

# Power-Conditional-Expected Priors: Using $g$ -priors with Random Imaginary Data for Variable Selection

D. Fouskakis\* and I. Ntzoufras†

## Summary:

The Zellner's  $g$ -prior and its recent hierarchical extensions are the most popular default prior choices in the Bayesian variable selection context. These prior set-ups can be expressed power-priors with fixed set of imaginary data. In this paper, we borrow ideas from the power-expected-posterior (PEP) priors in order to introduce, under the  $g$ -prior approach, an extra hierarchical level that accounts for the imaginary data uncertainty. For normal regression variable selection problems, the resulting power-conditional-expected-posterior (PCEP) prior is a conjugate normal-inverse gamma prior which provides a consistent variable selection procedure and gives support to more parsimonious models than the ones supported using the  $g$ -prior and the hyper- $g$  prior for finite samples. Detailed illustrations and comparisons of the variable selection procedures using the proposed method, the  $g$ -prior and the hyper- $g$  prior are provided using both simulated and real data examples.

*Keywords:* Bayesian variable selection; Bayes factors; Conjugate prior; Consistency; Expected-posterior priors; Gaussian linear models; Objective model selection methods; Power prior; Training sample; Unit-information prior.

## 1 Introduction

During the last years, research in Bayesian variable selection has been focused on the choice of suitable and meaningful priors for the model parameters. Specification of the hyperparameters of proper priors for model-specific parameters is crucial since posterior model odds are highly sensitive on the values of the prior variances due to the Jeffreys-Lindley-Bartlett paradox (Lindley 1957, Bartlett 1957). Moreover, the use of improper priors is not allowed, due to the presence of unknown normalizing constants involved in the calculation of the Bayes factors. A series of important publications deal with the above mentioned issues, including the  $g$ -prior (Zellner 1986), the benchmark priors of (Fernandez, Ley & Steel 2001), the fractional Bayes factor approach (O'Hagan 1995), the intrinsic Bayes factor (Berger & Pericchi 1996), the intrinsic variable selection method (Casella & Moreno 2006) and the expected-posterior prior approach (Pérez & Berger 2002) among others. More recently, interest lies on the mixtures of  $g$ -priors, including the hyper- $g$  prior of Liang, Paulo, Molina, Clyde & Berger (2008), the extension of Sabanés Bové & Held (2011) for GLMs and the work of Ley & Steel (2012) for economic applications.

---

\*D. Fouskakis is with the Department of Mathematics, National Technical University of Athens, Zografou Campus, Athens 15780 Greece; email [fouskakis@math.ntua.gr](mailto:fouskakis@math.ntua.gr)

†I. Ntzoufras is with the Department of Statistics, Athens University of Economics and Business, 76 Patision Street, Athens 10434 Greece; email [ntzoufras@aueb.gr](mailto:ntzoufras@aueb.gr)

A usual mechanism to produce sensible and compatible prior distributions across models is via imaginary data. The Zellner’s  $g$ -prior can be expressed as a power-prior with fixed set of imaginary data; see for details Zellner (1986) and Ibrahim & Chen (2000). Similar is the case for any mixture of  $g$ -prior, with additional uncertainty introduced on the volume of the information that the imaginary data account in the posterior inference.

In this article, we further use ideas from the expected-posterior prior approach (Pérez & Berger 2002) in order to introduce uncertainty around the assumed imaginary data in a similar manner as in Fouskakis, Ntzoufras & Draper (2013). Specifically, we introduce a hyperprior for the imaginary data by adding an extra hierarchical level to our model structure that has an effect on the prior mean of the regression coefficients.

When our approach is implemented in the Zellner’s  $g$ -prior, the result is a normal-inverse gamma conjugate prior that leads to a variable selection procedure that is similar, for large datasets, but systematically more parsimonious, for small sample sizes, than the one using the Zellner’s  $g$ -prior or mixtures of  $g$ -priors.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the role of imaginary data in  $g$ -priors. In Section 3 we discuss the extension of the  $g$ -prior by considering imaginary data coming from a “suitable” predictive distribution using the expected-posterior prior approach. Our new prior and the induced variable selection procedure, under a specific choice of baseline prior, is fully described in detail in Section 4; formulas for the resulting prior, posterior and marginal likelihood are given and a short discussion about the choice of hyperparameters is presented. Section 5 explores the limiting behaviour of the marginal likelihood, while in Section 6 we discuss the differences between our prior and the Zellner’s  $g$ -prior. In Section 7 we present illustrations of our method and Section 8 concludes the paper with a brief discussion.

## 2 The role of imaginary data in $g$ -priors

Let us consider a set of imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^* = (y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_{n^*}^*)^T$  of size  $n^*$ . Then, following the power-prior approach introduced by Ibrahim & Chen (2000), for any model  $m_\ell$  with parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell$ , likelihood  $f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell, m_\ell)$  and baseline prior  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell)$ , we can obtain a “sensible” prior for the model parameters based on the following expression

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell|\mathbf{y}^*; \delta) \propto f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell, m_\ell)^{1/\delta} \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell).$$

The parameter  $\delta \geq 1$  controls the weight that the imaginary data contribute to the “final” posterior distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell$ , since

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) \propto f(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell, m_\ell) f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell, m_\ell)^{1/\delta} \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell).$$

For  $\delta = 1$ , the above prior is exactly equal to the posterior distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell$  after observing the imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^*$ . For  $\delta = 1/n^*$  the contribution of the imaginary data to the overall posterior is equal to one data point; i.e. the prior has a unit-information interpretation (Kass & Wasserman 1995).

