


Bayesian Decision-theoretic Methods for Parameter Ensembles with Application to Epidemiology



By
Cedric E. Ginestet

Under the supervision of
Nicky G. Best, Sylvia Richardson and David J. Briggs

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.
February 2011

Doctorate Thesis submitted to the
Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Imperial College London.

Abstract

Parameter ensembles or sets of random effects constitute one of the cornerstones of modern statistical practice. This is especially the case in Bayesian hierarchical models, where several decision theoretic frameworks can be deployed to optimise the estimation of parameter ensembles. The reporting of such ensembles in the form of sets of point estimates is an important concern in epidemiology, and most particularly in spatial epidemiology, where each element in these ensembles represent an epidemiological unit such as a hospital or a geographical area of interest. The estimation of these parameter ensembles may substantially vary depending on which inferential goals are prioritised by the modeller. Since one may wish to satisfy a range of desiderata, it is therefore of interest to investigate whether some sets of point estimates can simultaneously meet several inferential objectives. In this thesis, we will be especially concerned with identifying ensembles of point estimates that produce good approximations of (i) the true empirical quantiles and empirical quartile ratio (QR) and (ii) provide an accurate classification of the ensemble's elements above and below a given threshold. For this purpose, we review various decision-theoretic frameworks, which have been proposed in the literature in relation to the optimisation of different aspects of the empirical distribution of a parameter ensemble. This includes the constrained Bayes (CB), weighted-rank squared error loss (WRSEL), and triple-goal (GR) ensembles of point estimates. In addition, we also consider the set of maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs) and the ensemble of posterior means –the latter being optimal under the summed squared error loss (SSEL). Firstly, we test the performance of these different sets of point estimates as plug-in estimators for the empirical quantiles and empirical QR under a range of synthetic scenarios encompassing both spatial and non-spatial simulated data sets. Performance evaluation is here conducted using the posterior regret, which corresponds to the difference in posterior losses between the chosen plug-in estimator and the optimal choice under the loss function of interest. The triple-goal plug-in estimator is found to outperform its counterparts and produce close-to-optimal empirical quantiles and empirical QR. A real data set documenting schizophrenia prevalence in an urban area is also used to illustrate the implementation of these methods. Secondly, two threshold classification losses (TCLs) –weighted and unweighted– are formulated. The weighted TCL can be used to emphasise the estimation of false positives over false negatives or the converse. These weighted and unweighted TCLs are optimised by a set of posterior quantiles and a set of posterior medians, respectively. Under an unweighted classification framework, the SSEL point estimates are found to be quasi-optimal for all scenarios studied. In addition, the five candidate plug-in estimators are also evaluated under the rank classification loss (RCL), which has been previously proposed in the literature. The SSEL set of point estimates are again found to constitute quasi-optimal plug-in estimators under this loss function, approximately on a par with the CB and GR sets of point estimates. The threshold and rank classification loss functions are applied to surveillance data reporting methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) prevalence in UK hospitals. This application demonstrates that all the studied plug-in classifiers under TCL tend to be more liberal than the optimal estimator. That is, all studied plug-in estimators tended to classify a greater number of hospitals above the risk threshold than the set of posterior medians. In a concluding chapter, we discuss some possible generalisations of the loss functions studied in this thesis, and consider how model specification can be tailored to better serve the inferential goals considered.

Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Content	4
Acknowledgements	7
1 Introduction	8
2 Loss functions for Parameter Ensembles	11
2.1 Bayesian Decision Theory	11
2.1.1 Premises of Decision Theory	12
2.1.2 Frequentist and Bayesian Decision Theories	13
2.1.3 Classical Loss Functions	14
2.1.4 Functions of Parameters	15
2.2 Parameter Ensembles and Hierarchical Shrinkage	16
2.2.1 Bayesian Hierarchical Models	17
2.2.2 Spatial Models	18
2.2.3 Estimation of Parameter Ensembles	19
2.2.4 Hierarchical Shrinkage	21
2.3 Ranks, Quantile Functions and Order Statistics	21
2.3.1 Ranks and Percentile Ranks	21
2.3.2 Quantile Function	22
2.3.3 Quantiles, Quartiles and Percentiles	23
2.4 Loss Functions for Parameter Ensembles	24
2.4.1 Constrained Bayes	24
2.4.2 Triple-Goal	25
2.4.3 Weighted and Weighted Ranks Loss Functions	26
2.5 Research Questions	28
3 Empirical Quantiles and Quartile Ratio Losses	30
3.1 Introduction	30
3.2 Estimation of Empirical Quantiles and Quartile Ratio	33
3.2.1 Empirical Quantiles	33
3.2.2 Empirical Quartile Ratio	34
3.2.3 Performance Evaluation	36
3.3 Non-spatial Simulations	36
3.3.1 Design	36
3.3.2 Generative Models	37
3.3.3 Simulation Scenarios	37
3.3.4 Fitted Models	38
3.3.5 Plug-in Estimators under Q-SEL	38
3.3.6 Plug-in Estimators under QR-SEL	41
3.4 Spatial Simulations	43
3.4.1 Design	43
3.4.2 Spatial Structure Scenarios	44

3.4.3	Fitted Models	48
3.4.4	Plug-in Estimators under Q-SEL	49
3.4.5	Plug-in Estimators under QR-SEL	51
3.4.6	Consequences of Scaling the Expected Counts	52
3.5	Urban Distribution of Schizophrenia Cases	55
3.5.1	Data Description	55
3.5.2	Models Used and Performance Evaluation	56
3.5.3	Results	57
3.6	Conclusion	59
4	Threshold and Rank Classification Losses	62
4.1	Introduction	62
4.2	Classification Losses	64
4.2.1	Threshold Classification Loss	64
4.2.2	Rank Classification Loss	68
4.2.3	Posterior Sensitivity and Specificity	69
4.2.4	Performance Evaluation	70
4.3	Non-spatial Data Simulations	71
4.3.1	Parameter Ensembles and Experimental Factors	71
4.3.2	Plug-in Estimators under TCL	72
4.3.3	Plug-in Estimators under RCL	73
4.4	Spatial Simulations	74
4.4.1	Parameter Ensembles and Experimental Factors	75
4.4.2	Plug-in Estimators under Unweighted TCL	75
4.4.3	Plug-in Estimators under Weighted TCL	77
4.4.4	Plug-in Estimators under RCL	78
4.4.5	Consequences of Scaling the Expected Counts	79
4.5	MRSA Prevalence in UK NHS Trusts	82
4.5.1	Data Pre-processing	82
4.5.2	Fitted Model	83
4.5.3	TCL Classification	84
4.5.4	RCL Classification	90
4.6	Conclusion	90
4.7	Proof of TCL Minimisation	93
5	Discussion	94
5.1	Main Findings	94
5.2	Generalised Classification Losses	95
5.3	Modelling Assumptions	96
A	Non-Spatial Simulations	97
B	Spatial Simulations	99
C	WinBUGS Codes	102
C.1	CAR Normal (BYM) Model	102
C.2	CAR Laplace (L1) Model	103
C.3	MRSA Model	104
	References	104
	Index	109

Abbreviations

AVL	Absolute value error loss
DAG	Directed Acyclic Graph
iid	Independent and identically distributed
ind	Independent
BHM	Bayesian hierarchical model
BYM	Besag, York and Mollié model
CAR	Conditional autoregressive
CB	Constrained Bayes
CDI	Carstairs' deprivation index
CDF	Cumulative distribution function
DoPQ	Difference of posterior quartiles
EB	Empirical Bayes
EDF	Empirical distribution function
G-IG	Gamma-Inverse Gamma model
GR	Triple-goal (G for empirical distribution and R for rank)
ICC	Intraclass Correlation
IQR	Interquartile range
IQR-SEL	Interquartile range squared error loss
ISEL	Integrated squared error loss
L1	Laplace-based Besag, York and Mollié model
MCMC	Markov chain Monte Carlo
MLE	Maximum likelihood estimate
MOR	Median odds ratio
MRSA	Methicillin resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
N-N	Normal-Normal model
OR	Odds ratio
pdf	Probability density function
PM	Posterior mean
Q-SEL	Quantiles squared error loss
QR	Quartile ratio
QR-SEL	Quartile ratio squared error loss
RCL	Rank classification loss
RoPQ	Ratio of Posterior Quartiles
RR	Relative risk
RSEL	Rank squared error loss
SEL	Squared error loss
SBR	Smoothing by roughening algorithm
SSEL	Summed squared error loss
WRSEL	Weighted rank squared error loss
TCL	Threshold classification loss

À mes parents.

Acknowledgements

Writing a thesis is always an arduous process, and the present one has been a particularly testing one. However, during that long journey, I had the chance to receive support from distinguished scholars. For my entry in the world of statistics, I am greatly indebted to Prof. Nicky Best, my director of studies, who has entrusted me with the capacity to complete a PhD in biostatistics, and has demonstrated mountains of patience in the face of my often whimsical behaviour.

I also owe a great debt of gratitude to my second supervisor, Prof. Sylvia Richardson, who has helped me a great deal throughout the PhD process, and has been particularly understanding during the write-up stage. This revised thesis, however, would not be in its current form without the advice and recommendations of the two examiners –Prof. Angelika van der Linde and Dr. Maria De Iorio– and I am also extremely grateful to them. In particular, I would like to thank Prof. Angelika van der Linde for suggesting how to simplify the minimisation of the threshold classification loss (TCL).

This work was supported by a capacity building scholarship awarded by the UK Medical Research Council. In terms of technical resources, I also wish to acknowledge the use of the Imperial College High Performance Computing (HPC) Service. In particular, I would like to thank Simon Burbidge for his help in using the HPC. In addition, I have also benefited from the help of James Kirkbride from the Department of Psychiatry in Cambridge University, who provided the schizophrenia prevalence data set.

Lastly, my greatest thanks go to Sofie Davis, who has been a trove of patience and encouragement throughout the last four years.

Chapter 1

Introduction

An important concern in epidemiology is the reporting of ensembles of point estimates. In disease mapping, for example, one may wish to ascertain the levels of risk for cancer in different regions of the British Isles (Jarup et al., 2002), or evaluate cancer mortality rates in different administrative areas (Lopez-Abente et al., 2007). In public health, one may be interested in comparing different service providers such as neonatal clinics (MacNab et al., 2004). Estimation of parameter ensembles may also be of interest as performance indicators, such as when compiling league tables (Goldstein and Spiegelhalter, 1996). Thus, one of the fundamental tasks of the epidemiologist is the summarising of data in the form of an ensemble of summary statistics, which constitutes an approximation of a ‘parameter ensemble’.

Such a task, however, is complicated by the variety of goals that such an ensemble of point estimates has to fulfil. A primary goal, for instance, may be to produce element-specific point estimates, which optimally reflect the individual level of risk in each area. Alternatively, one may be required to select the ensemble of point estimates that best approximate the histogram of the true parameter ensemble (Louis, 1984). A related but distinct desideratum may be to choose the set of point estimates that gives a good approximation of the true heterogeneity in the ensemble. This is especially important from a public health perspective since unexplained dispersion in the ensemble of point estimates may indicate the effect of unmeasured covariates. Naturally, there does not exist a set of point estimates, which simultaneously optimise all of these criteria. However, reporting several ensembles of point estimates corresponding to different desiderata can yield to some inconsistencies, which generally lead epidemiologists to solely report a single set of point estimates when communicating their results to the public or to decision makers. There is therefore a need for considering how certain ensembles of point estimates can satisfy several epidemiological goals at once.

A natural statistical framework within which these issues can be addressed is Bayesian decision theory. This approach relies on the formulation of a particular loss function and the fitting of a Bayesian model to the data of interest. The former formalises one’s inferential goals, whereas the latter permits to derive the joint posterior distribution of the parameters of interest, which will then be used for the optimisation of the loss function. Once these two ingredients are specified, standard arguments in decision theory imply that an optimal set of point estimates can be obtained by minimising the posterior expected loss function. In spatial epidemiology, the use of Bayesian methods, thanks to the now wide availability of computational resources, has increasingly become the procedure of choice for the estimation of small-area statistics (Lawson, 2009). This has paralleled an increase in the amount of multilevel data routinely collected in most fields of public health and in the social sciences. The expansion of Bayesian methods has especially been motivated by an increased utilisation of hierarchical models, which are characterised by the use of hierarchical priors (Best et al., 1996, Wakefield et al., 2000, Gelman et al., 2004). This family of models has the desirable property of borrowing strength across different areas, which permits to decrease the variability of each point estimate in the ensemble.

Such Bayesian models are generally used in conjunction with summed of squared error loss

(SSEL) function, whose optimal estimator is the set of posterior means of the elements of the parameter ensemble of interest. The SSEL is widely used in most applications because it produces estimators, which are easy to handle computationally, and often readily available from MCMC summaries. Despite being the most popular loss function in both spatial and non-spatial epidemiology, this particular choice of loss function, however, remains criticised by several authors (Lehmann and Casella, 1995, Robert, 1996). In particular, the use of the quadratic loss has been challenged by researchers demonstrating that the posterior means tend to overshrink the empirical distribution of the ensemble's elements (Louis, 1984). The empirical variance of the ensemble of point estimates under SSEL can indeed be shown to represent only a fraction of the true empirical variance of the unobserved parameters (Ghosh, 1992, Richardson et al., 2004).

Due to these limitations and motivated by a need to produce parameter ensemble estimates that satisfy other epidemiological desiderata, several authors have suggested the use of alternative loss functions. Specifically, Louis (1984) and Ghosh (1992) have introduced a constrained loss function, which produce sets of point estimates that match both the empirical mean and empirical variance of the true parameter ensemble. Other authors have made use of the flexibility of the ensemble distribution to optimise the estimation of certain parts of the empirical distribution to the detriment of the remaining ones. This has been done by specifying a set of weights ϕ , which emphasise the estimation of a subset of the elements of the target ensemble (Wright et al., 2003, Craigmile et al., 2006). A particularly successful foray in simultaneously satisfying several inferential objectives was achieved by Shen and Louis (1998), who proposed the use of triple-goal ensembles of point estimates. These sets of point estimates constitute a good approximation of the empirical distribution of the parameter ensemble. Moreover, their ranks are close to the optimal ranks. Finally, they also provide good estimates of element-specific levels of risk.

Two specific goals, however, do not appear to have hitherto been fully addressed in the literature on Bayesian decision theory. These are (i) the estimation of the empirical quantiles and the empirical quartile ratio (QR) of a parameter ensemble of interest, and (ii) the optimisation of the classification of the elements of an ensemble above or below a given threshold. The first objective lies close to a need of evaluating the amount of dispersion of a parameter ensemble. The estimation of the QR indeed constitutes a good candidate for quantifying the variability of the elements in the ensemble, which can then be related to the presence or absence of unmeasured risk factor. While some epidemiologists have considered the problem of choosing a specific measure of dispersion for parameter ensembles (Larsen et al., 2000, Larsen and Merlo, 2005), these methods have been formulated in a frequentist framework and little work has been conducted from a Bayesian perspective.

The second goal, which we wish to explore in this thesis, is the classification of elements in a parameter ensemble. Increased interest in performance evaluation and the development of league tables in education and health has led to the routine gathering of surveillance data, which permit to trace the evolution of particular institutions over time. Despite the range of drawbacks associated with these methods (Goldstein and Spiegelhalter, 1996), a combination of factors has made the use of surveillance data particularly popular. Excess mortality rates following paediatric cardiac surgery in Bristol Royal Infirmary, for instance, has raised awareness about the significance of this type of data (Grigg et al., 2003). The Shipman inquiry, in addition, has stressed the need for a closer monitoring of mortality rates in general practices in the UK (Shipman-Inquiry, 2004). These factors have been compounded by the public and political attention to hospital-acquired infections such as methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) or *Clostridium difficile* (Grigg and Spiegelhalter, 2007, Grigg et al., 2009). Such developments are reflected by the recent creation of a new journal entitled *Advances in Disease Surveillance*, published by the International Society for Diseases Surveillance in 2007. While some statistical work has focused on the monitoring of disease counts over time (Spiegelhalter, 2005, Grigg et al., 2009), few authors have considered the problem of classifying the elements of a parameter ensemble in low- and high-risk groups (Richardson et al., 2004). Such classifications, however, may be particularly useful for the mapping of risk in spatial epidemiology, where different groups of areas could be assigned different colours, according to each group's level of risk.

However, while the estimation of the empirical quantiles and empirical QR or the classification

of the elements of a parameter ensemble can be conducted optimally, these optimal estimators may not succeed to meet other inferential goals. One of the central themes of this thesis will therefore be to identify sets of point estimates that can simultaneously satisfy several inferential objectives. For this purpose, we will study the behaviour of various plug-in estimators under the specific loss functions of interest. Plug-in estimators are computed by applying a particular function to a candidate set of point estimates. In order to evaluate the performance of each of these candidate ensembles in comparison to the optimal choice of estimator under the loss functions of interest, we will compute the posterior regret associated with the use of that specific candidate plug-in estimator. We will compare different plug-in estimators using spatial and non-spatial simulations, as well as two real data sets documenting schizophrenia and MRSA prevalence.

This thesis is organised as follows. In chapter 2, we describe the general principles of decision theory and present the specific modelling assumptions commonly made in epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. Several loss functions, which have been proposed for the estimation of parameter ensembles in hierarchical models are introduced with their respective optimal estimators. Estimators resulting from these loss functions will be used throughout the thesis as plug-in estimators under other loss functions of interest. Chapter 3 is specifically dedicated to the optimisation of the empirical quantiles and empirical QR of a parameter ensemble, which permit to evaluate the amount of dispersion in the ensemble distribution. In chapter 4, we consider the issue of classifying the different elements of a parameter ensemble above or below a given threshold of risk, which particularly pertains to the analysis of surveillance data. Finally, in chapter 5, we consider some possible extensions and generalisations of the techniques proposed in this thesis, with special emphasis on the specification of tailored Bayesian models, which may better serve the target inferential goals.

Chapter 2

Loss functions for Parameter Ensembles

Summary

In this introductory chapter, we briefly introduce the general decision-theoretic framework used in Bayesian statistics, with special attention to point estimation problems. We present three commonly used loss functions: the squared-error loss, the absolute error loss and the 0/1-loss. A working definition of Bayesian hierarchical models is then provided, including the description of three specific families of models characterised by different types of prior structure, which will be used throughout the thesis. The concept of a parameter ensemble in a hierarchical model is also defined with some emphasis on the optimal estimation of the functions of parameter ensembles. Issues related to hierarchical shrinkage are reviewed with a brief discussion of the Ghosh-Louis theorem. Several commonly adopted decision-theoretic approaches to the estimation of a parameter ensemble are also introduced, including the constrained Bayes estimator (CB), the triple-goal estimator (GR) and the weighted-rank squared-error loss estimator (WRSEL). Finally, we discuss plug-in estimators, which consist of functions of an ensemble of point estimates. Differences between such plug-in estimators and the optimal estimators of various functions of parameter ensembles will be the object of most of the thesis at hand. In particular, the performance of optimal and plug-in estimators will be studied within the context of two inferential objectives relevant to epidemiological practice: (i) the estimation of the dispersion of parameter ensembles and (ii) the classification of the elements of a parameter ensemble above or below a given threshold. We conclude with a description of the posterior regret, which will be used throughout the thesis as a criterion for performance evaluation.

2.1 Bayesian Decision Theory

In this section, we briefly introduce the premises of decision theory with special attention to point estimation. We also consider the differences between the frequentist and the Bayesian approach to the problem of point estimation, and describe three classical loss functions. A discussion of the specific issues arising from the estimation of a function of the model's parameters is also given, as this is especially relevant to the thesis at hand. Note that, throughout this chapter and the rest of this thesis, we will not emphasise the niceties of measure theory, but restrict ourselves to the level of formality and the notation introduced by Berger (1980) and Robert (2007). Unless otherwise specified, all random variables in this thesis will be assumed to be real-valued.

2.1.1 Premises of Decision Theory

Decision theory formalises the statistical approach to decision making. Here, decision making should be understood in its broadest sense. The estimation of a particular parameter, for instance, constitutes a decision as we opt for a specific value among a set of possible candidates. The cornerstone of decision theory is the specification of a utility function. The main strength and appeal of decision theory is that once a utility function has been selected, and a set of alternative options has been delineated, the decision problem is then fully specified and the optimal decision can be derived.

A rigorous approach to decision theory is based on the definition of three spaces. Firstly, let Θ denote the space of the true states of the world. Secondly, the decision space, denoted \mathcal{D} , will comprise the decisions –sometimes referred to as acts, actions or choices– that one can take. A third space encompasses the consequences of a particular course of action. These are often expressed in monetary terms, and for that reasons are generally termed rewards. This last space will be denoted \mathcal{Z} . The true states of the world, the decision space and the space of consequences are linked together by a loss function defined as follows,

$$L : \Theta \times \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathcal{Z}, \quad (2.1)$$

where \times denotes the Cartesian product. A loss function is thus a criterion for evaluating a possible procedure or action $\delta \in \mathcal{D}$, given some true state of the world $\theta \in \Theta$. This loss function takes values in the space of consequences \mathcal{Z} . A decision *problem* is therefore fully specified when the above four ingredients are known: $(\Theta, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, L)$. Note that, in axiomatic treatments of decision theory, the aforementioned quadruple is generally replaced by $(\Theta, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, \preceq)$, where \preceq is a total ordering on the space of consequences. Providing several properties of \preceq hold (e.g. transitivity, asymmetry), the existence of a loss function L can be demonstrated. Decision theory originated in the context of game theory (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944), and was adapted to statistics by Savage (1954). The formalisation of a decision problem as the quadruple $(\Theta, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, \preceq)$ is probably the most accepted definition (Fishburn, 1964, Kreps, 1988, DeGroot, 1970, Robert, 2007), although some other authors also include the set of all possible experiments, \mathcal{E} , in the definition of a decision problem (Raiffa and Schlaifer, 1960).

In this thesis, we will be especially interested in parameter estimation. Since the space of the true states of the world is the set of values that the parameter of interest can take, we will simply refer to Θ as the parameter space. In estimation problems, the space of decisions, denoted \mathcal{D} , is generally taken to be identical to the parameter space, Θ . In addition, both spaces are also usually defined as subsets of the Real line. That is, we have

$$\mathcal{D} = \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.2)$$

For convenience, we will assume in this section that θ is univariate and study the multivariate case in section . Moreover, the space of consequences is defined as the positive half of the Real line $[0, +\infty)$. Thus, when considering point estimation problems, such as the ones of interest in the present thesis, a decision problem will be defined as $(\Theta, \Theta, [0, +\infty), L)$, with L satisfying

$$L : \Theta \times \Theta \mapsto [0, +\infty). \quad (2.3)$$

Albeit our discussion has centered on the specification of a particular loss function, historically, the definition of a total ordering on \mathcal{Z} has been associated with the choice of an arbitrary *utility* function (see von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944). However, the use of an unbounded utility leads to several problems, as exemplified by the Saint Petersburg’s paradox. (This paradox involves a gamble, which results in an infinite average gain, thereby leading to the conclusion that an arbitrarily high entrance fee should be paid to participate in the game (see Robert, 2007, for a full description).) As a result, the codomain of the utility function is usually taken to be bounded, with $U : \Theta \times \Theta \mapsto (-\infty, 0]$. This gives the following relationship with our preceding definition of

the loss function in estimation problems,

$$U(\theta, \delta) = -L(\theta, \delta). \quad (2.4)$$

In the context of decision theory, point estimation problems can be naturally conceived as games, where the player attempts to minimise her losses (see Berger, 1980). Such losses, however, are associated with some level of uncertainty. That is, there exists a space \mathcal{P} of probability distributions on \mathcal{Z} . The total ordering on the space of consequences \mathcal{Z} can then be transposed onto the probability space \mathcal{P} , using the expectation operator. An axiomatic construction of a total ordering \preceq on \mathcal{Z} leading to the proof of the existence of a utility or loss function can be found in several texts (see Savage, 1954, Fishburn, 1964, Kreps, 1988) or see Robert (2007) for a modern treatment. The purpose of the game is therefore to minimise one's loss, by selecting the optimal decision, δ^* , which is defined as follows,

$$\delta^* := \operatorname{argmin}_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}[L(\theta, \delta)], \quad (2.5)$$

where $:=$ indicates that the LHS is defined as the RHS. Here, the two schools of thought in statistics differ in their handling of the expectation operator. Frequentist and Bayesian statisticians have traditionally chosen different types of expectations, as we describe in the next section.

2.1.2 Frequentist and Bayesian Decision Theories

From a statistical perspective, the specification of the space of the states of the world Θ and the decision space \mathcal{D} are complemented by the definition of a sample of observations, which we will denote by $\mathbf{y} := \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$, where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We assume that this sample was generated from a population distribution $p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$, with $\theta \in \Theta$. Our decision δ is therefore computed on the basis of this sample, and we will denote this dependency by $\delta(\mathbf{y})$. Following Robert (2007), we will use the term *estimator* to refer to the function $\delta(\cdot)$. That is, an estimator is the following mapping,

$$\delta : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{D}, \quad (2.6)$$

where \mathcal{D} is taken to be equivalent to the space of states of the world, Θ . An *estimate*, by contrast, will be a single value in $\mathcal{D} = \Theta$, given some observation \mathbf{y} .

From a frequentist perspective, the experiment that has generated the finite sample of observations \mathbf{y} is assumed to be infinitely repeatable (Robert, 2007). Under this assumption of repeatability, the optimal decision rule δ can be defined as the rule that minimises the expectation of the loss function with respect to the (unknown) population distribution $p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$. This gives

$$R_F[\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})] := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})) p(\mathbf{y}|\theta) d\mathbf{y}. \quad (2.7)$$

The quantity R_F is called the *frequentist risk*, whereas $p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$ can be regarded as the likelihood function of traditional statistics, evaluated at the true state of the world, $\theta \in \Theta$.

In the context of Bayesian theory, by contrast, we specify a prior distribution on the space of the states of the world, Θ . This distribution, denoted $p(\theta)$, reflects our uncertainty about the true state of the world. Given these assumptions and the specification of a particular prior, it is then possible to integrate over the parameter space. This gives the following Bayesian version of equation (2.7),

$$R_B[p(\theta), \delta(\mathbf{y})] := \iint_{\Theta \times \mathcal{Y}} L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})) p(\mathbf{y}|\theta) p(\theta) d\mathbf{y} d\theta, \quad (2.8)$$

which is usually termed the *Bayes risk*. Note that R_B takes the prior distribution $p(\theta)$ as an argument, since its value entirely depends on the choice of prior distribution on θ . The optimal decision δ^* that minimises R_B in equation (2.8) can be shown (using Fubini's theorem and Bayes'

rule, see Robert (2007) for a proof) to be equivalent to the argument that minimises the *posterior expected loss*, which is defined as follows,

$$\rho[p(\theta|\mathbf{y}), \delta(\mathbf{y})] := \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y}))p(\theta|\mathbf{y})d\theta, \quad (2.9)$$

where $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$ is the posterior distribution of θ , obtained via Bayes' rule,

$$p(\theta|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)p(\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)p(\theta)d\theta}. \quad (2.10)$$

Since minimisation of ρ for all y is equivalent to the minimisation of R_B , we will generally use the terms Bayes risk and posterior (expected) loss interchangeably. The optimal decision under both the Bayes risk and the posterior loss is termed the Bayes choice, action or decision.

For notational convenience, we will use the following shorthand for the posterior loss,

$$\rho[\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})] := \rho[p(\theta|\mathbf{y}), \delta(\mathbf{y})], \quad (2.11)$$

where the dependence of ρ on the posterior distribution $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$, and the dependence of the decision $\delta(\mathbf{y})$ on the data are made implicit. In addition, since in this thesis, we will adopt a Bayesian approach to statistical inference, all expectation operator will be defined with respect to the appropriate posterior distribution of the parameter of interest, generally denoted θ , except when otherwise specified.

The defining condition for the Bayes choice to exist is that the Bayes risk is finite. In the preceding discussion, we have assumed that the prior distribution on θ is proper. When specifying improper priors, the Bayes risk will, in general, not be well defined. In some cases, however –when an improper prior yields a proper posterior– the posterior expected loss will be well defined. The decision that minimises ρ in that context is then referred to as the *generalised Bayes* estimator. Several commonly used models in spatial epidemiology make use of improper prior distributions, which nonetheless yield proper posteriors. In such cases, we will be using the generalised Bayes estimator in the place of the Bayes choice.

We thus readily see why decision theory and Bayesian statistics form such a successful combination. The use of a prior distribution in Bayesian models completes the assumptions about the space of the states of the world in decision theory. By contrast, the frequentist perspective runs into difficulties by conditioning on the true parameter θ . As a result, the decisions that minimise R_F are conditional on θ , which is unknown. In a Bayesian setting, by contrast, the expected loss is evaluated conditional on \mathbf{y} , which does not constitute a problem since such observations are known (see also Robert, 2007, for a discussion).

Decision theory puts no constraints on the nature of the loss function that one may utilise. It should be clear from the foregoing discussion that the specification of the loss function will completely determine which decision in \mathcal{D} is considered to be optimal, everything else being equal. In practice, the choice of a particular loss function is dependent on the needs of the decision maker, and which aspects of the decision problem are of interest. However, to facilitate comparisons between different estimation problems, there exists a set of loss functions which are widely accepted and used throughout the statistical sciences. These classical loss functions are described in the following section.

2.1.3 Classical Loss Functions

There exist three classical loss functions, which constitute the building blocks of many other loss functions, and are therefore of key importance to our development. They are the following: (i) the squared error loss, (ii) the absolute value error loss and (iii) the 0/1-loss. We review them in turn, alongside their corresponding minimisers. These three loss functions are especially useful for estimation problems, and will therefore be described with respect to some known sample of

observations, \mathbf{y} .

Squared Error Loss

The quadratic loss or squared error loss (SEL) is the most commonly used loss function in the statistical literature. It is defined as the Euclidean distance between the true state of the world θ and the candidate estimator $\delta(\mathbf{y})$. Thus, we have

$$\text{SEL}(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})) := (\theta - \delta(\mathbf{y}))^2. \quad (2.12)$$

In a Bayesian context, this loss function can be minimised by integrating $\text{SEL}(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y}))$ with respect to the posterior distribution of θ , and minimising the posterior expected loss with respect to $\delta(\mathbf{y})$. Since the SEL is strictly convex, there exists a unique minimiser to SEL, which is the posterior mean: $\mathbb{E}[\theta|\mathbf{y}]$. We will usually denote $\mathbb{E}[\theta|\mathbf{y}]$ by θ^{SEL} , when comparing that particular estimator with other estimators based on different loss functions.

Absolute Value Error Loss

Another classical loss function is the absolute error loss (AVL), which makes use of the modulus to quantify one's losses. It is defined as follows,

$$\text{AVL}(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})) := |\theta - \delta(\mathbf{y})|, \quad (2.13)$$

and its minimiser in the context of Bayesian statistics, is the posterior median, which will be denoted θ^{AVL} . It can be shown that the posterior median is not the unique minimiser of the posterior expected AVL (see Berger, 1980). In addition, since the posterior median will be found to be the optimal Bayes choice under other loss functions, it will be useful to denote this quantity without any reference to a specific loss function. We will therefore use θ^{MED} to denote the posterior median in this context. This quantity will be discussed in greater details in chapter 4, when considering the classification of the elements of a parameter ensemble.

0/1-Loss

For completion, we also introduce the 0/1-loss function. It is defined as follows,

$$L_{0/1}(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{y})) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \delta(\mathbf{y}) = \theta; \\ 1 & \text{if } \delta(\mathbf{y}) \neq \theta. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

The optimal minimiser of the 0/1-loss under the posterior distribution of θ is the posterior mode. In the sequel, we will drop any reference to the data \mathbf{y} , when referring to the estimator $\delta(\mathbf{y})$, and simply use the notation δ . We now turn to a more specific aspect of loss function optimisation, which will be especially relevant to the research questions addressed in this thesis.

2.1.4 Functions of Parameters

It will be of interest to consider the estimation of functions of parameters, say $h(\theta)$, where h is some mapping from Θ to itself, or possibly to a subset of the true states of the world. For convenience, we will assume in this section that θ is univariate, and study the multivariate case in section 2.2.3. In such cases, the Bayesian decision problem can be formulated as follows. Choose the δ^* , which is defined as,

$$\delta^* := \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \rho(h(\theta), \delta), \quad (2.15)$$

where the minimisation is conducted over the decision space, here defined as $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \Theta$. When the loss function of interest is the SEL, we then have the following equality, for any arbitrary function $h(\cdot)$ of the parameter θ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[h(\theta)|\mathbf{y}] = \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E} \left[(h(\theta) - \delta)^2 \middle| \mathbf{y} \right]. \quad (2.16)$$




Figure 2.1. Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) for a general hierarchical model, with $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ denoting n observations and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$ denoting the parameter ensemble of interest. The prior distribution of each θ_i is controlled by a vector of hyperparameter $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, which is given a hyperprior. Following standard convention, arrows here indicate direct dependencies between random variables.

That is, the optimal estimator $\delta^* \in \mathcal{D}$ of $h(\theta)$ is the posterior expectation of $h(\theta)$. Here, the decision problem is fully specified by defining both the parameter space Θ and the decision space \mathcal{D} , as the codomain of $h(\cdot)$.

If, in addition, $h(\cdot)$ is a linear function, it then follows from the linearity of the expectation that

$$\mathbb{E}[h(\theta)|\mathbf{y}] = h(\mathbb{E}[\theta|\mathbf{y}]). \quad (2.17)$$

However, for non-linear $h(\cdot)$, this relationship does not hold. Let ρ denotes an arbitrary Bayesian expected loss for some loss function L , we then have the following non-equality,

$$\delta^* := \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \rho(h(\theta), \delta) \neq h\left(\underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \rho(\theta, \delta)\right) =: h(\theta^*). \quad (2.18)$$

Much of this thesis will be concerned with the differences between δ^* and $h(\theta^*)$, for particular ρ 's. An estimator of $h(\theta)$ based on an estimator of θ will be referred to as a *plug-in estimator*. Thus, in equation (2.18), $h(\theta^*)$ is the plug-in estimator of $h(\theta)$. Our use of the term plug-in, here, should be distinguished from its utilisation in reference to the plug-in principle introduced by Efron and Tibshirani (1993) in the context of the bootstrap. For Efron and Tibshirani (1993), plug-in estimators have desirable asymptotic properties in the sense that such estimators cannot be asymptotically improved upon. In the present thesis, however, estimators such as $h(\theta^*)$ are not deemed to be necessarily optimal, except in the sense that θ^* is the Bayes action for some $\rho(\theta, \delta)$.

Specifically, it will be of interest to evaluate whether commonly encountered optimal Bayes actions, such as the posterior means and medians can be used to construct quasi-optimal plug-in estimators. This problem especially arises when the true parameter of interest is an ensemble of parameters, as described in the next section.

2.2 Parameter Ensembles and Hierarchical Shrinkage

The notion of a parameter ensemble will be the object of most of our discussion in the ensuing two chapters. In this section, we define this concept for general Bayesian models as well as for specific hierarchical models that will be considered throughout the thesis. In addition, we present the Ghosh-Louis theorem, which originally motivated research on the specific inferential problems associated with parameter ensembles.

2.2.1 Bayesian Hierarchical Models

Bayesian hierarchical models (BHM) can be conceived as Bayesian extensions of traditional mixed models, sometimes called multilevel models, where both fixed and random effects are included in a generalized linear model (see Demidenko, 2004). In its most basic formulation, a BHM is composed of the following two layers of random variables,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} p(y_i|\theta_i, \sigma_i), \quad g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sim p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (2.19)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and where $g(\cdot)$ is a transformation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, which may be defined as a link function as commonly used in generalised linear models (see McCullagh and Nelder, 1989). The probability density function at the first level of the BHM, $p(y_i|\theta_i, \sigma_i)$, is the likelihood function. The joint distribution on the $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, here denoted $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\xi})$, is a multivariate prior, which is directly specified as a distribution on the transformed $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Different choices of transformations, $g(\cdot)$, will hence induce different joint prior distributions. The specification of a BHM is complete when one fixes values for the vector of hyperparameters, $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, or specifies a hyperprior distribution for that quantity. When the θ_i 's are independent and identically distributed (iid) given $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, we obtain the hierarchical structure described in figure 2.1 on page 16, which is represented using a directed acyclic graph (DAG). By extension, we will refer to the prior on such θ_i 's as an iid prior.

In the sequel, we will assume that the n vectors of nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$ are known, albeit in practice, this may not be the case. Typically, such $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$'s will include the sampling variance of each y_i . In its simplest form, the model in equation (2.19) will be assumed to be composed of conjugate and proper probability density functions and each θ_i will be an iid draw from a hierarchical prior. These modelling assumptions, however, will be sometimes relaxed in the present thesis. In particular, we will be interested in the following three variants.

- i. *Conjugate proper iid* priors on the θ_i 's, where the link function $g(\cdot)$ is the identity function. This simple case will encompass both the Normal-Normal model –sometimes referred to as compound Gaussian model– and the compound Gamma or Gamma-Inverse Gamma model. For the former, we have the following hierarchical structure,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} N(\theta_i, \sigma_i^2), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\mu, \tau^2), \quad (2.20)$$

with $i = 1, \dots, n$, and where the σ_i^2 's are known variance components. Secondly, for the Gamma-Inverse Gamma model, we specify the following likelihood and prior,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Gam}(a_i, \theta_i), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Inv-Gam}(\alpha, \beta), \quad (2.21)$$

where the Gamma and Inverse-Gamma distributions will be specifically described in section 3.3.2.

- ii. *Non-conjugate proper iid* priors on the θ_i 's. In standard epidemiological settings, the specification of a Poisson likelihood for the observations naturally leads to the modelling of the logarithm of the relative risks at the second level of the hierarchy. Such a model is sometimes referred to as a log-linear model. In such cases, however, the conjugacy of the likelihood with the prior on the θ_i 's does not hold anymore. As an example of such non-conjugacy, we will study the following model,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Pois}(\theta_i E_i), \quad \log \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\alpha, \tau^2), \quad (2.22)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where the link function $g(\cdot) := \log(\cdot)$. Here, the conjugacy of the prior with the Poisson likelihood does not hold, and specific sampling schemes need to be adopted in order to evaluate the posterior distributions of the θ_i 's (see Robert and Casella, 2004).

