Modeling,” in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods of Statistical Analysis*, vol. 11, pp. 197–211.
- (2000), “Markov Chain Sampling Methods for Dirichlet Process Mixture Models,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9, 249–265.
- Nguyen, X. and Gelfand, A. (2009), “The Dirichlet labeling process for functional data analysis,” *Statistica Sinica*, under invited revision.
- Petrone, S., Guidani, M., and Gelfand, A. (2009), “Hybrid Dirichlet processes for functional data,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, to appear.
- Pittman, J. (2002), “Poisson-Dirichlet and GEM invariant distributions for split-and-merge transformations of an interval partition,” *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 11, 501–514.
- Rabiner, L. (1989), “A Tutorial on Hidden Markov Models and Selected Applications in Speech Recognition,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 77, 257–285.
- Rasmussen, C. and Ghahramani, Z. (2002), “Infinite Mixtures of Gaussian Process Experts,” in *Neural Information Processing Systems 14*, pp. 881–888.
- Rodriguez, A., Dunson, D., and Gelfand, A. (2009), “Latent stick-breaking processes,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, under invited revision.
- Schwartz, L. (1965), “On Bayes procedures,” *Z. Wahr. Verw. Gebiete*, 4, 10–26.
- Sethuraman, J. (1994), “A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors,” *Statistica Sinica*, 4, 639–650.
- Sudderth, E., Torralba, A., Freeman, W., and Willsky, A. (2008), “Describing visual scenes using transformed objects and parts,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 77.
- Teh, Y., Jordan, M., Beal, M., and Blei, D. (2006), “Hierarchical Dirichlet processes,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 101, 1566–1581.
- Teh, Y. W. and Jordan, M. I. (2010), “Hierarchical Bayesian nonparametric models with applications,” *Bayesian Nonparametrics: Principles and Practice*, In N. Hjort, C. Holmes, P. Mueller, and S. Walker (Eds.).

- Tomlinson, G. (1998), “Analysis of Densities,” Ph.D. thesis, Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto.
- Tomlinson, G. and Escobar, M. (2003), “Analysis of Densities,” Tech. rep., Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto.
- Wainwright, M. J. and Jordan, M. I. (2008), “Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference,” *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 1, 1–305.
- Whittaker, J. (2009), *Graphical Models in Applied Multivariate Statistics*, Wiley.