In the following we focus on variable selection problems for normal regression models. Therefore, for any model  $m_\ell$ , with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\ell = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2)$  the likelihood is specified by

$$\mathbf{Y}|X_\ell, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell \sim N_n(X_\ell \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \tag{1}$$

where  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^T$  is a multivariate random variable expressing the response for each subject,  $\mathbf{X}_\ell$  is a  $n \times d_\ell$  design matrix containing the values of the explanatory variables in its columns,  $\mathbf{I}_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell$  is a vector of length  $d_\ell$  with the effects of each covariate on the response variable and  $\sigma^2$  is the error variance, common to all models.

If we adopt the power-prior approach for the regression coefficients  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$ , with imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , of size  $n^*$  and imaginary design matrix  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^*$ , then the prior will be defined as

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\delta\sigma^2} (\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell)^T (\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell)\right) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2),$$

with  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2)$  denoting the baseline prior for  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$ . When  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2) \propto 1$ , then

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) = f_{N_{d_\ell}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^*, \delta (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2\right),$$

where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^* = (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{y}^*$  and  $f_{N_d}(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  denoting the density of the  $d$ -dimensional normal distribution with mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and variance-covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  evaluated at  $\mathbf{y}$ . From the above, it is obvious that the Zellner's  $g$ -prior can be expressed as a power-prior using imaginary data with the same design matrix as the original, i.e.  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$ , mean equal to  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y}^*$  and  $g = \delta$ . The usual case with zero mean is simply obtained assuming imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^* = \mathbf{0}$ , i.e. the imaginary data are coming from the constant model with zero mean and no variability.

A similar expression is obtained even if the baseline prior has the following  $g$ -prior structure:

$$\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2) = f_{N_{d_\ell}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \mathbf{0}, g_0 (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2\right). \quad (2)$$

In this case, the power-prior is given by

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) = f_{N_{d_\ell}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; w \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^*, w \delta (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $w = g_0 / (g_0 + \delta)$ . Thus, the Zellner's  $g$ -prior can be interpreted now as a power-prior using imaginary data with the same design matrix as the original, i.e.  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$ , mean equal to  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = w (\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y}^*$  and  $g = w \delta$ .

Furthermore, the modified version of the  $g$ -prior, as in Liang et al. (2008):

$$\pi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\setminus 0, \ell} | \beta_{0, \ell}, \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*) = f_{N_{d_\ell}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\setminus 0, \ell}; \mathbf{0}, g (\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 0, \ell}^T \mathbf{X}_{\setminus 0, \ell})^{-1} \sigma^2\right), \quad (4)$$

with  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\setminus 0, \ell}$  denoting the sub-vector of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell$  without the constant parameter  $\beta_{0, \ell}$ , can be also interpreted as a power-prior using similar arguments as above. Specifically, we can obtain (4) by assuming imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^* = \beta_{0, \ell} \mathbf{1}_n$  for a given  $\beta_{0, \ell}$  since the linear predictor of the regression model is written as  $\mathbf{X}_\ell \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell = \beta_{0, \ell} \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbf{X}_{\setminus 0, \ell} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\setminus 0, \ell}$ ; where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  is the vector of length  $n$  with all elements equal to one.

### 3 Random imaginary data and $g$ -priors

The hyperparameter  $g$  in the  $g$ -prior, controls the inverse relative imaginary sample size. Over the last years research has been focused on the selection of this hyperparameter (e.g. George & Foster 2000, Fernandez et al. 2001). Lately, Liang et al. (2008) studied mixtures of  $g$ -priors by

introducing the use of an hyperprior for  $g$ . In all the developments of the  $g$ -prior the imaginary data are assumed to be fixed as described in the previous section. Here we extend the  $g$ -prior (with  $g$  either fixed or random) in a different direction, by considering imaginary data coming from a “suitable” predictive distribution. Specifically, we add an extra hierarchical level to the specification of the prior distribution, that has an effect on both the prior mean and the prior variance, through the variability of the imaginary data. Therefore, for any model  $m_\ell$ , the resulting prior for  $\beta_\ell$ , given  $\sigma^2$  has the following form

$$\pi_\ell(\beta_\ell|\sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*) = \int f_{N_{d_\ell}}\left(\beta_\ell; w\widehat{\beta}_\ell^{*z}, g(X_\ell^T X_\ell)^{-1}\sigma^2\right) m^*(\mathbf{y}^*) d\mathbf{y}^* \quad (5)$$

where  $\widehat{\beta}_\ell^{*z} = (X_\ell^T X_\ell)^{-1} X_\ell^T \mathbf{y}^*$  and  $m^*(\mathbf{y}^*)$  is the hyperprior for the imaginary data  $\mathbf{y}^*$  of size  $n$ . In the above expression  $w$  and  $g$  are hyperparameters that need to be specified; details are shown later in this Section.

For the specification of the hyperprior  $m^*$ , we might use the expected-posterior prior approach (Pérez & Berger 2002), that, as will see in the next section, assumes random imaginary samples coming from a common underlying predictive distribution, using an initial baseline prior distribution.