- iii. *Non-conjugate improper non-iid* priors on the θ_i 's. In this final situation, all assumptions on the prior distributions of the θ_i 's will be relaxed. This type of model will be illustrated

in the context of spatial epidemiology, where Poisson-based generalized linear models are commonly used to model counts of disease cases in each of a set of geographical areas, and the joint prior distribution on the θ_i 's models the spatial dependence between the regions of interest. A popular choice of prior distribution reflecting inter-regional spatial dependence is the intrinsic Gaussian conditional autoregressive (CAR) prior—an instance of a Markov random field. The intrinsic CAR does not constitute a proper distribution (Besag, 1974). However, Besag et al. (1991) have shown that the resulting marginal posterior distributions of the θ_i 's are proper (see also Besag and Kooperberg, 1995). It then follows that the posterior expected loss for the parameter ensemble is finite, and that we can therefore derive the generalised Bayes decision, which will be optimal for that decision problem. We describe this particular family of spatial models in more detail in the following section.

In this thesis, when studying the properties of such epidemiological models, we will employ the term *prevalence* to refer to the rate of a particular condition in the population at risk. That is, the term prevalence here refers to the number of affected cases divided by the total number of individuals at risk for that condition.

2.2.2 Spatial Models

Here, we briefly present some conventional modelling assumptions made in spatial epidemiology, which will be used throughout the thesis (Wakefield et al., 2000). The starting point for modelling a non-infectious disease with known at-risk populations is the Binomial model,

$$y_{ij}|p_{ij} \sim \text{Bin}(N_{ij}, p_{ij}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \quad j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (2.23)$$

where p_{ij} and N_{ij} represent, respectively, the risk of disease and the population size in the i^{th} area for the j^{th} age strata. In this thesis, we are especially interested in modelling the prevalence of rare non-infectious diseases, such as specific types of cancers. For rare conditions, we approximate this model with a Poisson model

$$y_{ij}|p_{ij} \sim \text{Pois}(N_{ij}p_{ij}). \quad (2.24)$$

Furthermore, we generally make a proportionality assumption, which states that $p_{ij} = \theta_i \times p_j$, where θ_i is the relative risk (RR) for the i^{th} area, and p_j is the reference rate for age strata j , which is assumed to be known. Each θ_i is here the ratio of the age-standardised rate of the disease in area i compared to the age-standardised reference rate. Using the proportionality assumption, we may then sum over the risk in each strata in order to obtain

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Pois}(\theta_i E_i), \quad (2.25)$$

where $y_i = \sum_{j=1}^J y_{ij}$ and $E_i = \sum_{j=1}^J N_{ij}p_j$ are the observed and expected counts, respectively. Equation (2.25) is the likelihood of the model. Maximum likelihood, in this context, produces the following point estimate ensemble,

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{MLE}} := \frac{y_i}{E_i}, \quad (2.26)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, which are generally referred to as the standardised mortality or morbidity ratios (SMRs). The $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{MLE}}$'s, however, tend to be over-dispersed in comparison to the true RRs.

In order to provide such a model with more flexibility, different types of hierarchical priors are commonly specified on the θ_i 's (see Wakefield et al., 2000, for a review). Two spatial BHMs will be implemented in this thesis. A popular hierarchical prior in spatial epidemiology is the convolution prior (Besag et al., 1991), which is formulated as follows,

$$\log \theta_i = v_i + u_i, \quad (2.27)$$

for every region $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note, however, that this model will be implemented within the WinBUGS software, which uses a different representation of the spatial random effects, based on

the joint specification of an intercept with an improper flat prior and a sum-to-zero constraint on the u_i (see Appendix C, and section 3.4.3).

Here, \mathbf{v} is a vector of unstructured random effects with the following specification,

$$v_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \tau_v^2), \quad (2.28)$$

and the vector \mathbf{u} captures the spatial auto-correlation between neighbouring areas. Priors on each element of \mathbf{u} are specified conditionally, such that

$$u_i | u_j, \forall j \neq i \sim N\left(\frac{\sum_{j \in \partial_i} u_j}{m_i}, \frac{\tau_u^2}{m_i}\right), \quad (2.29)$$

with ∂_i is defined as the set of indices of the neighbours of the i^{th} area. Formally, $\partial_i := \{j \sim i : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $i \sim j$ implies that regions i and j are neighbours, and by convention, $i \notin \partial_i$. Moreover, in equation (2.29), we have also used $m_i := |\partial_i|$ –that is, m_i is the total number of neighbours of the i^{th} area. Therefore, each of the u_i 's is normally distributed around the mean level of risk of the neighbouring areas, and its variability is inversely proportional to its number of neighbours.

A different version of this model can be formulated using the Laplace distribution (Besag et al., 1991). As this density function has heavier tails, this specification is expected to produce less smoothing of abrupt changes in risk between adjacent areas. For the CAR Laplace prior, we therefore have $u_i | u_j, \forall j \neq i \sim L(u_i | \sum_{j \in \partial_i} u_j / m_i, \tau_u^2 / m_i)$, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, using the following definition of the Laplace distribution,

$$L(x | m_0, s_0) := \frac{1}{2s_0} \exp\left\{-\frac{|x - m_0|}{s_0}\right\}. \quad (2.30)$$

We will refer to this model as the CAR Laplace or L1 model. The rest of the specification of this BHM is identical to the one chosen for the CAR Normal. In these two models, following common practice in spatial epidemiology, two regions are considered to be neighbours if they share a common boundary (Clayton and Kaldor, 1987, Besag et al., 1991, Waller et al., 1997).

2.2.3 Estimation of Parameter Ensembles

The set of parameters, θ_i 's, in the hierarchical model described in equation (2.19) is generally referred to as a vector of random effects (Demidenko, 2004). In this thesis, we will refer to such a vector as an ensemble of parameters. That is, in a BHM following the general structure presented in equation (2.19), the vector of parameters,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}, \quad (2.31)$$

will be referred to as a *parameter ensemble*. Several properties of a parameter ensemble may be of interest. One may, for instance, wish to optimise the estimation of each of the individual elements in the ensemble. A natural choice in this context is the sum of quadratic losses for each parameter. This particular loss function is the summed squared error loss (SSEL) function that takes the following form,

$$\text{SSEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \theta_i^{\text{est}})^2, \quad (2.32)$$

In this context, using the notation that we have adopted in section 2.1.1, the decision problem for the estimation of a parameter ensemble using the SSEL function results in a parameter space Θ and a decision space \mathcal{D} which are both assumed to be subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . The posterior expected loss associated with the loss function in equation 2.32 can be minimised in a straightforward manner. Its optimum is attained when selecting the vector of posterior means as Bayes choice, which will

be denoted by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{SSEL}} := \{\hat{\theta}_1^{\text{SSEL}}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n^{\text{SSEL}}\} = \{\mathbb{E}[\theta_1|\mathbf{y}], \dots, \mathbb{E}[\theta_n|\mathbf{y}]\}. \quad (2.33)$$

This type of decision problems, characterised by the estimation of a set of parameters are sometimes referred to as compound estimation problems or *compound loss functions* (Ghosh, 1992). We will use of the term *estimator* to refer to an entire set of point estimates, such as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{SSEL}}$ with respect to a particular loss function, here SSEL. This indeed follows from the fact that such a multivariate estimator is optimal under that posterior loss. Such an estimator, however, also constitutes an ensemble of single *point estimates*.

Another property of a parameter ensemble, which may be of interest is the empirical distribution function (EDF) of that ensemble, which will generally be referred to as the ensemble distribution. The EDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is defined as follows,

$$F_n(t) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}\{\theta_i \leq t\}, \quad (2.34)$$

for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and where \mathcal{I} is the usual indicator function. The term EDF is used here in analogy with its usual application in the context of iid observations. Note, however, that neither the elements of a true parameter ensemble nor the realisations of random effects can (in general) be assumed to be realisations of iid variables. A range of different loss functions may be considered in order to optimise the estimation of the EDF in equation (2.34). Previous authors have formalised this decision problem by using the integrated squared error loss function (ISEL), which takes the following form (see Shen and Louis, 1998),

$$\text{ISEL}(F_n, F_n^{\text{est}}) := \int (F_n(t) - F_n^{\text{est}}(t))^2 dt. \quad (2.35)$$

The posterior expectation of the ISEL can be easily minimised using Fubini's theorem to invert the ordering of the two integrals (i.e. the one with respect to t , and the one with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, see Shen and Louis (1998), for a formal proof). It then follows that the optimal estimator of $\mathbb{E}[\text{ISEL}(F_n, F_n^{\text{est}})|\mathbf{y}]$ is the posterior EDF,

$$\hat{F}_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[F_n(t)|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq t|\mathbf{y}]. \quad (2.36)$$

When there may be ambiguity as to which parameter ensemble the posterior EDF is based on, we will emphasise the dependence on the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, by using $\hat{F}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)$.

Finally, as discussed in section 2.1.4, one is sometimes interested in specific functions of a parameter. For the case of parameter ensembles, summary functions are often used to quantify particular properties of the ensemble distribution, such as the variance of the ensemble, for instance. These functions are generally real-valued, and the decision problem, in this context, can therefore be formalised as the standard quadruple: $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}, [0, +\infty), L)$, for some loss function L . When using the quadratic loss, we may have

$$\text{SEL}(h(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta) = (h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \delta)^2, \quad (2.37)$$

for a function of interest, $h : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mapsto \Theta$, with $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. One may, for instance, wish to estimate the empirical variance of the parameter ensemble. This gives the following $h(\cdot)$,

$$h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})^2, \quad (2.38)$$

where $\bar{\theta} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i$. Naturally, in this particular case, the optimal Bayes estimator would be $\mathbb{E}[h(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\mathbf{y}]$. However, as argued in section 2.1.4, since $h(\cdot)$ is a non-linear function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the posterior empirical variance is different from the empirical variance of the posterior means. It

turns out that this particular observation has led to a key result in the study of BHMs, as we describe in the next section.

2.2.4 Hierarchical Shrinkage

Although the vector of posterior means is optimal under SSEL, their empirical variance is biased in comparison to the empirical variance of the true parameters of interest. The theorem that shows this systematic bias was first proved by Louis (1984) for the Gaussian compound case and further generalised by Ghosh (1992), who relaxed the distributional assumptions, but retained the modelling assumptions. In particular, whereas Louis (1984) proved this result for the case of conjugate models composed of Normal distributions, Ghosh (1992) showed that this relationship also holds for non-conjugate models based on arbitrary probability densities.

Theorem 1 (Ghosh-Louis Theorem). *Let a parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ controlling the distribution of a vector of observations \mathbf{y} , in a general two-stage hierarchical model as described in equation (2.19). If $n \geq 2$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})^2 \middle| \mathbf{y} \right] \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{E}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}] \right]^2, \quad (2.39)$$

where $\bar{\theta} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i$; with equality holding if and only if all $\{(\theta_1 - \bar{\theta}), \dots, (\theta_n - \bar{\theta})\}$ have degenerate posteriors.

A proof of this result is provided in Ghosh (1992), and a weighted version is presented in Frey and Cressie (2003). The Ghosh-Louis theorem bears a lot of similarity with the *law of total variance*, which posits that $\text{Var}(X) = \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(X|Y)] + \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[X|Y])$. One may, however, note that there exists one substantial difference between this standard law of probability and the result at hand. The Ghosh-Louis theorem differs from the law of total probability in the sense that the former is conditioning on the data on both sides of the equation.

The Ghosh-Louis theorem states a general property of BHMs. Hierarchical shrinkage is the under-dispersion of the empirical distribution of the posterior means in comparison to the posterior mean of the empirical variance of the true parameter ensemble. This should be contrasted to the commonly encountered issue of shrinkage in Bayesian model, where a single posterior mean is shrank towards its prior mean. Although hierarchical shrinkage is here presented as a problem, it is often seen as a desirable property of BHMs; most especially when little information is available for each data point. This theorem has been used both to justify such a modelling decision and to highlight the limitations of this choice. In spatial epidemiological settings, Gelman and Price (1999) have shown that such shrinkage especially affects areas with low expected counts. Before reviewing the different decision-theoretic solutions that have been proposed to produce better estimates of the empirical properties of parameter ensembles, we briefly introduce several statistical concepts, which will be useful in the sequel.

2.3 Ranks, Quantile Functions and Order Statistics

2.3.1 Ranks and Percentile Ranks

We here adopt the nomenclature introduced by Laird and Louis (1989) on order statistics and rank percentiles as a guidance for our choice of notation. Of particular importance to our development is the definition of a rank. The rank of an element in a parameter ensemble is defined as follows,

$$R_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \text{rank}(\theta_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{I}\{\theta_i \geq \theta_j\}, \quad (2.40)$$

where the smallest θ_i in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is given rank 1 and the largest θ_i is given rank n . In equation (2.40), we have made explicit the fact that the rank of each θ_i depends on the entire parameter ensemble, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In particular, this notation emphasises the fact that the function $R_i(\cdot)$ is non-linear in its argument.

In the sequel, we will also make extensive use of percentile ranks (PRs). These are formally defined as follows,

$$P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{R_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{n+1}, \quad (2.41)$$

Quite confusingly, percentile ranks are sometimes referred to as “percentiles”, which should not be confused with the notion of percentiles discussed in section 2.3.2 in reference to quantiles. In general terms, the percentile rank of an element in a parameter ensemble is the percentage of elements in the corresponding EDF, which are lower or equal to the value of that rank. Rank percentiles are especially useful in statistics when communicating ranking statistics to practitioners. Percentile ranks are empirical quantities, in the sense that they depend on the size of the parameter ensemble, n . However, it can be shown that percentile ranks rapidly converge to asymptotic quantities, which are independent of n (Lockwood et al., 2004).

2.3.2 Quantile Function

The quantile function, denoted $Q(p)$, of a continuous random variable X is formally defined as the inverse of the cumulative distribution function (CDF), $F(x)$. Formally, since the function $F : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ is continuous and strictly monotonic, we can define

$$Q(p) := F^{-1}(p), \quad (2.42)$$

for some real number $p \in [0, 1]$. In general, the inverse function of the CDF of most random variables does not exist in closed-form. Among the rare exceptions are the uniform distribution, $\text{unif}(x|a, b)$, and the exponential distribution, $\text{exp}(x|\lambda)$, for which the quantile functions are $Q(p|a, b) = (1-p)a + pb$ and $Q(p|\lambda) = -\log(1-p)/\lambda$, respectively (see Gilchrist, 2000). For discrete random variables, whose CDF may only be weakly monotonic, the quantile distribution function (QDF) is defined as

$$Q(p) := \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq p\}, \quad (2.43)$$

for every $p \in [0, 1]$. Note that the latter definition holds for any arbitrary CDF, whether continuous or discrete. Like the CDF, the QDF is monotone non-decreasing in its argument. It is continuous for continuous random variables, and discrete for discrete random variables. However, whereas the $F(x)$ is right-continuous, its inverse is, by convention, continuous from the left. This last property is a consequence of the use of the infimum in equation 2.43. When it is deemed necessary for clarity, we will specify the random variable for which a quantile is computed by a subscript, such as in $Q_X(p)$, for the random variable X . More generally, we will distinguish between the *theoretical* QDF and the *empirical* QDF, by denoting the former by $Q(p)$ and the latter by $Q_n(p)$. For some parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of size n , we define the empirical QDF as follows,

$$Q_n(p) := \min \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n : F_n(\theta_i) \geq p\}, \quad (2.44)$$

where F_n is the EDF of the parameter ensemble as defined in equation (2.34). Note that our utilisation of the EDF, in this context, corresponds to a slight abuse of the concept. As aforementioned, the EDF of a particular random variable, assumes that several iid realisations of that random variable are available. In our case, given the hierarchical nature of the models under scrutiny, and the possible spatial structure linking the different geographical units of interest, such an iid assumption is not satisfied. Our use of the term empirical distribution should therefore be understood solely in reference to our chosen mode of construction for the discrete distribution of an ensemble of realisations.

When we wish to emphasise the vector of parameters with respect to which the QDF and EDF are defined, we will use the notation, $Q_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $F_{\mathbf{X}}$, respectively. Sometimes, it will be useful to allow the function $Q(\cdot)$ to accept multivariate arguments, such as $\mathbf{p} := \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$. In such cases, the QDF will be vector-valued, such that

$$Q(\mathbf{p}) = Q(\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}) = \{Q(p_1), \dots, Q(p_k)\}. \quad (2.45)$$

In contrast to the sample mean, for which the relationship $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] = g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ only holds for linear function $g(\cdot)$, the quantile function satisfies

$$Q_{h(X)}(p) = h[Q(p)], \quad (2.46)$$

for every monotonic non-decreasing function $h(\cdot)$. In particular, we have the following useful transformation

$$Q_{\log(X)}(p) = \log [Q_X(p)], \quad (2.47)$$

which follows from the monotonicity of the logarithm. Moreover, we can recover the mean of X from its quantile function, by integrating the quantile function over its domain. That is,

$$\int_{[0,1]} Q_X(p) dp = \mathbb{E}[X], \quad (2.48)$$

which is a standard property of the quantile function (see Gilchrist, 2000). When considering the quantile function of the standard cumulative normal distribution, denoted $\Phi(x)$, the quantile function specialises to the *probit*, defined as $\text{probit}(p) := \Phi^{-1}(p)$. The probit is widely used in econometrics as a link function for the generalised linear model when modelling binary response variables.

2.3.3 Quantiles, Quartiles and Percentiles

In this thesis, we will be mainly concerned with the quantiles of parameter ensembles, these quantities will therefore be defined with respect to the EDF of a vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In such cases, the p^{th} empirical *quantile* of the ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is formally defined as

$$\theta_{(p)} := Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p), \quad (2.49)$$

where the $.50^{\text{th}}$ quantile is the empirical median. In the sequel, we will also make use of the $.25^{\text{th}}$, $.50^{\text{th}}$ and $.75^{\text{th}}$ quantiles, which are referred to as the first, second and third empirical *quartiles*, respectively. Of particular interest is the difference between the third and first quartiles, which produces the empirical interquartile range (IQR). For some parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we have

$$\text{IQR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \theta_{(.75)} - \theta_{(.25)}. \quad (2.50)$$

In some texts, the term quantile is used to classify different types of divisions of the domain of a probability distribution. More precisely, the k^{th} q -quantile is defined as $Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k/q)$. In that nomenclature, the *percentiles* therefore correspond to the 100-quantiles, which would imply that the values taken by the quantile function are, in fact, percentiles. Other authors, however, have used the term quantile in a more straightforward manner, where the p^{th} quantile is simply defined as $Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p)$, as in equation (2.49) (see, for instance, Koenker and Bassett, 1978). In the sequel, we adopt this particular definition of quantiles and only use the term percentiles to refer to percentile ranks, as introduced in section 2.3.1.

There exist different techniques to derive the quantile function and quantiles of a particular CDF (see Steinbrecher and Shaw, 2008, for recent advances). One of the most popular methods has been the algorithm AS 241 (Wichura, 1988), which permits to compute the empirical p^{th} quantile of any finite parameter ensemble very efficiently. We will make use of this standard computational technique in chapter 3.

2.4 Loss Functions for Parameter Ensembles

In this section, we review three important approaches, which have been proposed to address the issue of hierarchical shrinkage that we have highlighted in the previous section. These three decision-theoretic perspectives will be specifically considered in chapters 3 and 4, and compared with other methods through the construction of plug-in estimators. Here, the parameter space satisfies $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathcal{D} = \Theta$, as before.

2.4.1 Constrained Bayes

In order to address the problem associated with hierarchical shrinkage, described in section 2.2, Louis (1984) developed a particular set of point estimates that automatically correct for hierarchical shrinkage. This approach is a constrained minimisation problem, where $\text{SSEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \theta_i^{\text{est}})^2$ is minimised subject to the following two constraints: (i) the mean of the ensemble of point estimates is equal to the mean of the true ensemble,

$$\bar{\theta}^{\text{est}} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^{\text{est}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i =: \bar{\theta}, \quad (2.51)$$

and (ii) the variance of the ensemble of point estimates is equal to the variance of the true ensemble,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i^{\text{est}} - \bar{\theta}^{\text{est}})^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})^2. \quad (2.52)$$

Based on these constraints, Louis (1984) derived the optimal Bayes estimator minimising the corresponding constrained SSEL function. Since this method is developed within a Bayesian framework, it is generally referred to as the constrained Bayes (CB) or constrained empirical Bayes (EB) estimator, albeit its use is not restricted to models estimated using EB techniques (see Rao, 2003). This result was further generalised by Ghosh (1992) for any distribution belonging to the exponential family.

Theorem 2 (Ghosh-Louis Estimator). *The minimiser of the SSEL under the constraints in equation (2.51) and (2.52) is*

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{CB}} := \omega \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} + (1 - \omega) \hat{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}}, \quad (2.53)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} := \mathbb{E}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}]$, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\hat{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}} := 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}}$ is the mean of the empirical distribution of posterior means. The weight ω is defined as

$$\omega = \left[1 + \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}]}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} - \hat{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}})^2} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (2.54)$$

where $\text{Var}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}]$ is the posterior variance of the i^{th} parameter in the ensemble.

Proof. The minimisation of the posterior expected loss is a constrained minimisation problem, which can be solved using Lagrange multipliers (see Rao, 2003, page 221). \square

The role played by the weight ω is more explicitly demonstrated by transforming equation (2.53), in order to obtain the following

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{CB}} = \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} + \omega \left(\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} - \hat{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}} \right). \quad (2.55)$$

In addition, note that the expression in equation (2.53) resembles a convex combination of the corresponding SSEL estimator of the i^{th} element with respect to the mean of the ensemble. This

is not the case, however, since the weight ω may take values greater than unity. Note also that the weights do not depend on the index i . This is a constant quantity, which is identical for all elements in the parameter ensemble. In particular, for the Gaussian compound case, described in equation (3.19), the CB estimates have a direct interpretation in terms of hierarchical shrinkage. Let

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta_i, \sigma^2), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\mu, \tau^2), \quad (2.56)$$

where we assume that σ^2 , τ^2 and μ are known. Note that here, for convenience, we have assumed σ^2 to be constant over all elements in the parameter ensemble, which differs from the model specification described in equation (3.19). The use of the Bayes' rule under quadratic loss yields the conventional posterior mean, $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} = \gamma y_i + (1-\gamma)\mu$, where γ is the countershrinkage parameter, defined as

$$\gamma := \frac{\tau^2}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2}. \quad (2.57)$$

In this context, it can be shown that the Ghosh-Louis constrained point estimates bears some important structural similarities with the formulae of the posterior means for this model. We have

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{CB}} \doteq \gamma^{1/2} y_i + (1 - \gamma^{1/2})\mu, \quad (2.58)$$

where $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ (see Rao, 2003, p.212), for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and where \doteq means that the equality is an approximation. This is a particularly illuminating result, which intuitively illustrates how this estimator controls for the under-dispersion of the posterior means. The countershrinkage parameter γ is here given more weight by taking its square root, as opposed to the use of γ in computing the $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}}$'s. This produces a set of point estimates which are therefore more dispersed than the posterior means.

This set of point estimates has very desirable asymptotic properties. As an ensemble, the mean and the variance of the CB point estimates converge almost surely to the mean and variance, respectively, of the true ensemble distribution (Ghosh and Rao, 1994). Furthermore, the CB estimator has a readily interpretable formulation as a shrinkage estimator, as we have seen for the compound Gaussian case. However, the CB approach also suffers from an important limitation: Its performance will be greatly influenced by the functional form of the true ensemble distribution. In particular, since the CB estimator only match the first two moments of the true ensemble, the empirical distribution of the CB point estimates may provide a poor approximation of the ensemble distribution, when the distribution of interest is substantially skewed. The next approach attempts to address this limitation by directly optimising the estimation of the EDF of the parameter ensemble.

2.4.2 Triple-Goal

The triple-goal estimator of a parameter ensemble was introduced by Shen and Louis (1998). It constitutes a natural extension of the CB approach. Here, however, instead of solely constraining the minimisation exercise with respect to the first two moments of the ensemble distribution, we consider three successive goals, which are optimised in turn (see also Shen and Louis, 2000). The set of point estimates resulting from these successive minimisations are generally referred to as the GR point estimates, where G denotes the EDF and R refers to the ranks. For consistency, we will therefore adhere to this acronym in the sequel (Shen and Louis, 1998). Note, however, that the GR point estimates are not optimal for these three goals, but will produce very good performance under each of these distinct objectives. These three consecutive steps can be described as follows.

- i. Firstly, minimise the ISEL function, as introduced in equation (2.35), in order to obtain an estimate $\hat{F}_n(t)$ of the ensemble EDF, $F_n(t)$, for some ensemble of interest, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$. As we have seen in equation (2.36), the optimal estimate is the posterior EDF defined as follows,

$$\hat{F}_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[F_n(t)|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq t|\mathbf{y}]. \quad (2.59)$$

- ii. Secondly, minimise the ranks squared error loss (RSEL) in order to optimise the estimation of the ranks of the parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Let $\mathbf{R}^{\text{est}} := \mathbf{R}^{\text{est}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{R} := \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ denote the vector of candidate ranks and the vector of true ranks, respectively. We wish to minimise the following loss function,

$$\text{RSEL}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}^{\text{est}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i - R_i^{\text{est}})^2. \quad (2.60)$$

The vector of optimisers $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$ of the posterior expected RSEL is composed of the following elements,

$$\bar{R}_i := \mathbb{E}[R_i | \mathbf{y}] = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\theta_i \geq \theta_j | \mathbf{y}). \quad (2.61)$$

The \bar{R}_i 's are not generally integers. However, one can easily transform the \bar{R}_i 's into integers by ranking them such that

$$\hat{R}_i := \text{rank}(\bar{R}_i | \bar{\mathbf{R}}), \quad (2.62)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. The \hat{R}_i 's are then used as optimal estimates of the true ranks, under RSEL.

- iii. Finally, we generate an ensemble of points estimates, conditional on the optimal estimate of the ensemble EDF, \hat{F}_n , and the optimal estimates of the true ranks, \hat{R}_i 's. This is done by setting

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{GR}} := \hat{F}_n^{-1} \left(\frac{2\hat{R}_i - 1}{2n} \right), \quad (2.63)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. The -1 in the numerator of equation (2.63) arises from the minimisation of the posterior expected ISEL (see Shen and Louis, 1998, for this derivation).

Despite the seeming complexity of the successive minimisations involved in producing the triple-goal estimators, the computation is relatively straightforward (more details can be found in Shen and Louis, 1998). We note, however, that one of the limitations of the triple-goal technique is that it heavily relies on the quality of the prior distribution –that is, the joint prior distribution for the θ_i 's, which we denoted by $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\xi})$ in equation (2.19). Specific non-parametric methods have been proposed to obtain an EB estimate of the prior distribution, which permits to attenuate these limitations. The smoothing by roughening (SBR) algorithm introduced by Shen and Louis (1999) is an example of such a technique. In such cases, the joint prior distribution, $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{\xi})$, is estimated using the SBR algorithm. Estimation of the parameter ensemble is then conducted using standard Bayesian inference based on this SBR prior. Shen and Louis (1999) demonstrated good performance of this method using simulated data and rapid convergence of the SBR algorithm.

2.4.3 Weighted and Weighted Ranks Loss Functions

The standard SSEL framework can also be extended by the inclusion of a vector of weights within the quadratic loss. These weights, denoted $\phi(\theta_i)$, may be specified as a function of the unknown parameters of interest, with $\phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. The weights may therefore be made to vary with each of the elements in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In addition, since loss functions are assumed to be strictly positive, all weights are also constrained to be positive: they satisfy $\phi_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n$. The resulting weighted squared error loss (WSEL) is then

$$\text{WSEL}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta_i) (\theta_i - \theta_i^{\text{est}})^2, \quad (2.64)$$

with $\phi(\theta_i) \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. The set of optimal point estimates, denoted θ_i^{WSEL} 's, that minimise the posterior expected WSEL take the following form

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{WSEL}} := \mathbb{E}[\phi(\theta_i)\theta_i|\mathbf{y}]/\mathbb{E}[\phi(\theta_i)|\mathbf{y}], \quad (2.65)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Naturally, if the weights do not depend on the parameters of interest, then the optimal estimators reduce to the posterior means. That is, when the weights are independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, they can be extracted from the expectations and cancel out. In the ensuing discussion, we will therefore implicitly assume that the weights are functions of the $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and they will be simply denoted by ϕ_i 's.

The weighted ranks squared error loss (WRSEL) is a component-wise loss function that spans the entire set of order statistics of a given function (Wright et al., 2003). The vector of weights $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is here dependent on the ranks of each of the θ_i 's. Taking $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{WRSEL}}$ to be the Bayes decision under WRSEL, we therefore have a compound loss function of the form,

$$\text{WRSEL}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \phi_j \mathcal{I}\{R_j = i\} (\theta_i - \theta_i^{\text{est}})^2, \quad (2.66)$$

where as before $R_i := R_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the rank of the i^{th} element in the parameter ensemble. For notational convenience, we write

$$\text{WRSEL}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{R_i} (\theta_i - \theta_i^{\text{est}})^2, \quad (2.67)$$

where $\phi_{R_i} := \sum_{j=1}^n \phi_j \mathcal{I}\{R_j = i\}$ identifies the weight that is assigned to the i^{th} rank. The Bayes action minimising the posterior expected WRSEL is an ensemble of point estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{WRSEL}}$, whose elements are defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{WRSEL}} := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \phi_j \mathbb{E}[\theta_i | R_j = i, \mathbf{y}] \mathbb{P}(R_j = i | \mathbf{y})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \phi_j \mathbb{P}(R_j = i | \mathbf{y})}, \quad (2.68)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(R_j = i | \mathbf{y})$ is the posterior probability that the i^{th} element has rank j . Each estimator $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{WRSEL}}$ can therefore be seen as a weighted average of conditional posterior means of θ_i , given that that element has rank j . Note that we can further simplify the formulae provided by Wright et al. (2003) by using the law of total expectation, $\int \mathbb{E}(x|y)p(y)dy = \mathbb{E}(x)$, such that

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{WRSEL}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\theta_i \phi_{R_i} | \mathbf{y}]}{\mathbb{E}[\phi_{R_i} | \mathbf{y}]}, \quad (2.69)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, which is equivalent to the minimiser of the standard WSEL function presented in equation (2.64).

In addition, Wright et al. (2003) noted that the WRSEL and the SSEL are equivalent up to a multiplicative constant, which is the vector of weights $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. That is,

$$\text{WRSEL} = \boldsymbol{\phi} \text{SSEL}. \quad (2.70)$$

Moreover, the WRSEL trivially reduces to the SSEL when $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \mathbf{1}_n$. It therefore follows that the WRSEL is a generalization of the SSEL. This family of loss functions allows the targeting of a range of different inferential goals by adjusting the shape of the vector of weights, $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Wright et al. (2003) and Craigmile et al. (2006) proposed a vector of weights consisting of a bowl-shaped function of the rank of each of the θ_i 's, which emphasises estimation of the extreme quantiles of the ensemble distribution. Wright et al. (2003) makes use of the following specification for the

ϕ_i 's,

$$\phi_i := \exp \left\{ a_1 \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right\} + \exp \left\{ -a_2 \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right\}, \quad (2.71)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, where both a_1 and a_2 are real numbers greater than 0. Different choices of a_1 and a_2 permit to adjust the amount of emphasis put on the extremes of the EDF. In the sequel, when considering spatial models, these two parameters will be fixed to $a_1 = a_2 = 0.5$, which is a symmetric version of the specification used by Wright et al. (2003). When considering non-spatial models, however, we will see that the shape of the ensemble of WRSEL point estimates is highly sensitive to the choice of a_1 and a_2 , as will be described in section 3.3.5. For such non-spatial models, we will choose the following ‘softer’ specification: $a_1 = a_2 = 0.05$. Such symmetric specifications of the ϕ_i 's emphasises the estimation of the extrema over the estimation of other elements occupying the middle ranks of the parameter ensemble. Therefore, the ensemble distribution of WRSEL point estimators resulting from such a specification of the ϕ_i 's will be expected to be more dispersed than the empirical of the posterior means.

2.5 Research Questions

The main focus of this thesis is the estimation of *functions* of parameter ensembles. Given a particular BHM, we wish to estimate a function $h(\cdot)$ of the parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. As we have seen in section 2.1.4, the optimal estimator of $h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for some loss function L is the following,

$$\delta^* := \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E}[L(h(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta) | \mathbf{y}]. \quad (2.72)$$

Depending on the nature of the function $h(\cdot)$, the computation of the optimiser δ^* could be relatively expensive. By contrast, computation of the ensemble of optimal point estimates, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$, for a variety of commonly used loss functions L' , is generally straightforward. Moreover, in the interest of consistency, one generally wishes to report a single set of point estimates that may simultaneously satisfy several inferential desiderata. Thus, we are interested in evaluating the performance of $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})$ as an alternative to the optimal estimator, δ^* . For instance, one may evaluate the performance of a plug-in estimator based on the ensemble of posterior means, when this particular estimator –i.e. $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{SSEL}})$ – is used in the place of δ^* .

A natural way of comparing the performance of different sets of estimators, is to utilise the posterior regret (Shen and Louis, 1998). The posterior regret expresses the penalty paid for using a sub-optimal estimator. That is, it is defined as the difference between the posterior loss associated with using the Bayes choice and the posterior loss incurred for using another estimator. Formally, the posterior regret for using δ' under L is

$$\operatorname{regret}(L, \delta') := \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta') | \mathbf{y}] - \min_{\delta} \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta) | \mathbf{y}]. \quad (2.73)$$

As for loss functions, $\operatorname{regret}(L, \delta') \geq 0$, with equality holding if and only if $\delta' = \operatorname{argmin} \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta) | \mathbf{y}]$. One of the first utilisations of this concept was Savage (1954), although not expressed in terms of posterior expectations. Shen and Louis (1998) specifically used the posterior regret when comparing ensembles of point estimators. This concept has also been used in more applied settings such as in computing credibility premiums in mathematical finance (Gomez-Deniz et al., 2006).

For our purpose, we can specialise the definition in equation (2.73) to the estimation of functions of parameter ensembles in BHMs. We will be interested in considering the posterior regret associated with using a plug-in estimator, $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})$, for some loss functions L' . We will therefore compute the following posterior regret,

$$\operatorname{regret}(L, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) = \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) | \mathbf{y}] - \min_{\delta} \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta) | \mathbf{y}], \quad (2.74)$$

where the optimal estimator δ^* under L may be vector-valued. In general, we will refer to the

quantity in equation (2.74) as the posterior regret based on $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))$. When comparing different plug-in estimators, the classical loss function, denoted L' in equation (2.74), will be taken to be one of the loss functions reviewed in section 2.4. In particular, following the research conducted in estimating parameter ensembles in BHM, the L' function of interest will be taken to be the SSEL, WRSEL, constrained Bayes or triple-goal loss. Moreover, we will also evaluate the posterior regret for the ensemble of MLEs, as these estimators represent a useful benchmark with respect to which the performance of other plug-in estimators can be compared. For clarity, since optimal estimators under L' are vectors of point estimates, we will denote them as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$. In order to facilitate comparison between experimental conditions where the overall posterior expected loss may vary, it will be useful to express the posterior regret in equation (2.74) as a percentage of the minimal loss that can be achieved using the optimal minimiser. That is, we will generally also report the following quantity,

$$\text{PercRegret}(L, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) := \frac{100 \times \text{regret}(L, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))}{\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}]}, \quad (2.75)$$

which we term the *percentage regret*. Both the posterior and percentage regrets will be used extensively in the ensuing chapters. In order to emphasise the distinction between these two quantities, the posterior regret in equation (2.74) will sometimes be referred to as the absolute posterior regret.

Specifically, in chapters 3 and 4, we will study two aspects of parameter ensembles in BHM. Firstly, motivated by current practice in both epidemiology and spatial epidemiology, we will consider the optimal determination of the heterogeneity or dispersion of a parameter ensemble. In this case, the function $h(\cdot)$ will either be the quantile function, as described in section 2.3.3 or a ratio of quartiles. Secondly, following an increased demand for the classification of epidemiological units in low-risk and high-risk groups –for surveillance purposes, for instance– we will concentrate our attention on optimising such classification. Here, the function $h(\cdot)$ will be defined as an indicator function with respect to some cut-off point of interest, denoted by C . Specifically, we will use two variants of the posterior regret introduced in equation (2.74) for the following choices of L and $h(\cdot)$:

- i. In chapter 3, we will optimise the estimation of the heterogeneity of a parameter ensemble. Our main focus will be on defining $h(\cdot)$ as a ratio of some of the quartiles of the parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, with L being the quadratic loss.
- ii. In chapter 4, we will treat the problem of classifying the elements of a parameter ensemble below and above a particular threshold. Here, the function $h(\cdot)$ will be defined as the indicator function with respect to some cut-off point C , and the loss function of interest L will penalise misclassifications.

Chapter 3

Empirical Quantiles and Quartile Ratio Losses

Summary

The amount of heterogeneity present in a parameter ensemble is crucial in both epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. A highly heterogeneous ensemble of RRs, for instance, may indicate the presence of a hidden risk factor not included in the model of interest. In modern BHMs, however, the quantification of the heterogeneity of a parameter ensemble is rendered difficult by the utilisation of link functions and the fact that the joint posterior distribution of the parameter ensemble is generally not available in closed-form. In this chapter, we consider the estimation of such heterogeneity through the computation of the empirical quantiles and empirical quartile ratio (QR) of a parameter ensemble. We construct a simple loss function to optimise the estimation of these quantities, which we term respectively the quantile squared error loss (Q-SEL) and the QR squared error loss (QR-SEL) functions. We compare the performance of the optimal estimators under these two losses with the use of plug-in estimators based on ensembles of point estimates obtained under standard estimation procedures using the posterior regret. These candidate plug-in estimators include the set of MLEs and the ensembles of point estimates under the SSEL, WRSEL, CB and triple-goal functions. In addition, we also consider the ratio of posterior quartiles (RoPQ), as a possible candidate for measuring the heterogeneity of a parameter ensemble. We evaluate the performance of these plug-in estimators using non-spatial and spatially structured simulated data. In these two experimental studies, we found that the RoPQ and QR plug-in estimators tend to outperform other plug-in estimators, under a variety of simulation scenarios. It was observed that the performance of the WRSEL function is highly sensitive to the size of the parameter ensemble. We also noted that the CAR Normal model tends to yield smaller posterior losses when using the optimal estimator under both the Q-SEL and QR-SEL. In addition, we computed these optimal and plug-in quantities for a real data set, describing the prevalence of cases of schizophrenia in an urban population. On this basis, we draw some recommendations on the type of QR summary statistics to use in practice.