### 3.1 Expected-posterior priors

Pérez & Berger (2002) have defined the expected-posterior (EP) prior as the posterior distribution of a parameter vector of the model under consideration averaged over all possible samples  $\mathbf{y}^*$  coming from the predictive distribution  $f(\mathbf{y}^*|m_0)$  of a reference model  $m_0$  (Pérez & Berger 2002, def. 1, p. 493). Hence the EP prior for the parameter vector  $\theta_\ell = (\beta_\ell, \sigma^2)$  of any model  $m_\ell \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is the model space, is given by

$$\pi_\ell^{EP}(\theta_\ell) = \int \pi_\ell^N(\theta_\ell|\mathbf{y}^*) m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^*) d\mathbf{y}^*, \quad (6)$$

where  $\pi_\ell^N(\theta_\ell|\mathbf{y}^*)$  is the posterior of  $\theta_\ell$  for model  $m_\ell$  using a baseline prior  $\pi_\ell^N(\theta_\ell)$  and  $m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^*)$  is the prior predictive distribution, evaluated at  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , for model  $m_0$  under the prior  $\pi_0^N(\theta_0)$ .

### 3.2 Power-conditional-expected-posterior (PCEP) priors

Since  $\sigma^2$  appears in all models under comparison, we can assume a common prior distribution  $\pi_\ell^N(\sigma^2)$  for all models  $m_\ell \in \mathcal{M}$ . This is a usual practice in the related literature as noted by Fernandez et al. (2001) and references therein. Hence, we may implement the EP prior approach only for the regression coefficients  $\beta_\ell$  conditionally on the values of the error variance  $\sigma^2$ . By this way, we define the conditional-expected-posterior (CEP) prior by

$$\pi_\ell^{CEP}(\beta_\ell, \sigma_\ell^2) = \pi_\ell^{CEP}(\beta_\ell|\sigma_\ell^2) \pi_\ell^N(\sigma^2)$$

with

$$\pi_\ell^{CEP}(\beta_\ell|\sigma_\ell^2) = \int \pi_\ell^N(\beta_\ell|\sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*) m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2) d\mathbf{y}^*.$$

Furthermore, in order to diminish the effect of the training samples, we use ideas from the power-expected-posterior prior approach as defined by Fouskakis et al. (2013). Thus we introduce

the *power-conditional-expected-posterior* (PCEP) prior by raising the likelihood, involved in the CEP prior, to a power  $1/\delta$  that controls the effect of the training sample in the PCEP prior. Therefore, the PCEP prior is defined as

$$\pi_\ell^{PCEP}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma_\ell^2; \delta) = \pi_\ell^{PCEP}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma_\ell^2; \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\sigma^2) = \left[ \int \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \delta) d\mathbf{y}^* \right] \pi_\ell^N(\sigma^2), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta) = \frac{f(\mathbf{y}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)}{m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)}$$

with  $f(\mathbf{y}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \propto f(\mathbf{y}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{1/\delta}$  being the density-normalized power-likelihood given, in our case, by

$$f(\mathbf{y}^* | \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}). \quad (8)$$

Moreover,  $m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$  is the prior predictive distribution (or the marginal likelihood), evaluated at  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , of model  $m_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$  with the power-likelihood defined by (8) under the baseline prior  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)$ , i.e.

$$m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = \int f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*) d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell.$$

As discussed in Fouskakis et al. (2013), we can set the power-parameter  $\delta$  equal to  $n^*$ , to represent prior information equal to one data point. In a similar manner as in the  $g$ -prior, we set  $n^* = n$  (and therefore  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$ ); by this way we also dispense with the selection of the training samples.

### 3.3 Using PCEP prior for the specification of the hyperprior for the imaginary data

As we have already seen in Section 2, the posterior  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \delta)$  involved in the definition of the PCEP prior takes the form  $f_{N_{a_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; w \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^*, w \delta (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2)$ , with  $w = g_0 / (g_0 + \delta)$ , when the baseline prior of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$  is (2).

Thus (5) can be obtained as the PCEP prior (7) with  $g = w\delta$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$  and the hyperprior for the imaginary data of size  $n^* = n$  given by  $m^*(\mathbf{y}^*) = m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \delta)$ , i.e. the prior predictive of the reference model, evaluated using the power-likelihood (8) and the baseline prior (2).

A question which naturally arises is which model must be selected as a reference model. Pérez & Berger (2002) indirectly supported the choice of the most parsimonious model in  $\mathcal{M}$ . This choice provides a sensible interpretation since we a-priori argue in favor of the assumption that the data are coming from the simplest model supporting by this way the parsimony principle. The latter interpretation is close to the sceptical prior approach as described by Spiegelhalter, Abrams & Myles (2004, Section 5.5.2) where a tendency toward the null hypothesis must be a-priori supported by centering our prior beliefs around values assumed by this hypothesis when no other information is available. The constant model (with no predictors) can naturally serve as the reference model in our case.

## 4 PCEP $g$ -prior methodology

In this section we implement the PCEP prior introduced in Section 3.2 using the Zellner’s  $g$ -prior (2) as baseline. Furthermore, we assume an  $IG(a, b)$  prior distribution for  $\sigma^2$ . Then, for any model  $m_\ell$ , the prior predictive distribution, under the baseline prior, conditional on  $\sigma^2$ , is a multivariate normal distribution given by

$$m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = f_{N_n}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{0}, \Lambda_\ell^{*-1}\sigma^2), \quad (9)$$

where

$$\Lambda_\ell^{*-1} = \delta \left( \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - \frac{g_0}{g_0 + \delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \right)^{-1} = \delta \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + g_0 \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T}. \quad (10)$$

Derivation of the above marginal likelihood is given in Appendix A. For the special case of the constant model, the variance–covariance matrix of the above distribution simplifies to  $[\delta \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + g_0 n^{*-1} \mathbf{1}_{n^*} \mathbf{1}_{n^*}^T] \sigma^2$ ; where  $\mathbf{1}_{n^*}$  is a vector of length  $n^*$  with all elements equal to one.

### 4.1 Prior distribution

The power-conditional-expected-posterior (PCEP) prior on  $\beta_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\ell^{PCEP}(\beta_\ell, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) &= \pi_\ell^{PCEP}(\beta_\ell | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\sigma^2) \quad (11) \\ &= \left[ \int \frac{f(\mathbf{y}^* | \beta_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\beta_\ell | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)}{m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)} m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_0^*, \delta) d\mathbf{y}^* \right] f_{IG}(\sigma^2; a, b) \\ &= \left[ \int \pi_\ell^N(\beta_\ell | \mathbf{y}^*, \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) m_0^N(\mathbf{y}^* | \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_0^*, \delta) d\mathbf{y}^* \right] f_{IG}(\sigma^2; a, b) \\ &= \left[ \int f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\beta_\ell; w \widehat{\beta}_\ell^*, w \delta (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2) f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{0}, \Lambda_0^{*-1} \sigma^2) d\mathbf{y}^* \right] f_{IG}(\sigma^2; a, b) \\ &= f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\beta_\ell; \mathbf{0}, \delta \left\{ \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} [w^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - (\delta \Lambda_0^* + w \mathbf{H}_\ell^*)^{-1}] \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \right\}^{-1} \sigma^2) f_{IG}(\sigma^2; a, b), \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_{IG}(y; a, b)$  denotes the density of the inverse gamma distribution with parameters  $a$  and  $b$  and mean equal to  $b/(a-1)$  evaluated at  $y$ . Additionally,  $\pi_\ell^N(\beta_\ell | \mathbf{y}^*, \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$  can be considered as a conditional posterior of  $\beta_\ell | \sigma^2$  with power-likelihood (8) and prior (2) and is given by (3); details are provided in the Appendix B. Furthermore  $\mathbf{H}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T}$ .

### 4.2 Posterior distribution

The above resulting prior is the usual conjugate normal–inverse gamma prior with mean equal to  $\mathbf{0}$ , scale parameter equal to

$$\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^* = \delta \left\{ \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} [w^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - (\delta \Lambda_0^* + w \mathbf{H}_\ell^*)^{-1}] \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \right\}^{-1} \quad (13)$$

and parameters  $a$  and  $b$  for the inverse–gamma component. Hence, the posterior distribution under the power-conditional-expected-posterior (PCEP) prior on  $\beta_\ell$  given  $\sigma^2$  is a normal inverse gamma distribution, i.e.

$$\pi_\ell^{PCEP}(\beta_\ell, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{X}_\ell, \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\beta_\ell; \widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\Sigma} \sigma^2) f_{IG}(\sigma^2; \widetilde{a}_\ell, \widetilde{b}_\ell),$$

where

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \tilde{\Sigma} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y}, \quad \tilde{\Sigma} = \left\{ \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell}^*{}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell \right\}^{-1}, \quad \tilde{a}_\ell = n/2 + a, \quad \tilde{b}_\ell = SS_\ell/2 + b$$

with  $SS_\ell = \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \tilde{\Sigma} \mathbf{X}_\ell) \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell}^* \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{y}$ .

### 4.3 Marginal likelihood

The marginal likelihood, under the PCEP  $g$ -prior approach is given by

$$m_\ell^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}_\ell, \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = f_{Stn} \left( \mathbf{y}; 2a, \mathbf{0}, \frac{b}{a} \left[ \mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell}^* \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \right] \right), \quad (14)$$

in which  $f_{Stn}(\mathbf{y}; d, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$  is the density of the multivariate Student distribution in  $n$  dimensions with  $d$  degrees of freedom, location  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and scale  $\Sigma$ .

Since the above marginal likelihood can be calculated analytically, we can directly compare all models without any problem and identify the maximum a-posteriori (MAP) model, the median probability (MP) model or the best equally well behaved models with Bayes factors less than 3 when compared with the MAP according to the interpretation table of Kass & Raftery (1995).

When the model space is large we can implement  $MC^3$  (Madigan & York 1995) to explore the model space and trace the best models (see Appendix C).