3.1 Introduction

In mixed effects models, which can be regarded as the frequentist version of BHMs, the main focus of the analysis has historically been on estimating fixed effects—that is, the regression coefficients of particular covariates. However, since the values of the fixed effect parameters are highly dependent on the values taken by the random effects, statisticians’ attention has progressively turned to the systematic study of random effects (Demidenko, 2004). Such a vector of random effects can be described as a parameter ensemble as introduced in section 2.2.1. A standard way of quantifying the amount of heterogeneity present in a parameter ensemble is to use the intraclass

coefficient (ICC). The ICC can be computed whenever quantitative measurements are made on units organised into groups. This statistic constitute a useful complement to the analysis of variance (ANOVA), for instance, where individual units are grouped into N groups, with $j = 1, \dots, N$. The nested observations are then modelled as

$$y_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_j + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\alpha^2)$ and $\epsilon_{ij} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$. Here, the α_j 's are independent of the ϵ_{ij} 's, and we assume that there is an identical number of units in each group, i.e. $i = 1, \dots, n$. For this model, the ICC is defined as follows,

$$\text{ICC} := \frac{\sigma_\alpha^2}{\sigma_\alpha^2 + \sigma_\epsilon^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

The ICC is a useful measure of parameter ensemble heterogeneity for general linear models that contains random effects. However, there does not exist an equivalent measure for generalised linear models. Indeed, in generalised linear models, the random effects of interest affect the response through a link function, which transforms the distribution of the original random effects. Thus, the variance parameter controlling the variability of these random effects only provides a distorted image of the dispersion of the parameter ensemble of interest.

Generalised linear models are commonly used in epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. In this context, the heterogeneity of a set of random effects may be indicative of the effect of hidden covariates that have not been included in the model. An accurate estimation of the dispersion of the random effects is therefore crucial for the detection of unexplained variability, which may then lead to the inclusion of new candidate risk factors. Most Bayesian models used in modern epidemiological practice, however, are hierarchical. In such models, the set of parameters of interest will be a non-linear function of one or more random effects as well as unit-specific covariates. The units may here be administrative areas within a region of interest such as hospitals, schools or other aggregates. For general BHMs, therefore, there does not exist a unique parameter, which controls for the variability of the unit-specific levels of risk. The variance parameters of several random effects can be added together, but this only constitutes a heuristic solution for quantifying the heterogeneity of the resulting empirical distribution of the parameters of interest. For such generalized linear models commonly used in epidemiology, there is therefore a need for a statistically principled way of estimating the heterogeneity of parameter ensembles.

One of the first formal attempts at estimating the amount of heterogeneity present in a set of random effects was conducted by Larsen et al. (2000). These authors studied a mixed effects logistic regression model, and considered the variance of the ensemble distribution of random effects, as a potential candidate for a measure of dispersion. Formally, they considered N groups of individuals with n subjects in each group. The probability of the i^{th} individual in the j^{th} cluster to develop the disease of interest was modelled as

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_{ij} = 1 | \alpha_j, \mathbf{x}_i] = \frac{\exp\left(\alpha_j + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k x_{ik}\right)}{1 + \exp\left(\alpha_j + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k x_{ik}\right)}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$, and where the random effects are assumed to be independent and identically distributed such that $\alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\alpha^2)$, for every j . The β_k 's constitute a set of fixed effects associated with individual-specific K -dimensional vectors of risk factors denoted by \mathbf{x}_i , for every i . Although the variance parameter, σ_α^2 , controls the distribution of the random effects, it only affects the probability of developing the disease of interest through the logistic map and the exact relationship between the variances at the first and second-level of the model hierarchy is therefore difficult to infer from the sole consideration of σ_α^2 .

Larsen et al. (2000) addressed this problem by assessing the amount of variability in the α_j 's by computing the median odds ratio (MOR). For two randomly chosen α_j 's drawn from the empirical distribution of the parameter ensemble, Larsen et al. (2000) considered the absolute

difference between these two parameters. Since the α_j 's are iid normal variates centered at zero with variance σ_α^2 , as described above, it can be shown that the difference between two such random variates is $\alpha_j - \alpha_k \sim N(0, 2\sigma_\alpha^2)$ for any pair of indices satisfying $j \neq k$ (Spiegelhalter et al., 2004). Moreover, the absolute difference between two randomly chosen random effects is a truncated Gaussian, sometimes called a half-Gaussian, with mean zero and variance $2\sigma_\alpha^2$. Larsen et al. (2000) suggested taking the median of that distribution. For the aforementioned specification, the median of such a truncated Gaussian is $\Phi^{-1}(0.75) \times \sqrt{2}\sigma_\alpha \doteq 1.09\sigma_\alpha$. When the α_j 's are ORs on the logarithmic scale, the dispersion of the parameter ensemble becomes $\exp(1.09\sigma_\alpha^2)$ (see also Larsen and Merlo, 2005). The MOR has been met with singular success in the literature, and has been adopted by several authors in the medical and epidemiological sciences. In particular, it has been used in cancer epidemiology (e.g. Elmore et al., 2002) and in the study of cardiovascular diseases (e.g. Sundquist et al., 2004), as well as in the monitoring of respiratory health (e.g. Basagana et al., 2004).

In a Bayesian setting, however, the MOR will only be available in closed-form if the posterior distribution of the random effect ensemble is also available in closed-form. This will rarely be the case in practice. For more realistic models, the computation of the MOR will typically require a substantial amount of computational power in order to be estimated. Specifically, the calculation of the MOR is based on the distribution of the differences between two random variates. The exhaustive evaluation of such a distribution, however, will require the computation of $\binom{n}{2}$ differences for a parameter ensemble of size n . If one wishes to estimate this particular quantity within a Bayesian context, one could specify a quadratic loss on the MOR. The optimal estimator under that loss function is the posterior mean. It then follows that we would need to compute the median of the distribution of the absolute differences of any two randomly chosen parameters at each iteration of the MCMC algorithm used for fitting the model. Such an estimation scheme becomes rapidly unwieldy as n grows (for $n = 2000$, about 2×10^6 differences, $|\alpha_j - \alpha_k|$, need to be computed at *each* MCMC iteration). The use of the MOR for Bayesian models thus appears to be impractical.

A less computationally intensive method for quantifying the dispersion of a parameter ensemble is the use of the quartile ratio (QR). This quantity is defined as the ratio of the third to the first quartile of a parameter ensemble. The use of quartiles for measuring heterogeneity comes here with no surprise as these summary statistics have been shown to be especially robust to deviation from normality (Huber and Ronchetti, 2009). That is, the utilisation of quartiles as summary statistics of the data is less sensitive to small departures from general modelling assumptions. This robustness of the quartiles is therefore especially significant when the field of application is the generalised linear model, as in the present case. We will see that, for models with no covariates, the logratio of the third to the first quartile of the empirical distribution of the RRs is equivalent to the IQR of the random effects on their natural scale. Like the IQR, the ratio of the third to first quartiles of the RRs can thus be regarded as a non-parametric measure of dispersion.

As any function of a parameter ensemble, the QR is amenable to standard optimisation procedures using a decision-theoretic approach. In this chapter, we will construct a specific loss function to quantify the estimation of this quantity. In addition, it will be of interest to optimise the estimation of the quantiles of the ensemble distribution. Specifically, we will study the computation of the optimal first and third quartiles of the ensemble distribution of the parameters of interest. As described in section 2.5, one of our goals in this thesis is to compare the use of optimal estimators with the performance of plug-in estimators, based on commonly used ensembles of point estimates. We will conduct these comparisons using the posterior regret, as introduced in chapter 2. The performance of the various plug-in estimators will be assessed by constructing two sets of data simulations. Different experimental factors deemed to influence the estimators' performance will be manipulated in order to precisely evaluate their effects. In particular, the synthetic data sets will be constructed using both a non-spatial and a spatial structure. The non-spatial simulations used in the sequel reproduce in part some of the simulation experiments conducted by Shen and Louis (1998), whereas the spatially structured risk surfaces will be based on the simulation study implemented by Richardson et al. (2004).

In addition, we will also be evaluating the impact of using different types of plug-in estimators

for the estimation of the dispersion of parameter ensembles in a real data set. We will re-analyse a published data set describing schizophrenia prevalence in an urban setting. Delineating the geographical distribution of psychoses plays an important role in generating hypotheses about the aetiology of mental disorders, including the role of socioeconomic status (Giggs and Cooper, 1987, Hare, 1956, Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958), urbanicity (Lewis et al., 1992), migration (Cantor-Graae et al., 2003), ethnicity (Harrison et al., 1997) and, more recently, of family history interactions that may betray effect modification by genes (Krabbendam and van Os, 2005, van Os et al., 2003). A raised prevalence of schizophrenia in urban areas was first observed over 75 years ago (Faris and Dunham, 1939), and has been consistently observed since (Giggs, 1973, Giggs and Cooper, 1987, Hafner et al., 1969, Hare, 1956, Lewis et al., 1992, Loffler and Haffner, 1999). Faris and Dunham (1939) demonstrated that the highest rates of schizophrenia occurred in inner-city tracts of Chicago with a centripetal gradient. More recently, a dose-response relationship between urban birth and the prevalence of schizophrenia has been reported in Sweden (Lewis et al., 1992), the Netherlands (Marcelis et al., 1998) and Denmark (Pedersen and Mortensen, 2001), suggesting that a component of the aetiology of schizophrenia may be associated with the urban environment. This specific data set is especially relevant to the task at hand, since it is characterised by low expected counts, which tend to lead to high levels of shrinkage in commonly used ensembles of point estimates (Gelman and Price, 1999); thereby providing a good testing ground for comparing the use of optimal dispersion estimators with the construction of plug-in estimators.

This chapter is organised as follows. We will first describe our decision-theoretic approach to the estimation of both empirical quantiles and empirical QR in section 3.2. The construction of the non-spatial simulations as well as the comparison of the optimal estimators with some plug-in estimators of interest will then be reported in section 3.3. The specification of the spatial simulation scenarios and the effects of the different experimental factors considered will be described in section 3.4. Finally, the analysis of the schizophrenia prevalence data set will be given in section 3.5, and some conclusions on the respective performance of the different studied estimators will be provided in section 3.6.

3.2 Estimation of Empirical Quantiles and Quartile Ratio

We here introduce two specific loss functions, which formalise our approach to the estimation of parameter ensembles' quantiles and QR. Both of these loss functions are straightforward adaptations of the quadratic loss, which provides easily derivable optimal minimisers. In addition, we discuss the computation of the respective posterior regrets for these loss functions, as this will be used for evaluating the performance of the plug-in estimators of the quantities of interest.

3.2.1 Empirical Quantiles

The empirical quantiles of a parameter ensemble are especially relevant when one wishes to quantify the dispersion of the ensemble distribution of a parameter ensemble. As defined in section 2.3.3, the p^{th} empirical quantile of an n -dimensional parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is

$$\theta_{(p)} := Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p), \quad (3.4)$$

where $Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ is the empirical QDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $p \in [0, 1]$. The quantity $\theta_{(p)}$ is a non-linear function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Optimal estimation of this quantity can be formalised by quantifying our loss using an SEL function on $\theta_{(p)}$, which takes the following form,

$$\text{SEL}(Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p), \delta) = (\theta_{(p)} - \delta)^2. \quad (3.5)$$

We saw in section 2.1.4 that the optimal estimator for such a posterior expected SEL is the posterior mean of the QDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ evaluated at p . Note that because $\theta_{(p)}$ is a function of the entire parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, it follows that the posterior expected loss depends on an n -dimensional

joint posterior distribution. When more than one quantile is of interest, one may use a quantiles squared error loss (Q-SEL) defined for some k -dimensional vector $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^k$ as

$$\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \sum_{j=1}^k \text{SEL}(Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p_j), \delta_j) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\theta_{(p_j)} - \delta_j)^2, \quad (3.6)$$

where we have emphasised the dependence of the Q-SEL on the full parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Note, however, that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ will generally not have the same dimension. Here, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is n -dimensional whereas $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is k -dimensional. Thus, the posterior expected Q-SEL is minimised by a k -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{Q-SEL}}$, which has the following elements,

$$\theta_{(p_j)}^{\text{Q-SEL}} := \mathbb{E}[Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p_j) | \mathbf{y}] = \mathbb{E}[\theta_{(p_j)} | \mathbf{y}]. \quad (3.7)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, k$, where the expectation is taken with respect to the joint posterior distribution, $p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n | \mathbf{y})$.

Parameter ensemble quantiles can also be estimated using plug-in estimators, which are based on empirical distributions of point estimates, as described in section 2.5. For any loss function L' , we define the empirical quantiles of an ensemble of point estimates denoted $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$, as follows,

$$\hat{\theta}_{(p)}^{L'} := Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(p) := \min \left\{ \hat{\theta}_1^{L'}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n^{L'} : F_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\hat{\theta}_i^{L'}) \geq p \right\}, \quad (3.8)$$

for any $p \in [0, 1]$, where the EDF of the ensemble $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$ is defined as

$$F_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(t) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}\{\hat{\theta}_i^{L'} \leq t\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Note that equation (3.8) is solely the empirical version of the general definition of a quantile reported in equation (2.43) on page 22. The performance of such plug-in estimators of the posterior quantiles will be evaluated and compared to the optimal Bayes choice under Q-SEL. In particular, we will consider ensembles of point estimates based on the loss functions described in section 2.4. This will include the SSEL, WRSEL, CB and GR ensembles of point estimates, as well as the MLEs.

3.2.2 Empirical Quartile Ratio

A natural candidate for the quantification of the dispersion of a parameter ensemble is the quartile ratio (QR). This quantity is defined as the ratio of the third to the first empirical quartile of the vector of parameters of interest, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. For a given BHM, of the type described in equation (2.19), the QR is defined as follows,

$$\text{QR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(.75)}{Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(.25)} = \frac{\theta_{(.75)}}{\theta_{(.25)}}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\theta_{(.25)}$ and $\theta_{(.75)}$ denote the first and third empirical quartiles, respectively. For generalized linear models, we will compute this quantity on the scale of the data –that is, as a ratio of ORs for a binomial likelihood, or as a ratio of RRs for a Poisson likelihood. When considering a log-linear model (e.g. Poisson likelihood combined with a normal prior on the log-intensities), the QR is related to the IQR introduced in section 2.3.3. If we take the logarithm of the QR, we obtain the IQR of the parameter ensemble on the prior scale, i.e. on the scale of the normal prior in the case of a log-linear model. We have

$$\log \left(\frac{\theta_{(.75)}}{\theta_{(.25)}} \right) = \log \theta_{(.75)} - \log \theta_{(.25)} = \text{IQR}(g(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (3.11)$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is the log link function.

The decision problem associated with the estimation of the QR can be formulated using a quadratic loss taking the QR as an argument. For clarity, we will refer to that particular quadratic loss as the QR squared error loss (QR-SEL). This loss function is defined as follows,

$$\text{QR-SEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta) := \text{SEL}(\text{QR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta) = \left(\frac{\theta_{(.75)}}{\theta_{(.25)}} - \delta \right)^2. \quad (3.12)$$

The $\text{QR}(\cdot)$ function is a non-linear mapping of the parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Equation (3.12) is of the form $L(h(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta)$, where L is the SEL and $h(\cdot)$ is the QR. The minimiser of the corresponding posterior expected loss is therefore the following posterior quantity,

$$\text{QR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\theta_{(.75)}}{\theta_{(.25)}} \middle| \mathbf{y} \right], \quad (3.13)$$

which will be referred to as the posterior empirical QR, where recall that $\theta_{(.25)}$ and $\theta_{(.75)}$ denotes the *empirical* first and third quartiles of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$.

It is of interest to compare the performance of this optimal estimator with some plug-in estimators, $\text{QR}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})$. As before, the ensemble of point estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$ has been obtained as the optimiser of L' , where L' represents a commonly used compound loss function. This therefore gives the following plug-in QR estimator,

$$\text{QR}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}) := \frac{\hat{\theta}_{(.75)}^{L'}}{\hat{\theta}_{(.25)}^{L'}}, \quad (3.14)$$

where both numerator and denominator are here defined as in equation (3.8). Note that $\text{QR}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})$ only depends on the data through the vector of point estimates, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$. An alternative solution to the problem of estimating the QR of a parameter ensemble is the direct utilisation of the Bayes choice for each quartiles. These quantities may have been estimated using the Q-SEL function described in equation (3.6). In such a case, once the minimiser of the posterior expected Q-SEL has been obtained, we can estimate the QR as the ratio of posterior empirical quartiles (RoPQ). That is, we have

$$\text{RoPQ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) := \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(.75)|\mathbf{y}]}{\mathbb{E}[Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(.25)|\mathbf{y}]} = \frac{\theta_{(.75)}^{\text{Q-SEL}}}{\theta_{(.25)}^{\text{Q-SEL}}}, \quad (3.15)$$

where the numerator and denominator are components of the optimal estimator under Q-SEL, as described in equation (3.7). Note that we have here drawn an explicit distinction between posterior empirical quartiles and quartiles of an ensemble of point estimates, which are respectively denoted by $\theta_{(p)}^{\text{Q-SEL}}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{(p)}^{L'}$, by using a hat to qualify the latter.

The QR is a useful indicator of the dispersion of a parameter ensemble, when the elements of that ensemble are constrained to take positive values. For parameter ensembles with Normally distributed elements, however, one needs to use a different measure of dispersion. In such contexts, we will optimise the estimation of the IQR, as introduced in section 2.3.3. Such optimisation can be conducted using a quadratic loss on the IQR such that

$$\text{IQR-SEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta) := \text{SEL}(\text{IQR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta) = ((\theta_{(.75)} - \theta_{(.25)}) - \delta)^2. \quad (3.16)$$

The optimal estimator of the posterior expected IQR-SEL is the posterior mean IQR,

$$\text{IQR}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}[\theta_{(.75)} - \theta_{(.25)}|\mathbf{y}]. \quad (3.17)$$

As for the posterior QR, plug-in estimators for this quantity can be defined by simply using the quartiles of the empirical distribution of the corresponding point estimates. Alternatively, one can also use two posterior empirical quartiles to estimate the IQR, as was done for the QR-SEL in equation (3.15). The latter estimator will be referred to as the difference of posterior empirical

quartiles (DoPQ), defined as follows,

$$\text{DoPQ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}[\theta_{(.75)}|\mathbf{y}] - \mathbb{E}[\theta_{(.25)}|\mathbf{y}]. \quad (3.18)$$

In the sequel, when dealing with ensembles of real-valued parameters taking both negative and positive values, we will automatically replace the QR-SEL with the IQR-SEL.

3.2.3 Performance Evaluation

The performance of these different quantities will be evaluated using simulated data, as well as compared in the context of real data examples. In the sequel, the posterior expected loss associated with the use of the optimal estimators under the Q-SEL and the QR-SEL functions will be compared to the posterior penalties incurred when using various plug-in estimators under these loss functions. In particular, we will be interested in assessing Q-SEL for $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$, as this leads to a direct comparison with the optimisation of the QR-SEL, which is related to the estimation of these specific quartiles. As described in section 2.5, we will therefore compute the following posterior regrets.

In the notation of section 2.5, the function $h(\cdot)$, which takes an ensemble of point estimates as an argument, becomes the empirical quantile function or the empirical quartile ratio depending on whether we wish to evaluate the posterior regret of the Q-SEL or the one of the QR-SEL function. Specifically, when the empirical quantiles are of interest, then equation (2.74) becomes

$$\text{regret}(\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}, Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p})) = \mathbb{E}[\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p}))|\mathbf{y}] - \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}],$$

where the optimal estimator, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, minimising Q-SEL is the corresponding vector of posterior empirical quartiles, as described in equation (3.7). In the sequel, \mathbf{p} will be taken to be $\{.25, .75\}$. In addition, we will use

$$\text{regret}(\text{QR-SEL}, \text{QR}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) = \mathbb{E}[\text{QR-SEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \text{QR}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))|\mathbf{y}] - \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[\text{QR-SEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}],$$

when the focus is on the empirical quartile ratio, with the optimal estimator minimising QR-SEL being here the posterior empirical QR, as described in equation (3.13). A similar posterior regret can be defined for the IQR-SEL function introduced in equation (3.16). For every pair of L and L' functions, where L will be either the Q-SEL or QR-SEL functions and L' will be either the SSEL, WRSEL, CB or GR loss functions. In addition, we will also consider the use of the RoPQ and the DoPQ, as introduced in equation (3.15) and (3.18), when evaluating the QR-SEL and IQR-SEL functions, respectively.

3.3 Non-spatial Simulations

3.3.1 Design

The proposed quantile and QR estimators were evaluated using synthetic datasets. The main objective of these simulations was to assess the influence of various factors on quantile estimation, and more specifically on the estimation of the QR of the posterior ensemble. Three factors were of particular interest. Firstly, (i) the size of the parameter ensemble was hypothesised to have a significant impact on the quality of the estimation, since as the number of variables in the ensemble goes to infinity, the quantiles of that ensemble distribution become better identified. In addition, (ii) we varied the level of heterogeneity of the sampling variances of the elements in the parameter ensemble. Finally, (iii) we were also concerned with assessing the sensitivity of empirical quantile and QR estimation on distributional assumptions. Two different hierarchical models were therefore compared. In this set of simulations, the models used to generate the data was also used to estimate the different posterior quantities of interest. That is, the generative and fitted models were identical.

3.3.2 Generative Models

The data were simulated using two different BHMs, which were partially described in section 2.2.1. We here give a full description of these models and our specific choices of hyperparameters. We tested for the effect of skewness on the estimation of the parameter ensemble quantiles and QR by comparing a compound Gaussian and a compound Gamma model. In the first case, the prior distribution on the θ_i 's is symmetric, whereas in the latter case, the prior on the θ_i 's is skewed. For convenience, conjugacy between the likelihood and the prior was respected for these two models (Bernardo and Smith, 1994). Non-conjugate models will be studied in section 3.4, for the case of spatial priors. These two simulation models and the specific values given to the hyperparameters can be regarded as a replication the first part of the simulation design conducted by Shen and Louis (1998). The models of interest in this section can be described as follows.

- i. For the compound Gaussian or Normal-Normal (N-N) model, we had the following likelihood and prior,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta_i, \sigma_i^2), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\mu_0, \tau_0^2), \quad (3.19)$$

respectively, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Standard application of Bayes' rule gives $\theta_i | y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}}, \tau_0^2 \gamma_i)$, with $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} := \gamma_i \mu_0 + (1 - \gamma_i) y_i$, and where $\gamma_i := \sigma_i^2 / (\sigma_i^2 + \tau_0^2)$ are the shrinkage parameters. The MLEs for this model are given by $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{MLE}} = y_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. In every simulation, the hyperparameters controlling the prior distribution of the θ_i 's were given the following specification: $\mu_0 = 0$, and $\tau_0^2 = 1$, as in Shen and Louis (1998). Note that this simulation setup is somewhat artificial since τ_0^2 is fixed to a particular value, instead of being estimated from the data. However, this choice of specification has the advantage of directly reproducing the simulation study of Shen and Louis (1998).

- ii. For the compound Gamma or Gamma-Inverse Gamma (G-IG) model, the likelihood function and prior take the following form,

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gam}(a_i, \theta_i), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Inv-Gam}(\alpha_0, \beta_0), \quad (3.20)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. The Gamma and Inverse-Gamma distributions were respectively given the following specifications:

$$\text{Gam}(a_i, \theta_i) = \frac{1}{\theta_i^{a_i} \Gamma(a_i)} y_i^{a_i-1} e^{-y_i/\theta_i}, \quad (3.21)$$

with $a_i, \theta_i > 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\text{Inv-Gam}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = \frac{\beta_0^{\alpha_0}}{\Gamma(\alpha_0)} \theta_i^{-\alpha_0-1} e^{-\beta_0/\theta_i}, \quad (3.22)$$

with $\alpha_0, \beta_0 > 0$. From the conjugacy of the prior, we obtain the following posterior distribution, $\theta_i | y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Inv-Gam}(a_i + \alpha_0, y_i + \beta_0)$, and the MLEs are $\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{MLE}} = y_i / a_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. All simulations were based on the following choices of the hyperparameters: $\alpha_0 = 4$, and $\beta_0 = 3$, as in Shen and Louis (1998).

Detailed descriptive statistics of the synthetic data generated by these models are reported in tables A.1 and A.2 in appendix A, for the simulated observations, and variance parameters, respectively.

3.3.3 Simulation Scenarios

In addition to the different models tested, two other factors were manipulated when producing these synthetic data sets. Firstly, in order to evaluate the effect of the size of the ensemble distribution on the quality of the classification estimates, we chose three different sizes of parameter ensemble. Specifically, in the BHMs of interest, the vector of observations and the vector of

parameters are both of size n . In these simulations, we chose n to take the following values:

$$n \in \{100, 200, 1000\}. \quad (3.23)$$

The second experimental factor under consideration was the amount of variability associated with each data point, i.e. the sampling variances of the y_i 's. This aspect of the synthetic data sets was made to vary by selecting different ratios of the largest to the smallest (RLS, in the sequel) sampling variances. Formally,

$$\text{RLS}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \frac{\sigma_{(n)}^2}{\sigma_{(1)}^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{RLS}(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{a_{(n)}}{a_{(1)}}, \quad (3.24)$$

for the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models, respectively. Thus, different choices of the vectors $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ and $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ produced different levels of that ratio. We generated the scaling parameters similarly in the two models in order to obtain three comparable levels of shrinkage. The sampling variances in both models were produced using

$$\log(\sigma_i^2) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-C_l, C_l), \quad \text{and} \quad \log(a_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-C_l, C_l), \quad (3.25)$$

for the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models, respectively, and where $l = 1, \dots, 3$. Different choices of the parameters $C_l \in \{.01, 1.5, 2.3\}$ approximately generated three levels of RLS, such that both $\text{RLS}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\text{RLS}(\mathbf{a})$ took the following values $\{1, 20, 100\}$, where small values of RLS represented scenarios with small variability in sampling variances.

In spite of these modifications of n and RLS, the empirical mean of the ensemble distributions of the true θ_i 's was kept constant throughout all simulations, in order to ensure that the simulation results were comparable. For the compound Gaussian model, the empirical ensemble mean was fixed to 0, and for the compound Gamma model, the empirical ensemble mean was fixed to 1. These values were kept constant through adequate choices of the hyperparameters of the prior distribution in each model. The combination of all these factors, taking into account the 2 different models, the 3 different sizes of the parameter ensemble and the 3 different levels of RLS resulted in a total of 1,800 different synthetic data sets with 100 replicates for each combination of the experimental factors.

3.3.4 Fitted Models

As aforementioned, the fitted models were identical to the generative models. For both the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models, no burn-in was necessary since each of the θ_i 's are conditionally independent given the fixed hyperparameters. The posterior distributions were directly available in closed-form for the two hierarchical models as both models were given conjugate priors. Nonetheless, in order to compute the different quantities of interest, we generated 2,000 draws from the joint posterior distribution of the θ_i 's in each model for each simulation scenario. The various plug-in estimators were computed on the basis of these joint posterior distributions. For this set of non-spatial simulations, the WRSEL function was specified using $a_1 = a_2 = 0.05$ (see section 2.4.3 on page 26).

3.3.5 Plug-in Estimators under Q-SEL

The results of these simulations for the Q-SEL function are presented in table 3.1 on page 39 for both the compound Gaussian (N-N) and the compound Gamma (G-IG) models. For the posterior regret of each plug-in estimator, we have reported in parentheses the posterior regret as a percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator. This quantity is the *percentage regret*, as described in section 2.5 on page 28. Specifically, for any ensemble of point estimates,

Table 3.1. Posterior regrets based on $Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p}))$ with $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$, for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for the compound Gaussian model in equation (2.20) and the compound Gamma model in equation (2.21), for 3 different levels of RLS, and 3 different values of n , averaged over 100 replicate data sets. Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 . In parentheses, the posterior regrets are expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator.

Scenarios	Q-SEL	Posterior regrets ^a					
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	
RLS \doteq 1							
N-N, $n = 100$	24.9	182.8 (734)	79.3 (318)	22.6 (91)	8.5 (34)	0.3(1)	
N-N, $n = 200$	12.7	176.4 (1389)	81.7 (643)	355.8 (2802)	5.3 (42)	0.0(0)	
N-N, $n = 1000$	2.6	158.4 (6177)	80.4 (3134)	3126.8 (121905)	1.3 (51)	0.0(1)	
G-IG, $n = 100$	8.8	170.6 (1938)	59.7 (678)	57.6 (654)	6.0 (69)	0.2(2)	
G-IG, $n = 200$	4.4	147.7 (3365)	62.9 (1432)	182.7 (4164)	6.2 (141)	0.1(2)	
G-IG, $n = 1000$	0.9	137.2(15705)	62.7 (7179)	2193.1 (251039)	5.9 (680)	0.0(4)	
RLS \doteq 20							
N-N, $n = 100$	24.9	251.0 (1009)	95.7 (385)	12.7 (51)	8.8 (35)	0.6(3)	
N-N, $n = 200$	12.4	233.0 (1886)	106.4 (861)	241.6 (1955)	7.2 (58)	0.1(1)	
N-N, $n = 1000$	2.5	210.7 (8327)	97.8 (3865)	2506.6 (99044)	3.3 (131)	0.0(1)	
G-IG, $n = 100$	8.5	186.9 (2201)	79.0 (930)	73.3 (864)	13.5 (159)	0.2(3)	
G-IG, $n = 200$	4.3	163.9 (3812)	76.5 (1779)	185.9 (4324)	17.1 (398)	0.1(2)	
G-IG, $n = 1000$	0.8	156.2(18600)	77.0 (9167)	1979.9 (235817)	18.2(2166)	0.1(6)	
RLS \doteq 100							
N-N, $n = 100$	23.7	302.9 (1277)	111.9 (472)	6.2 (26)	14.6 (62)	0.0(0)	
N-N, $n = 200$	12.3	254.9 (2077)	137.3 (1118)	131.4 (1070)	18.0 (147)	0.0(0)	
N-N, $n = 1000$	2.5	253.8(10161)	135.2 (5413)	1903.4 (76214)	16.1 (643)	0.0(1)	
G-IG, $n = 100$	8.0	208.4 (2592)	76.4 (950)	66.3 (825)	16.5 (205)	0.5(6)	
G-IG, $n = 200$	4.0	190.2 (4698)	79.7 (1968)	169.0 (4174)	17.1 (422)	0.1(2)	
G-IG, $n = 1000$	0.8	190.4(23096)	80.3 (9744)	1622.9 (196836)	25.5(3090)	0.1(8)	

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$, we have computed the following percentage regret,

$$\frac{100 \times \text{regret}(Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}, Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p}))}{\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}]}, \quad (3.26)$$

where the optimal estimator is the vector of posterior empirical quartiles for $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$. In the sequel, most simulation results will be presented in tabulated format, where the first column will correspond to the denominator in formulae (3.26), which is here posterior expected $Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}$, and the remaining columns will provide both the posterior regret and the percentage regret in parentheses expressed with respect to $Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p})$, for different choices of L' .

Overall, the lowest posterior regret for estimating the first and third quartiles was achieved by using the GR plug-in estimator. That is, estimates of the posterior empirical quantiles using the ensemble of GR point estimates was almost optimal under both models and all simulation scenarios. By comparing the columns of table 3.1 corresponding to the posterior regrets of each plug-in estimator, we can observe that the performance of the GR was followed by the ones of the CB, SSEL and MLE ensembles in order of increasing percentage regret for every condition where $n > 100$. The quartiles derived from the WRSEL ensemble outperformed the ones based on the SSEL and MLE sets of point estimates when $n = 100$, under both types of models and under all levels of the RLS. The WRSEL quartile estimator also surpassed the performance of the CB ensemble of point estimates when RLS \doteq 100 and $n = 100$. However, the performance of the WRSEL estimator was very sensitive to the size of the parameter ensemble, and deteriorated rapidly as n increased, under both types of models. Figure 3.1 on page 40 illustrates the impact of an increase of the size of the parameter ensemble on the behaviour of the WRSEL ensemble of point estimates. In panel (b), one can observe that the WRSEL ensemble distribution becomes increasingly bimodal as n increases. This particular behaviour can be explained in terms of the




Figure 3.1. Effect of the change in the size of the parameter ensemble on the performance of the WRSEL point estimates. Panel (b) shows a histogram of the ensemble of WRSEL point estimates for $n = 1000$ with superimposed lines representing the same set of point estimates under $n = 100, 200$ and 1000 . We have also provided the SSEL parameter ensemble in panel (a) for comparison. Results are here shown for a randomly chosen data set among the 100 replicates. The superimposed curves were produced using a Gaussian kernel over 512 equal-sized bins.

specification of the ϕ_i 's in the WRSEL estimation procedure. Each of the ϕ_i 's is a function of both the parameters a_1 and a_2 and the size of the ensemble distribution, n . We here recall the definition of these WRSEL weights,

$$\phi_i := \exp \left\{ a_1 \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right\} + \exp \left\{ -a_2 \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right\}, \quad (3.27)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and where for the present set of non-spatial simulations, we chose $a_1 = a_2 = 0.05$. It can therefore be seen that as n increases, the range of the ϕ_i 's tends to increase at an exponential rate. Since these weights control the counterbalancing of hierarchical shrinkage in the ensemble distribution, it follows that an increase in the size of the ensemble yields an accentuation of such countershrinkage. As a result, we obtain the phenomenon visible in panel (b) of figure 3.1, where the units in the tails of the WRSEL ensemble distribution are pushed away from the center of the distribution, thus creating a bimodal distribution. This effect explains why the performance of the WRSEL tends to rapidly deteriorate as n increases.

The relative performance—that is, in terms of percentage regrets—of all plug-in estimators, except perhaps for the GR quartile estimator, appeared to worsen under the compound Gamma model, in comparison to the compound Normal model. The percentage regrets of most plug-in estimators, indicated in parentheses in table 3.1, can be observed to be higher under the compound Gamma model. The sole exception to that trend was the performance of the GR plug-in quartiles for which no systematic trend could be identified. Overall, however, that estimator also tended to do slightly worse under the G-IG model, although its performance was still very close to optimal. A comparison of the shape of the ensemble distributions of the different point estimates studied

in this simulation experiment is reported in figure 3.2 on page 42. It can be observed that the empirical distribution of point estimates remains centered at zero under the N-N model, thereby matching the central tendency of the true ensemble distribution. Under the G-IG model, however, the skewness of the true ensemble distribution made it more difficult for plug-in estimators to match the values of the quantiles of the true parameter ensemble.

Increasing the magnitude of the RLS was found to detrimentally affect the performance of the MLE, SSEL and CB plug-in estimators. The percentage regrets for these three families of plug-in estimators was found to increase systematically with the magnitude of the RLS. This effect may be explained in terms of the added variability associated with a high RLS. For the MLEs, this difference in percentage regrets is directly attributable to differences in sampling variance. For the SSEL and CB plug-in estimators, one may explain the detrimental effect of the RLS experimental factor in terms of hierarchical shrinkage. That is, units with very high sampling variance are subject to a larger degree of hierarchical shrinkage than ensemble units with low sampling variance. These changes may then modify the ordering of the units and the overall shape of the ensemble of SSEL and CB point estimates, thereby leading to poorer performance than under low RLS. No similar trend could be observed for the GR and WRSEL quartile estimators. The GR quartile estimators seemed to be robust to changes in RLS levels, although the scale of the differences in performance was too small to reach any definite conclusions. For the WRSEL plug-in estimator, an increase in RLS was found to decrease percentage regret when considering the N-N model, but not necessarily under the G-IG model.

Finally, increasing the size of the parameter ensemble resulted in a systematic increase of percentage regret for all plug-in estimators, except for the quartiles based on the triple-goal function. As noted earlier, this relative deterioration of the performance of the plug-in estimators was particularly acute for the WRSEL estimators. The absolute value of the posterior loss under the optimal Q-SEL estimator, however, tended to decrease as n increased. Thus, while the posterior empirical quartiles are better estimated when the size of the parameter ensemble of interest is large, the relative performance of the plug-in estimators tends to decrease when their performance is quantified in terms of percentage regret. One should note, however, that for ensembles of point estimates, which optimised some aspects of the ensemble empirical distribution, the absolute posterior regrets (cf. first column of table 3.1) tended to diminish with n , even if this was not true for the corresponding percentage posterior regrets (cf. values in parentheses in the remaining columns 3.1). This trend was especially noticeable for the CB and GR plug-in estimators, whose absolute posterior regrets can be seen to be lower under larger parameter ensembles.

3.3.6 Plug-in Estimators under QR-SEL

The simulation results for the QR-SEL function are reported in table 3.2, on page 43. For the compound Gaussian model, we computed the plug-in estimators under the IQR-SEL function. For this loss, the optimal estimator is the posterior IQR, and the RoPQ is replaced by the DoPQ, as described in equation (3.18). We considered the effect of the different experimental factors on the performance of the plug-in estimators, in turn.

Overall, the ordering of the different plug-in estimators in terms of percentage regret under QR-SEL was found to be identical to the ordering observed under the Q-SEL function. The empirical QR of the MLEs tended to exhibit the largest percentage regret across all conditions and scenarios, except under the N-N model with $n = 1000$, for which the WRSEL plug-in estimator performed worse. As was previously noticed under the Q-SEL, the WRSEL plug-in estimator of the empirical QR was found to be very sensitive to the size of the parameter ensemble. That is, the performance of the WRSEL plug-in estimator severely deteriorated as n grew large. We can explain this effect in terms of the modification of the ϕ_i 's in the WRSEL function following an increase in n . Ignoring the WRSEL-based estimator, the SSEL plug-in estimator exhibited the second worst percentage regret after the MLE-based QR. This was followed by the CB plug-in estimator. The triple-goal and RoPQ were found to almost match the performance of the optimal estimator under the QR-SEL function over all simulated scenarios. No systematic difference in percentage regret could be identified between the GR and the RoPQ plug-in estimators.




Figure 3.2. Histograms of a randomly chosen simulated parameter ensemble under the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models in panel (a) and (b), respectively, for $n = 100$ and $RLS \doteq 1$. For each model, ensemble distributions of point estimates have been superimposed for five different estimation schemes.

As for the Q-SEL function, increasing the level of heterogeneity of the sampling variances had a detrimental effect on the percentage regret exhibited by the MLE, SSEL and CB plug-in estimators. The performance of these three families of QR estimators systematically decreased as RLS increased (cf. table 3.2 on page 43). The plug-in estimator under the WRSEL function, by contrast, tended to behave in the opposite direction, whereby an increase in RLS yielded an increase in performance, albeit this increase was restricted to the N-N model. Both the GR and DoPQ/RoPQ plug-in estimators appeared to be robust to changes in RLS levels, although the GR estimator of the QR exhibited a substantial increase in percentage regret for very large parameter ensembles –i.e. for $RLS \doteq 100$ and $n = 1000$, where the percentage regret for using the GR reached 24% of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator.

The choice of statistical model had a strong effect on the performance of the MLE, SSEL and CB plug-in estimators. Consider the values of the percentage regrets in parentheses in columns three, five and nine of table 3.2 on page 43. For these three families of ensembles of point estimates, the use of a compound Gamma model yielded a larger percentage regret. For the WRSEL estimator of the QR, no systematic trend could be identified, as the performance of that estimator under the different statistical models seemed to be also dependent on the choice of RLS levels and the number of units in the parameter ensemble. In addition, the behaviour of the triple-goal plug-in estimator appeared to deteriorate under the G-IG model. The DoPQ/RoPQ plug-in estimators, by contrast, exhibited slightly lower percentage regret under the compound Gamma model.