### 4.4 Specification of prior parameters

Clearly the marginal likelihood for the PCEP methodology depends on the selection of the power parameter  $\delta$ , the training sample and its size  $n^*$ , the reference model  $m_0$  and the prior hyperparameters  $g_0$ ,  $a$  and  $b$ . Following Fouskakis et al. (2013) we propose

- the power parameter  $\delta$  to be equal to  $n^*$  in order to account the data for information equal to one data point. If additionally we set  $n^* = n$ , and therefore  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$ , we avoid completely the training sample and its possible effect to the posterior model comparison inference, while we account still for information equal to one data point.
- the parameter  $g_0$  in the normal baseline prior is set equal to  $\delta n^*$ . Therefore, for  $\delta = n^*$  we propose to use  $g_0 = n^{*2}$ . This choice will make the baseline Zellner's  $g$ -prior to contribute with information equal to one data point within the posterior  $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell | \sigma^2, \mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$ . By this way, the whole PCEP prior will account to information equal to  $1 + 1/\delta$  data points.
- the parameters  $a$  and  $b$  in the inverse gamma baseline prior to be equal to 0.01 in order to have a baseline prior mean 1 and variance equal to 100 (i.e. large) for the precision parameter.
- the reference model  $m_0$  to be the constant model as discussed in Section 3.3. With this choice we also avoid the need for the specification of the imaginary design matrix, since  $\mathbf{X}_0^* = \mathbf{1}_{n^*}$ .
- the size of the training sample  $n^*$  to be  $n$ .

## 5 Limiting behaviour of the marginal likelihood

From (14), we have that

$$\log m_\ell^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}_\ell, \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) = C - \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^* \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| - \left(\frac{n}{2} + a\right) \log \left(2b + \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^* \mathbf{X}_\ell^T)^{-1} \mathbf{y}\right),$$

where  $C$  is a constant that does not depend on the model structure  $m_\ell$ . We set  $n^* = n$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$  and let  $\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_\ell$  and  $\Lambda_0$  defined as  $\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_\ell^*$  and  $\Lambda_0^*$  by replacing  $\mathbf{X}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell$ .

The determinant involved in the above expression is equal to

$$|\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| = (1 + \delta w)^{d_\ell} |\Lambda_0|^{-1} \left| \Lambda_0 + \left(\frac{w^2}{1 + \delta w}\right) \mathbf{H}_\ell \right| \quad (15)$$

while

$$\mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T) \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \frac{1 + w\delta}{w\delta} \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell \left( \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \frac{w}{1 + w\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\mathbf{I}_n + w[\mathbf{H}_\ell - \mathbf{H}_0])^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y}; \quad (16)$$

for detailed derivations of these two identities see Appendix D.

For large  $n$  and for the proposed hyperparameter values (see Section (4.4)) we obtain

$$|\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| = (nw + 1)^{d_\ell} \frac{|\Lambda_0 + \frac{w^2}{nw+1} P_\ell|}{|\Lambda_0|} \approx (n + 1)^{d_\ell}, \quad (17)$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T) \mathbf{y} &\approx \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \frac{1 + \delta}{\delta} \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell \left( \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \frac{1}{1 + \delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\mathbf{I}_n + [\mathbf{H}_\ell - \mathbf{H}_0])^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y} \\ &\approx \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell (\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y} \equiv RSS_\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the log marginal likelihood can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} \log m_\ell^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}_\ell, \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) &\approx C - \frac{d_\ell}{2} \log(n + 1) - \left(\frac{n}{2} + a\right) \log(2b + RSS_\ell) \\ &\approx C - \frac{d_\ell}{2} \log(n) - \frac{n}{2} \log RSS_\ell \\ &\approx C - \frac{1}{2} BIC_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, PCEP  $g$ -prior has the same limiting behavior as the BIC. Generally, this limiting behavior holds for  $g_0 = n^k$  for any value  $k > 0$  (assuming  $\delta = n$ ) with the approximation rate depending on  $k$ . For  $k > 1$ , the proof is similar to the one presented above with  $k = 2$ . For  $k = 1$ ,  $w = 1/2$  and thus the dimensionality penalty becomes equal to  $\log(1 + n/2)$ . Therefore for large  $n$  again the PCEP  $g$ -prior has the same limiting behavior as the BIC but with a slower convergence rate than before. Finally for  $0 < k < 1$ , the dimensionality penalty will be approximately equal to  $\log(1 + n^k) \approx k \log(n)$  which again for large values of  $n$  will become equivalent to the penalty induced by BIC but with an even slower convergence rate. Finally, it is well known (Fernandez et al. 2001) that consistency holds for BIC under a minor and realistic assumption; see for example Equation 22 in Liang et al. (2008).



## 6 Comparison between the PCEP and the Zellner's $g$ -prior

The structure of PCEP  $g$ -prior is similar to the structure of the Zellner's  $g$ -prior but with different covariance matrix, for given  $\sigma^2$ . As we will see our prior leads to a variable-selection procedure that it is more parsimonious than the one using Zellner's  $g$ -prior with  $g = n$  taking into account uncertainty of imaginary data generated from the null model as reference.

We compare theoretically the volumes of the covariance matrices, the maximum prior ordinates, and by this way the dispersions of the two prior distributions. Additionally, we compared graphically, for simulated scenarios, the orientations of the two prior distributions and the behavior of the posterior model probabilities for a variety of correlations.

From (12), we have that for a given  $\sigma^2$ , the covariance matrix of the PCEP  $g$ -prior is given by

$$\Sigma_{\ell}^{PCEP} = \delta \left\{ \mathbf{X}_{\ell}^{*T} \left[ w^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - (\delta \Lambda_0^* + w \mathbf{H}_{\ell}^*)^{-1} \right] \mathbf{X}_{\ell}^* \right\}^{-1}.$$

The determinant of  $\Sigma_{\ell}^{PCEP}$  is given by

$$|\Sigma_{\ell}^{PCEP}| = [\delta w(w+1)]^{d_{\ell}-d_0} g_0^{d_0} |\mathbf{X}_{\ell}^{*T} \mathbf{X}_{\ell}^*|^{-1}; \quad (19)$$

detailed derivation of this expression is given at the Appendix D.

If we set in the PCEP  $g$ -prior  $g_0 = n^2$  and  $\delta = n$  then the volume variance multiplier appearing in (19) becomes equal to

$$[\delta w(w+1)]^{d_{\ell}-d_0} g_0^{d_0} = n^{2d_{\ell}} \left[ \frac{2n+1}{(n+1)^2} \right]^{d_{\ell}-d_0}$$

which is greater than  $n^{d_{\ell}}$ , i.e. the corresponding multiplier in the Zellner's  $g$ -prior with  $g = n$ , for any sample size  $n \geq 2$ . This can be easily proved if we consider the function

$$\phi(n) = \log \left( n^{d_{\ell}} \left[ \frac{2n+1}{(n+1)^2} \right]^{d_{\ell}-d_0} \right)$$

which is the logarithm of the ratio of the two multipliers. This is an increasing function of  $n$  since

$$\frac{\partial \phi(n)}{\partial n} = \frac{d_{\ell}(3n+1)}{n(2n+1)(n+1)} + \frac{2d_0 n}{(2n+1)(n+1)} \geq 0$$

and furthermore  $\phi(2) = \log \left[ 2^{d_{\ell}} \left( \frac{5}{9} \right)^{d_{\ell}-d_0} \right] = \log \left[ \left( \frac{10}{9} \right)^{d_{\ell}} \left( \frac{9}{5} \right)^{d_0} \right] \geq 0$ .

For illustration, we have generated two covariates  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  for a prespecified grid of correlations ( $\rho = 0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9$ ) and compared the contour plots of the two prior distributions. In all cases, PCEP is more dispersed as expected by the above result and the orientation (i.e. prior dependence between  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ ) remains similar (but not exactly the same) for medium and large sized datasets (e.g.  $n \geq 30$ ). Some indicative contour plots for various correlation values  $r$  and for  $n = 30$  and  $n = 50$  are given in Figure 1.

Finally, in order to compare the behavior of the posterior model probabilities between the PCEP and the Zellner's  $g$ -prior we have created 100 different datasets of  $n = 100$  observations and  $p = 2$  covariates. We have considered different correlation values between the covariates,  $Cor(X_1, X_2) = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 0.99$ , while the response was generated from a model  $Y =$

$1 + \rho X_1 + \sqrt{(1 - \rho^2)}\varepsilon$ , with  $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\rho = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6$ . Under this model, the total variance of  $Y$ , under each value of  $\rho$ , is equal to one.

Figure 2(a) presents the relative differences (%) in the mean posterior model probabilities of the true model over the 100 different generated datasets, while Figure 2(b) presents the corresponding differences of the standard deviations. From these two figures it is obvious that PCEP  $g$ -prior leads to a variable-selection procedure that it is more parsimonious than the one using Zellner’s  $g$ -prior (for the pre-selected hyperparameter values) selecting the true model with a higher weight when the covariates are higher correlated and with lower weight when the covariates are less correlated. Moreover, the standard deviations of the posterior model probabilities are higher when using the PCEP  $g$ -prior, compared to the corresponding ones when using the Zellner’s  $g$ -prior, when the true effect of  $X_1$  on  $Y$  (i.e.  $\rho$ ) is lower. This is a desired property; PCEP  $g$ -prior gives less posterior weight on average on the true model when  $\rho$  is low but with less certainty compared with Zellner’s  $g$ -prior, while when  $\rho$  is large PCEP  $g$ -prior gives higher posterior weights on average to the true model with greater confidence.

## 7 Experimental results

In this section we illustrate the PCEP  $g$ -prior methodology on both simulated and real examples. For the implementation of the method we have used the hyperparameter specification described in Section 4.4. We contrast the results of our proposed method using the modified version of the  $g$ -prior, as in Liang et al. (2008), with  $g = n$ , the hyper- $g$  prior with  $\alpha = 3$ , as suggested by Liang et al. (2008) and (for the real life example only) the BIC. For the implementation of the  $g$ -prior and the hyper- $g$  prior the R package `BAS`, available from <http://www.stat.duke.edu/~clyde/BAS>, has been used.

### 7.1 Simulation study

Here we consider the simulated dataset of Nott & Kohn (2005). This dataset consists of  $n = 50$  observations and  $p = 15$  covariates. The first 10 covariates are generated from a standardized normal distribution while

$$X_{ij} \sim N(0.3X_{i1} + 0.5X_{i2} + 0.7X_{i3} + 0.9X_{i4} + 1.1X_{i5}, 1) \text{ for } j = 11, \dots, 15, i = 1, \dots, 50$$

and the response from

$$Y_i \sim N(4 + 2X_{i1} - X_{i5} + 1.5X_{i7} + X_{i11} + 0.5X_{i13}, 2.5^2), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 50. \quad (20)$$

With  $p = 15$  covariates we are able to conduct a full enumeration search and avoid extra Monte Carlo variation due to stochastic search of the model space.