Increasing the size of the parameter ensemble tended to produce worse plug-in estimators with higher posterior percentage regrets. This trend can be observed for the MLE, SSEL, WRSEL and CB plug-in estimators. The triple-goal and DoPQ/RoPQ-based QR estimators, by contrast, appeared to be robust to an increase in the size of the parameter ensemble. No systematic effect of the size of n could be noticed for these two families of estimators. In summary, the GR and DoPQ/RoPQ plug-in estimators exhibited the best performance under both the Q-SEL and QR-

Table 3.2. Posterior regrets based on QR-SEL(θ , QR($\theta^{L'}$)), for five plug-in estimators, for the compound Gaussian model in equation (2.20) and the compound Gamma model in equation (2.21), for 3 different levels of RLS, and 3 different values of n , averaged over 100 replicate data sets. The posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator is given in the first column. Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 . In parentheses, the posterior regrets are expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator.

Scenarios	QR-SEL	Posterior regrets ^a							
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	RoPQ		
RLS \doteq 1									
N-N, $n = 100$	21	329 (1565)	151 (717)	39 (184)	9 (45)	0 (1)	0(2)		
N-N, $n = 200$	11	325 (3001)	158 (1455)	705 (6503)	4 (38)	0 (0)	0(1)		
N-N, $n = 1000$	2	313 (14063)	160 (7198)	6258 (281565)	2 (76)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 100$	27	18641 (69283)	467 (1736)	160 (593)	61 (226)	0 (2)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 200$	14	12501 (92484)	488 (3608)	16 (116)	44 (328)	0 (2)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 1000$	3	12692 (471628)	486 (18078)	2098 (77969)	50 (1871)	0 (4)	0(0)		
RLS \doteq 20									
N-N, $n = 100$	21	448 (2139)	181 (866)	20 (97)	10 (48)	0 (1)	0(2)		
N-N, $n = 200$	10	436 (4237)	206 (1998)	478 (4643)	9 (91)	0 (0)	0(1)		
N-N, $n = 1000$	2	412 (19081)	195 (9012)	5016 (232022)	6 (278)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 100$	27	22062 (83039)	572 (2154)	296 (1113)	105 (397)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 200$	13	19019 (142416)	565 (4228)	63 (475)	153 (1148)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 1000$	3	17738 (675792)	566 (21555)	850 (32365)	176 (6721)	0(11)	0(0)		
RLS \doteq 100									
N-N, $n = 100$	20	522 (2660)	213 (1087)	7 (34)	18 (93)	0 (0)	0(2)		
N-N, $n = 200$	10	463 (4578)	270 (2664)	259 (2555)	32 (320)	0 (0)	0(1)		
N-N, $n = 1000$	2	500 (24301)	270 (13108)	3804 (184974)	32 (1542)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 100$	26	65739 (256477)	563 (2197)	301 (1176)	148 (579)	1 (3)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 200$	13	36096 (284722)	572 (4510)	97 (763)	147 (1160)	0 (1)	0(0)		
G-IG, $n = 1000$	3	29789 (1140841)	586 (22424)	569 (21800)	230 (8806)	1(24)	0(0)		

^a Entries for both the posterior and percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

SEL functions, over all the scenarios considered. We now present a set of spatial simulations to evaluate the behaviour of the different families of plug-in estimators of interest under more realistic modelling assumptions.

3.4 Spatial Simulations

In this simulation study, four experimental factors were of interest. Firstly, we manipulated the spatial structure of the true parameter ensemble. Secondly, we considered the effect of different modelling assumptions. Thirdly, we modified the level of heterogeneity of the parameter ensemble, and finally, we assessed the influence of changing the overall level of the expected counts, in each scenario.

3.4.1 Design

The general framework for data generation followed the one implemented by Richardson et al. (2004). The data were generated using a subset of expected counts from the Thames Cancer Registry (TCR) for lung cancer in West Sussex, which contains $n = 166$ wards. The expected counts, denoted E_i 's for $i = 1, \dots, n$, were adjusted for age only, and correspond to the number of cases of lung cancer occurring among males during the period 1989–2003. The overall level of expected counts for lung cancer over the entire region varied from $\min(E) = 7.97$ to $\max(E) = 114.35$ with a mean of 42.44. The level of the expected counts was also made to vary across the simulations, in order to assess its influence on the performances of the different plug-in estimators. Specifically, we will study the effect of three different levels of expected counts over the performance of the plug-in estimators of interest.

Four different types of spatial patterns were simulated. The main objective of these simulations was to create a set of varying levels of difficulty for a smoothing technique, such as the CAR prior.




Figure 3.3. True RRs based on expected counts ($SF = 1.0$) for lung cancer among males between 1989 and 2003, for 166 wards located in West Sussex, UK. The values of the RRs were generated using the protocols described in section 3.4.2, and are respectively denoted by SC1 (one isolated cluster), SC2 (five isolated clusters and five isolated areas), SC3 (spatial pattern generated using the Matérn function), SC4 (spatial pattern using a hidden covariate). RRs in all four scenarios were here produced with a medium level of variability.

The scenarios were thus constructed in order to include a scenario with only a single isolated area of elevated risk (simulation SC1, the hardest scenario for a smoothing procedure) and a situation containing a relatively smooth risk surface with clear spatial structure (simulation SC3). The spatial simulations were constructed either by randomly selecting a subset of the areas in the region and labelling these areas as elevated-risk areas (SC1 and SC2), or by directly modelling the generation of the RRs ascribed to each area (SC3 and SC4). The construction of the spatial scenarios occurred only once, and the overall level of the expected counts was kept constant throughout the four spatial scenarios.

3.4.2 Spatial Structure Scenarios

Four different spatial structures were constructed, which respectively correspond to a situation with one isolated foyer of elevated risk (SC1), five isolated foyers and five isolated areas of elevated risk (SC2), a spatially distributed risk pattern (SC3), and the effect of a spatially structured risk factor (SC4). For each scenario, we describe the generation of the true RRs. In each case, three different levels of risk variability across the region was generated by manipulating scenario-specific parameters. Scenarios SC1 and SC2 replicate the first two spatial simulations considered by Richardson et al. (2004).

Simulation 1 (SC1). In the first scenario, a single isolated cluster of areas with elevated risk




Figure 3.4. Simulated observed counts based on expected counts ($SF = 1.0$) for lung cancer among males between 1989 and 2003, for 166 wards located in West Sussex, UK. The values of the y_i 's were generated following the protocols described in section 3.4.2, with a medium level of variability in the RRs.

was generated by choosing an area randomly, and selecting its first-degree neighbours. The cluster was chosen such that the total sum of the expected counts of the areas contained in the cluster was approximately equal to 5% of the sum of the expected counts over the entire region. The remaining areas in the region will be referred to as background areas. The set of indices of the wards in the cluster will be denoted by \mathcal{E} , whereas the background areas will be denoted by $\mathcal{B} := \{i = 1, \dots, n : i \notin \mathcal{E}\}$. The level of risk in each individual ward was then fixed using the following rule,

$$\theta_i := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B}, \\ LR & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E}; \end{cases} \quad (3.28)$$

where LR stands for level of risk. Three different levels of elevated risk were chosen with $LR = \{1.5, 2.0, 3.0\}$, thereby creating different levels of RR variability in the simulated data sets.

Simulation 2 (SC2). In the second scenario, we created a situation of mixed heterogeneity by combining both the simulation of clustered foyers of risks with the presence of isolated single areas with elevated risks. Firstly, five single areas were categorised as elevated risk areas. These areas corresponded to the 10th, 20th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentiles of the empirical distribution of the expected counts. The indices of these five wards will be denoted by I . In addition, we chose five non-contiguous clusters, which did not comprise the individual areas of elevated risk. These foyers, denoted C_j 's with $j = 1, \dots, 5$, were constructed using the method described for the first scenario, ensuring that the cumulated expected counts in




Figure 3.5. Simulated SMRs based on expected counts ($SF = 1.0$) for lung cancer among males between 1989 and 2003, for 166 wards located in West Sussex, UK. The values of the SMRs were generated following the protocols described in section 3.4.2, with a medium level of variability in the RRs.

each cluster did not exceed 5% of the total sum of expected counts in the region. Variability in levels of risk was here controlled by varying LR. As in the first scenario, for every i , we defined the θ_i 's according to the rule described in equation (3.28), except that the set of indices of the elevated risk areas was here defined as

$$\mathcal{E} := I \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^5 C_j. \quad (3.29)$$

Note that some buffering was required in simulations SC1 and SC2 in order to ensure that the randomly selected areas and clusters, respectively, were not adjacent or overlapping with each other. This was done by selecting a buffer of background areas around each of the cluster in SC1, and around each cluster and each of the individual areas in SC2. Note that in the latter case, the neighbours of the neighbours of the regions included in any one cluster were also excluded from further random selection, in order to ensure non-adjacent clusters.

Simulation 3 (SC3). In a third scenario, a spatially structured risk surface was generated using the Matérn function. Spatial structure was specified through the variance/covariance matrix, Σ , of the $\log \theta_i$'s. We computed the following symmetric matrix of intercentroidal distances, denoted \mathbf{D} , whose entries take the following values,

$$D_{ij} = \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|_2, \quad (3.30)$$

for every pair of indices (i, j) , with $\|\cdot\|_2$ denoting the L2-norm and where each \mathbf{x}_i represents a

set of 2-dimensional coordinates locating the centroid of the i^{th} region in \mathbb{R}^2 . By convention, $D_{ii} := 0$ for every i . We then computed the mean intercentroidal distance between all pairs of neighbours, defined as follows,

$$\bar{w} = \frac{1}{N_{\partial}} \sum_{i < j}^n D_{ij} \mathcal{I}\{i \sim j\}, \quad (3.31)$$

where N_{∂} is the total number of neighbouring relationships in the entire region. We used \bar{w} to select a particular level of risk decay, as a function of the intercentroidal distance. Our objective was here to obtain high to moderate correlations when the intercentroidal distance approached \bar{w} . Spatial autocorrelations were then made to drop off to a low level once the distances were equal to twice the value of the mean intercentroidal distance. We used the Matèrn function to specify this form of spatial structure in the entries of the variance/covariance matrix, such that

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{2^{\nu-1} \Gamma(\nu)} (2\sqrt{\nu} D_{ij} \phi)^{\nu} K_{\nu}(2\sqrt{\nu} D_{ij} \phi), \quad (3.32)$$

choosing $\phi = 3000$ and $\nu = 40$, and where $K_{\nu}(\cdot)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the third kind of order ν . The resulting matrix Σ was then used to draw sets of realisations from a multivariate normal distribution,

$$\log(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sim \text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{\text{SC3}}^2 \Sigma), \quad (3.33)$$

with parameter σ_{SC3}^2 controlling for the overall marginal variance of the spatial structure. Three different values of σ_{SC3} among $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$ were selected in order to vary the amount of variability of the RRs.

Simulation 4 (SC4). The last scenario produced a risk surface characterised by a high heterogeneity, which was generated using a hidden covariate. We used the Carstairs' deprivation index (CDI) for each area in the region of interest in order to create spatial variation in levels of risk (Carstairs and Morris, 1989a,b, Carstairs, 2000). The logRRs were here generated using a linear combination of the ward-specific CDIs. Formally, we had

$$\log(\theta_i) = \alpha + \beta C_i + v_i, \quad (3.34)$$

where $v_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{SC4}}^2)$, and C_i indicates the level of social deprivation in the i^{th} ward. The intercept α was assumed to be null throughout the simulations. The regression coefficient, β , took values in the set $\{0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$ in order to produce different levels of variability in the parameter ensemble, while the standard deviation, σ_{SC4} , was fixed to 0.1 in this scenario. The set of values for β allowed the generation of scenarios with low, medium and high RR variability.

The simulated observed counts in each scenario were simulated under the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n E_i$ (see Wright et al., 2003, for an example of synthetic simulations under this constraint). This condition was respected by generating the full vector of observed counts, \mathbf{y} , from a multinomial distribution parametrised such that the number of trials corresponded to the total number of expected counts $\sum_{i=1}^n E_i$, denoted N_E , and with the following vector of probability masses

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} := \left\{ \frac{E_1 \theta_1}{\sum_{i=1}^n E_i \theta_i}, \dots, \frac{E_n \theta_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n E_i \theta_i} \right\}, \quad (3.35)$$

and using

$$\mathbf{y} \sim \text{Multinomial}(N_E, \boldsymbol{\pi}), \quad (3.36)$$

for each of the scenarios and under the three levels of variability. For every combination of scenario and variability, we produced 100 replicates, thereby totalling 1,200 different data sets. Since each of these data sets was fitted with two different models, the complete spatial simulations generated 2,400 sets of joint posterior distributions of parameter ensembles. In addition, we also produced further simulations in order to evaluate the effect of different scaling of the expected counts. We employed three different values of the scaling factor (SF), such that

$$\text{SF} \in \{0.1, 1.0, 2.0\}. \quad (3.37)$$

That is, for each combination of the aforementioned experimental factors, we additionally varied the level of the expected counts

$$y_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Pois}(\theta_i E_i \text{SF}), \quad (3.38)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, for a given vector of true θ_i 's, whose generation depended on the specific spatial scenario considered. The main simulation results in this section will be described for $\text{SF} = 1.0$. In section 3.4.6, however, we will briefly consider the consequences of scaling up or scaling down the expected counts for a smaller subset of simulated data, choosing SF to be either 0.1 or 2.0.

Typical examples of the different maps produced by this set of simulated scenarios are illustrated in Figures 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, representing the true RRs, observed counts and standard mortality ratios, respectively. These maps were produced for a medium level of variability with $\text{LR} = 2$ for SC1 and SC2, $\sigma_{\text{SC3}}^2 = \sigma_{\text{SC4}}^2 = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0.3$, for SC3 and SC4. The full details of the simulated data sets are given in tables B.1, B.2 and B.3, on pages 100, 100 and 101, respectively, in appendix B. These tables also include descriptive statistics for simulated data based on different scaling of the expected counts.

3.4.3 Fitted Models

The synthetic data sets were modelled using the two spatial BHMs described in section 2.2.2. These models are characterised by the combined use of spatially structured and unstructured random effects. This particular combination of random effects was originally introduced by Besag et al. (1991), and is therefore sometimes referred to as the BYM model (see also Best et al., 2005). The CAR Normal and CAR Laplace models were fitted using WinBUGS 1.4 (Lunn et al., 2000) with 4,000 iterations including 2,000 burn-in. In this software, the u_i 's in the CAR priors are constrained to sum to zero (Spiegelhalter et al., 2000). The non-stationarity of the model, however, is induced by specifying a flat prior on α , which is the intercept for the log θ_i 's in equation (2.27). That is, we have

$$\alpha \sim \text{Unif}(-\infty, +\infty). \quad (3.39)$$

This particular formulation of the CAR distribution was suggested by Besag and Kooperberg (1995). The CAR Normal and CAR Laplace models are fully specified once the hyperparameters τ_v^2 and τ_u^2 in equations (2.28) and (2.29), respectively, are given hyperpriors. In our case, these two parameters were given the following 'vague' specification,

$$\tau_v^{-2} \sim \text{Gam}(a_0, b_0), \quad \tau_u^{-2} \sim \text{Gam}(a_0, b_0), \quad (3.40)$$

where we chose $a_0 := .5$ and $b_0 := .0005$, which constitutes a common specification for BHMs (Gelman, 2006). Note, however, that different choices of hyperparameters may yield different posterior distributions of the parameters of interest. The WinBUGS codes used for these two models is reported in appendix C. We now consider in greater detail the various aspects of a parameter ensemble in a BHM that may be of interest, and how estimation of these aspects may be optimised.

For each simulated scenario, we computed the posterior regrets under the Q-SEL and QR-SEL functions, as described in section 3.2.3. In both cases, we estimated these loss functions with

respect to the vector of RRs, θ . For the Q-SEL function, this gave

$$\text{regret}(\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}, Q_{\hat{\theta}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p})). \quad (3.41)$$

for different plug-in estimators, $\hat{\theta}^{L'}$, and where the optimal estimator under this loss function is the vector of posterior empirical \mathbf{p} -quantiles as reported in equation (3.7). Similarly, the following posterior regret was calculated to quantify the estimation of the QR using ensembles of sub-optimal point estimates,

$$\text{regret}(\text{QR-SEL}, \text{QR}(\hat{\theta}^{L'})), \quad (3.42)$$

defined with respect to $\text{QR-SEL}(\theta, \delta)$, as described in section 3.2.3. Note that we have here chosen to compute both the empirical quantiles and the QR on the scale of the RR. However, we could have chosen to evaluate these quantities with respect to the logRRs. In section 3.6, we discuss the implications of such a change of parametrisation on the decision-theoretic problems of interest.

All the results presented in the following sections are expressed as posterior expected losses, which are functions of the joint posterior distribution of the parameters under scrutiny. Since these evaluative criteria are highly dependent on the type of hierarchical models used for the evaluation, we have also computed the mean squared error of the QR with respect to the true QR, based on the simulated RRs. For the BYM model, we found that the optimal QR estimate (i.e. the posterior mean of the empirical QR) was on average at a 0.082 square distance from the true QR. That discrepancy was slightly higher for the Laplace model, at 0.087, when averaged over all simulated scenarios.

3.4.4 Plug-in Estimators under Q-SEL

The results of the spatial data simulations for the estimation of the parameter ensemble's quantiles are presented in table 3.3, on page 50, for the CAR normal (denoted BYM in the table) and the CAR Laplace (denoted L1 in the table). As for the non-spatial simulations, we reported the percentage posterior regrets in parentheses for each plug-in estimator. Note that for these spatial simulations, the parameters controlling the size of the ϕ_i 's in the WRSEL function were given the following specification, $a_1 = a_2 = 0.5$, which is a symmetric version of the original specification used by Wright et al. (2003) for similar spatial models.

Overall, the GR plug-in estimator of the first and third quartiles outperformed the four other plug-in estimators across all spatial scenarios and levels of the different experimental parameters. The quartiles derived from the ensemble of CB point estimates tended to exhibit the second best performance on most scenarios, followed by the quartiles of the SSEL and WRSEL ensemble distributions, with the WRSEL displaying the worse performance, as can be observed in column six of table 3.3, on page 50. The MLE-based empirical quartiles were poor when we considered SC3 and SC4 as spatial scenarios. However, the MLE plug-in estimates outperformed the SSEL, WRSEL and CB ensemble quartiles under scenarios SC1 and SC2, for simulations with medium to high heterogeneity of the true RRs.

The most important experimental factor was the use of different scenarios, as can be observed in table 3.3 by comparing the SC1/SC2 lines with the SC3/SC4 lines of each section of the table. In particular, SC1 and SC2 tended to produce very different outcomes from the ones obtained for the SC3 and SC4 synthetic data sets. One should note that the SC1 and SC2 spatially structured scenarios are somewhat artificial because the true distributions of the level of risks in these scenarios is discrete: each RR can only take one of two values. This produced some particularly counter-intuitive results when comparing the performances of different plug-in estimators.

In figure 3.6 on page 51, the typical ensemble distributions for different choices of point estimates are reported under the four spatial scenarios. Despite the discrete nature of the true distributions in scenarios SC1 and SC2, all ensembles of point estimators behaved similarly in terms of level of shrinkage. That is, the WRSEL and SEL functions exerted a moderate to high level of shrinkage towards the prior mean, whereas the CB and GR point estimators resulted in an

Table 3.3. Posterior regrets based on $Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, Q_{\hat{\theta}L'}(\mathbf{p}))$ with $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$, for five plug-in estimators, and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for three different levels of variability, with $SF = 1.0$ and for four spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and a risk surface generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries, averaged over 100 replicate data sets in each condition, are scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator in parentheses.

Scenarios	Q-SEL	Posterior regrets ^a				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.6	6.9 (1091)	2.0 (315)	22.0 (3477)	0.3 (55)	0.1(11)
BYM-SC2	0.8	4.1 (511)	3.3 (416)	93.8 (11651)	1.1(142)	0.1 (7)
BYM-SC3	1.1	3.4 (300)	0.7 (63)	151.4 (13427)	0.7 (58)	0.1 (5)
BYM-SC4	0.9	5.5 (606)	1.7 (183)	140.6 (15476)	0.4 (48)	0.1 (7)
L1-SC1	0.7	7.2 (1058)	2.1 (316)	21.1 (3104)	0.3 (41)	0.1(10)
L1-SC2	0.8	4.1 (504)	3.7 (458)	99.3 (12136)	1.0(124)	0.1 (8)
L1-SC3	1.2	4.5 (375)	1.3 (108)	206.2 (17237)	0.6 (54)	0.1 (5)
L1-SC4	1.0	5.6 (578)	2.2 (232)	156.9 (16341)	0.4 (42)	0.1 (7)
<i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.6	1.6 (246)	3.3 (510)	65.9 (10179)	1.3(195)	0.1(10)
BYM-SC2	1.3	2.7 (200)	9.9 (738)	235.5 (17548)	7.3(542)	0.1 (5)
BYM-SC3	1.5	2.8 (181)	1.0 (65)	215.0 (13906)	0.8 (52)	0.1 (4)
BYM-SC4	1.2	4.0 (325)	1.2 (98)	230.9 (18609)	0.5 (43)	0.1 (5)
L1-SC1	0.7	1.5 (223)	3.7 (531)	71.1 (10299)	1.3(188)	0.1(10)
L1-SC2	1.4	3.9 (270)	10.6 (738)	210.7 (14650)	7.4(517)	0.1 (4)
L1-SC3	1.7	3.5 (208)	1.5 (88)	321.7 (19389)	1.0 (59)	0.1 (4)
L1-SC4	1.3	4.4 (338)	1.7 (129)	262.5 (20067)	0.7 (51)	0.1 (5)
<i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.8	0.6 (85)	4.3 (566)	115.2 (15209)	2.6(342)	0.1(10)
BYM-SC2	2.2	7.7 (353)	18.4 (840)	578.4 (26420)	16.8(767)	0.1 (3)
BYM-SC3	1.8	2.8 (158)	1.0 (57)	253.8 (14156)	1.1 (62)	0.1 (4)
BYM-SC4	1.6	3.4 (214)	1.0 (61)	300.6 (18872)	0.8 (48)	0.1 (4)
L1-SC1	0.8	1.0 (120)	4.4 (537)	124.0 (15255)	2.6(316)	0.1 (9)
L1-SC2	2.4	10.8 (447)	19.1 (794)	619.5 (25727)	17.1(711)	0.1 (3)
L1-SC3	2.0	3.9 (196)	1.3 (64)	357.2 (18064)	1.2 (61)	0.1 (5)
L1-SC4	1.7	3.7 (224)	1.4 (82)	346.5 (20771)	1.0 (57)	0.1 (4)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been here truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, whereas entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer.

ensemble distribution closer to the true ensemble of the RRs. The MLEs, by contrast, tended to be over-dispersed. In effect, the ordering of the different families of point estimators in terms of level of shrinkage was maintained. Therefore, the estimators retained their typical properties. However, it is these properties that have changed in their level of desirability. While the over-dispersion of the MLEs is generally a disadvantage in terms of the estimation of the quantiles of the true ensemble distribution; for SC1 and SC2, it has now become one of the desirable properties of a point estimator because the true RRs are artificially over-dispersed in these two scenarios. These observations account for the superiority of the quartiles based on the ensemble distribution of the MLEs in comparison to the SSEL, WRSEL and CB plug-in estimators for these scenarios.

The level of variability of the true ensemble of RRs was also found to have a substantial effect on the ordering of the different plug-in estimators in terms of percentage regret, although this effect was mediated by the choice of spatial scenarios. For the discrete two-category spatial scenarios – SC1 and SC2 – the quartiles of the ensemble distributions of the SSEL, WRSEL and CB estimators were detrimentally affected by an increase in the heterogeneity of the true parameter ensemble. The MLE-based empirical quartiles, by contrast, appeared to improve their performance as the true RRs became more dispersed, although this trend was mainly restricted to the SC1 scenario. For SC3 and SC4, however, the effect of increasing the variability of the RRs tended to result in a decrease in percentage regret for most plug-in estimators, although systematic trends were difficult to isolate. Under SC4, the MLE, SSEL and WRSEL plug-in estimators were positively affected by an increase in the heterogeneity of the RR ensemble.




Figure 3.6. Histograms of simulated parameter ensembles, under scenarios SC1, SC2, SC3 and SC4 in panels (a), (b), (c) and (d), respectively for a low variability specification. Distributions of point estimate ensembles have been superimposed using different coloured lines, and are based on posterior distributions produced under the CAR Normal model. For SC1 and SC2, in panels (a) and (b), the true parameter ensemble of the RRs is a discrete distribution on solely two values.

The choice of the CAR prior –that is, the contrast between the BYM model with its robust version based on the Laplace distribution– mainly affected the SSEL, WRSEL and CB plug-in estimators, whose performance was worsened when using the CAR Laplace prior, under the SC3 and SC4 simulation scenarios. We note, however, that this trend was not completely verified for the CB quartile estimator for which the use of the BYM model produced worse percentage regret under low variability. The GR plug-in estimators, by contrast, appeared to be only marginally affected by the choice of prior. The use of the Laplace prior slightly increased the posterior expected loss (cf. first column of table 3.3, on page 50) associated with the optimal estimator under the Q-SEL function, thereby indicating that the use of such a model leads to estimators of empirical quartiles, which are inferior to the ones obtained when specifying a CAR Normal prior.

3.4.5 Plug-in Estimators under QR-SEL

The posterior regrets associated with the QR-SEL function for different plug-in estimators and different levels of experimental factors are presented in table 3.4, on page 52. The results for the QR-SEL function were found to follow the pattern described for the Q-SEL function. As in the preceding section, the most important experimental factor was the choice of simulation scenario. Although the over-dispersion of the MLEs was found to be disadvantageous when estimating the QR under SC1 and SC2 with a low level of variability in the true RRs, this property became advantageous as the variability of the RRs increased. The converse was true for the QRs of the SSEL, WRSEL and CB ensemble distributions. That is, these three families of plug-in estimators produced QRs associated with greater percentage regret under SC1 and SC2, as the level of variability increased. As for the Q-SEL, the triple-goal plug-in estimator was found to outperform all the other ensembles of point estimates across all scenarios and experimental conditions. For the QR-SEL, we also evaluated the posterior regret associated with the use of the RoPQ. This particular choice of estimator yielded a quasi-optimal performance with percentage regrets lower than one percentage point under all scenarios considered.

Table 3.4. Posterior regrets based on $\text{QR-SEL}(\theta, \text{QR}(\theta^{L'}))$ for six plug-in estimators, and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for three different levels of variability, with $\text{SF} = 1.0$ and for four spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and a risk surface generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries, averaged over 100 replicate data sets in each condition, are scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator in parentheses.

Scenarios	QR-SEL	Posterior regrets ^a					
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	RoPQ
<i>Low Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	1	18 (2583)	5 (679)	58 (8187)	1(106)	0 (1)	0(0)
BYM-SC2	1	13 (1152)	9 (849)	489 (44527)	2(195)	0 (0)	0(0)
BYM-SC3	3	14 (521)	2 (86)	1355 (50724)	2 (89)	0 (1)	0(0)
BYM-SC4	1	20 (1349)	5 (371)	871 (58847)	1 (57)	0 (0)	0(0)
L1-SC1	1	19 (2295)	5 (636)	61 (7454)	1 (73)	0 (2)	0(0)
L1-SC2	1	12 (1016)	11 (924)	537 (46600)	2(167)	0 (0)	0(0)
L1-SC3	3	19 (686)	5 (173)	2059 (72936)	2 (62)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC4	2	18 (1150)	8 (496)	1021 (65581)	1 (51)	0 (1)	0(0)
<i>Med. Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	1	3 (451)	9 (1327)	72 (10596)	4(585)	0 (1)	0(0)
BYM-SC2	3	2 (86)	30 (1149)	453 (17301)	19(711)	0 (0)	0(0)
BYM-SC3	6	16 (284)	5 (81)	3093 (54655)	3 (61)	0 (3)	0(0)
BYM-SC4	3	18 (640)	5 (193)	2181 (77181)	1 (38)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC1	1	3 (344)	10 (1271)	100 (12706)	4(514)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC2	3	3 (103)	32 (1128)	760 (26507)	19(650)	0 (0)	0(0)
L1-SC3	6	21 (341)	8 (132)	5694 (93879)	4 (65)	0 (2)	0(0)
L1-SC4	3	17 (574)	8 (252)	2569 (86403)	1 (47)	0 (1)	0(0)
<i>High Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	1	1 (99)	13 (1409)	149 (16321)	10(1043)	0 (2)	0(0)
BYM-SC2	6	16 (288)	63 (1128)	76 (1357)	52(927)	0 (1)	0(0)
BYM-SC3	8	18 (215)	5 (65)	4858 (58570)	10(122)	0 (1)	0(0)
BYM-SC4	5	19 (398)	5 (108)	3930 (83209)	2 (34)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC1	1	2 (172)	13 (1211)	175 (16350)	9(873)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC2	6	24 (379)	67 (1077)	103 (1658)	54(870)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC3	9	26 (280)	7 (77)	7609 (82689)	6 (70)	0 (1)	0(0)
L1-SC4	5	17 (354)	8 (155)	4772 (97158)	2 (40)	0 (1)	0(0)

^a Entries for both posterior and percentage regrets have been here truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

As with quantile estimation, the use of the CAR Laplace prior resulted in higher posterior expected losses when considering the optimal estimator of the QR, and also tended to produce substantially larger percentage posterior regrets for the SSEL, WRSEL and CB plug-in estimators. In summary, this spatial simulation study has shown that the different plug-in estimators of interest tend to behave similarly under both the Q-SEL and QR-SEL functions. As for the non-spatial study, the triple-goal estimators were found to exhibit the lowest amount of percentage regret across all the simulation scenarios considered.

3.4.6 Consequences of Scaling the Expected Counts

Simulation results for two different scalings of the expected counts are reported in table 3.5 on page 53 for the Q-SEL function and in table 3.6 on page 54 for the QR-SEL function. As in the previous sections, percentage regrets with respect to the posterior loss under the optimal estimator is reported in parentheses in the two tables.

For both the Q-SEL and QR-SEL functions, the use of smaller expected counts resulted in a substantial increase of the posterior losses associated with the use of the optimal estimators under all simulated scenarios. Similarly, the absolute posterior regrets associated with the use of the MLE, SSEL, WRSEL and CB plug-in estimators tended to be larger when applying a scaling factor of 0.1, in comparison to the use of a scaling factor of $\text{SF} = 2.0$. In terms of percentage regret, however, this trend was reversed for the GR plug-in estimators under both the Q-SEL and

Table 3.5. Posterior regrets based on $Q\text{-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^L}(\mathbf{p}))$ with $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$, for five plug-in estimators, and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator reported in the first column. Results are presented for three different levels of variability, and for four spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and a risk surface generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries, averaged over 100 replicate data sets in each condition, are scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator in parentheses.

<i>Scenarios</i>	Q-SEL	<i>Posterior regrets^a</i>				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>SF = 0.1 Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	4.2	216.6 (5163)	2.8 (66)	1.9 (46)	0.3 (7)	0.2 (4)
BYM-SC2	4.1	231.5 (5614)	3.2 (78)	2.5 (60)	0.3 (8)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC3	6.3	138.8 (2197)	3.0 (47)	3.0 (47)	1.7 (27)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC4	5.5	211.6 (3827)	6.0 (109)	4.9 (88)	1.2 (21)	0.1 (2)
L1-SC1	4.3	222.3 (5136)	2.7 (61)	2.0 (45)	0.3 (6)	0.2 (4)
L1-SC2	4.1	243.9 (5912)	2.9 (70)	2.3 (55)	0.3 (7)	0.2 (5)
L1-SC3	8.6	200.1 (2335)	7.6 (89)	6.7 (78)	0.9 (11)	0.3 (4)
L1-SC4	6.0	235.7 (3900)	7.3 (121)	6.1 (101)	0.5 (8)	0.2 (3)
<i>SF = 0.1 Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	5.7	189.2 (3332)	6.4 (114)	4.7 (82)	1.7 (30)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC2	8.6	166.6 (1941)	13.9 (162)	12.3 (144)	1.5 (18)	0.3 (3)
BYM-SC3	7.4	92.9 (1261)	4.5 (61)	3.5 (48)	3.2 (43)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC4	7.4	155.8 (2115)	14.0 (190)	10.1 (137)	2.8 (38)	0.1 (2)
L1-SC1	4.8	231.2 (4810)	4.9 (102)	3.9 (80)	0.5 (9)	0.2 (4)
L1-SC2	6.7	171.0 (2559)	18.7 (280)	15.3 (229)	1.1 (17)	0.1 (2)
L1-SC3	7.3	154.7 (2115)	23.0 (314)	20.1 (275)	3.5 (48)	0.1 (2)
L1-SC4	8.0	175.4 (2184)	17.1 (213)	14.2 (177)	1.5 (19)	0.3 (4)
<i>SF = 0.1 High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	6.1	103.9 (1706)	17.7 (291)	14.5 (238)	6.4(104)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC2	8.3	78.2 (939)	26.0 (312)	24.0 (288)	7.9 (95)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC3	7.5	73.6 (986)	6.6 (89)	7.3 (98)	6.7 (90)	0.1 (1)
BYM-SC4	7.6	103.9 (1364)	11.8 (155)	9.2 (121)	3.3 (43)	0.1 (1)
L1-SC1	6.7	89.3 (1329)	27.7 (413)	23.2 (345)	6.0 (89)	0.1 (1)
L1-SC2	8.4	75.8 (898)	38.9 (462)	39.9 (473)	10.2(121)	0.1 (1)
L1-SC3	10.1	109.5 (1079)	17.7 (175)	18.1 (178)	5.8 (58)	0.3 (3)
L1-SC4	7.3	116.2 (1589)	32.0 (438)	28.0 (383)	5.0 (68)	0.1 (1)
<i>SF = 2 Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.3	1.6 (540)	1.3 (429)	1.0 (344)	0.5(159)	0.1(25)
BYM-SC2	0.5	1.3 (260)	2.7 (516)	1.6 (302)	1.4(279)	0.1(13)
BYM-SC3	0.7	1.3 (191)	0.3 (44)	0.2 (26)	0.3 (44)	0.1 (9)
BYM-SC4	0.6	1.5 (249)	0.7 (112)	0.5 (89)	0.2 (39)	0.0 (8)
L1-SC1	0.3	1.6 (461)	1.4 (419)	1.0 (307)	0.5(143)	0.1(16)
L1-SC2	0.5	1.3 (231)	2.6 (467)	2.0 (373)	1.1(195)	0.1 (9)
L1-SC3	0.7	1.7 (250)	0.5 (66)	0.4 (54)	0.4 (56)	0.1 (9)
L1-SC4	0.6	1.5 (237)	0.7 (108)	1.0 (152)	0.1 (13)	0.1(15)
<i>SF = 2 Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.3	0.2 (74)	1.8 (552)	1.5 (464)	1.1(327)	0.1(24)
BYM-SC2	1.2	3.1 (270)	8.8 (755)	6.3 (541)	7.7(664)	0.1 (5)
BYM-SC3	1.1	1.5 (129)	0.5 (41)	0.3 (25)	0.5 (48)	0.1 (5)
BYM-SC4	0.8	1.1 (142)	0.3 (38)	0.2 (25)	0.3 (32)	0.1 (7)
L1-SC1	0.4	0.7 (197)	1.9 (518)	1.6 (445)	1.0(274)	0.1(26)
L1-SC2	1.2	4.3 (346)	7.7 (623)	7.1 (576)	6.4(521)	0.0 (4)
L1-SC3	1.2	2.1 (175)	0.7 (62)	0.6 (49)	0.8 (69)	0.1 (5)
L1-SC4	0.9	1.2 (136)	0.5 (59)	0.5 (61)	0.3 (32)	0.1 (6)
<i>SF = 2 High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.4	0.3 (73)	2.3 (618)	1.9 (489)	1.7(449)	0.1(19)
BYM-SC2	1.7	8.7 (505)	12.4 (717)	10.7 (621)	12.1(701)	0.1 (4)
BYM-SC3	1.3	0.8 (61)	0.5 (40)	0.6 (45)	0.6 (46)	0.1 (9)
BYM-SC4	1.1	1.6 (150)	0.5 (43)	0.3 (32)	0.4 (33)	0.1 (6)
L1-SC1	0.7	0.7 (100)	2.2 (333)	1.5 (232)	1.6(241)	0.1(12)
L1-SC2	1.9	9.2 (485)	12.8 (676)	11.5 (610)	12.5(660)	0.1 (5)
L1-SC3	1.5	0.8 (56)	0.8 (56)	0.6 (40)	0.7 (47)	0.2(12)
L1-SC4	1.1	1.7 (149)	0.3 (31)	0.5 (44)	0.4 (32)	0.1 (5)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer.

Table 3.6. Posterior regrets based on QR-SEL($\theta, \text{QR}(\theta^{L'})$) for six plug-in estimators, and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for three different levels of variability, and for four spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and a risk surface generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries, averaged over 100 replicate data sets in each condition, are scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator in parentheses.

Scenarios	QR-SEL	Posterior regrets ^a					
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	RoPQ
<i>SF = 0.1 Low Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	3	945 (28427)	7 (202)	5 (138)	0 (14)	0 (9)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	3	992 (30596)	8 (253)	6 (196)	1 (23)	0 (4)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	11	783 (6819)	10 (83)	9 (74)	4 (38)	0 (1)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	6	1005 (15697)	17 (264)	14 (216)	1 (17)	0 (3)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	4	964 (25898)	6 (175)	5 (129)	0 (11)	0(10)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	3	1037 (29816)	7 (198)	5 (156)	0 (13)	0(11)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	17	1047 (6098)	25 (143)	20 (119)	2 (11)	1 (8)	0 (0)
L1-SC4	9	1070 (12516)	21 (243)	17 (201)	1 (10)	1 (6)	0 (0)
<i>SF = 0.1 Med. Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	7	869 (12769)	17 (254)	13 (187)	3 (42)	0 (1)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	18	957 (5237)	51 (279)	44 (243)	2 (13)	1 (7)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	18	584 (3219)	18 (102)	15 (84)	10 (57)	0 (1)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	13	855 (6678)	46 (361)	34 (265)	5 (42)	0 (2)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	5	988 (18505)	13 (251)	11 (197)	1 (19)	0 (8)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	13	957 (7170)	70 (524)	56 (416)	3 (21)	0 (3)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	16	832 (5207)	97 (605)	79 (493)	13 (83)	0 (3)	0 (0)
L1-SC4	16	894 (5756)	58 (375)	46 (299)	4 (23)	1 (8)	0 (0)
<i>SF = 0.1 High Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	9	564 (6583)	60 (697)	49 (575)	18(209)	0 (2)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	25	629 (2545)	144 (581)	141 (571)	20 (83)	0 (1)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	23	528 (2276)	26 (111)	30 (128)	33(144)	0 (1)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	17	736 (4381)	52 (312)	41 (245)	2 (9)	0 (1)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	12	455 (3806)	101 (844)	82 (689)	17(144)	0 (2)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	27	603 (2203)	220 (802)	221 (808)	34(125)	1 (2)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	30	748 (2533)	86 (291)	84 (285)	18 (62)	1 (5)	0 (1)
L1-SC4	16	713 (4374)	144 (882)	123 (752)	15 (94)	0 (1)	0 (0)
<i>SF = 2 Low Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	0	4 (1541)	3 (1158)	2 (936)	1(363)	0(52)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	1	3 (373)	7 (889)	4 (566)	2(303)	0(27)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	1	4 (313)	1 (50)	0 (32)	1 (50)	0 (6)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	1	6 (519)	2 (180)	2 (145)	0 (20)	0(10)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	0	4 (1135)	3 (1017)	3 (751)	1(296)	0(24)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	1	3 (318)	7 (872)	6 (722)	2(252)	0(14)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	1	6 (432)	2 (103)	1 (81)	1 (86)	0(11)	0 (0)
L1-SC4	1	5 (446)	2 (212)	3 (280)	0 (12)	0(20)	0 (0)
<i>SF = 2 Med. Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	0	1 (176)	5 (1505)	4 (1280)	3(832)	0(35)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	2	4 (190)	23 (1005)	19 (848)	16(717)	0 (6)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	4	5 (127)	2 (44)	1 (23)	2 (61)	0 (5)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	2	5 (244)	1 (49)	1 (35)	0 (26)	0 (6)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	0	2 (389)	5 (1260)	4 (1096)	2(613)	0(51)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	2	7 (268)	21 (847)	21 (864)	13(552)	0 (5)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	4	7 (161)	2 (47)	2 (56)	3 (66)	0 (6)	0 (0)
L1-SC4	2	4 (205)	2 (95)	2 (95)	1 (30)	0 (5)	0 (0)
<i>SF = 2 High Variab.</i>							
BYM-SC1	0	0 (118)	6 (1527)	5 (1229)	4(1063)	0(41)	0 (0)
BYM-SC2	4	19 (495)	34 (900)	33 (871)	29(754)	0 (6)	0 (0)
BYM-SC3	6	3 (56)	2 (32)	2 (37)	3 (49)	1(10)	0 (0)
BYM-SC4	3	10 (284)	2 (45)	1 (34)	1 (20)	0 (8)	0 (0)
L1-SC1	1	1 (123)	6 (520)	4 (368)	4(349)	0(10)	0 (0)
L1-SC2	4	20 (468)	36 (834)	36 (835)	30(700)	0 (6)	0 (0)
L1-SC3	7	4 (65)	4 (60)	3 (43)	3 (50)	1(10)	0 (0)
L1-SC4	4	9 (251)	1 (37)	1 (32)	1 (36)	0 (4)	0 (0)

^a Entries for both the posterior and percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.




Figure 3.7. Histograms of the ensembles of point estimates under SSEL for the schizophrenia prevalence data set under the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace models in panels (a) and (b), respectively. Smoothed empirical distributions of the five families of point estimates of interest have been superimposed.

QR-SEL functions. For this family of estimators, the percentage regrets tended to increase as the SF became larger. This somewhat counter-intuitive result, however, may be explained in terms of the comparative decrease of the posterior losses based on the optimal estimators for both the Q-SEL and QR-SEL functions. That is, although the percentage regrets associated with the GR plug-in estimators at $SF = 2.0$ was larger than the ones at $SF = 0.1$, these percentages tended to correspond to smaller fractions of the corresponding posterior losses.

3.5 Urban Distribution of Schizophrenia Cases

In this section, we consider the use of different plug-in estimators for the estimation of the quantiles and QR of a parameter ensemble for a real data set, which describes the spatial distribution of cases of schizophrenia in an urban population. This particular data set was found to be especially relevant to the problem at hand, as it is characterised by very low expected counts, thereby inducing a high level of hierarchical shrinkage.

3.5.1 Data Description

We here re-analysed prevalence data on first-onset cases of schizophrenia collected from the Southeast London study area of the Aetiology and Ethnicity in Schizophrenia and Other Psychoses (AESOP) study (Kirkbride et al., 2006). This is a large, population-based, epidemiological case-control study of first-episode psychoses conducted in Southeast London, Nottingham and Bristol. It was designed to investigate differential rates of psychoses across different cities and ethnic groups in the UK, based upon a comprehensive survey of all incident cases of first-episode psychoses. The data has been shown to be of a very high quality, and the AESOP study is the largest ever study of first episode psychoses conducted in the UK to date (see Kirkbride et al., 2006, for a detailed description of AESOP). In the analyses presented here, we solely use a subset of the AESOP data base, covering prevalence data from the Southeast London study centre only.

All individuals aged 16-64 years living in the study area having had contact with mental health services for a first episode of any probable psychosis, non-psychotic mania or bipolar disorder




Figure 3.8. Maps of point estimates denoting the RRs for schizophrenia in 33 boroughs of Southeast London. The ensembles of the MLEs, posterior means, WRSEL estimates, CB estimates, and triple-goal estimates are plotted in panels (a) to (e), respectively.

were selected. Initial inclusion criteria were broad, based upon those used in the WHO 10-country study (Jablensky et al., 1992). Ascertainment bias was minimised by incorporating a wide variety of psychiatric services into the study design. Here, cases were excluded if an address at first presentation was not obtained. The study took place over 24 months (September 1997-August 1999). Subjects who passed the screen underwent the Schedules for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry (SCAN); a modified Personal and Psychiatric History Schedule, and a schedule developed to record sociodemographic data. International Classification of Diseases (10th Edition) (ICD-10) diagnoses were made by consensus agreement from a panel of clinicians. All cases of broadly defined schizophrenia, corresponding to ICD-10 F20 to F29 diagnoses were included. Full details of the methodology used in this study have been provided by Kirkbride et al. (2006).

3.5.2 Models Used and Performance Evaluation

The expected counts in this data set ranged from 2.68 to 6.86 with a mean of 4.48 and a standard deviation of 0.91. The observed counts ranged from 0 to 17 with a mean of 4.48 and a standard deviation of 3.43. For three areas, the observed counts were null. We fitted the data with the spatial CAR Normal and Laplace models described in section 3.4.3, using the same specification for the hyperparameters as in the spatial simulation study. The BYM model considered here constituted one of the five different models utilised in the original analysis of this data set by Kirkbride et al. (2007). As before, the models were fitted using WinBUGS 1.4 (Lunn et al., 2000). Our results are based on 50,000 MCMC samples collected after discarding 10,000 burn-in realisations from the joint posterior. The ϕ_i 's used in the computation of the WRSEL plug-in estimators were here specified using $a_1 = a_2 = 0.5$, as previously done for the spatially structured simulations.

We compared the values taken by the different plug-in estimators by expressing them as departure from the value of the optimal estimator. Our strategy, here, is similar in spirit to the one used when computing the posterior regrets in equation (2.74), except that we were more specifically interested in evaluating the direction of the departure from the optimal estimate. Thus, for every loss function of interest L' , we computed

$$Q_p(\hat{\theta}^{L'}) - \mathbb{E}[Q_p(\theta)|\mathbf{y}], \quad (3.43)$$

separately for five different empirical quantiles, taking $p \in \{.05, .25, .50, .75, .95\}$. In addition, we derived the departure of the empirical QR plug-in estimators from the posterior mean empirical QR. Thus, we calculated

$$\text{QR}(\hat{\theta}^{L'}) - \mathbb{E}[\text{QR}(\theta)|\mathbf{y}], \quad (3.44)$$

for the five ensembles of point estimates under scrutiny. The RoPQ was also derived for this data set and compared to the posterior mean empirical QR in a similar fashion.

3.5.3 Results

In figure 3.7 on page 55, the ensemble distributions of the different families of point estimates have been plotted. In this figure, the histograms represent the ensembles of the posterior means under the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace models. The empirical distributions of other ensembles of point estimates have been superimposed as densities. As expected, the empirical distribution of the MLEs was found to be more dispersed than the ensemble distributions of the four other sets of point estimates. In particular, the ensemble distributions of the SSEL and WRSEL estimators were similar, and were found to be especially sensitive to hierarchical shrinkage. The ensemble distributions of the CB and GR point estimates struck a balance between the over-dispersion of the MLEs and the shrinkage of the SSEL and WRSEL ensembles. Overall, the CB and GR ensemble distributions behaved similarly, albeit the empirical distribution of the GR point estimates tended to be smoother. Changes in the modelling assumptions did not modify the behaviour of the different families of point estimates. As can be observed from panels (a) and (b) of figure 3.7, the ensemble distributions obtained under the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace priors did not markedly differ. The maps of the ensembles of point estimates evaluated in this section have also been reported in figure 3.8 on page 56, for the CAR Normal model.

A summary of the analysis conducted for this data set is provided in table 3.7 on page 58, where we report several summary statistics for the estimation of five different empirical quantiles and the empirical QR of the parameter ensembles of interest. As expected, the empirical quantiles of the MLE point estimates were over-dispersed relative to the optimal estimators under both modelling assumptions: the MLE plug-in estimates of $\theta_{(.05)}$ and $\theta_{(.25)}$ were found to be smaller than the optimal empirical quantiles, whereas the MLE plug-in estimates of $\theta_{(.75)}$ and $\theta_{(.95)}$ were found to be larger than the optimal empirical quantiles. By contrast, the ensemble of posterior means followed exactly the opposite pattern: they were under-dispersed relative to the optimal estimators due to hierarchical shrinkage. That is, the SSEL-based estimates of $\theta_{(.05)}$ and $\theta_{(.25)}$ were larger than the corresponding posterior empirical quantiles and the SSEL-based estimates of $\theta_{(.75)}$ and $\theta_{(.95)}$ were smaller than their posterior empirical counterparts. The plug-in empirical quantiles obtained under the WRSEL, CB and GR functions were more difficult to classify, but we note that the CB plug-in estimators appeared to perform best overall.

Regarding the posterior QR, table 3.7 shows that the MLE-based plug-in estimator tended to over-estimate the posterior mean of the empirical QR, whereas most other plug-in estimators were likely to under-estimate its value. The RoPQ also tended to be smaller than the posterior mean of the empirical QR. Overall, the ordering of the different plug-in estimators with respect to their departure from the optimal QR followed the ordering reported in our non-spatial and spatial simulation studies. The sole exception to this parallel was the CB-based empirical QR, which was observed to be slightly larger than the posterior mean of the empirical QR. These results were found to be robust to a change in modelling assumptions, albeit the value of the posterior mean of the empirical QR was found to be slightly smaller when using the CAR Laplace prior. Most importantly, however, one can observe that the credible intervals for the posterior empirical quantiles and the empirical QR were found to be larger under the CAR Laplace model, thereby suggesting that the estimation of these quantities was noisier for this model than for the CAR Normal.

In addition, in table 3.8 on page 59, we have reported the posterior regrets for the plug-in estimators of interest under the Q-SEL and QR-SEL. For the estimation of the empirical quantiles under Q-SEL, the ordering of the plug-in estimators in terms of percentage regrets reproduced the one found in the simulation studies. In particular, the choice of the MLEs and WRSEL plug-in estimators yielded the largest posterior regrets, whereas the triple-goal plug-in empirical quantiles were found to be quasi-optimal. For this data set, however, the SSEL plug-in empirical quantiles were found to be almost identical to the ones based on the CB ensemble. Under the QR-SEL function, the CB plug-in estimator slightly outperformed the triple-goal plug-in estimator when estimating the QR. This result should be contrasted with our synthetic data simulations, which indicated that the triple-goal plug-in QR was generally better than the CB estimator in terms of posterior regret. We note, however, that in the case of the schizophrenia prevalence data set, the

Table 3.7. Means and credible intervals (2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of posterior distributions) of the posterior empirical quantiles and posterior empirical QR for the schizophrenia prevalence data set. Values of plug-in estimators are expressed as departures from the posterior mean empirical quantiles and the posterior mean empirical QR, which are reported in the first column, as described in equations (3.43) and (3.44). For each plug-in estimator, the percentage departures from the value of the optimal estimates –i.e. posterior means– have been reported in parentheses.

<i>Models</i>	<i>Posterior Means</i>		<i>Departures from Posterior Mean^a</i>						
	Estimates (CIs)		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	RoPQ	
CAR Normal									
$\theta_{(.05)}$	0.473	(0.22–0.87)	–0.47(100)	+0.16 (35)	+0.14 (30)	–0.04 (10)	–0.07 (17)	–	
$\theta_{(.25)}$	0.714	(0.52–0.96)	–0.14 (20)	+0.10 (15)	+0.10 (14)	+0.01 (1)	+0.01 (1)	–	
$\theta_{(.50)}$	0.932	(0.77–1.10)	–0.03 (4)	+0.02 (2)	+0.00 (0)	–0.00 (0)	+0.02 (2)	–	
$\theta_{(.75)}$	1.211	(0.99–1.45)	+0.32 (27)	–0.02 (1)	–0.08 (7)	+0.11 (9)	–0.02 (2)	–	
$\theta_{(.95)}$	1.735	(1.12–2.35)	+0.51 (30)	–0.26 (15)	–0.34 (20)	+0.03 (2)	+0.05 (3)	–	
QR	1.761	(1.11–2.50)	+0.92 (52)	–0.31 (18)	–0.38 (21)	+0.06 (4)	–0.11 (6)	–0.06 (3)	
CAR Laplace									
$\theta_{(.05)}$	0.486	(0.21–0.91)	–0.48(100)	+0.16 (35)	+0.14 (30)	–0.04 (9)	–0.09 (19)	–	
$\theta_{(.25)}$	0.719	(0.52–0.97)	–0.14 (20)	+0.09 (13)	+0.08 (12)	–0.01 (2)	+0.01 (1)	–	
$\theta_{(.50)}$	0.932	(0.77–1.10)	–0.03 (4)	+0.01 (2)	+0.00 (0)	–0.01 (1)	+0.02 (2)	–	
$\theta_{(.75)}$	1.204	(0.98–1.45)	+0.33 (28)	–0.02 (2)	–0.09 (8)	+0.09 (8)	–0.02 (2)	–	
$\theta_{(.95)}$	1.726	(1.09–2.35)	+0.52 (30)	–0.27 (16)	–0.37 (22)	+0.01 (1)	+0.05 (3)	–	
QR	1.744	(1.07–2.49)	+0.94 (54)	–0.29 (17)	–0.37 (21)	+0.11 (6)	–0.11 (7)	–0.07 (4)	

^a Entries for the departures from the optimal estimates have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point, while entries for the percentage departures have been truncated to the closest integer.

Table 3.8. Posterior regrets based on QR-SEL(θ , QR($\theta^{L'}$)), and Q-SEL(\mathbf{p} , θ , $\theta_{(\mathbf{p})}^{L'}$) with $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$, for the schizophrenia prevalence data set. The posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator is given in the first column. In parentheses, posterior regrets are expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator.

<i>Models</i>		<i>Posterior regrets^a</i>					
	Post. Loss	MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR	RoPQ
Q-SEL							
CAR Normal	0.04	0.13(342)	0.01 (24)	0.15(392)	0.01 (25)	0.00(1)	--
CAR Laplace	0.04	0.13(341)	0.01 (32)	0.16(434)	0.01 (32)	0.00(1)	--
QR-SEL							
CAR Normal	0.17	0.86(498)	0.10 (55)	0.42(245)	0.00 (3)	0.01(7)	0.00(3)
CAR Laplace	0.18	0.89(492)	0.09 (47)	0.49(273)	0.01 (7)	0.01(8)	0.00(3)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point. Entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer.

small size of the parameter ensemble may have detrimentally affected the performance of the triple-goal estimator, which requires large parameter ensembles for a good estimation of the EDF. Since the data set under scrutiny only had only 33 regions, it may be speculated that this negatively affected the performance of that particular plug-in estimator. The behaviour of the remaining QR plug-in estimators appeared to be in agreement with the conclusions of our synthetic data simulations. In particular, the RoPQ was found to outperform all of its counterparts.

Overall, this re-analysis of Kirkbride et al.'s (2007) schizophrenia prevalence data set has helped to characterise the heterogeneity of the empirical distribution of the RRs for schizophrenia in the region of interest. Optimal estimation under the QR-SEL function has yielded a QR of approximately 1.7, which implies that the areas in the upper quartile of risk exhibit 70% higher risk for schizophrenia than the areas in the lower quartile of risk. This high level of heterogeneity in the empirical distribution of the RRs in this region suggests the presence of unmeasured risk factors which may account for the between-area variability.

3.6 Conclusion

One of the consistent findings of this chapter has been the good performance of the empirical quantiles and empirical QR based on the ensemble of triple-goal point estimates. The GR plug-in estimators behaved well throughout the set of simulations under both spatial and non-spatial scenarios. This can be explained in terms of the optimality criteria satisfied by the triple-goal point estimates described in section 2.4.2. The first goal that this ensemble of point estimates is optimising is the estimation of the EDF of the parameters of interest. Since both the empirical quantiles and the empirical QR are properties of the EDF, it follows that the ensembles of point estimates optimising the estimation of the EDF would also be expected to do well when estimating these empirical properties. These particular findings therefore highlight another potential benefit of choosing to report the ensemble of triple-goal point estimates when conducting research in epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. In addition, we have also noted the good performance of the RoPQ and DoPQ under the QR-SEL and IQR-SEL functions, respectively. These plug-in estimators were found to consistently outperform all other plug-in estimators in our simulation studies. It can therefore be concluded that when the posterior quartiles of a parameter ensemble have been collected, one can readily obtain a robust estimation of the dispersion of that ensemble by using either the RoPQ or the DoPQ, depending on the nature of the models investigated.

This chapter has also highlighted several limitations associated with the use of the WRSEL function for the estimation of parameter ensembles in both spatial and non-spatial models. Through the manipulation of the size of the parameter ensemble in our non-spatial simulations, we have first observed that the range of the WRSEL weights increased exponentially with the size of the parameter ensemble. Naturally, this is an aspect of the WRSEL function that would

need to be calibrated according to the specificities of the estimation problem under consideration. Moreover, we have also noted that the WRSEL plug-in estimators performed poorly under the compound Gamma model. This is due to the fact that we have specified a vector of symmetric weights on the ranks of the units in the ensemble of interest. Both of these problems can be addressed by choosing different values of the parameters a_1 and a_2 controlling the range of the WRSEL weights, despite the fact that the true empirical distribution of the parameters of interest was skewed. Asymmetric choices may therefore help to deal with skewed parameter ensembles, whereas assigning very low values to a_1 and a_2 would counterbalance the effect of a large n . However, since there does not currently exist an automated way of estimating these parameters from the properties of the data, these issues ultimately limit the applicability of the WRSEL function as an automated estimation procedure, since it necessitates a substantial amount of preliminary tuning.

A second important conclusion of this chapter is the apparent superiority of the CAR Normal over the CAR Laplace model for the estimation of both the empirical quantiles and the empirical QR of a parameter ensemble. Our spatial simulation study has shown that the utilisation of the CAR Laplace model tended to increase the posterior expected loss associated with the optimal estimators of the ensemble's quantiles and QR in comparison to the use of the CAR Normal model. The CAR Laplace also yielded larger posterior regrets when using plug-in estimators. Finally, our analysis of the schizophrenia prevalence data set showed that the posterior distributions of the empirical quantiles and empirical QR were less concentrated around their means when using the CAR Laplace model. In practice, we therefore recommend the use of the CAR Normal model when the dispersion of the RRs is of special interest. However, one should note that we used identical specifications for the variance hyperparameters for both the Normal and Laplace CAR priors, which may have contributed to the comparatively poor performance of the Laplace prior model. In particular, note that the variance parameter, τ_u^2 , for both the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace priors was given a Gamma prior, such that

$$\tau_u^2 \sim \text{Gam}(0.5, 0.0005). \quad (3.45)$$

However, identical choices of variance parameters in a Laplace and a Normal distributions do not result in identical amount of variability. While $X \sim N(0, 1)$ has a variance of 1.0, a Laplace random variate with distribution $L(0, 1)$ has a variance of 2.0. Thus, a fair comparison of the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace performances would require the use of comparative hyperprior distributions on the variance parameter of the ensemble priors, τ_u^2 .

In both the spatially-structured simulations and in the analysis of the schizophrenia prevalence data set, we have computed the Q-SEL on the scale of the RRs. That is, both the Q-SEL and the QR-SEL were computed using $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as the parameter of interest. However, one should note that, since the true empirical distribution of the RRs tends to be skewed, the estimation of low and high quantiles will not be penalised symmetrically. A possible solution to this problem is to compute the Q-SEL posterior regret on the logscale. In our notation, this may be formulated with respect to the following ensemble of plug-in estimators,

$$\widehat{\log \boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'} := \left\{ \widehat{\log \theta}_1^{L'}, \dots, \widehat{\log \theta}_n^{L'} \right\}. \quad (3.46)$$

That is, for some loss function L' , each point estimate could be computed on the basis of the joint posterior distribution of the RRs on the logscale, i.e. $p(\log \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y})$. It then follows that the corresponding optimal estimator under the Q-SEL function is the set of posterior empirical \mathbf{p} -quantiles of the ensemble of the $\log \theta_i$'s. This gives the following posterior regret,

$$\text{regret} \left(\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}, Q_{\widehat{\log \boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}}(\mathbf{p}) \right), \quad (3.47)$$

which is defined with respect to $\text{Q-SEL}_{\mathbf{p}}(\log \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ with $\mathbf{p} := \{.25, .75\}$. Note that the optimal estimator, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbb{E}[Q_{\log \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{p}) | \mathbf{y}]$ will here differ from the optimal estimator of the Q-SEL on the RR

scale, which we considered in the rest of this chapter. Thus, the estimation of the Q-SEL function is not invariant under reparametrisation and such a change of scale produces two different decision-theoretic problems, which cannot be directly compared. In practice, preference for one approach over another will be determined by the specific needs of the modeller.

The good performance of the triple-goal plug-in estimators under both the Q-SEL and QR-SEL functions indicate that this ensemble of point estimates could be useful in epidemiological practice. As highlighted in chapter 1, the choice of specific point estimates in epidemiology and most particularly in spatial epidemiology is made arduous by the wide set of desiderata that such an ensemble of point estimates should fulfil. Here, we have seen that, in addition to providing good estimation of the EDF, the ranks and the set of levels of risk; the GR point estimates also provide a good approximation of the amount of heterogeneity in the ensemble. Therefore, the triple-goal point estimates constitute a good candidate for both the mapping of area-specific levels of risks and the reporting of summary statistics about the overall risk heterogeneity in the region of interest. There are other inferential objectives, however, for which the GR point estimates are far from optimal. These limitations will be highlighted in the next chapter where we study different classification loss functions.

Chapter 4

Threshold and Rank Classification Losses

Summary

In this chapter, we study the problem of the classification of a subset of parameters in an ensemble given a particular threshold. This problem can be envisaged from two different perspectives as either (i) a rank-based classification problem or (ii) a threshold-based classification problem. In the first case, the total amount of data points that one wishes to classify is known. We are answering the question: Which are the parameters situated in the top 10% of the ensemble? By contrast, in the threshold-based classification, we are only given a particular threshold of risk, and therefore need to determine both the total number of elements above the pre-specified threshold, and the identity of these elements. We review some previous research by Lin et al. (2006), who have investigated this problem from the ranking perspective. We adopt a similar approach when one is concerned with threshold-based classification and derive the minimiser in that case. We then evaluate the corresponding optimal estimators of these two families of loss functions using spatial and non-spatial synthetic data for both weighted and unweighted classification losses. Of special interest, we find that a decision rule originally proposed by Richardson et al. (2004), in the context of spatial epidemiology, can be shown to be equivalent to the specification of a weighted threshold-based classification loss. Overall, our experimental simulations support the use of the set of posterior means as a plug-in estimator under balanced, but not necessarily under weighted, threshold-based classification. Finally, we illustrate the use of our decision-theoretic frameworks for a surveillance data set describing prevalence of MRSA in UK hospitals. The good performance of the SSEL point estimates on both types of classification paradigms indicate that this may be a good choice of classifiers in practice when one wishes to deprecate the occurrence of false alarms.

4.1 Introduction

The problem of the optimal classification of a set of data points into several clusters has occupied statisticians and applied mathematicians for several decades (see Gordon, 1999, for a review). As is true for all statistical methods, a classification is, above all, a summary of the data at hand. When clustering, the statistician is searching for an optimal partition of the parameter space into a –generally, known or pre-specified– number of classes. The essential ingredient underlying all classifications is the minimisation of some distance function, which generally takes the form of a similarity or dissimilarity metric (Gordon, 1999). Optimal classification will then result from a trade-off between the level of similarity of the within-cluster elements and the level of dissimilarity of the between-cluster elements. In a decision-theoretic framework, such distance functions naturally arise through the specification of a loss function for the problem at hand.




Figure 4.1. Posterior probability that parameter θ is larger than a given threshold C_α , which is here $\mathbb{P}[\theta > C_\alpha|\mathbf{y}]$. In the framework proposed by Richardson et al. (2004), the element in the ensemble corresponding to parameter θ is considered to be greater than C_α if $\mathbb{P}[\theta > C_\alpha|\mathbf{y}] > \alpha$, for some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

The task of computing the optimal partition of the parameter space then becomes a matter of minimising the chosen loss function.

In spatial epidemiology, the issue of classifying areas according to their levels of risk has been previously investigated by Richardson et al. (2004). These authors have shown that areas can be classified according to the joint posterior distribution of the parameter ensemble of interest. In particular, a taxonomy can be created by selecting a decision rule $D(\alpha, C_\alpha)$ for that purpose, where C_α is a particular threshold, above and below which we wish to classify the areas in the region of interest. The parameter α , in this decision rule, is the cut-off point associated with C_α , which determines the amount of probability mass necessary for an area to be allocated to the above-threshold category. Thus, an area i with level of risk denoted by θ_i will be assigned above the threshold C_α if $\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C_\alpha|\mathbf{y}] > \alpha$. Richardson et al. (2004) have therefore provided a general framework for the classification of areas, according to their levels of risk. This research has attracted a lot of interest in the spatial epidemiological literature, and has been applied to a wide range of epidemiological settings, including healthcare use in France (Chaix et al., 2005), disparities in the prevalence of psychotic disorders in London (Kirkbride et al., 2007), as well as the study of the prevalence of bladder cancer (Lopez-Abente et al., 2006) and breast cancer (Pollan et al., 2007), in Spain.

Central to the decision framework proposed by Richardson et al. (2004) is the choice of C_α and α . We have illustrated this general classification problem in figure 4.1 on page 63. From this figure, it is clear that the choice of the risk threshold C_α , apart from its dependence on α , is otherwise arbitrary. Therefore, C_α may be chosen on the basis of previous research, and will ultimately depend on the subjective evaluation of the spatial epidemiologists or applied statisticians working on that particular classification problem. This decision will generally be informed by previous epidemiological studies of identical or comparable risk surfaces. The choice of α , however, is statistically problematic in the sense that its value will directly determine the sensitivity and the specificity of the classification procedure. In selecting a value for α , one is faced with issues which are reminiscent of the ones encountered by a statistician of a frequentist persuasion when deciding which level of significance to adopt.

Moreover, it should be noted that, in order to obtain good discrimination using their classification procedure, Richardson et al. (2004) made use of a value of C_α substantially different from the desired threshold. (That is, different statistical models were given different decision rules with different associated C_α .) This is another undesirable consequence of the use of a particular cut-off point α for optimal classification: it requires the choice of a threshold, which usually differs from the true threshold of interest. We may, for instance, have a target threshold, which we will denote by C and a decision rule $D(C_\alpha, \alpha)$ with $C_\alpha \neq C$. This particular dependence on α justifies our choice of notation, as we have indexed the threshold C_α in order to emphasise that its value may vary for different choices of α . Richardson et al. (2004) therefore adopted different decision rules for different models, depending on the spread of the ensemble distribution estimated by these different models. They studied the BYM model and the spatial mixture (MIX) model, introduced by Green and Richardson (2002), and chose $D_{\text{BYM}}(1.0, 0.8)$ and $D_{\text{MIX}}(1.5, 0.05)$, respectively, as decision rules for these two models, in order to produce a classification of areas into two clusters:

non-elevated and elevated risk areas. In this chapter, we will address the two main quandaries associated with the classification method proposed by Richardson et al. (2004), which are (i) the dependence of C_α in $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ on the choice of α , and (ii) the dependence of the entire decision rule on the choice of model. It should be noted that these limitations were discussed by Richardson et al. (2004), who emphasised the difficulties associated with the “*calibration*” of these decision rules, when considering different models, and in particular with the use of the MIX model.

Our approach to this classification question in spatial epidemiology will draw extensively from the work of Lin et al. (2006), who investigated rank-based classification problems in BHM. Although this perspective on the classification of a subset of elements in an ensemble substantially differs from the problem at hand, we will see that one can easily introduce similar loss families in the context of *threshold-based classification* –that is, classification based on a particular cut-off point expressed on the scale of the parameters of interest, as opposed to Lin et al.’s (2006) *rank-based classification* problems, where we are given a proportion (e.g. top 20%) of elements in the ensemble, which we need to identify. Despite the inherent similarities between rank-based and threshold-based classifications, we will see that the optimal minimisers of these losses are substantially different. Moreover, experimentation with simulated data will show that different plug-in estimators are quasi-optimal under these two decision-theoretic paradigms. One of the clear advantages of our proposed classification framework is that it does not require any calibration, as the resulting estimates are optimal for a specific choice of threshold C , and thus do not necessitate any subsequent tuning from the epidemiologist or applied statistician conducting the classification.

The chapter is organised as follows. In section 4.2, we introduce both the threshold-based and rank-based classification frameworks, and describe their respective optimal estimators. In section 4.3, we illustrate the use of these techniques with a non-spatial set of synthetic simulations. In section 4.4, the performance of the plug-in estimators of interest is evaluated within the context of a spatially structured set of data simulations. In section 4.5, these methods are illustrated with a real data set describing MRSA prevalence in UK hospitals. Finally, we close the chapter by discussing the broader implications of these results for epidemiologists and spatial epidemiologists under the light of Bayesian decision theory, especially with respect to the choice of a particular set of point estimates for a given set of data.

4.2 Classification Losses

In this section, we present our general decision-theoretic framework for the classification of elements of a parameter ensemble above or below a given threshold. We also introduce the rank-based classification framework introduced by Lin et al. (2006). For both types of classification schemes, we will consider possible plug-in estimators that can be used in the place of the optimal estimators for these particular loss functions. Some links with the concepts of posterior sensitivity and specificity will also be described for both families of loss functions.

4.2.1 Threshold Classification Loss

We first describe our proposed family of loss functions, following the same structure advanced by Lin et al. (2006). Here, we are given a particular cut-off point C . The loss associated with misclassification either above or below the threshold of interest will be formulated as follows. Following standard statistical terminology, we will express such misclassifications in terms of false positives (FPs) and false negatives (FNs). These concepts are formally described as

$$\text{FP}(C, \theta, \delta) := \mathcal{I} \{ \theta \leq C, \delta > C \}, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\text{FN}(C, \theta, \delta) := \mathcal{I} \{ \theta > C, \delta \leq C \}, \quad (4.2)$$

which correspond to the occurrence of a false positive misclassification (type I error) and a false negative misclassification (type II error), respectively. In equation (4.1), our decision –denoted δ – is above threshold, whereas the true value of the parameter –denoted θ – is below threshold, and the reverse situation can be observed in equation (4.2).

For the decision problem to be fully specified, we need to choose a loss function based on the sets of unit-specific FPs and FNs. We here assume that $C \in \mathbb{R}$ if the parameters of interest are real numbers, or $C \in \mathbb{R}^+$ if the parameters of interest are strictly positive such as when considering RRs in the context of spatial epidemiology. Following the decision framework introduced by Lin et al. (2006), we therefore formalise this problem using the threshold classification loss (TCL), defined as follows. We first introduce the weighted version of the TCL function, and will then specialise our definition to the case of unweighted threshold classification. Let $0 \leq p \leq 1$. The p -weighted threshold classification loss (TCL $_p$) function is then defined as

$$\text{TCL}_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n p \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) + (1-p) \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i). \quad (4.3)$$

One of the advantages of the choice of TCL $_p$ for quantifying the misclassifications of the elements of a parameter ensemble is that it is normalised, in the sense that $\text{TCL}_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \in [0, 1]$ for any choice of C and p . Moreover, TCL $_p$ attains zero if the classification of each element is correct and 1.0 if none of the elements are correctly classified. As was previously done for the loss families described in the preceding chapters, we will drop references to the arguments $(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ controlling $\text{TCL}_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, when their specification is obvious from the context. Our main result, in this section, is the following minimisation.

Proposition 1. *For some parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and given a real-valued threshold $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, we have the following optimal estimator under weighted TCL,*

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(1-p)}^{\text{TCL}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [\text{TCL}_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}], \quad (4.4)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(1-p)}^{\text{TCL}}$ is the vector of posterior $(1-p)$ -quantiles defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(1-p)}^{\text{TCL}} := \{Q_{\theta_1 | \mathbf{y}}(1-p), \dots, Q_{\theta_n | \mathbf{y}}(1-p)\}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $Q_{\theta_i | \mathbf{y}}(1-p)$ denotes the posterior $(1-p)$ -quantile of the i^{th} element, θ_i , in the parameter ensemble. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(1-p)}^{\text{TCL}}$ is not unique. That is, there exists more than one minimiser in equation (4.4).

In our notation, we have emphasised the distinction between the *posterior empirical quantile* of the ensemble and the individual *posterior quantiles*, as follows. In chapter 3, the posterior quantile of the empirical distribution of the θ_i 's was denoted $\mathbb{E}[Q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(p) | \mathbf{y}]$. This quantity minimises the posterior expected Q-SEL function for some given p . By contrast, in this chapter, we are interested in the *posterior quantile* of a single θ_i , which we have denoted by $Q_{\theta_i | \mathbf{y}}(p)$ in proposition 1, and which is formally defined as

$$Q_{\theta_i | \mathbf{y}}(p) := \inf \{x \in \Theta_i : F_{\theta_i | \mathbf{y}}(x) \geq p\}, \quad (4.6)$$

where Θ_i is the domain of θ_i . The proof of proposition 1 makes use of a strategy similar to the one reported by Berger (1980), who showed that the posterior median is the optimal estimator under AVL, as reported in section 2.1.3. We prove the result by exhaustion in three cases. The full proof is reported in section 4.7, at the end of this chapter. Note that the fact that TCL $_p$ is minimised by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(1-p)}^{\text{TCL}}$ and not $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(p)}^{\text{TCL}}$ is solely a consequence of our choice of definition for the TCL function. If the weighting of the FPs and FNs had been $(1-p)$ and p , respectively, then the optimal minimiser of that function would indeed be a vector of posterior p -quantiles.

We now specialise this result to the unweighted TCL family, which is defined analogously to

equation (4.3), as follows,

$$\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) + \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i). \quad (4.7)$$

The minimiser of this loss function can be shown to be trivially equivalent to the minimiser of $\text{TCL}_{0.5}$. The following corollary of proposition 1 formalises this relationship between the weighted and unweighted TCL.

Corollary 1. *For some parameter ensemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{MED}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}], \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{MED}} := \boldsymbol{\theta}_{(0.5)}^{\text{TCL}} = \{Q_{\theta_1 | \mathbf{y}}(0.5), \dots, Q_{\theta_n | \mathbf{y}}(0.5)\}, \quad (4.9)$$

is the vector of posterior medians, and this optimal estimator is not unique.

As noted earlier, this corollary immediately follows from proposition 1 by noting that

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}] = \underset{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [\text{TCL}_{0.5}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}], \quad (4.10)$$

for every C . Note that although both the classical AVL loss described in section 2.1.3 and the unweighted TCL presented here have identical minimisers, the relationship between these two estimation schemes is not trivial. Indeed, the former is a problem of estimation, whereas the latter is a problem of classification. However, it can be noted that for both the AVL and the TCL functions, these estimators are not unique.

Our main focus in this chapter will be on the unweighted TCL, except in section 4.4.3, where we consider the relationship between the decision rule originally proposed by Richardson et al. (2004) and the weighted TCL. We also supplement this discussion with a set of simulations evaluating the performance of plug-in estimators under weighted TCL. The rest of this chapter, however, will focus on the unweighted TCL, and except otherwise specified, the TCL function will therefore refer to the unweighted version presented in equation (4.7).

A graphical interpretation of the posterior TCL is illustrated in figure 4.2 on page 67. The posterior expected loss under this function takes the following form,

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^C d\mathbb{P}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}] \mathcal{I} \{\delta_i > C\} + \int_C^{+\infty} d\mathbb{P}[\theta_i | \mathbf{y}] \mathcal{I} \{\delta_i \leq C\}, \quad (4.11)$$

whose formulae is derived using $\mathcal{I} \{\theta \leq C, \delta > C\} = \mathcal{I} \{\theta \leq C\} \mathcal{I} \{\delta > C\}$. It is of special importance to note that when using the posterior TCL, any classification –correct or incorrect– will incur a penalty. The *size* of that penalty, however, varies substantially depending on whether or not the classification is correct. A true positive, as in diagram (a) in figure 4.2, can be distinguished from a false positive, as in diagram (c), by the fact that the former will only incur a small penalty proportional to the posterior probability of the parameter to be below the chosen cut-off point C . By contrast, a false positive, as in panel (c), will necessarily incur a larger penalty, because more mass is located below the threshold than above the threshold. We can make similar observations when comparing diagrams (b) and (d). In addition, note that although the TCL attains zero when the classification of each element in the ensemble is correct, this is not the case for the posterior expected TCL, which is necessarily greater than zero. Moreover, this representation also clarifies the arguments used in the proof of proposition 1, and provides an intuitive justification for the use of the median as an optimal estimator under unweighted TCL.




Figure 4.2. Illustration of the components of the posterior expected TCL based on the posterior distribution of θ_i . The choice of a point estimate δ_i for the quantity θ_i results in either a correct classification (a-b) or a misclassification (c-d), with (a) and (c) representing $\mathbb{E}[\text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i)|\mathbf{y}]$ and (b) and (d) denoting $\mathbb{E}[\text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i)|\mathbf{y}]$.