In order to check the efficiency of the proposed method, we generate repeatedly 100 different sets of response variables from the sampling scheme (20). Figure 3 presents boxplots comparing the posterior marginal inclusion probabilities, under the three different prior set-ups, over those 100 different samples. No noticeable differences between the boxplots of the posterior marginal inclusion probabilities are observed for the dominating effects of variables  $X_1$ ,  $X_7$  and  $X_{11}$ . For the rest of the covariates (i.e. the ones with median posterior marginal inclusion probabilities below 0.5), the PCEP based method is systematically more parsimonious, while the hyper- $g$  based

Figure 1: Contour plots of PCEP and Zellner's  $g$ -priors ( $g = n$ ) for various correlation values  $r$  and for  $n = 30$  and  $50$






Figure 2: Relative percentage differences (PCEP - Zellner's  $g$ -prior,  $g = n$ ) between the means and the standard deviations of the posterior probabilities of the true model over 100 generated samples

(a) Differences between the means



(b) Differences between the standard deviations



procedure supports more complicated models than the other approaches. Generally, PCEP shrinks marginal posterior inclusion probabilities towards zero for small effects. Figure 4 illustrates this behavior; it graphically presents the density of the marginal posterior inclusion probability of  $X_{13}$  over the 100 different samples and under the three different priors. Variable  $X_{13}$  was selected due to its large variability of the posterior marginal inclusion probabilities under all three prior set-ups, as suggested by Figure 3. In all three cases, the distribution is bimodal, with the same mode for datasets with clearly non-zero effect and a considerably lower mode when using the PCEP prior for realizations with close to zero estimated effects.

Similar findings are observed in Table 1 which presents summary statistics of the posterior ranking of the true model. All three methods identify the true as the maximum a-posteriori (MAP) model, at least once, but, the PCEP method gives, on average, lower rankings to the true model. Additionally, we observe considerably higher variability under the other two prior approaches, with the standard deviation of the ranks under the hyper- $g$  prior to be twice as large as the corresponding one under the PCEP prior.

Finally, the hyper- $g$  prior identifies, on average, 3.8 of the 5 non-zero effects, in contrast to the other two procedures that identify, on average, 3.4 of the 5 non-zero effects. On the other hand, the PCEP and  $g$ -prior perform better in regard to the identification of the zero effects (9.2 out of 10 in contrast to 8.6 out of 10 for the hyper- $g$  prior).

Figure 3: Boxplots, over 100 random samples, of posterior inclusion probabilities under the three different prior set-ups for the simulation study (1: PCEP, 2:  $g$ -prior with  $g = n$ , 3: hyper- $g$  prior with  $\alpha = 3$ )





Figure 4: Density plots of the posterior marginal inclusion probability for  $X_{13}$ , over the 100 different samples



## 7.2 Crime dataset

Here, we use the crime data (Vandaele 1978) to implement the PCEP  $g$ -prior approach. Raftery, Madigan & Hoeting (1997) used those data as an illustration of Bayesian model averaging in linear regression using a normal-inverse-gamma prior for each model parameters, while Fernandez et al. (2001) revisited the crime data exploring the choice of  $g$  on  $g$ -priors. Finally Liang et al. (2008) used those data for comparing the mixture of  $g$  priors formulation with fixed  $g$ -priors, empirical Bayes approaches and other default procedures.

The data are available in the R package `MASS` under the name `UScrime`, and comprise aggregate measures of the crime rate for 47 states and include 15 explanatory variables. The response variable is the rate of crimes in a particular category per head of population. All variables, including the response and excluding the indicator covariate ( $X_2$ ), have been initially log-transformed and then all variables have been centered.

Again, with  $p = 15$  covariates we were able to conduct a full enumeration search. Here additionally to the three different prior set-ups, we present results for BIC. Posterior marginal inclusion probabilities, are presented in Table 2 and in Figure 5. We see that all four methods give approximately equal support to the most prominent covariates, while for the remaining ones the posterior inclusion probabilities are lower under the PCEP approach. Posterior model odds and rankings for the five best PCEP models under all competing approaches are given in Table 3. We notice that all methods support the same two models as the two best ones, model  $m_{(1)}$  that includes covariates  $X_1, X_3, X_4, X_9, X_{11}, X_{13}, X_{14}$  and model  $m_{(2)}$  which is the same as model  $m_{(1)}$  with the addition

Table 1: Summary statistics of the posterior ranking of the true model, over 100 repeated samples for the simulation study

Method	Min	$Q_1$	Median	Mean	$Q_3$	Max	SD
PCEP	1.0	5.0	20.5	87.5	66.5	1733.0	226.0
Zellner's $g$ -prior ( $g = n$ )	1.0	4.7	22.0	110.1	95.0	2345.0	300.5
Hyper- $g$ prior ( $\alpha = 3$ )	1.0	4.0	29.5	232.3	207.8	4163.0	572.0

$Q_1$  and  $Q_3$  denote the first and third quartile respectively


of covariate  $X_{15}$ . For all four model selection procedures, the posterior odds of  $m_{(1)}$  versus  $m_{(2)}$ , range from 0.76 (for BIC) to 1.25 (for PCEP). These differences do not suggest that any of the two models dominate over the other. For the remaining three models no firm conclusion can be drawn except that the third model under PCEP (with only six covariates) is placed in a much lower position under all three remaining approaches.