4.2.2 Rank Classification Loss

We here briefly present a different family of classification loss functions based on ranks, which was originally introduced by Lin et al. (2006). In this chapter, we will be interested in evaluating the performance of various plug-in estimators for rank-based classification.

Lin et al. (2006) were concerned with the identification of the elements of a parameter ensemble that represent the proportion of elements with the highest level of risk. In an epidemiological setting, one may, for instance, wish to estimate the ten percent of hospitals that have the highest RRs for a particular condition. Such a classification is therefore based on a particular rank percentile cut-off denoted $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, which determines a group of areas of high-risk. That is, we wish to identify the areas whose percentile rank is above the cut-off point γ . Specific false positive and false negative functions dependent on the percentile ranks of the parameter ensemble can be defined following the convention introduced in equations (4.1) and (4.2). This gives

$$\text{FP}(\gamma, P, \delta) := \mathcal{I}\{P \leq \gamma, \delta > \gamma\}, \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$\text{FN}(\gamma, P, \delta) := \mathcal{I}\{P > \gamma, \delta \leq \gamma\}, \quad (4.13)$$

where the percentile rank, P , is a function of the ranks of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, as formally defined in equation 2.41. In this chapter, the word percentile will refer to rank percentile, except specified otherwise. Note that we have not made an explicit notational distinction between threshold-based FP and FN functions and their equivalent in a percentile rank-based setting. However, which one we are referring to should be obvious from the context. Of particular interest to our development and related to these families of loss functions is the following unweighted rank classification loss (RCL) function,

$$\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(\gamma, P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta_i) + \text{FN}(\gamma, P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta_i), \quad (4.14)$$

which is the rank-based analog of the unweighted TCL described in equation (4.7). Lin et al. (2006) showed that the RCL function is minimised by the following estimator. We report this result here and refer the reader to the original paper for a proof.

Proposition 2 (Lin et al., 2006). *For any $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, the set of percentile ranks $\widehat{\mathbf{P}} = \{\widehat{P}_1, \dots, \widehat{P}_n\}$, whose elements are defined as*

$$\widehat{P}_i := \frac{1}{(n+1)} R_i \left(\mathbb{P}[P_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \gamma | \mathbf{y}], \dots, \mathbb{P}[P_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \gamma | \mathbf{y}] \right), \quad (4.15)$$

satisfies

$$\widehat{\mathbf{P}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) | \mathbf{y}]. \quad (4.16)$$

Moreover, the minimiser $\widehat{\mathbf{P}}$ is not unique.

Associated with the optimal classifier $\widehat{\mathbf{P}}$, one can also derive the optimal rank $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$. In order to gain a greater understanding of the mechanisms underlying the computation of this optimal minimiser, one can expand the formulae in equation (4.15), using the definition of rank in equation (2.40) on page 21, in order to obtain the following,

$$\widehat{P}_i = \frac{1}{(n+1)} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{I} \left\{ \mathbb{P}[P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \gamma | \mathbf{y}] \geq \mathbb{P}[P_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \gamma | \mathbf{y}] \right\}, \quad (4.17)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. It can be seen from this expansion that the percentiles, which will optimally classify the areas above a certain threshold, are the percentiles of the posterior probabilities of the true percentiles being above the γ cut-off. We have already encountered this method of *double ranking* when introducing the triple-goal estimator of Shen and Louis (1998). Proposition 2 also

states that the minimiser \hat{P}_i is not unique. This follows from the fact that the percentile ranks on each side of γ form two subsets and the elements in these subsets can be permuted while maintaining the optimality of the resulting percentile ranks. This non-uniqueness is especially illustrated by the asymptotic equivalence between the minimiser $\hat{\mathbf{P}}(\gamma|\mathbf{y})$ and another popular classifier in the literature: the Normand’s estimator (see Normand et al., 1997).

Albeit the TCL and RCL functions have a similar structure, they nonetheless differ in two important ways. Firstly, the RCL can be simplified due to the symmetry between the FPs and FNs, while no such symmetry can be employed to simplify the formulation of the TCL function. From equation (4.14), the RCL can be simplified as follows,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(\gamma, P_i, \delta_i) + \text{FN}(\gamma, P_i, \delta_i) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(\gamma, P_i, \delta_i), \quad (4.18)$$

where we have used the relation,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(\gamma, P_i, \delta_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FN}(\gamma, P_i, \delta_i), \quad (4.19)$$

which follows from the fact that any number of FPs in the context of rank classification is necessarily compensated by an identical number of FNs. By contrast, the equivalent relationship does not hold for TCL. That is, the quantities

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i), \quad (4.20)$$

need not be equal. This follows from the fact that the total number of data points that should be classified above a particular threshold C is unknown when evaluating the TCL function. However, this is not the case for the RCL function, where we know *a priori* the total number of percentiles, which should be classified above the target percentile of interest, γ . That is, the RCL function is optimised with respect to a vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, whose ‘size’ is a known quantity –where, by size, we mean the total number of δ_i ’s above γ . By contrast, for TCL, one cannot derive the number of elements in the latent categories. Thus, both the allocation vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, and the total number of elements above C are unknown. In this sense, the minimisation procedure for the TCL function is therefore more arduous than the optimisation of the RCL function.

4.2.3 Posterior Sensitivity and Specificity

Our chosen decision-theoretic framework for classification has the added benefit of being readily comparable to conventional measures of classification errors widely used in the context of test theory. For our purpose, we will define the Bayesian sensitivity of a classification estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, also referred to as the posterior true positive rate (TPR), as follows

$$\text{TPR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{TP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) | \mathbf{y}]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C | \mathbf{y}]}, \quad (4.21)$$

where the expectations are taken with respect to the joint posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Similarly, the Bayesian specificity, or posterior true negative rate (TNR), will be defined as

$$\text{TNR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{TN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) | \mathbf{y}]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C | \mathbf{y}]}, \quad (4.22)$$

where in both definitions, we have used $\text{TP}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) := \mathcal{I}\{\theta_i > C, \delta_i > C\}$ and $\text{TN}(C, \theta_i, \delta_i) := \mathcal{I}\{\theta_i \leq C, \delta_i \leq C\}$. It then follows that we can formulate the relationship between the posterior

expected TCL and the Bayesian sensitivity and specificity as

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{1}{n} \text{FPR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] + \frac{1}{n} \text{FNR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}].$$

where $\text{FPR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := 1 - \text{TNR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ and $\text{FNR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := 1 - \text{TPR}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$.

In the RCL framework, the definitions of the TPR and TNR in equations (4.21) and (4.22) can be adapted to the context of percentile rank-based classification in the following manner:

$$\text{TPR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{TP}(\gamma, P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \delta_i)|\mathbf{y}]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > \gamma|\mathbf{y}]}, \quad (4.23)$$

and analogously for $\text{TNR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$. One can easily derive the relationship between the posterior RCL and the percentile rank-based definitions of Bayesian sensitivity and specificity. These are

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{2}{n} \text{FNR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > \gamma|\mathbf{y}], \quad (4.24)$$

where $\text{FNR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := 1 - \text{TPR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, and equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{2}{n} \text{FPR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[P_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \gamma|\mathbf{y}], \quad (4.25)$$

with $\text{FPR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := 1 - \text{TNR}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, which follows from equation (4.18) on page 69.

4.2.4 Performance Evaluation

The posterior regret will be used to compare the optimal classifiers under the TCL and RCL functions with different plug-in classifiers, denoted $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})$, for some loss function of interest L' . The posterior regret was introduced in section 2.5. For the unweighted TCL, this quantity takes the following form,

$$\text{regret}(\text{TCL}, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) = \mathbb{E}[\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))|\mathbf{y}] - \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}], \quad (4.26)$$

where here $h(\cdot)$ is simply the identity function returning the original vector of point estimates, and the optimal estimator under TCL is the vector of posterior medians of the parameter ensemble of interest. Similarly, the posterior regret under RCL takes the following form,

$$\text{regret}(\text{RCL}, h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})) = \mathbb{E}[\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))|\mathbf{y}] - \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbb{E}[\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}], \quad (4.27)$$

where $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$ is a multivariate percentile rank function returning the vector of percentile rank corresponding to the ensemble of point estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$, and the optimal estimator under the RCL is the minimiser reported in proposition 2. In this chapter, we will be interested in comparing the optimal estimators under the TCL and RCL functions with different plug-in estimators based on various ensembles of point estimates including the set of MLEs, the posterior means and the WRSEL, CB and GR ensembles, as described in chapter 2.

Computationally, the posterior regrets of the TCL and RCL functions for several plug-in estimators can be calculated at a lesser cost by noting that both functions simply require the computation of the vector of penalties for misclassification once. Consider the posterior TCL first. Let us denote the allocation vector for some classification estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$ above and below the chosen threshold C by

$$\mathbf{z}_C^{\geq}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}) := \left\{ \mathcal{I}\{\hat{\theta}_1^{L'} > C\}, \dots, \mathcal{I}\{\hat{\theta}_n^{L'} > C\} \right\}, \quad (4.28)$$

and \mathbf{z}_C^{\leq} , respectively. In addition, we define the following vector of posterior probabilities,

$$\mathbf{p}_C^{\geq}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \{\mathbb{P}[\theta_1 > C|\mathbf{y}], \dots, \mathbb{P}[\theta_n > C|\mathbf{y}]\}, \quad (4.29)$$

with \mathbf{p}_C^{\leq} being defined similarly for the n -dimensional vector of posterior probabilities of each θ_i being below C . Then, the posterior TCL used as a criterion for evaluation in this section can simply be computed as

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{TCL}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{z}_C^{\leq}, \mathbf{p}_C^{\geq} \rangle + \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{z}_C^{\geq}, \mathbf{p}_C^{\leq} \rangle, \quad (4.30)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ stands for the dot product. It is therefore sufficient to compute the vectors of penalties $-\mathbf{p}_C^{\geq}$ and \mathbf{p}_C^{\leq} once and then apply it to any vector of plug-in classifiers, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}$. This formulae has also the added advantage of providing some insights into the generating process of the threshold-based loss quantities. Equation (4.30) shows that the posterior TCL is the sum of two dot products, where the allocations of the elements and posterior probabilities of these elements being above or below a threshold have been inverted. An equivalent computational formulae can be derived for the posterior expected RCL. For the percentile rank-based performance, we evaluated the percentile-based classifiers, denoted $\mathbf{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}) := \{P_1(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}), \dots, P_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'})\}$, using the following simplified Bayesian expected loss,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{RCL}(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{L'}))|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{2}{n} \langle \mathbf{z}_\gamma^{\leq}, \mathbf{p}_\gamma^{\geq} \rangle = \frac{2}{n} \langle \mathbf{z}_\gamma^{\geq}, \mathbf{p}_\gamma^{\leq} \rangle, \quad (4.31)$$

which can be derived from an application of equation (4.18), and where we have defined \mathbf{z}_γ^{\leq} , \mathbf{z}_γ^{\geq} , \mathbf{p}_γ^{\leq} and \mathbf{p}_γ^{\geq} , following the convention introduced in equations (4.28) and (4.29), respectively.

For all simulated scenarios and replicate data sets in the sequel, when considering the performance of plug-in estimators under TCL, we fixed the threshold C to the following value,

$$C := \bar{\theta} + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (4.32)$$

with $\bar{\theta} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i$ being the true ensemble mean, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes the true ensemble distribution. That is, we evaluated the ability of the target plug-in estimators to determine which elements in the parameter ensemble should be classified as farther than one standard deviation from the true empirical mean. For the RCL, we fixed $\gamma = .80$ for all scenarios and replicates, which corresponded to the identification of the top 20% of ensemble's elements taking the largest values. These conventions for the TCL and RCL functions were applied to both the non-spatial and spatial simulation experiments.

4.3 Non-spatial Data Simulations

The full description of the synthetic data sets used in this simulation experiment have been fully described in chapter 3. We are here concerned with two BHMs: (i) the compound Gaussian and (ii) compound Gamma models. In the next section, we briefly describe which parameters will be the object of the classification scheme in each model family and recall the two main factors, which were manipulated in these simulations.

4.3.1 Parameter Ensembles and Experimental Factors

Our choice of simulation models and the specific values given to the hyperparameters parallel the first part of the simulation design conducted by Shen and Louis (1998). As in chapter 3, the same models were used to generate and to fit the data. The parameter ensembles, denoted $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, in both the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models were classified according to the threshold

Table 4.1. Posterior regrets based on $TCL(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, with $C = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] + \text{sd}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]$, for five plug-in estimators for the conjugate Gaussian model in equation (2.20) and the conjugate Gamma model in equation (2.21), and for 3 different levels of RLS, and 3 different values of n , averaged over 100 replicate data sets. The posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator is given in the first column. Entries are scaled by a factor of 10^3 . The posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator is indicated in parentheses.

Scenarios	TCL	Posterior regrets ^a				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
RLS $\doteq 1$						
N-N, $n = 100$	133.6	49.9 (37)	0.0(0)	16.6 (12)	13.3 (10)	13.3 (10)
N-N, $n = 200$	133.1	49.1 (37)	0.0(0)	69.7 (52)	13.2 (10)	13.8 (10)
N-N, $n = 1000$	133.2	48.8 (37)	0.0(0)	167.3(126)	13.9 (10)	14.1 (11)
G-IG, $n = 100$	109.7	74.0 (67)	3.5(3)	35.9 (33)	37.3 (34)	31.2 (28)
G-IG, $n = 200$	102.4	72.1 (70)	2.9(3)	100.8 (98)	33.7 (33)	32.1 (31)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	99.1	72.4 (73)	2.6(3)	268.0(270)	29.4 (30)	33.3 (34)
RLS $\doteq 20$						
N-N, $n = 100$	127.9	61.3 (48)	0.0(0)	15.0 (12)	15.2 (12)	17.2 (13)
N-N, $n = 200$	131.4	59.5 (45)	0.0(0)	63.4 (48)	14.3 (11)	18.8 (14)
N-N, $n = 1000$	128.5	59.5 (46)	0.0(0)	173.0(135)	14.1 (11)	18.7 (15)
G-IG, $n = 100$	102.9	68.2 (66)	2.3(2)	28.6 (28)	30.1 (29)	30.1 (29)
G-IG, $n = 200$	100.4	67.7 (67)	2.5(3)	94.6 (94)	28.1 (28)	31.5 (31)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	93.9	69.0 (73)	2.2(2)	276.2(294)	25.0 (27)	31.8 (34)
RLS $\doteq 100$						
N-N, $n = 100$	122.8	70.5 (57)	0.0(0)	12.6 (10)	14.9 (12)	23.4 (19)
N-N, $n = 200$	123.3	68.4 (56)	0.0(0)	53.6 (43)	15.2 (12)	23.3 (19)
N-N, $n = 1000$	123.4	70.6 (57)	0.0(0)	174.1(141)	14.6 (12)	24.3 (20)
G-IG, $n = 100$	99.2	62.8 (63)	2.5(3)	24.1 (24)	25.4 (26)	29.9 (30)
G-IG, $n = 200$	93.5	64.4 (69)	1.9(2)	78.8 (84)	23.5 (25)	30.9 (33)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	93.2	63.3 (68)	2.0(2)	314.9(338)	21.7 (23)	32.1 (34)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

described in equation (4.32). This choice of classification threshold resulted in approximately 16% and 10% of the ensemble distribution being above C for the Normal-Normal and Gamma-Inverse Gamma models, respectively. This choice of C therefore produced a proportion of above-threshold ensemble elements of the same order of magnitude as the one used for the evaluation of the posterior expected RCL, which was $\gamma = .80$. As in chapter 3, we manipulated the ratio of the largest to the smallest (RLS) sampling variances in both models. In addition, we also considered the effect of an increase of the size of the parameter ensemble on the posterior expected TCL and RCL functions. The plug-in estimators of interest were the classifiers constructed on the basis of the ensemble of MLEs, posterior means, as well as the WRSEL, CB and GR plug-in classifiers.

4.3.2 Plug-in Estimators under TCL

The results of these simulations for the TCL function are summarised in table 4.1 on page 72. As in chapter 3, we have reported these results in terms of both absolute and percentage posterior regrets. The percentage regret expresses the posterior regret of a particular plug-in estimator as a proportion of the posterior expected TCL under the optimal estimator, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{MED}}$.

Overall, the ensemble of posterior means exhibited the best performance over all simulation scenarios considered. The SSEL plug-in classifiers was found to be substantially better than all the other plug-in estimators in terms of posterior regrets. Moreover, since the set of optimal classifiers under the TCL function is the ensemble of posterior medians, the performance of the ensemble of posterior means was found to be no different from the one of the optimal classifiers under the compound Gaussian model. The performance of the SSEL plug-in estimators also approached optimality under the compound Gamma BHM, with its percentage posterior regret not exceeding 3%. Of the remaining four plug-in classifiers, the CB and GR ensembles of point estimates performed best. The performance of these two ensembles of point estimates was approximately

Table 4.2. Posterior regrets based on $RCL(\gamma, \theta, \delta)$, with $\gamma := .80$, for five plug-in estimators, for the conjugate Gaussian model in equation (2.20) and the conjugate Gamma model in equation (2.21), and for 3 different levels of RLS, and 3 different values of n , averaged over 100 replicate data sets. The posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator is given in the first column. Entries are scaled by a factor of 10^3 . The posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator is indicated in parentheses.

Scenarios	Posterior regrets ^a					
	RCL	MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
RLS \doteq 1						
N-N, $n = 100$	173.01	0.09 (0)	0.03 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.03 (0)	0.05 (0)
N-N, $n = 200$	172.53	0.10 (0)	0.04 (0)	0.15 (0)	0.04 (0)	0.04 (0)
N-N, $n = 1000$	172.19	0.08 (0)	0.03 (0)	1.41 (1)	0.03 (0)	0.04 (0)
G-IG, $n = 100$	221.72	0.11 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.11 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.04 (0)
G-IG, $n = 200$	221.60	0.11 (0)	0.05 (0)	0.16 (0)	0.05 (0)	0.04 (0)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	221.21	0.12 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.89 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.05 (0)
RLS \doteq 20						
N-N, $n = 100$	169.13	9.64 (6)	0.91 (1)	0.18 (0)	0.91 (1)	2.10 (1)
N-N, $n = 200$	172.33	9.07 (5)	0.76 (0)	0.77 (0)	0.76 (0)	2.05 (1)
N-N, $n = 1000$	169.80	8.91 (5)	0.79 (0)	9.88 (6)	0.79 (0)	2.04 (1)
G-IG, $n = 100$	216.42	2.60 (1)	0.08 (0)	0.15 (0)	0.08 (0)	0.20 (0)
G-IG, $n = 200$	215.70	2.03 (1)	0.06 (0)	0.26 (0)	0.06 (0)	0.22 (0)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	215.53	2.08 (1)	0.05 (0)	2.04 (1)	0.05 (0)	0.22 (0)
RLS \doteq 100						
N-N, $n = 100$	169.24	20.68(12)	1.95 (1)	0.39 (0)	1.95 (1)	4.24 (3)
N-N, $n = 200$	167.74	19.83(12)	1.93 (1)	1.77 (1)	1.93 (1)	3.96 (2)
N-N, $n = 1000$	167.94	19.53(12)	2.20 (1)	16.47(10)	2.20 (1)	4.76 (3)
G-IG, $n = 100$	209.71	4.07 (2)	0.08 (0)	0.22 (0)	0.08 (0)	0.58 (0)
G-IG, $n = 200$	212.23	3.39 (2)	0.11 (0)	0.68 (0)	0.11 (0)	0.71 (0)
G-IG, $n = 1000$	210.66	3.08 (1)	0.11 (0)	6.81 (3)	0.11 (0)	0.69 (0)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

equivalent over the range of scenarios studied. However, some differences are nonetheless notable. The CB plug-in classifiers tended to exhibit a better performance than the triple-goal classifiers under the compound Gaussian model. This superiority of the CB plug-in estimator over the GR one was accentuated by an increase in RLS. This trend was also true under the compound Gamma model, for which the CB plug-in classifiers modestly outperformed the triple-goal estimator.

The WRSEL and MLE plug-in classifiers exhibited the worst performance. Although the WRSEL plug-in classifier tended to outperform the MLE-based one for small parameter ensembles, the posterior regret of the WRSEL rapidly increased with n . The poor performance of the WRSEL plug-in estimator can here be explained using the same arguments that we have discussed in section 3.3.5 on page 38. The effect of the vector of weights in the WRSEL function is indeed highly sensitive to the size of the parameter ensemble, as was described in equation (3.27) and can be observed from figure 3.1. In addition, increasing the size of the parameter ensemble resulted in a modest reduction of the posterior expected TCL under the optimal estimator for the compound Gamma model, but not for the compound Gaussian model. Among the plug-in estimators, only the CB classifier benefited from an increase in n , and this improvement was restricted to the compound Gamma model. For all other plug-in estimators, no systematic effect of the size of the parameter ensemble could be identified. We now turn to the RCL simulation results, which are characterised by a different ordering of the plug-in classifiers.

4.3.3 Plug-in Estimators under RCL

Table 4.2 on page 73 documents the performance of the different classifiers under posterior expected RCL. Overall, all estimators performed well with posterior regrets typically within a few percentage points of the optimal estimator. The ensemble of posterior means and the CB plug-in classifier performed slightly better than the other plug-in estimators considered. In fact, these two families

of classifiers exhibited identical performances on all the simulation scenarios. (This can be observed by comparing columns 2 and 8 of table 4.2 on page 73). This is due to the fact that the CB plug-in estimator is simply a monotonic function of the posterior means, which preserves the ranking of this ensemble of point estimates. That is, from equation (2.53) in chapter 2, the CB point estimates are defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_i^{\text{CB}} := \omega \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} + (1 - \omega) \bar{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}}, \quad (4.33)$$

and therefore it follows that

$$R_i(\hat{\theta}^{\text{SSEL}}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{I} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{SSEL}} \geq \hat{\theta}_j^{\text{SSEL}} \right\} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{I} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_i^{\text{CB}} \geq \hat{\theta}_j^{\text{CB}} \right\} = R_i(\hat{\theta}^{\text{CB}}), \quad (4.34)$$

which accounts for the identical posterior regrets of these two plug-in estimators in table 4.2. The GR plug-in classifiers exhibited the third best percentage regret performance after the SSEL and CB estimators. This is somewhat surprising since the ranks of the GR point estimates are explicitly optimised as part of the triple-goal procedure. However, this optimisation of the ranks is conditional upon the optimisation of the EDF of the parameter ensemble, and therefore the GR point estimates are only expected to produce quasi-optimal ranks. The WRSEL plug-in classifier tended to outperform the MLE one, although the latter appeared to do better for RLS $\doteq 1$.

Manipulation of the RLS experimental factor resulted in a substantial increase of the posterior regrets for all plug-in estimators under both the compound Gaussian and compound Gamma models. This increase in posterior regret due to higher RLS was especially severe for the compound Gaussian model. Under this model, all plug-in estimators performed worse as the RLS increased. This may be explained in terms of the relationship between the level of the RLS factor and the ranking of the different elements in a parameter ensemble. That is, the larger the RLS factor, the greater was the influence of hierarchical shrinkage on the ordering of the ensemble's elements, since the θ_i 's with larger sampling variance tended to be more shrunk towards the prior mean. It was difficult to pinpoint the exact effect of changes in the size of the parameter ensemble on the performance of the various plug-in estimators. As was noted before, the posterior regret associated with the use of the WRSEL plug-in estimator substantially deteriorated as n increased (see section 3.3.5). However, no systematic trend related to an increase of the size of the parameter ensembles seemed to emerge for the other plug-in estimators.

In contrast to threshold-based classification, most of the different plug-in estimators under the RCL function exhibited performance very close to the one of the optimal estimator. In particular, one can observe that all plug-in classifiers produced a percentage posterior regret of 0 in at least one of the simulation scenarios. This starkly contrasts with the behaviour of the same ensembles of point estimates under the TCL function. This set of non-spatial simulations therefore highlights a pressing need for carefully choosing plug-in estimators when considering threshold-based classification. However, such a choice appears to be somewhat less consequential when considering rank-based classification.

4.4 Spatial Simulations

We now turn to the set of spatial simulations, which have been conducted in order to evaluate the performance of the different plug-in classifiers under both the TCL and RCL functions for spatially structured parameter ensembles. In addition, we also consider the weighted TCL function, as this can be shown to be equivalent to the decision rule proposed by Richardson et al. (2004). The complete description of these synthetic data sets was provided in section 3.4. In this section, we solely highlight the specific aspects of the simulations, which are directly relevant to the classification problem at hand.

4.4.1 Parameter Ensembles and Experimental Factors

We investigated four different spatially structured scenarios: SC1, characterised by one isolated cluster of elevated risk; SC2, composed of a mixture of isolated areas and isolated clusters of elevated risk; SC3, where the spatial structure of the level of risk was generated by the Matèrn function; and SC4, where the risk surface was indexed by a hidden covariate. In addition, we varied the heterogeneity of the risk surface in all of these scenarios by modifying the data generating process, in order to produce a greater dispersion of the true RRs. We recovered these simulated levels of risk by using two different models: BYM and the robustified Laplace version of the BYM model, which is denoted by L1. These two models were fully described in section 3.4. Finally, we also varied the level of the expected counts in order to assess the sensitivity of the performance of the classification estimators to modifications in the amount of information available from the data. All these analyses were conducted within the WinBUGS 1.4 software (Lunn et al., 2000). As for the non-spatial data simulations, we evaluated the different classifiers using two loss criteria: the posterior expected TCL and the posterior expected RCL functions. Moreover, we considered the performance of five different plug-in classifiers based on the MLE, SSEL, WRSEL, CB and triple-goal ensembles of point estimates. These different plug-in estimators were compared using the posterior regrets of the TCL and RCL functions with respect to the vector of RRs, denoted θ in the models of interest. We discuss the performance of the different plug-in classifiers under the (i) unweighted TCL, (ii) weighted TCL and (iii) RCL functions, in turn. Finally, we evaluate the consequences of scaling the expected counts on the performance of the various plug-in estimators of interest.

All the results presented in this section are expressed as posterior expected losses, which are functions of the joint posterior distribution of the parameter ensemble of interest. Naturally, this is highly dependent on our choice of model. For completeness, we therefore also compared the optimal classifiers with respect to the *true* values of the simulated data. For the BYM model, the use of the optimal classifier (i.e. the vector of posterior medians) yielded 8.1% of misclassifications, on average over all simulation scenarios. This misclassification rate was slightly higher for the Laplace model at 8.6%.

4.4.2 Plug-in Estimators under Unweighted TCL

The results of the spatial simulations under the posterior expected TCL function are reported in tables 4.3 on page 76. As before, the percentage regrets associated with each plug-in estimator is reported in parentheses. Overall, the SSEL plug-in classifiers were found to be quasi-optimal for all simulation scenarios. This may be explained by the fact that in both models of interest, the full conditional distribution of each θ_i was a symmetric distribution.

The ordering of the remaining plug-in classifiers in terms of percentage regrets varies depending on the type of spatial scenarios considered. Overall, the CB classifier was found to be the second best plug-in estimator after the ensemble of posterior means. This was true for all spatial scenarios, except under SC2, where the triple-goal estimator demonstrated better performance than the CB classifier, except when considering a high degree of variability in the parameter ensemble. The MLE-based classifiers behaved poorly throughout the entire set of simulations, and the WRSEL plug-in classifier was consistently outperformed by its counterparts, except for the SC1 scenario and under a high level of variability of the ensemble distribution.

Increasing the heterogeneity of the parameter ensemble tended to produce easier classification problems for the plug-in estimators. This was especially apparent when examining the posterior TCL under the optimal classifier, in table 4.3, where one can observe that the posterior expected losses diminish with increased levels of heterogeneity, in all four spatial scenarios. That is, most plug-in estimators appeared to benefit from an increase of the parameter ensemble's dispersion. In terms of relative performance as measured by percentage posterior regret, the areas in the SC1 scenario were found to be easier to classify for all plug-in classifiers when greater levels of heterogeneity was considered. Under SC2 and to a much lesser extent under SC3, only the MLE and CB classifiers appeared to benefit from an increase in the parameter ensemble's dispersion.

Table 4.3. Posterior regrets based on $TCL(C, \theta, \delta)$ with $C := \mathbb{E}[\theta] + \text{sd}[\theta]$ for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for 3 different levels of variability and for 4 spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and spatial structure generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 , with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator indicated in parentheses.

Scenarios	TCL	Posterior regrets ^a				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	71.6	110.3 (154)	0.1 (0)	117.9 (165)	12.9(18)	20.1(28)
BYM-SC2	49.8	39.2 (79)	0.1 (0)	151.3 (304)	10.6(21)	4.0 (8)
BYM-SC3	67.9	26.8 (39)	0.1 (0)	156.2 (230)	1.7 (3)	2.4 (4)
BYM-SC4	51.4	33.1 (64)	0.1 (0)	191.8 (373)	4.4 (9)	4.3 (8)
L1-SC1	76.1	107.4 (141)	0.1 (0)	115.7 (152)	14.4(19)	23.1(30)
L1-SC2	52.0	37.8 (73)	0.1 (0)	159.9 (308)	12.7(24)	5.6(11)
L1-SC3	78.2	20.7 (26)	0.2 (0)	159.0 (203)	3.1 (4)	3.6 (5)
L1-SC4	60.4	25.9 (43)	0.1 (0)	197.0 (326)	5.5 (9)	6.5(11)
<i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	26.6	25.2 (95)	0.0 (0)	78.6 (296)	1.1 (4)	7.9(30)
BYM-SC2	44.1	15.2 (34)	0.1 (0)	104.9 (238)	4.9(11)	1.8 (4)
BYM-SC3	42.6	10.9 (25)	0.1 (0)	110.9 (260)	0.8 (2)	1.6 (4)
BYM-SC4	36.8	12.7 (35)	0.0 (0)	178.2 (484)	1.7 (5)	2.2 (6)
L1-SC1	31.3	23.3 (74)	0.0 (0)	83.8 (267)	1.4 (4)	10.5(33)
L1-SC2	44.1	13.8 (31)	0.1 (0)	113.2 (257)	5.3(12)	2.0 (5)
L1-SC3	48.3	7.9 (16)	0.1 (0)	119.9 (248)	1.6 (3)	2.1 (4)
L1-SC4	40.3	9.7 (24)	0.1 (0)	191.3 (475)	2.4 (6)	2.6 (6)
<i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	2.9	1.5 (52)	0.0 (0)	0.7 (25)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (6)
BYM-SC2	25.5	3.9 (15)	0.0 (0)	106.1 (416)	1.2 (5)	3.7(15)
BYM-SC3	35.9	8.6 (24)	0.1 (0)	107.8 (300)	0.6 (2)	1.3 (4)
BYM-SC4	27.3	6.0 (22)	0.0 (0)	98.7 (361)	0.9 (3)	1.2 (5)
L1-SC1	4.1	1.4 (34)	0.0 (0)	1.6 (38)	0.1 (1)	1.0(25)
L1-SC2	25.0	3.7 (15)	0.0 (0)	107.7 (430)	1.0 (4)	4.1(16)
L1-SC3	40.8	5.1 (12)	0.1 (0)	116.7 (286)	0.9 (2)	1.6 (4)
L1-SC4	28.7	4.5 (16)	0.0 (0)	115.1 (401)	1.2 (4)	1.6 (6)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

For SC4, the CB, MLE and to a lesser extent the GR plug-in classifiers appeared to benefit from higher variability in the parameter ensemble. However, for the plug-in estimators, which failed to estimate the overall shape of the ensemble distribution, such as the WRSEL classifier, the *number* of areas above or below the prescribed threshold was more likely to be erroneous. Hence, we did not observe any systematic improvement of the performance of the WRSEL classifier when the parameter ensemble's dispersion increased.

As was previously noted, the CAR Normal model was found to yield lower posterior losses than the CAR Laplace model across all the studied spatial scenarios. In chapter 3, we have emphasised that the simulation of discrete two-category distributions in the SC1 and SC2 scenarios had detrimental consequences on the quantile estimation procedures. We here make a similar caveat for the assessment of classification estimators. The fact that the simulated ensemble distributions in SC1 and SC2 take a discrete form should be taken into account when evaluating the performance of the classification procedures under scrutiny in this chapter. In particular, the classifiers, which are dependent on the entire ensemble distribution will be more heavily penalised. This dependency was especially detrimental to the GR-based classification because each point estimate in this set of point estimates is dependent on the full ensemble distribution, as is visible from table 4.3 for SC1 especially. However, this detrimental effect on the performance of the GR classifier was attenuated by an increase in the variability of the parameter ensemble.

Table 4.4. Posterior regrets based on $\text{TCL}_{0.8}(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ with $C := 1.0$ for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for 3 different levels of variability and for 4 spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and spatial structure generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries are scaled by a factor of 10^3 , with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator in parentheses.

Scenarios	$\text{TCL}_{0.8}$	Posterior regrets ^a				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	80	92(114)	58 (72)	48 (59)	60 (74)	79 (98)
BYM-SC2	52	54(103)	28 (53)	30 (58)	30 (58)	55(105)
BYM-SC3	39	39(100)	20 (51)	36 (91)	20 (51)	20 (50)
BYM-SC4	47	55(117)	24 (51)	44 (94)	28 (59)	37 (79)
L1-SC1	84	85(101)	67 (80)	61 (72)	69 (82)	85(101)
L1-SC2	57	46 (80)	33 (58)	37 (64)	35 (62)	57(100)
L1-SC3	48	36 (75)	27 (55)	38 (78)	27 (55)	27 (56)
L1-SC4	53	44 (83)	29 (56)	46 (88)	32 (61)	42 (79)
<i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	68	74(109)	46 (68)	24 (35)	47 (69)	68(101)
BYM-SC2	25	24 (99)	9 (37)	9 (38)	10 (40)	38(156)
BYM-SC3	30	26 (86)	14 (48)	41(134)	14 (48)	15 (51)
BYM-SC4	34	35(103)	17 (49)	48(139)	18 (54)	24 (70)
L1-SC1	70	67 (96)	49 (70)	26 (38)	50 (72)	71(102)
L1-SC2	28	19 (70)	11 (41)	11 (42)	12 (45)	41(148)
L1-SC3	37	24 (64)	18 (50)	38(103)	18 (50)	21 (56)
L1-SC4	38	30 (78)	19 (50)	46(121)	21 (55)	28 (74)
<i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	52	55(106)	30 (58)	37 (71)	30 (58)	61(117)
BYM-SC2	7	5 (66)	1 (18)	6 (82)	1 (19)	17(236)
BYM-SC3	28	24 (85)	15 (51)	45(159)	15 (52)	15 (51)
BYM-SC4	26	23 (90)	12 (46)	56(217)	13 (49)	17 (66)
L1-SC1	52	53(102)	31 (60)	36 (69)	31 (60)	62(119)
L1-SC2	9	4 (45)	2 (24)	6 (67)	2 (25)	19(224)
L1-SC3	32	22 (68)	17 (52)	42(128)	17 (52)	18 (56)
L1-SC4	28	20 (71)	13 (46)	51(179)	14 (48)	20 (70)

^a Entries for both the posterior regrets and percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integers.

4.4.3 Plug-in Estimators under Weighted TCL

Here, we consider the performance of various plug-in estimators under a weighted TCL function. This decision-theoretic framework reproduces the decision rule proposed by Richardson et al. (2004) for CAR models in the context of spatial epidemiology. In the notation adopted by Richardson et al. (2004), the i^{th} area in an ensemble was classified as having an “increased risk” when the following condition was verified,

$$\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}] > p. \quad (4.35)$$

For the BYM and BYM-L1 models, these parameters were given the following values: $p = .80$, and $C = 1.0$. This particular decision rule can easily be seen to be equivalent to a weighted TCL based on $1 - p$ as introduced in equation 4.3, such that

$$\text{TCL}_{0.8}(1.0, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 0.8 \text{FP}(1.0, \theta_i, \delta_i) + 0.2 \text{FN}(1.0, \theta_i, \delta_i), \quad (4.36)$$

which implies that Richardson et al. (2004) selected a conservative decision rule, giving a larger penalty to FPs than to FNs. As a result, the number of potential false alarms is deprecated. This rule indeed requires that a large amount of probability mass ($p = 0.80$) is situated above threshold before declaring an area to have “increased risk” for a given medical condition of interest. Using

proposition 1, the posterior expectation of the loss function in equation (4.36) is minimised by the ensemble of posterior .20-quantiles, denoted $\theta_{(.20)}^{\text{TCL}}$. We have evaluated the different plug-in estimators of interest under this weighted classification loss and reported the results of these simulations for the CAR Normal and CAR Laplace models in table 4.4 on page 77.

The ordering of the plug-in estimators in terms of percentage regrets reproduced the findings reported under the weighted TCL. Moreover, the performance of the plug-in classifiers was found to be approximately consistent across the different spatial scenarios considered. Overall, the SSEL estimator exhibited the best performance throughout this simulation study. Under the SC1 and SC2 scenarios, the SSEL classifier was more or less on a par with the CB estimator, especially for medium to high heterogeneity. This can be observed by considering the first two rows of each of the three sections of table 4.4 on page 77. However, the WRSEL classifier was found to do marginally better than the SSEL and CB plug-in estimators under SC2 and for a low level of variability in the ensemble distribution. Under the SC3 and SC4 scenarios, the SSEL, CB and GR classifiers exhibited similar behaviour and outperformed their counterparts for all levels of heterogeneity. This can be observed by comparing the different columns in the third and fourth rows of each of the three sections of table 4.4. This set of simulations therefore showed that while the set of posterior means constitute a good plug-in estimator under the unweighted TCL, it also outperformed its counterparts under a weighted version of the same loss function, when a greater penalty is given to false positives. In addition, we also conducted some further simulations under $\text{TCL}_{0.2}$, which gives a greater penalty to false negatives (results not shown). These simulations yielded a different ordering of the plug-in classifiers. In that case, the SSEL estimator were found to be outperformed by some of its counterparts under several spatial scenarios. These findings are contrasted and discussed in section 4.6.

4.4.4 Plug-in Estimators under RCL

The results of the spatial simulations under the posterior expected RCL are summarised in table 4.5 on page 79. Overall, the SSEL and CB classifiers were found to outperform their counterparts under all the spatially structured scenarios studied. This corroborates our findings for the non-spatial simulations in section 4.3.3. As indicated in that section, the ranks obtained from these two classifiers are identical, because of the monotonicity of the CB transformation of the posterior means. The triple-goal estimator was also found to exhibit good performance, which closely followed the ones of the SSEL and CB plug-in classifiers. The MLE and WRSEL demonstrated the worse performance overall, with the use of the MLE classifier yielding lower percentage regret under the SC3 and SC4 scenarios. By contrast, the WRSEL plug-in estimator outperformed the MLE classifier on the SC1 and SC2 spatial scenarios, albeit as the variability of the ensemble distribution increased, the MLE became better than the WRSEL estimator under SC2. This discrepancy in performance between the MLE and WRSEL classifiers may be explained by the extreme cases considered under the SC1 and SC2 scenarios, for which the WRSEL plug-in estimator was generally found to outperform the MLE-based classifier. Indeed, as discussed in chapter 3, the discrete nature of the true ensemble distributions in both SC1 and SC2 required a very high level of countershrinkage, which was better achieved by the artificial re-weighting of the WRSEL function than by the MLE classifiers. Note, however, that for the more standard SC3 and SC4 scenarios, the MLE plug-in estimator was found to provide better ranks than the WRSEL estimator.

Increasing the amount of heterogeneity present in the ensemble distribution tended to systematically diminish the posterior expected loss under the optimal estimator. As noted in section 4.4.2 when considering the TCL function, greater variability in the ensemble distribution tended to attenuate the effect of hierarchical shrinkage on rank estimation for all plug-in estimators. The performance of the SSEL, CB and GR plug-in classifiers was approximately stable under different levels of heterogeneity. The MLE-based estimator, however, substantially benefited from increasing the dispersion of the parameter ensemble. For the WRSEL classifier, the effect of increasing the parameter ensemble's heterogeneity was more difficult to evaluate, and tended to vary with the spatial scenario considered.

As for all other simulations, the posterior expected RCL when using the optimal estimator was

Table 4.5. Posterior regrets based on $RCL(\gamma, \theta, \delta)$ with $\gamma = .80$, for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for 3 different levels of variability and for 4 spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and spatial structure generated by a hidden covariate (SC4). Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 , with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator indicated in parentheses.

<i>Scenarios</i>	RCL	<i>Posterior regrets^a</i>				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	187.82	26.70 (14)	0.36 (0)	3.26 (2)	0.36 (0)	0.66 (0)
BYM-SC2	106.49	12.03 (11)	0.11 (0)	9.61 (9)	0.11 (0)	0.49 (0)
BYM-SC3	86.07	22.13 (26)	0.07 (0)	22.44 (26)	0.07 (0)	0.22 (0)
BYM-SC4	105.46	16.45 (16)	0.05 (0)	17.01 (16)	0.05 (0)	0.36 (0)
L1-SC1	204.99	11.55 (6)	0.35 (0)	2.97 (1)	0.35 (0)	0.67 (0)
L1-SC2	120.84	3.81 (3)	0.12 (0)	9.68 (8)	0.12 (0)	0.49 (0)
L1-SC3	101.70	10.31 (10)	0.11 (0)	29.85 (29)	0.11 (0)	0.42 (0)
L1-SC4	118.72	4.79 (4)	0.13 (0)	18.33 (15)	0.13 (0)	0.62 (1)
<i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	163.44	16.05 (10)	0.33 (0)	5.57 (3)	0.33 (0)	0.92 (1)
BYM-SC2	35.37	2.36 (7)	0.03 (0)	7.75 (22)	0.03 (0)	0.11 (0)
BYM-SC3	66.60	12.45 (19)	0.03 (0)	22.54 (34)	0.03 (0)	0.19 (0)
BYM-SC4	75.85	7.33 (10)	0.03 (0)	21.10 (28)	0.03 (0)	0.30 (0)
L1-SC1	169.40	5.63 (3)	0.42 (0)	5.88 (3)	0.42 (0)	1.17 (1)
L1-SC2	42.21	0.71 (2)	0.05 (0)	12.85 (30)	0.05 (0)	0.15 (0)
L1-SC3	78.77	3.64 (5)	0.06 (0)	32.29 (41)	0.06 (0)	0.37 (0)
L1-SC4	83.99	2.25 (3)	0.07 (0)	22.24 (26)	0.07 (0)	0.40 (0)
<i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	152.71	10.83 (7)	0.42 (0)	9.59 (6)	0.42 (0)	1.42 (1)
BYM-SC2	8.88	0.51 (6)	0.05 (1)	4.00 (45)	0.05 (1)	0.11 (1)
BYM-SC3	61.47	8.96 (15)	0.03 (0)	21.32 (35)	0.03 (0)	0.16 (0)
BYM-SC4	57.71	3.74 (6)	0.02 (0)	15.73 (27)	0.02 (0)	0.18 (0)
L1-SC1	155.96	4.01 (3)	0.39 (0)	10.28 (7)	0.39 (0)	1.70 (1)
L1-SC2	10.15	0.33 (3)	0.06 (1)	5.07 (50)	0.06 (1)	0.13 (1)
L1-SC3	70.20	3.15 (4)	0.08 (0)	29.69 (42)	0.08 (0)	0.39 (1)
L1-SC4	62.13	0.91 (1)	0.03 (0)	17.94 (29)	0.03 (0)	0.23 (0)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

lower under the CAR Normal model than under the CAR Laplace for all scenarios considered. In comparison to the TCL function, one can also observe that, as discussed in section 4.3.3, the overall size of the posterior and percentage regrets under the RCL function was found to be substantially lower than under the TCL function. This indicated that the choice of a particular plug-in classifier is more consequential under the TCL decision-theoretic framework than under the RCL function.

4.4.5 Consequences of Scaling the Expected Counts

Tables 4.6 and 4.7 on pages 80 and 81 document the posterior and percentage regrets of the different plug-in estimators of interest under the TCL and RCL functions, respectively, for two different scaling of the expected counts with $SF \in \{0.1, 2.0\}$. Overall, the posterior expected losses under both the TCL and RCL functions were found to benefit from an increase of the level of the expected counts. The percentage regrets of the different plug-in classifiers, however, did not necessarily diminish with an increase in SF.

Under the TCL function, our results showed that the SSEL classifier tended to do better for higher levels of expected counts. Although the differences in posterior and percentage regrets tended to be small since the SSEL plug-in estimator is close to optimal under the TCL function, a systematic trend is nonetheless notable, whereby the SSEL classifier showed consistent improvement for higher expected counts. Similarly, the MLE and CB plug-in classifiers benefited from an increase in SF. Although this tended to be also true for the triple-goal classifier, its performance in

Table 4.6. Posterior regrets based on $TCL(C, \theta, \delta)$ with $C := \mathbb{E}[\theta] + \text{sd}[\theta]$ for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for 3 different levels of variability and for 4 spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and spatial structure generated by a hidden covariate (SC4); as well as two different scaling (SF) of the expected counts. Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator indicated in parentheses.

Scenarios	TCL	Posterior regrets ^a				
		MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
SF = 0.1 <i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	128.3	253.5 (198)	0.3 (0)	92.0 (72)	75.5(59)	66.4(52)
BYM-SC2	11.0	236.6 (2153)	0.0 (0)	17.8 (162)	5.7(52)	6.5(59)
BYM-SC3	119.4	113.5 (95)	0.4 (0)	84.9 (71)	4.5 (4)	6.3 (5)
BYM-SC4	53.9	204.3 (379)	0.1 (0)	88.9 (165)	23.9(44)	17.4(32)
L1-SC1	109.5	270.0 (247)	0.1 (0)	61.8 (56)	80.3(73)	61.7(56)
L1-SC2	7.2	241.1 (3346)	0.0 (0)	9.2 (127)	6.7(93)	6.2(86)
L1-SC3	116.0	128.7 (111)	1.4 (1)	42.4 (37)	23.3(20)	15.1(13)
L1-SC4	45.9	218.9 (477)	0.1 (0)	64.6 (141)	20.4(44)	23.3(51)
SF = 0.1 <i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	74.8	218.5 (292)	0.5 (1)	80.4 (108)	24.0(32)	23.4(31)
BYM-SC2	33.5	116.1 (346)	0.3 (1)	140.9 (420)	13.6(41)	10.3(31)
BYM-SC3	49.2	64.7 (131)	0.3 (1)	118.9 (241)	2.4 (5)	6.2(13)
BYM-SC4	55.4	129.7 (234)	0.3 (0)	125.4 (226)	16.4(30)	15.8(29)
L1-SC1	48.3	252.5 (523)	0.2 (0)	48.8 (101)	25.1(52)	23.2(48)
L1-SC2	35.1	116.6 (332)	0.2 (1)	146.0 (416)	19.4(55)	13.6(39)
L1-SC3	67.3	61.2 (91)	1.1 (2)	84.5 (125)	12.5(19)	9.0(13)
L1-SC4	58.7	130.9 (223)	0.1 (0)	124.7 (213)	19.8(34)	23.5(40)
SF = 0.1 <i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	50.3	110.6 (220)	0.1 (0)	101.5 (202)	2.2 (4)	17.6(35)
BYM-SC2	30.0	37.0 (124)	0.1 (0)	163.8 (547)	5.4(18)	4.1(14)
BYM-SC3	65.2	63.9 (98)	0.4 (1)	106.5 (163)	3.5 (5)	4.2 (6)
BYM-SC4	51.1	62.9 (123)	0.2 (0)	188.8 (370)	9.2(18)	7.4(14)
L1-SC1	83.5	82.0 (98)	0.2 (0)	132.4 (159)	11.4(14)	29.7(36)
L1-SC2	29.7	36.9 (124)	0.2 (1)	166.1 (560)	6.6(22)	5.2(18)
L1-SC3	83.2	61.2 (74)	0.6 (1)	92.2 (111)	9.8(12)	9.9(12)
L1-SC4	62.1	57.2 (92)	0.3 (1)	161.7 (260)	12.8(21)	15.1(24)
SF = 2 <i>Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	36.4	66.1 (182)	0.0 (0)	78.3 (215)	2.0 (6)	16.0(44)
BYM-SC2	54.3	30.0 (55)	0.0 (0)	130.9 (241)	9.6(18)	3.9 (7)
BYM-SC3	49.6	13.3 (27)	0.1 (0)	151.8 (306)	0.7 (1)	2.8 (6)
BYM-SC4	45.4	12.2 (27)	0.0 (0)	192.5 (424)	1.1 (2)	1.7 (4)
L1-SC1	46.5	59.4 (128)	0.0 (0)	86.1 (185)	1.8 (4)	19.8(43)
L1-SC2	56.0	26.4 (47)	0.0 (0)	128.1 (229)	9.4(17)	2.4 (4)
L1-SC3	55.7	9.2 (16)	0.0 (0)	165.1 (296)	2.0 (4)	3.2 (6)
L1-SC4	50.0	9.5 (19)	0.0 (0)	201.2 (402)	1.5 (3)	2.4 (5)
SF = 2 <i>Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	4.7	8.8 (186)	0.0 (0)	2.5 (53)	0.0 (0)	5.0(105)
BYM-SC2	48.1	11.8 (25)	0.1 (0)	99.8 (208)	3.0 (6)	2.1 (4)
BYM-SC3	30.6	6.3 (21)	0.0 (0)	91.1 (298)	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)
BYM-SC4	28.0	7.4 (26)	0.0 (0)	109.4 (391)	0.4 (2)	1.7 (6)
L1-SC1	9.3	6.7 (72)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (269)	0.2 (3)	4.4(48)
L1-SC2	49.4	10.0 (20)	0.0 (0)	103.3 (209)	4.2 (8)	2.2 (5)
L1-SC3	34.0	2.8 (8)	0.0 (0)	96.2 (283)	0.5 (2)	0.8 (2)
L1-SC4	29.8	5.4 (18)	0.0 (0)	124.2 (417)	0.6 (2)	1.4 (5)
SF = 2 <i>High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	0.1	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
BYM-SC2	21.2	1.1 (5)	0.0 (0)	95.8 (452)	0.4 (2)	4.4(21)
BYM-SC3	15.3	4.1 (27)	0.0 (0)	16.5 (108)	0.2 (1)	3.5(23)
BYM-SC4	23.2	2.7 (12)	0.0 (0)	58.1 (251)	0.4 (2)	0.8 (4)
L1-SC1	0.3	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
L1-SC2	21.0	1.6 (7)	0.0 (0)	100.2 (478)	0.4 (2)	4.7(22)
L1-SC3	17.8	1.8 (10)	0.0 (0)	21.3 (119)	0.3 (1)	3.6(20)
L1-SC4	23.8	2.1 (9)	0.0 (0)	66.6 (279)	0.7 (3)	1.0 (4)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest first digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

Table 4.7. Posterior regrets based on $RCL(\gamma, \theta, \delta)$ with $\gamma = .80$, for five plug-in estimators and with the posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator in the first column. Results are presented for 3 different levels of variability and for 4 spatial scenarios: an isolated cluster (SC1), a set of isolated clusters and isolated areas (SC2), highly structured spatial heterogeneity (SC3), and spatial structure generated by a hidden covariate (SC4); as well as two different scaling (SF) of the expected counts. Entries were scaled by a factor of 10^3 with posterior regrets expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator indicated in parentheses.

<i>Scenarios</i>	<i>Posterior regrets^a</i>					
	RCL	MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
<i>SF = 0.1 Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	277.38	15.82 (6)	1.71 (1)	4.32 (2)	1.71 (1)	1.77 (1)
BYM-SC2	280.36	10.29 (4)	1.21 (0)	3.71 (1)	1.21 (0)	1.43 (1)
BYM-SC3	176.56	64.78 (37)	0.30 (0)	23.14 (13)	0.30 (0)	0.83 (0)
BYM-SC4	213.14	46.40 (22)	0.50 (0)	4.11 (2)	0.50 (0)	0.72 (0)
L1-SC1	288.44	7.11 (2)	0.84 (0)	3.79 (1)	0.84 (0)	0.92 (0)
L1-SC2	293.29	2.99 (1)	0.84 (0)	2.87 (1)	0.84 (0)	0.83 (0)
L1-SC3	248.41	13.79 (6)	0.34 (0)	5.96 (2)	0.34 (0)	0.40 (0)
L1-SC4	266.64	7.98 (3)	0.44 (0)	2.27 (1)	0.44 (0)	0.54 (0)
<i>SF = 0.1 Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	213.78	48.11 (23)	0.83 (0)	4.26 (2)	0.83 (0)	1.05 (0)
BYM-SC2	196.60	18.45 (9)	0.24 (0)	5.29 (3)	0.24 (0)	0.55 (0)
BYM-SC3	122.31	60.99 (50)	0.13 (0)	22.57 (18)	0.13 (0)	0.30 (0)
BYM-SC4	191.33	34.96 (18)	0.17 (0)	4.76 (2)	0.17 (0)	0.32 (0)
L1-SC1	280.59	4.85 (2)	0.79 (0)	3.17 (1)	0.79 (0)	0.75 (0)
L1-SC2	218.70	6.35 (3)	0.24 (0)	3.53 (2)	0.24 (0)	0.45 (0)
L1-SC3	208.18	6.12 (3)	0.23 (0)	3.23 (2)	0.23 (0)	0.31 (0)
L1-SC4	230.52	6.08 (3)	0.48 (0)	2.55 (1)	0.48 (0)	0.61 (0)
<i>SF = 0.1 High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	182.54	44.78 (25)	0.47 (0)	4.02 (2)	0.47 (0)	1.04 (1)
BYM-SC2	117.85	15.45 (13)	0.07 (0)	12.03 (10)	0.07 (0)	0.60 (1)
BYM-SC3	112.30	49.51 (44)	0.14 (0)	15.31 (14)	0.14 (0)	0.42 (0)
BYM-SC4	143.06	34.08 (24)	0.09 (0)	12.02 (8)	0.09 (0)	0.40 (0)
L1-SC1	207.60	6.85 (3)	0.19 (0)	2.61 (1)	0.19 (0)	0.61 (0)
L1-SC2	135.69	4.25 (3)	0.05 (0)	7.35 (5)	0.05 (0)	0.34 (0)
L1-SC3	155.10	23.98 (15)	0.19 (0)	5.43 (4)	0.19 (0)	0.75 (0)
L1-SC4	179.98	1.97 (1)	0.10 (0)	3.94 (2)	0.10 (0)	0.36 (0)
<i>SF = 2 Low Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	176.52	30.11 (17)	0.36 (0)	4.98 (3)	0.36 (0)	1.25 (1)
BYM-SC2	66.23	7.20 (11)	0.01 (0)	17.47 (26)	0.01 (0)	0.12 (0)
BYM-SC3	82.39	13.60 (17)	0.05 (0)	21.08 (26)	0.05 (0)	0.38 (0)
BYM-SC4	79.16	5.55 (7)	0.08 (0)	21.89 (28)	0.08 (0)	0.21 (0)
L1-SC1	186.73	16.80 (9)	0.76 (0)	4.61 (2)	0.76 (0)	1.14 (1)
L1-SC2	73.88	2.39 (3)	0.03 (0)	21.69 (29)	0.03 (0)	0.33 (0)
L1-SC3	90.87	5.99 (7)	0.12 (0)	36.52 (40)	0.12 (0)	0.57 (1)
L1-SC4	85.05	1.00 (1)	0.04 (0)	23.86 (28)	0.04 (0)	0.31 (0)
<i>SF = 2 Med. Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	168.41	19.20 (11)	0.51 (0)	7.57 (4)	0.51 (0)	1.17 (1)
BYM-SC2	26.11	2.37 (9)	0.31 (1)	14.22 (54)	0.31 (1)	0.40 (2)
BYM-SC3	46.24	8.51 (18)	0.01 (0)	19.38 (42)	0.01 (0)	0.01 (0)
BYM-SC4	54.57	2.33 (4)	0.00 (0)	14.51 (27)	0.00 (0)	0.17 (0)
L1-SC1	172.85	7.70 (4)	0.45 (0)	9.23 (5)	0.45 (0)	1.67 (1)
L1-SC2	25.80	2.41 (9)	0.08 (0)	15.72 (61)	0.08 (0)	0.36 (1)
L1-SC3	52.17	3.37 (6)	0.04 (0)	23.93 (46)	0.04 (0)	0.11 (0)
L1-SC4	58.02	0.77 (1)	0.03 (0)	23.41 (40)	0.03 (0)	0.31 (1)
<i>SF = 2 High Variab.</i>						
BYM-SC1	163.70	9.72 (6)	1.17 (1)	9.28 (6)	1.17 (1)	1.91 (1)
BYM-SC2	19.77	0.50 (3)	0.06 (0)	15.13 (77)	0.06 (0)	0.38 (2)
BYM-SC3	41.49	4.46 (11)	0.05 (0)	15.40 (37)	0.05 (0)	0.07 (0)
BYM-SC4	45.21	2.15 (5)	0.00 (0)	15.45 (34)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)
L1-SC1	167.87	5.38 (3)	0.37 (0)	8.27 (5)	0.37 (0)	1.92 (1)
L1-SC2	19.99	0.50 (2)	0.18 (1)	15.29 (76)	0.18 (1)	0.35 (2)
L1-SC3	47.61	1.58 (3)	0.07 (0)	22.15 (47)	0.07 (0)	0.38 (1)
L1-SC4	46.52	0.45 (1)	0.05 (0)	17.94 (39)	0.05 (0)	0.21 (0)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point, and entries for the percentage regrets have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

Table 4.8. Number of hospitals above threshold for the MRSA data set with three different choices of threshold. The number of hospitals above threshold using the optimal classifier for the TCL function is reported in the first column. Classifications using plug-in estimators are reported as departures from the number of hospitals classified above threshold using the vector of posterior medians. For each plug-in estimator, the percentage departure has been indicated in parentheses.

<i>Thresholds</i>	<i>Optimal</i>	<i>Number of Hospitals above Threshold^a</i>				
		TCL	MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB
$C = 1/1.3$	56	5 (9)	-1(-2)	19 (34)	2 (4)	3 (5)
$C = 1.0$	15	2 (13)	0 (0)	10 (67)	1 (7)	0 (0)
$C = 1.3$	22	11 (50)	3 (14)	21 (95)	8 (36)	6 (27)

^a Entries for the percentage departure have been truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, the percentage departure is smaller than 1 percentage point.

terms of percentage regrets was sometimes worse with larger levels of expected counts. This can be observed by considering the percentage regrets in parentheses in the eleventh column of table 4.6 on page 80, and comparing the first part of the table for which $SF = 0.1$ with the second part of the table for which $SF = 2.0$. A more confusing picture emerged for the WRSEL classifier. In this latter case, the type of spatial scenario considered and the level of heterogeneity of the simulated ensembles both played a substantial role in determining whether the WRSEL plug-in estimator benefited from an increase in SF . The ordering of the different plug-in estimators, however, was left unchanged by the use of different levels of expected counts.

A similar trend can be observed for the RCL function in table 4.7 on page 81. Here, changes in SF did not, in general, modify the ordering of the plug-in estimators reported in section 4.4.4. The WRSEL classifier, however, was found to be detrimentally affected by an increase of the level of the expected counts under most spatial scenarios considered. This appeared to be true both in terms of posterior and percentage regrets. For the remaining plug-in estimators, the differences in percentage regrets associated an increase in SF was too small to allow the detection of any systematic trend, except perhaps for the MLE classifier, whose performance notably improved when specifying larger expected counts, albeit these improvements were restricted to the medium and high heterogeneity simulations. The different classification procedures considered in this chapter have also been applied to a real data example, which we describe in the next section.

4.5 MRSA Prevalence in UK NHS Trusts

The prevalence of MRSA in UK hospitals has been under scrutiny for the past 10 years, and surveillance data on MRSA prevalence has been made publicly available. The classification of National Health Services (NHS) trusts on the basis of MRSA risk may be of interest to medical practitioners and patients wishing to minimise their probability to contract the condition. Several statistical issues have been raised and discussed on the basis of this data set, including the evaluation of hospital performances over time (Spiegelhalter, 2005), and the monitoring of over-dispersed MRSA counts (Grigg et al., 2009). In this section, we use this data set to illustrate the implementation of a decision-theoretic approach to the classification of elements in a parameter ensemble. Here, the NHS hospitals constitute the parameter ensemble of interest and our main objective is to identify which hospitals have a level of risk for MRSA above a given threshold.

4.5.1 Data Pre-processing

The full data set was retrieved from the archives of the UK's Department of Health (www.dh.gov.UK). This data set documents MRSA prevalence in all NHS trusts in the UK. Hospitals are classified in three categories: (i) general acute trusts, (ii) specialist trusts and (iii) single speciality trusts. For each hospital, the data set covers four distinct time periods. In this

Table 4.9. Posterior regrets based on $TCL(C, \theta, \delta)$ and $RCL(\gamma, \theta, \delta)$ for the MRSA data set with three different choices of thresholds in each case. The posterior expected loss of the optimal estimator is given in the first column. In parentheses, posterior regrets are expressed as percentage of the posterior loss under the optimal estimator. Entries have been all scaled by a factor of 10^3 .

<i>Loss functions & Thresholds</i>		<i>Posterior regrets^a</i>				
	Post. Loss	MLE	SSEL	WRSEL	CB	GR
TCL						
$C = 1/1.3$	121.69	0.80 (1)	0.13 (0)	27.93 (23)	0.16 (0)	0.33 (0)
$C = 1.0$	125.14	0.15 (0)	0.15 (0)	14.78 (12)	0.15 (0)	0.15 (0)
$C = 1.3$	65.36	8.18 (13)	0.15 (0)	45.62 (70)	3.85 (6)	3.77 (6)
RCL						
$\gamma = .60$	131.58	0.40 (0)	0.40 (0)	0.32 (0)	0.40 (0)	0.40 (0)
$\gamma = .75$	105.63	1.43 (1)	0.63 (1)	5.48 (5)	0.63 (1)	1.55 (1)
$\gamma = .90$	67.65	4.14 (6)	1.13 (2)	0.86 (1)	1.13 (2)	1.13 (2)

^a Entries for the posterior regrets have been truncated to the closest second digit after the decimal point, and the percentage regrets were truncated to the closest integer. For some entries, percentage regrets are smaller than 1 percentage point.

thesis, we will focus on a subset of this longitudinal data, corresponding to the period running from April 2003 to March 2004, and consider how to classify NHS trusts according to the number of cases in that particular year. The Department of Health provided the prevalence of MRSA for each hospital and the number of bed days over that period. (Bed days are the number of inpatient hospital days per 1000 members of a health plan.) The NHS trusts with missing data or where no cases of MRSA was observed were eliminated, due to the impossibility of retrieving the number of bed days for these hospitals. That is, since the Department of Health only provided yearly numbers of observed cases and the rates of MRSA per bed days, the number of bed days could not be computed for the hospitals with no observed cases, since the MRSA rates was zero for these trusts. Data from the following seven hospitals were therefore discarded: Birmingham Women’s Hospital, Moorfields Eye Hospital, Liverpool Women’s Hospital, Medway Hospital, Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Sheffield Children’s Hospital, and the Royal Orthopaedic Hospital. The final sample size was composed of 166 trusts with MRSA prevalence for the year 2003-2004. In previous statistical publications, this data set has been utilised in order to illustrate the inherent difficulties associated with the monitoring of changes in levels of risk over several time points. Here, by contrast, we are mainly concerned with the classification of hospitals according to their levels of risks, as opposed to a consideration of the evolution of trust-specific risk over several years.

4.5.2 Fitted Model

We represent observed cases of MRSA by y_i for each hospital, with $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $n = 166$. The expected counts for each NHS trust were computed using the MRSA prevalence per thousand bed days and the number of inpatient bed days in each trust. That is,

$$E_i := p_{\text{MRSA}} \times \text{BD}_i, \tag{4.37}$$

where $p_{\text{MRSA}} := \sum_{i=1}^n y_i / \sum_{i=1}^n \text{BD}_i$ is the population MRSA prevalence, and we have assumed this rate to be constant across all UK hospitals. The BD_i ’s denote the number of bed days in the i^{th} NHS trust in thousands.

A two-level hierarchical model with Poisson likelihood and a lognormal exchangeable prior on the RRs was used to fit the data. This assumes that the counts are Poisson, but with potential over-dispersion, due to clustering of cases caused by the infectiousness of the disease or other

unmeasured risk factors. The full model had therefore the following structure,

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pois}(\theta_i E_i) & i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \log \theta_i &= \alpha + v_i \\ v_i &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2), \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

where the inverse of the variance parameter was given a ‘diffuse’ gamma distribution, $\sigma^{-2} \sim \text{Gam}(0.5, 0.0005)$, while a flat Normal distribution was specified for the intercept, $\alpha \sim N(0.0, 10^{-6})$. For each hospital, we have $\text{RR}_i := \theta_i$. Since the joint posterior distribution of the θ_i ’s is not available in closed-form, an MCMC algorithm was used to estimate this model. The MRSA data was fitted using WinBUGS 1.4 (Lunn et al., 2000). The codes used for the estimation of the model have been reproduced in Appendix C.

Five different ensembles of point estimates were derived from the joint posterior distribution of the θ_i ’s, including the MLEs, the posterior means and medians, and the WRSEL, CB and triple-goal point estimates. Given the size of the parameter ensemble in this data set, the vector of weights in the WRSEL function was specified using $a_1 = a_2 = 0.1$. (The sensitivity of the performance of the WRSEL plug-in estimators to the choice of a_1 and a_2 will be discussed in chapter 5). We considered the performance of these plug-in estimators under the TCL and RCL functions with three different choices of thresholds in each case. Here, we selected $C \in \{0.77, 1.0, 1.3\}$, where the first and third thresholds are equidistant from 1.0 on the logarithmic scale –that is, $1/1.3 \doteq 0.77$. For $C = 1/1.3$, we evaluated the number of hospitals classified *below* threshold. That is, we were interested in identifying the NHS trusts characterised by a substantially lower level of risk for MRSA. A choice of a threshold of 1.3, in this study, implies that hospitals above this threshold have an MRSA rate, which is 30% higher than the national average. A threshold lower than 1.0 (i.e. $C = 1/1.3$) was also selected in order to estimate which hospitals can be confidently classified as having substantially lower MRSA rates than the remaining trusts. Note that in that case, the definitions of the false positives and false negatives in equations (4.1) and (4.2) become inverted. That is, for $C < 1.0$, we now have

$$\text{FP}(C, \theta, \delta) := \mathcal{I} \{ \theta > C, \delta \leq C \}, \tag{4.39}$$

and

$$\text{FN}(C, \theta, \delta) := \mathcal{I} \{ \theta \leq C, \delta > C \}. \tag{4.40}$$

However, since we will solely be interested in unweighted classification loss, in this section, this inversion does not affect the computation of the posterior and percentage regrets of the plug-in estimators. The results are presented for the TCL and RCL functions, in turn.

4.5.3 TCL Classification

In table 4.8 on page 82, we have reported the departure of each plug-in classifier from the optimal TCL estimator in terms of number of NHS hospitals classified above –or below, if $C = 1/1.3$ –threshold. Remarkably, for the three thresholds ($C \in \{1/1.3, 1.0, 1.3\}$), almost all plug-in classifiers were found to yield a greater number of NHS trusts classified above (respectively below) threshold than when using the set of posterior medians. The sole exception to this trend was for the SSEL-based classifiers, which were modestly more conservative than the posterior medians under $C = 1/1.3$. That is, the ensemble of posterior means produced a smaller set of hospitals considered to have RRs lower than 1/1.3. This indicates therefore that the optimal TCL classifier generally tends to produce more conservative classifications than its plug-in counterparts.

Moreover, we also note that, for this particular data set, the GR-based classification was found to be closer to the optimal classification than the one based on the CB point estimates. These results should be contrasted with our spatial and non-spatial data simulations, which have shown that the CB and GR plug-in estimators tended to behave similarly under the TCL function. Not surprisingly, however, the ensemble of posterior means was found to provide the smallest number




Figure 4.3. Ensembles of point estimates of MRSA RRs under different loss functions for 166 NHS trusts during the 2003–2004 period. The panels correspond to the (a) MLEs, (b) posterior means, (c) posterior medians, (d) point estimates under WRSEL, (e) constrained Bayes point estimates and (f) triple-goal point estimates. Classification of these point estimates is conducted with respect to a threshold taken to be $C = 1.3$ (dashed line). A smoothed version of the histograms has also been superimposed.




Figure 4.4. Classification of individual ‘general acute’ NHS trusts ($n = 110$) during the year 2003–2004, on the basis of three different families of point estimates: (a) MLEs, (b) posterior means, and (c) posterior medians. The marginal posterior distributions of trust-specific RRs for MRSA are represented by box plots (Median, \pm sd, \pm 2sd). In each panel, the trusts classified above threshold, $C = 1.3$ (dashed line), are indicated in red.




Figure 4.5. Classification of individual ‘general acute’ NHS trusts ($n = 110$) during the year 2003–2004, on the basis of three different families of point estimates: (a) WRSEL, (b) CB and (c) triple-goal estimates. The marginal posterior distributions of trust-specific RRs for MRSA are represented by box plots (Median, \pm sd, \pm 2sd). In each panel, the trusts classified above threshold, $C = 1.3$ (dashed line), are indicated in red. Note the particular poor performance of the WRSEL plug-in classifier in this case.




Figure 4.6. Classification of individual ‘specialist’ NHS trusts ($n = 43$) during the year 2003–2004, on the basis of three different families of point estimates: (a) MLEs, (b) posterior means, and (c) posterior medians. The marginal posterior distributions of trust-specific RRs are represented by box plots (Median, \pm sd, \pm 2sd). In each panel, the trusts classified above threshold, $C = 1.3$ (dashed line), are indicated in red.




Figure 4.7. Classification of individual ‘specialist’ NHS trusts ($n = 43$) during the year 2003–2004, on the basis of three different families of point estimates: (a) WRSEL, (b) CB and (c) triple-goal estimates. The marginal posterior distributions of trust-specific RRs are represented by box plots (Median, \pm sd, ± 2 sd). In each panel, the trusts classified above threshold, $C = 1.3$ (dashed line), are indicated in red.

of misclassified areas in comparison to the optimal classifier. For $C = 1.0$, one can observe that both the SSEL and GR plug-in classifiers and the posterior medians yielded an identical number of NHS trusts above threshold.

In addition, the performance of the different sets of plug-in estimators in terms of posterior regret is also reported in table 4.9 on page 83 for the TCL and RCL functions. As aforementioned, one can see that the smallest posterior regret is achieved by the SSEL classifier across all three thresholds considered. In line with the results of our synthetic simulations, the triple-goal and CB plug-in estimators were found to exhibit the second best performance. Both of these classifiers tended to behave similarly under both the TCL and RCL functions. These plug-in estimators were followed by the MLE and WRSEL classifiers in increasing order of posterior regret. Figure 4.3 on page 85 shows the empirical ensemble distributions of point estimates for the six ensembles of point estimates that we have considered. In that figure, the RRs for MRSA for each NHS trust are classified above and below $C = 1.3$. The pathological behaviour of the WRSEL point estimates first discussed in section 3.3.5 is here particularly visible in panel (d), where the bimodality of the WRSEL ensemble of point estimates can be seen to emerge. The classification of NHS trusts using the six different types of classifiers can also be examined in greater detail in figures 4.4 and 4.5 on pages 86 and 87, which portray the classifications of the general acute NHS trusts. Similarly, the classification of specialist NHS trusts under these different ensembles of point estimates can be compared in figures 4.6 and 4.7 on pages 88 and 89, respectively. These box plots provide a summary of the hospital-specific marginal posterior distributions of the level of risk for MRSA. Specifically, one can see that for general NHS trusts, the set of hospitals classified above an RR of 1.3 is lower when we use the set of posterior medians to classify them. This contrasts with the adoption of the ensemble of MLEs and posterior means or other sets of point estimates for the same task. A similar pattern is visible for the specialist NHS trusts in figures 4.6 and 4.7, albeit to a lesser degree, since both the posterior means and posterior medians produce identical classifications for this particular class of hospitals.

4.5.4 RCL Classification

Results on the use of plug-in estimators under the RCL function, in this data set, are reported in table 4.9 on page 83. The different plug-in classifiers can here be compared in terms of posterior and percentage regrets. We have computed the performance of these plug-in estimators using three different proportions, $\gamma \in \{.60, .75, .90\}$. As pointed out in section 4.3.3, the SSEL and CB classifications under RCL are necessarily identical. In addition, the performance of these two classifiers was found to be very close to the one of the GR plug-in estimator. These three plug-in estimators outperformed the MLE and WRSEL classifiers, as expected from our spatial and non-spatial simulation results. As previously mentioned, it is important to note that the differences in posterior regrets between different choices of plug-in classifiers were found to be small in comparison to the differences in posterior regrets between different choices of classifiers under the TCL function, thereby indicating that the choice of plug-in estimator is more important under the latter function than when considering rank-based classification.

4.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have investigated a standard classification question, which often arises in both epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. This problem centers on the allocation of a subset of elements in a parameter ensemble of interest to an elevated-risk cluster according to the estimated RRs for each of the elements in that ensemble. We have showed that such a problem can be reformulated in a decision-theoretic framework, where standard machinery can be implemented to optimise the solution of the problem. Doing so, we showed that the posterior expected TCL function is minimised by the ensemble of posterior medians. In addition, we have also considered the RCL function, whose properties and minimiser have already been documented by Lin et al. (2006).

As in chapter 3, our main focus in this chapter has been on evaluating the performance of various plug-in estimators under both the TCL and RCL functions. Overall, the ensemble of posterior means was found to perform close to optimality under both decision-theoretic paradigms, thus indicating that this standard choice of point estimates could constitute a good candidate for routine epidemiological investigations. In particular, the posterior means have the non-negligible advantage of familiarity, which may aid the reporting of such point estimates in public health settings. The good performance of the SSEL point estimates under the TCL function can be explained by noting that, in most applications, the marginal posterior distributions of the parameters of interest will be asymptotically normally distributed. In such cases, as we gather more information about each parameter in the ensemble, the set of posterior means converges towards the set of posterior medians.

In section 4.4.3, we noted that the ensemble of SSEL point estimates also performed well under weighted TCL. In that section, we reported the results of a set of simulations based on $TCL_{0.8}$, which gives a greater penalty to false positives. However, in a separate set of simulations (results not shown), we also evaluated the performance of the different plug-in estimators under $TCL_{0.2}$, which gives a greater penalty to false negatives. In that case, we have found that the set of posterior means was outperformed by other plug-in classifiers under several experimental conditions. These discrepancies between different weighted TCLs can be explained in terms of hierarchical shrinkage. The posterior means tend to be shrunk towards the prior mean, and will therefore constitute a naturally conservative choice that is likely to produce less false positives, but a greater amount of false negatives.

The GR and CB classifiers produced good performance on the TCL and RCL functions, as measured by the posterior and percentage regrets. These plug-in estimators were followed by the MLE and WRSEL classifiers. However, the performance differences between the candidate estimators under the TCL decision-theoretic paradigm were much larger than the differences in posterior regrets between the plug-in estimators under the RCL function. These discrepancies may be explained in terms of the substantial differences between these two loss functions. As described in section 4.2.2 on page 68, the optimisation of the RCL function only requires an adequate ordering of the elements in the ensemble under scrutiny. For the TCL function, however, minimisation necessitates not only a good ordering of the elements in the ensemble, but also a reasonably precise estimation of the values of each of these elements. It appears that the combination of these two desiderata makes the task of optimising the posterior TCL more difficult than the one of minimising the RCL one, thereby yielding greater discrepancies between the different candidate plug-in estimators.

In spatial epidemiology, it is often of interest to consider weighted classification loss functions, which may, for instance, privilege true positives over false positives, or the converse. This is an issue, which has been addressed by Richardson et al. (2004), who discussed different re-weighting of the false positive and false negative rates. They used a numerical minimisation procedure based on synthetic data sets, which showed that an area should be classified above a threshold if approximately 80% of the mass of the posterior distribution of the level of risk in that area is above the threshold of interest (for the BYM and BYM-L1 models). In section 4.4.3, we have seen that this choice of decision rule is equivalent to the specification of a weighted TCL_p with $p = .80$. Thus, the decision rule proposed by Richardson et al. (2004) gives a greater penalty to false positives. This represents a natural choice of classification framework in the context of spatial epidemiology, which deprecates the number of potential false alarms. The adoption of a conservative approach to the identification of institutions or geographical areas as characterised by “elevated risk” is amply justified by the sensitive nature of public health studies and their extensive media coverage.

In spite of our emphasis on the use of suboptimal classifiers, we also note that our analysis of the MRSA data set has shown that the use of the set of posterior medians yield the most conservative classification of the NHS trusts. In an area as sensitive as the level of risk for contracting MRSA, one may prefer to err on the side of caution by classifying as few hospitals as possible as part of an elevated-risk cluster. From a public health perspective, Grigg et al. (2009) among others have argued in favour of the utilisation of conservative communication strategies when reporting

surveillance data. When communicating such epidemiological findings to a general audience, the use of the optimal estimator under the TCL function may therefore be usually preferred in order to attenuate the potential detrimental effects of too liberal a classification.

4.7 Proof of TCL Minimisation

Proof of proposition 1 on page 65.

Let $\rho_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}})$ denote $\mathbb{E}[\text{TCL}_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}})|\mathbf{y}]$. We prove the result by exhaustion over three cases. In order to prove that

$$\rho_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1-p)}) \leq \rho_p(C, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}}), \quad (4.41)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{est}} \in \Theta$ with $\theta_i^{(1-p)} := Q_{\theta_i|\mathbf{y}}(1-p)$, it suffices to show that $\rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{(1-p)}) \leq \rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}})$ holds, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Expanding these unit-specific risks,

$$\begin{aligned} p\mathcal{I}\{\theta_i^{(1-p)} > C\}\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] + (1-p)\mathcal{I}\{\theta_i^{(1-p)} \leq C\}\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}] \\ \leq p\mathcal{I}\{\theta_i^{\text{est}} > C\}\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] + (1-p)\mathcal{I}\{\theta_i^{\text{est}} \leq C\}\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Now, fix C and $p \in [0, 1]$ to arbitrary values. Then, for any point estimate θ_i^{est} , we have

$$\rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}) = \begin{cases} p\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}], & \text{if } \theta_i^{\text{est}} > C, \\ (1-p)\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}], & \text{if } \theta_i^{\text{est}} \leq C. \end{cases} \quad (4.43)$$

The optimality of $\theta_i^{(1-p)}$ over θ_i^{est} as a point estimate is therefore directly dependent on the relationships between $\theta_i^{(1-p)}$ and C , and between θ_i^{est} and C . This determines the following three cases:

i. If $\theta_i^{(1-p)}$ and θ_i^{est} are on the same side of C , then clearly,

$$\rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{(1-p)}) = \rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}), \quad (4.44)$$

ii. If $\theta_i^{(1-p)} \leq C$ and $\theta_i^{\text{est}} > C$, then,

$$\rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{(1-p)}) = (1-p)\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}] \leq p\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] = \rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}), \quad (4.45)$$

iii. If $\theta_i^{(1-p)} > C$ and $\theta_i^{\text{est}} \leq C$, then,

$$\rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{(1-p)}) = p\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] < (1-p)\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}] = \rho_p(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}), \quad (4.46)$$

Equation (4.44) follows directly from an application of the result in (4.42), and cases two and three follow from consideration of the following relationship:

$$p\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] \gtrsim (1-p)\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}], \quad (4.47)$$

where \gtrsim means either $<$, $=$ or $>$. Using $\mathbb{P}[\theta_i > C|\mathbf{y}] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}]$, this gives

$$\mathbb{P}[\theta_i \leq C|\mathbf{y}] = F_{\theta_i|\mathbf{y}}(C) \gtrsim 1 - p. \quad (4.48)$$

Here, $F_{\theta_i|\mathbf{y}}$ is the posterior CDF of θ_i . Therefore, we have

$$C \gtrsim F_{\theta_i|\mathbf{y}}^{-1}(1-p) =: Q_{\theta_i|\mathbf{y}}(1-p) =: \theta_i^{(1-p)}, \quad (4.49)$$

where \gtrsim takes the same value in equations (4.47), (4.48) and (4.49).

This proves the optimality of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1-p)}$. Moreover, since one can construct a vector of point estimates $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{\text{est}}$ satisfying $\theta_i^{\text{est}} \gtrsim C$, whenever $\theta_i^{(1-p)} \gtrsim C$, for every i , it then follows that $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1-p)}$ is not unique.

Chapter 5

Discussion

In this final chapter, we review the main findings of the thesis, and explore possible extensions of this work in several directions. In particular, we consider whether the loss functions used in this thesis can be generalised in order to take into account more sophisticated inferential requirements. Moreover, we also discuss how different modelling assumptions may better serve the decision-theoretic questions addressed in the thesis.

5.1 Main Findings

In the present thesis, we have adopted a formal decision-theoretic approach to two inferential issues that naturally arise in epidemiology and spatial epidemiology. Firstly, we have considered how the estimation of the heterogeneity of a parameter ensemble can be optimised. Secondly, we have derived the optimal estimator for the classification of the elements of a parameter ensemble above or below a given threshold. For consistency, epidemiologists are generally under pressure to report a single set of point estimates when presenting their research findings. We have therefore also explored the utilisation of various plug-in estimators based on more commonly used sets of point estimates in order to identify the ensembles of point estimates that may simultaneously satisfy several of these inferential objectives.

Overall, our experimentation and real data analyses have shown that the GR plug-in estimator is very close to optimality when evaluating the dispersion of a parameter ensemble, as quantified by the posterior QR. By contrast, the best quasi-optimal plug-in estimator under both the TCL and RCL functions was found to be the one based on the SSEL point estimates. Taken together, these results confirm the inherent difficulties associated with attempting to satisfy several inferential desiderata using a single set of point estimates. Ultimately, the two objectives considered in this thesis have been found to be optimised by two different sets of point estimates. Nonetheless, further research could investigate the formulation of nested decision-theoretic procedures in the spirit of the triple-goal methods introduced by Shen and Louis (1998), which could sub-optimally satisfy these two goals using a single set of point estimates. Specifically, one could construct a decision-theoretic framework where the two inferential objectives are weighted, hence allowing different modellers to express their preference for one goal over another in a formal manner.

Another of the consistent findings in this thesis has been the relatively poor performance of the WRSEL introduced by Wright et al. (2003). In most of the spatial and non-spatial synthetic simulations considered, this plug-in estimator tended to perform on a par with the MLE plug-in estimator. The main objective of the WRSEL function is to counteract the effect of hierarchical shrinkage in the models studied. Point estimates based on WRSEL have proved to be useful in improving the estimation of the ‘spread’ of parameter ensembles. However, the WRSEL estimation procedure was found to lack portability from one data set to another. Specifically, the main difficulty with this approach resides in the necessary pre-specification of the set of weights that recalibrate the loss function. We have seen that these ϕ_i ’s are determined by both the number of

elements in the ensemble and the values taken by two tuning parameters, a_1 and a_2 , which control the symmetry and the magnitude of the re-weighting effected by the WRSEL function. A step towards the automatization of the use of the WRSEL for any data set may, for instance, include the specification of both a_1 and a_2 as functions of the size of the ensemble.

Our work on classification loss was originally motivated by the paper of Richardson et al. (2004) on the identification of geographical areas with “elevated risk”. Our exploration of various classification loss functions in chapter 4 has demonstrated that the decision rule proposed by Richardson et al. (2004) is equivalent to the utilisation of a weighted TCL function based on $p = .80$. This particular choice of decision rule can be shown to give a greater penalty to false positives than to false negatives, thereby safeguarding the public and decision makers against potential false alarms.

5.2 Generalised Classification Losses

In chapter 4, we have described and used a classification loss function based on the ranking of the elements in a parameter ensemble. The RCL function was originally introduced by Lin et al. (2006) under a variety of guises. These authors suggested the use of several generalised RCL functions that combined penalties for misclassifications with explicit penalties for the distance of the point estimates from the threshold of interest. Their decision-theoretic framework was developed on the basis of rank classification but could easily be adapted to the problem of classifying elements in a parameter ensemble with respect to a threshold on the natural scale of these elements. The basic principles underlying the TCL function introduced in this thesis, could therefore be extended following the lead of Lin et al. (2006), in the following three directions. Here, each loss function takes three parameters, $p, q, b \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_C^{|\cdot|}(p, q, b) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |C - \theta_i^{\text{est}}|^p \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}) + b |C - \theta_i^{\text{est}}|^q \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}), \\ L_C^\dagger(p, q, b) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |C - \theta_i|^p \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}) + b |C - \theta_i|^q \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}), \\ L_C^\ddagger(p, q, b) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\theta_i^{\text{est}} - \theta_i|^p \text{FP}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}) + b |\theta_i^{\text{est}} - \theta_i|^q \text{FN}(C, \theta_i, \theta_i^{\text{est}}); \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where FP and FN are defined as in equations (4.1) and (4.2), respectively, on page 64. As for the TCL, none of these families of loss functions produce a penalty if the true parameter θ_i and the point estimate θ_i^{est} are both above or below the cut-off point C . (Note, however, that this is not true for the *expected* TCL, where integration over the parameter space will necessarily yield a loss greater than zero, regardless of the correctness of the classification). If θ_i and θ_i^{est} are not on the same side of C , $L_C^{|\cdot|}$ penalises the estimation procedure by an amount which is proportional to the distance of θ_i^{est} from C ; L_C^\dagger penalises by an amount which is proportional to the distance of θ_i from C ; and L_C^\ddagger penalises by an amount which is proportional to the distance between θ_i^{est} and θ_i . The parameters p and q permits to vary the strength of the penalties associated with the false positives and the false negatives, respectively. Moreover, a final parameter, b , allows to further adjust these two types of penalties by directly re-weighting their relative importance. Although L_C^\dagger and L_C^\ddagger are of theoretical interest, it should be clear that these particular loss families would be difficult to implement, in practice, because they rely on the unknown quantities, θ_i 's.

The three generalisations of the TCL family in equation (5.1) will require specific optimisation procedures as was demonstrated by Lin et al. (2006), who considered similar generalisations with respect to rank-based classification. Since the minimisation of the expected TCL and RCL functions were found to differ substantially, it is not expected that the work of Lin et al. (2006) on generalised RCLs will necessarily be relevant to the minimisation of the generalised TCLs described in equation (5.1). Further research will therefore be needed to explore these issues and

investigate the behaviour of various plug-in estimators under these generalised versions of the TCL function.

5.3 Modelling Assumptions

Since the choice of a particular loss function only affects the post-processing of the joint posterior distribution of the parameter ensemble of interest, such methods are only as good as the statistical model on which they are based. The use of different models may therefore lead to substantial improvements in either estimating the true heterogeneity of the ensemble or in classifying the elements of that ensemble. This is a concern, which has already been voiced by several authors. Shen and Louis (1999), for instance, have noted the dependence of their triple-goal estimator's performance on the quality of the ensemble prior distribution specified for the parameters of interest. It is this type of concern that led these authors to propose the Smoothing by Roughening (SBR) algorithm in order to produce an Empirical Bayes (EB) prior distribution for the θ_i 's (Shen and Louis, 1999). For spatial models, the critical influence of modelling assumptions on the validity of the subsequent estimation of the level of heterogeneity in a parameter ensemble has been highlighted by Lawson (2009) and Ugarte et al. (2009b).

In chapter 2, we have classified the models studied throughout the thesis in three categories depending on the choice of second-level priors. This included (i) proper conjugate iid priors, (ii) non-conjugate proper iid priors and (iii) non-conjugate improper non-iid priors on the θ_i 's. It may be of interest to consider non-parametric extensions of these models, such as ones based on the Dirichlet process prior (MacEachern, 1994, MacEachern and Muller, 1998). The specification of such priors in BHMs tends to give more flexibility to the model. In our case, this may particularly help to evaluate the shape of the ensemble distribution with greater accuracy, which could yield better estimates of the heterogeneity of the ensemble. The combination of a parametric likelihood function with a non-parametric hierarchical prior is often referred to as a semi-parametric model. When combined with the Q-SEL or QR-SEL functions, such semi-parametric Bayesian models may be particularly well-suited to the type of inferential problems encountered in epidemiology, where the estimation of the properties of the empirical distributions of parameter ensembles is especially important.

In terms of the classification of the elements of an ensemble, Ugarte et al. (2009a) have compared the performance of a HBM with an EB strategy, and have concluded that the full Bayesian framework may be preferable for the classification of elements in a parameter ensemble. In addition, a natural modelling approach to this problem may be the use of mixture models. One of the important limitations of the procedure developed in chapter 4 is that we are imposing the number of categories and fixing a particular cut-off point. When one is simply interested in identifying the elements of an ensemble, which are characterised by a level of risk greater than a certain threshold, this classification procedure could be sufficient. However, if one is interested in the number of categories per se, a more sophisticated modelling strategy may be adopted, where inference about the number of categories can be directly conducted. Richardson et al. (2004), for instance, have considered the use of the reversible-jump MCMC algorithm in conjunction with a decision-theoretic framework in order to classify the elements of an ensemble (see also Green, 1995, Richardson and Green, 1997). As explained in the introduction of chapter 4, Richardson et al. (2004) have calibrated their choice of classification thresholds differently, when utilising different models. While we have shown that the use of the posterior median is optimal under the posterior TCL function, it may nonetheless be of interest to investigate how specific modelling outputs, such as the distribution of the number of mixture components in a semi-parametric mixture models could be used in the context of classifying the elements of an ensemble in terms of levels of risk. More specifically, the posterior distribution of the number of mixture components could aid with the determination of the ideal cut-off value upon which the classification exercise is conducted.

Appendix A

Non-Spatial Simulations

In this appendix, we provide some descriptive statistics of the non-spatial simulated data sets used in chapters 3 and 4.

Table A.1. Descriptive statistics for the simulated y_i 's. Presented for the Normal-Normal model in equation (2.20) and the Gamma-Inverse gamma model in equation (2.21), and for 3 different levels of RLS (ratio of the largest to the smallest σ_i), and 3 different values for n , averaged over 100 synthetic data sets.

<i>Models & Shrinkage</i>	<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
	Mean	SD	2.5 th Qua.	Median	97.5 th Qua.
RLS \doteq 1					
N-N, $n = 100$	-0.002	1.414	-2.682	-0.006	2.641
N-N, $n = 200$	0.001	1.410	-2.709	-0.001	2.707
N-N, $n = 1000$	0.004	1.419	-2.766	0.006	2.775
G-IG, $n = 100$	1.000	1.253	0.027	0.588	4.252
G-IG, $n = 200$	0.992	1.325	0.024	0.575	4.308
G-IG, $n = 1000$	0.997	1.396	0.020	0.572	4.478
RLS \doteq 20					
N-N, $n = 100$	0.014	1.569	-2.984	0.016	3.014
N-N, $n = 200$	0.022	1.554	-2.998	0.026	3.053
N-N, $n = 1000$	0.005	1.558	-3.101	0.007	3.090
G-IG, $n = 100$	1.408	2.099	0.001	0.673	6.688
G-IG, $n = 200$	1.413	2.190	0.001	0.667	6.955
G-IG, $n = 1000$	1.412	2.235	0.000	0.659	7.071
RLS \doteq 100					
N-N, $n = 100$	0.023	1.786	-3.419	-0.001	3.647
N-N, $n = 200$	-0.003	1.767	-3.562	-0.010	3.563
N-N, $n = 1000$	0.006	1.773	-3.609	0.002	3.635
G-IG, $n = 100$	2.191	3.807	0.000	0.733	11.791
G-IG, $n = 200$	2.101	3.690	0.000	0.712	11.589
G-IG, $n = 1000$	2.130	3.749	0.000	0.704	11.885

Table A.2. Descriptive statistics for the simulated σ_i 's. Presented for the Normal-Normal model in equation (2.20) and the Gamma-Inverse gamma model in equation (2.21), and for 3 different levels of RLS (ratio of the largest to the smallest σ_i), and 3 different values for n , averaged over 100 synthetic data sets.

<i>Models & Shrinkage</i>	<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
	Mean	SD	2.5 th Qua.	Median	97.5 th Qua.
RLS \doteq 1					
$n = 100$	1.000	0.006	0.991	1.000	1.009
$n = 200$	1.000	0.006	0.991	1.000	1.009
$n = 1000$	1.000	0.006	0.991	1.000	1.010
RLS \doteq 20					
$n = 100$	1.398	1.135	0.246	0.993	4.027
$n = 200$	1.426	1.152	0.244	1.017	4.125
$n = 1000$	1.415	1.147	0.241	1.001	4.147
RLS \doteq 100					
$n = 100$	2.158	2.503	0.117	1.022	8.627
$n = 200$	2.119	2.464	0.115	1.006	8.663
$n = 1000$	2.139	2.487	0.113	0.999	8.839

Appendix B

Spatial Simulations

In this appendix, we provide some descriptive statistics of the spatial simulated data sets used in chapters 3 and 4.

Table B.1. Descriptive statistics for the E_i 's used in the synthetic data simulations. These are here presented with respect to three different values of the scaling factor (SF), controlling the level of the expected counts. The E_i 's reported here correspond to the expected counts for lung cancer in West Sussex adjusted for age only, occurring among males between 1989 and 2003. These data points have been extracted from the Thames Cancer Registry (TCR).

<i>Scaling Factor</i>	<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
	Mean	SD	2.5 th Qua.	Median	97.5 th Qua.
$SF = 0.1$	17	9	5	15	39
$SF = 1$	170	88	52	149	389
$SF = 2$	340	175	105	298	778

Table B.2. Descriptive statistics for the Relative Risks (RRs) in the synthetic spatial simulations. Presented under three different levels of variability (low, medium and high), where the parameters controlling the levels of variability are modified according to the spatial scenario (i.e. SC1, SC2, SC3 and SC4) considered. Note that while the RRs were simulated from specific statistical models in SC3 and SC4, they were set to specific values in SC1 and SC2.

<i>Scenarios & Variability</i>	<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
	Mean	SD	2.5 th Qua.	Median	97.5 th Qua.
<i>Low Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 1.5$)	1.018	0.093	1.000	1.000	1.500
SC2 ($LR = 1.5$)	1.107	0.206	1.000	1.000	1.500
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.1$)	1.027	0.283	0.604	0.992	1.622
SC4 ($\beta = 0.2$)	1.025	0.243	0.696	0.971	1.590
<i>Medium Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 2$)	1.036	0.187	1.000	1.000	2.000
SC2 ($LR = 2$)	1.215	0.412	1.000	1.000	2.000
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.2$)	1.194	0.513	0.535	1.077	2.408
SC4 ($\beta = 0.3$)	1.055	0.367	0.612	0.954	1.938
<i>High Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 3$)	1.072	0.373	1.000	1.000	3.000
SC2 ($LR = 3$)	1.430	0.824	1.000	1.000	3.000
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.3$)	1.193	0.598	0.465	1.049	2.641
SC4 ($\beta = 0.4$)	1.095	0.515	0.531	0.935	2.358

Table B.3. Descriptive statistics for the simulated y_i 's. Presented for three choices of the Scaling Factor (SF) of the expected counts, three different levels of variability (low, medium and high), and four different spatial scenarios (i.e. SC1, SC2, SC3 and SC4).

<i>Scenarios & Variability</i>	<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
	Mean	SD	2.5 th Qua.	Median	97.5 th Qua.
<i>SF = 0.1, Low Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 1.5$)	4.300	3.061	1.000	3.775	12.144
SC2 ($LR = 1.5$)	4.312	3.084	1.000	3.825	11.725
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.1$)	4.314	3.182	1.000	3.650	12.219
SC4 ($\beta = 0.2$)	4.325	3.291	1.000	3.550	12.463
<i>SF = 0.1, Medium Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 2$)	4.311	3.382	1.000	3.625	12.494
SC2 ($LR = 2$)	4.325	3.458	1.000	3.275	13.350
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.2$)	4.331	3.529	1.000	3.300	13.344
SC4 ($\beta = 0.3$)	4.328	3.666	1.000	3.100	13.669
<i>SF = 0.1, High Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 3$)	4.304	3.982	1.000	3.050	14.475
SC2 ($LR = 3$)	4.345	4.177	1.000	3.000	15.331
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.3$)	4.341	3.649	1.000	3.300	13.619
SC4 ($\beta = 0.4$)	4.355	4.210	1.000	3.050	15.456
<i>SF = 1, Low Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 1.5$)	42.440	24.587	10.294	36.850	104.000
SC2 ($LR = 1.5$)	42.440	25.761	9.931	36.125	104.469
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.1$)	42.440	25.681	9.531	36.475	106.369
SC4 ($\beta = 0.2$)	42.440	28.559	8.575	36.650	114.831
<i>SF = 1, Medium Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 2$)	42.440	27.544	10.350	36.000	122.906
SC2 ($LR = 2$)	42.440	30.502	8.750	33.225	122.244
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.2$)	42.440	30.418	7.381	34.625	117.656
SC4 ($\beta = 0.3$)	42.440	32.439	6.813	35.300	125.587
<i>SF = 1, High Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 3$)	42.440	34.910	9.638	34.100	175.525
SC2 ($LR = 3$)	42.440	38.826	6.725	29.275	151.644
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.3$)	42.440	31.448	7.744	33.500	123.769
SC4 ($\beta = 0.4$)	42.440	38.143	6.081	32.700	135.731
<i>SF = 2, Low Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 1.5$)	84.886	48.263	22.631	73.575	200.469
SC2 ($LR = 1.5$)	84.886	51.058	21.744	71.700	212.281
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.1$)	84.886	53.573	18.131	72.200	220.244
SC4 ($\beta = 0.2$)	84.886	56.077	17.500	74.275	227.494
<i>SF = 2, Medium Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 2$)	84.886	53.721	22.181	72.175	216.163
SC2 ($LR = 2$)	84.886	59.674	20.056	66.075	248.344
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.2$)	84.886	56.546	18.444	69.750	231.025
SC4 ($\beta = 0.3$)	84.886	65.128	14.856	70.825	250.919
<i>SF = 2, High Variab.</i>					
SC1 ($LR = 3$)	84.886	68.050	20.881	69.400	268.369
SC2 ($LR = 3$)	84.886	77.636	16.775	57.625	316.769
SC3 ($\sigma = 0.3$)	84.886	64.130	15.100	67.325	244.894
SC4 ($\beta = 0.4$)	84.886	75.035	12.675	66.125	271.725

Appendix C

WinBUGS Codes

C.1 CAR Normal (BYM) Model

```
                                CAR Normal                                

---

  
# CAR (convolution) Normal.  
#####  
model{  
  for (i in 1:N){  
    y[i] ~ dpois(lambda[i])  
    log(lambda[i]) <- log(E[i]) + theta[i]  
    theta[i] <- alpha + v[i] + u[i]  
    RR[i]    <- exp(theta[i])  
    v[i] ~ dnorm(0,tau2_v)  
  }  
  
#####  
# CAR prior:  
u[1:N] ~ car.normal(adj[],weights[],num[],tau2_u)  
for (j in 1:sumNumNeigh){  
  weights[j] <- 1.0  
}  
  
#####  
# Hyperpriors.  
alpha ~ dflat()  
# Scaling Parameters.  
tau2_v ~ dgamma(0.5,0.0005)  
tau2_u ~ dgamma(0.5,0.0005)  
sig_v <- sqrt(1/tau2_v)  
sig_u <- sqrt(1/tau2_u)  
  
}# EoF
```

C.2 CAR Laplace (L1) Model

CAR Laplace

```
# CAR (convolution) L1.

#####
model{
  for (i in 1:N){
    y[i] ~ dpois(lambda[i])
    log(lambda[i]) <- log(E[i]) + theta[i]
    theta[i] <- alpha + v[i] + u[i]
    RR[i] <- exp(theta[i])
    v[i] ~ dnorm(0,tau2_v)
  }

#####
# CAR prior
u[1:N] ~ car.l1(adj[],weights[],num[],tau2_u)
for (j in 1:sumNumNeigh){
  weights[j] <- 1.0
}

#####
# Hyperpriors.
alpha ~ dflat()

# Scaling Parameters.
tau2_v ~ dgamma(0.5,0.0005)
tau2_u ~ dgamma(0.5,0.0005)
sig_v <- sqrt(1/tau2_v)
sig_u <- sqrt(1/tau2_u)

}# EoF
```

C.3 MRSA Model

MRSA Model

```
# Loglinear Model.
#####
model{
  for (i in 1:n){
    y[i] ~ dpois(lambda[i])
    log(lambda[i]) <- log(E[i]) + theta[i]
    theta[i] <- alpha + v[i]
    RR[i] <- exp(theta[i])
    v[i] ~ dnorm(0,tau2_v)
  }

#####
# Hyperpriors.
alpha ~ dnorm(0.0,1.0E-6)

# Scaling Parameters.
tau2_v ~ dgamma(0.5,0.0005)
sig_v <- sqrt(1/tau2_v)

}# EoF
```

Bibliography

- Basagana, X., Sunyer, J., Kogevinas, M., Zock, J.P., Duran-Tauleria, E., Jarvis, D., Burney, P., and Anto, J.M. (2004). Socioeconomic status and asthma prevalence in young adults: The european community respiratory health survey. *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, **160**(2), 178–188.
- Berger, J. (1980). A Robust Generalized Bayes Estimator and Confidence Region for a Multivariate Normal Mean. *The Annals of Statistics*, **8**(4), 716–761.
- Bernardo, J. and Smith, A. (1994). *Bayesian theory*. Wiley, London.
- Besag, J. (1974). Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **36**, 192–236.
- Besag, J. and Kooperberg, C. (1995). On Conditional and Intrinsic Autoregression. *Biometrika*, **82**(4), 733–746.
- Besag, J., York, J., and Molli, A. (1991). Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **43**(1), 1–20.
- Best, N., Richardson, S., and Thomson, A. (2005). A comparison of Bayesian spatial models for disease mapping. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, **14**, 35–59.
- Best, N.G., Spiegelhalter, D.J., Thomas, A., and Brayne, C.E.G. (1996). Bayesian analysis of realistically complex models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)*, **159**(2), 323–342.
- Cantor-Graae, E., Pedersen, C., McNeil, T., and Mortensen, P. (2003). Migration as a risk factor for schizophrenia: a danish population-based cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry*, **182**(2), 117–122.
- Carstairs, V. (2000). Socio-economic factors at areal level and their relationship with health. In P. Elliott, J. Wakefield, N. Best, and D. Briggs (eds.) *Spatial Epidemiology: Methods and Applications*, -. Oxford University Press, London.
- Carstairs, V. and Morris, R. (1989a). Deprivation: explaining differences in mortality between scotland and england and wales. *British Medical Journal*, **299**(6704), 886–889.
- Carstairs, V. and Morris, R. (1989b). Deprivation and mortality: an alternative to social class? *Journal of Public Health*, **11**(3), 210–219.
- Chaix, B., Merlo, J., and Chauvin, P. (2005). Comparison of a spatial approach with the multilevel approach for investigating place effects on health: the example of healthcare utilisation in france. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, **59**(6), 517–526.
- Clayton, D. and Kaldor, J. (1987). Empirical bayes estimates of age-standardized relative risks for use in disease mapping. *Biometrics*, **43**(3), 671–681.
- Craigmile, P., Cressie, N., Santner, T., and Rao, Y. (2006). A loss function approach to identifying environmental exceedances. *Extremes*, **8**(3), 143–159.

- DeGroot, M. (1970). *Optimal statistical decisions*. Wiley, London.
- Demidenko, E. (2004). *Mixed Models: Theory and Applications*. Wiley, London.
- Efron, B. and Tibshirani, R. (1993). *An introduction to the bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Elmore, J.G., Miglioretti, D.L., Reisch, L.M., Barton, M.B., Kreuter, W., Christiansen, C.L., and Fletcher, S.W. (2002). Screening mammograms by community radiologists: Variability in false-positive rates. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.*, **94**(18), 1373–1380.
- Faris, R. and Dunham, H. (1939). *Mental disorders in urban areas*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fishburn, P. (1964). *Decision and Value Theory*. Wiley, London.
- Frey, J. and Cressie, N. (2003). Some results on constrained bayes estimators. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **65**, 389–399.
- Gelman, A. (2006). Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models. *Bayesian Analysis*, **3**, 515–533.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J., Stern, H., and Rubin, D. (2004). *Bayesian Data Analysis*. Chapman and Hall, London, 2nd ed.
- Gelman, A. and Price, P. (1999). All maps of parameter estimates are misleading. *Statistics in medicine*, **18**, 3221–3234.
- Ghosh, M. and Rao, J.N.K. (1994). Small area estimation: An appraisal. *Statistical Science*, **9**(1), 55–76.
- Ghosh, M. (1992). Constrained bayes estimation with applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **87**(418), 533–540.
- Giggs, J. (1973). Distribution of schizophrenics in nottingham. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **59**, 5–76.
- Giggs, J. and Cooper, J. (1987). Ecological structure and the distribution of schizophrenia and affective psychoses in nottingham. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **151**, 627–633.
- Gilchrist, W. (2000). *Statistical modelling with quantile functions*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Goldstein, H. and Spiegelhalter, D.J. (1996). League tables and their limitations: Statistical issues in comparisons of institutional performance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)*, **159**(3), 385–443.
- Gomez-Deniz, E., Perez-Sanchez, J., and Vazquez-Polo, F. (2006). On the use of posterior regret $[\gamma]$ -minimax actions to obtain credibility premiums. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **39**(1), 115–121.
- Gordon, A. (1999). *Classification*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Green, P. (1995). Reversible jump markov chain monte carlo computation and bayesian model determination. *Biometrika*, **82**, 711–32.
- Green, P. and Richardson, S. (2002). Hidden markov models and disease mapping. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **97**, 1055–1070.
- Grigg, O.A., Farewell, V.T., and Spiegelhalter, D.J. (2003). Use of risk-adjusted cusum and rsprtcharts for monitoring in medical contexts. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, **12**(2), 147–170.

- Grigg, O.A., Spiegelhalter, D.J., and Jones, H.E. (2009). Local and marginal control charts applied to methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus bacteraemia reports in uk acute national health service trusts. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, **172**(1), 49–66.
- Grigg, O. and Spiegelhalter, D. (2007). A simple risk-adjusted exponentially weighted moving average. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **102**(477), 140–152.
- Hafner, H., Reimann, H., and Immich, H. (1969). Inzidenz seelischer erkrankungen in mannheim 1965. *Soc Psychiatr*, **4**, 127–135.
- Hare, E. (1956). Mental illness and social condition in bristol. *Journal of Mental Sciences*, **102**, 349–357.
- Harrison, G., Glazebrook, C., and Brewin, J.e.a. (1997). Increased incidence of psychotic disorders in migrants from teh caribbean to the united-kingdom. *Psychological Medicine*, **27**, 799–806.
- Hollingshead, A. and Redlich, F. (1958). *Social class and mental illness*. Wiley, New York.
- Huber, P. and Ronchetti, E. (2009). *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, London, 2nd ed.
- Jablensky, A., Sartorius, N., Ernberg, G., Anker, M., Korten, A., Cooper, J., Day, R., and Bertelsen, A. (1992). Schizophrenia: manifestations, incidence and course in different cultures. a world health organization ten-counter study. *Psychological Medicine*, **S20**, 1–97.
- Jarup, L., Best, N., and Toledano, M. (2002). Geographical epidemiology of prostate cancer in great britain. *International Journal of Cancer*, **97**, 695–699.
- Kirkbride, J., Fearon, P., Morgan, C., Dazzan, P., Morgan, K., Murray, R., and Jones, P. (2007). Neighbourhood variation in the incidence of psychotic disorders in southeast london. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, **42**(6), 438–445.
- Kirkbride, J.B., Fearon, P., Morgan, C., Dazzan, P., Morgan, K., Tarrant, J., Lloyd, T., Holloway, J., Hutchinson, G., Leff, J.P., Mallett, R.M., Harrison, G.L., Murray, R.M., and Jones, P.B. (2006). Heterogeneity in incidence rates of schizophrenia and other psychotic syndromes: Findings from the 3-center aesop study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, **63**(3)(3), 250–258.
- Koenker, R. and Bassett, B. (1978). Regression quantiles. *Econometrica*, **46**, 33–50.
- Krabbendam, L. and van Os, J. (2005). Schizophrenia and urbanicity: a major environmental influence—conditional on genetic risk. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, **31**, 795–799.
- Kreps, D. (1988). *Notes on the Theory of Choice*. Underground Classics in Economics. Westview, New York.
- Laird, N.M. and Louis, T.A. (1989). Empirical bayes ranking methods. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, **14**(1), 29–46.
- Larsen, K. and Merlo, J. (2005). Appropriate assessment of neighborhood effects on individual health: Integrating random and fixed effects in multilevel logistic regression. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, **161**, 81–88.
- Larsen, K., Petersen, J.H., Budtz-Jrgensen, E., and Endahl, L. (2000). Interpreting parameters in the logistic regression model with random effects. *Biometrics*, **56**(3), 909–914.
- Lawson, A. (2009). *Bayesian disease mapping: hierarchical modeling in spatial epidemiology*. CRC Press, London.
- Lehmann, E. and Casella, G. (1995). *Theory of Point Estimation*. Wadsworth, Pacific Grove, California.

- Lewis, G., David, A., Andreasson, S., and et al. (1992). Schizophrenia and city life. *Lancet*, **340**, 137–140.
- Lin, R., Louis, T., Paddock, S., and Ridgeway, G. (2006). Loss function based ranking in two-stage hierarchical models. *Bayesian analysis*, **1**(4), 915–946.
- Lockwood, J., Louis, T., and McCaffrey, D. (2004). Uncertainty in rank estimation: Implications for value-added mode. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, **29**, 67–101.
- Loffler, W. and Haffner, H. (1999). Ecological patterns of first admitted schizophrenics to two german cities over 25 years. *Social Sciences and Medicine*, **49**, 93–108.
- Lopez-Abente, G., Ramis, R., Pollan, M., Aragonés, N., Perez-Gomez, B., Gomez-Barroso, D., Carrasco, J., Lope, V., Garcia-Perez, J., Boldo, E., and Garcia-Mendizabal, M. (2007). *Atlas of cancer mortality at municipality level in Spain 1989–1998*. Area de Epidemiologia Ambiental y Cancer del Centro Nacional de Epidemiologia ISCIII, Madrid.
- Lopez-Abente, G., Aragonés, N., Ramis, R., Hernandez-Barrera, V., Perez-Gomez, B., Escolar-Pujolar, A., and Pollan, M. (2006). Municipal distribution of bladder cancer mortality in Spain: Possible role of mining and industry. *BMC Public Health*, **6**(1), 17–27.
- Louis, T. (1984). Estimating a population of parameter values using bayes and empirical bayes methods. *JASA*, **79**, 393–398.
- Lunn, D., Thomas, A., Best, N., and Spiegelhalter, D. (2000). Winbugs – a bayesian modelling framework: concepts, structure, and extensibility. *Statistics and Computing*, **10**, 325–337.
- MacEachern, S. (1994). Estimating normal means with a conjugate style dirichlet process prior. *Communication in Statistics –Simulation and Computation*, **23**, 727–741.
- MacEachern, S.N. and Muller, P. (1998). Estimating mixture of dirichlet process models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **7**(2), 223–238.
- MacNab, Y., Qiu, Z., Gustafson, P., Dean, C., Ohlsson, A., and Lee, S. (2004). Hierarchical bayes analysis of multilevel health services data: A canadian neonatal mortality study. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology*, **5**, 5–26.
- Marcelis, M., Navarro-Mateu, F., Murray, R., and et al. (1998). Urbanization and psychosis: A study of 1942–1978 birth cohorts in the netherlands. *Psychological Medicine*, **28**, 871–879.
- McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J. (1989). *Generalized Linear Models*. Chapman and Hall, 2nd ed.
- Normand, S.L.T., Glickman, M.E., and Gatsonis, C.A. (1997). Statistical methods for profiling providers of medical care: Issues and applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**(439), 803–814.
- Pedersen, C. and Mortensen, P. (2001). Evidence of a dose-response relationship between urbanicity during upbringing and schizophrenia risk. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, **58**, 1039–1046.
- Pollan, M., Ramis, R., Aragonés, N., Perez-Gomez, B., Gomez, D., Lope, V., Garcia-Perez, J., Carrasco, J., Garcia-Mendizabal, M., and Lopez-Abente, G. (2007). Municipal distribution of breast cancer mortality among women in Spain. *BMC Cancer*, **7**(1), 78–88.
- Raiffa, H. and Schlaifer, R. (1960). *Applied Statistical Decision Theory*. Wiley Classics Library.
- Rao, J. (2003). *Small Area Estimation*. Wiley.
- Richardson, S., Thomson, A., Best, N., and Elliott, P. (2004). Interpreting posterior relative risk estimates in disease-mapping studies. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, **112**, 1016–1025.

- Richardson, S. and Green, P.J. (1997). On bayesian analysis of mixtures with an unknown number of components. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **59**(4), 731–792.
- Robert, C.P. (1996). Intrinsic losses. *Theory and Decision*, **40**(2), 191–214.
- Robert, C. (2007). *The Bayesian Choice*. Springer, London, 2nd ed.
- Robert, C. and Casella, G. (2004). *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods (2nd Ed.)*. Springer.
- Savage, L. (1954). *The Foundations of Statistics*. Dover, New York.
- Shen, W. and Louis, T. (1999). Empirical bayes estimation via the smoothing by roughening approach. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, **8**, 800–823.
- Shen, W. and Louis, T. (2000). Triple-goal estimates for disease mapping. *Statistics in Medicine*, **19**, 2295–2308.
- Shen, W. and Louis, T.A. (1998). Triple-goal estimates in two-stage hierarchical models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **60**(2), 455–471.
- Shipman-Inquiry (2004). *Shipman Inquiry Fifth Report – Safeguarding Patients: Lessons from the Past, Proposals for the future*. Stationary Office, London.
- Spiegelhalter, D. (2005). Problems in assessing rates of infection with methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus. *British Medical Journal*, **331**, 1013–1015.
- Spiegelhalter, D., Abrams, K., and Myles, J. (2004). *Bayesian approaches to clinical trials and health-care evaluation*. Wiley, London.
- Spiegelhalter, D., Thomas, A., and Best, N. (2000). *WinBUGS Version 1.3 User Manual*. Medical Research Council Biostatistics Unit., Cambridge.
- Steinbrecher, G. and Shaw, W. (2008). Quantile mechanics. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, **19**(02), 87–112.
- Sundquist, K., Malmstrom, M., and Johansson, S.E. (2004). Neighbourhood deprivation and incidence of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study of 2.6 million women and men in sweden. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, **58**(1), 71–77.
- Ugarte, M.D., Goicoa, T., Ibez, B., and Militino, A.F. (2009a). Evaluating the performance of spatio-temporal bayesian models in disease mapping. *Environmetrics*, **20**(6), 647–665.
- Ugarte, M., Goicoa, T., and Militino, A. (2009b). Empirical bayes and fully bayes procedures to detect high-risk areas in disease mapping. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **53**(8), 2938–2949.
- van Os, J., Hannssen, M., Bak, M., and et al. (2003). Do urbanicity and familial liability coparticipate in causing psychosis? *American Journal of Psychiatry*, **160**, 477–482.
- von Neumann, J. and Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press, New York.
- Wakefield, J., Best, N., and Waller, L. (2000). Bayesian approaches to disease mapping. In P. Elliott, J. Wakefield, N. Best, and D. Briggs (eds.) *Spatial epidemiology: Methods and applications*, 104–127. OUP, London.
- Waller, L.A., Carlin, B.P., Xia, H., and Gelfand, A.E. (1997). Hierarchical spatio-temporal mapping of disease rates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**(438), 607–617.
- Wichura, M.J. (1988). Algorithm as 241: The percentage points of the normal distribution. *Applied Statistics*, **37**(3), 477–484.
- Wright, D., Stern, H.S., and Cressie, N. (2003). Loss functions for estimation of extrema with an application to disease mapping. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **31**(3), 251–266.