Table 2: Posterior marginal inclusion probabilities for the crime data

Variables (log scale)		PCEP	BIC	Zellner's $g$ -prior ( $g = n$ )	Hyper- $g$ prior ( $\alpha = 3$ )
$X_1$	Percentage of males aged 14-24	0.828	0.909	0.850	0.843
$X_2$	Indicator variable for a Southern state	0.193	0.229	0.231	0.295
$X_3$	Mean years of schooling	0.974	0.992	0.978	0.967
$X_4$	Police expenditure in 1960	0.664	0.687	0.665	0.662
$X_5$	Police expenditure in 1959	0.402	0.404	0.422	0.465
$X_6$	Labour force participation rate	0.120	0.161	0.157	0.226
$X_7$	Number of males per 1000 females	0.124	0.168	0.160	0.228
$X_8$	State population	0.287	0.359	0.330	0.385
$X_9$	Number of non-whites per 1000 people	0.632	0.776	0.679	0.686
$X_{10}$	Unemployment rate of urban males 14-24	0.165	0.226	0.208	0.272
$X_{11}$	Unemployment rate of urban males 35-39	0.558	0.696	0.600	0.608
$X_{12}$	Gross domestic product per head	0.256	0.363	0.312	0.377
$X_{13}$	Income inequality	0.997	0.999	0.997	0.995
$X_{14}$	Probability of imprisonment	0.872	0.946	0.896	0.889
$X_{15}$	Average time served in state prisons	0.278	0.409	0.333	0.382

**Comparison of the predictive performance.** Here we examine the out-of-sample predictive performance of PCEP,  $g$ -prior ( $g = n$ ) and hyper- $g$  prior ( $\alpha = 3$ ) on the full model and the two MAP models indicated by PCEP and hyper- $g$  prior in the previous analysis. To do so, we randomly partitioned the data in half 50 times. For each partition, in order to measure the predictive performance of each model we compute the root mean square error for the validation

Figure 5: Posterior inclusion probabilities for the four different prior set-ups for crime data



dataset  $V$  of size  $n_V = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$

$$RMSE_\ell = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_V} \sum_{i \in V} (y_i - \hat{y}_{i|m_\ell})^2}; \quad (21)$$

here  $\hat{y}_{i|m_\ell} = X_{\ell(i)} \tilde{\beta}_\ell$  is the predicted value of  $y_i$  according to the assumed model  $m_\ell$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_\ell$  is the posterior mean of  $\beta_\ell$  and  $X_{\ell(i)}$  is the  $i$ -th row of matrix  $X_\ell$  of model  $m_\ell$ .

Results for the full model and the two MAP models are given in Table 4. For comparison purposes, we have also included the split-half  $RMSE$  measures for these three models using the Zellner's  $g$ -prior with  $g = n$  and the mixtures of  $g$ -prior with  $\alpha = 3$  as implemented by **BAS** package in **R**. In general the differences in  $RMSE$  are not large enough to infer towards the superiority of the predictive ability of one method.

## 8 Discussion

In this article we explore how random imaginary data can be used to extend the  $g$ -prior which is a popular default choice in Bayesian variable selection. We link approaches based on priors traditionally used in the objective Bayesian variable selection field, such as the intrinsic (Casella & Moreno 2006), the expected-posterior (Pérez & Berger 2002) and the more recent power-expected-posterior (Fouskakis et al. 2013) priors, with the most dominant Bayesian variable selection approaches based on the  $g$ -prior (Zellner 1986) and its recent extension using mixtures of  $g$ -priors



Table 3: Posterior odds and rankings for the five best PCEP models under all methods, for the crime data

Common variables in all models:  $X_1 + X_3 + X_{13} + X_{14}$

$k$	Additional Variables		Number of Covariates	Posterior odds $PO_{1k}$				
				PCEP	BIC	$g$ -prior	hyper- $g$ prior	
1	$+X_4$	$+X_9+X_{11}$	7	1.00	(2) 1.00	(1) 1.00	(2) 1.00	
2	$+X_4$	$+X_9+X_{11}+X_{15}$	8	1.25	(1) 0.76	(2) 1.03	(1) 0.93	
3	$+X_4$	$+X_{11}+X_{15}$	6	1.40	(> 50) > 9	(46) 6.88	(> 50) > 5	
4		$+X_5+X_9+X_{11}$	7	1.56	(5) 1.61	(13) 2.87	(3) 1.45	
5	$+X_4$	$+X_9$	6	2.07	26 4.39	(3) 1.52	(18) 2.87	

$PO_{1k}$  denote the posterior odds of the PCEP MAP model versus current model  $k$

Table 4: Comparison of the predictive performance of the full and the two highest a-posteriori models for the crime data

Model	$d_\ell$	$R^2$	$R_{adj}^2$	RMSE*		
				PCEP	$g$ -prior	hyper- $g$ prior
PCEP MAP	7	0.8268	0.7973	0.2262(0.0346)	0.2264(0.0347)	0.2262(0.0329)
hyper- $g$ MAP	8	0.8420	0.8087	0.2320(0.0387)	0.2322(0.0387)	0.2310(0.0381)
full	15	0.8685	0.8064	0.3133(0.0695)	0.3136(0.0697)	0.2967(0.0571)

\*Mean (standard deviation) over 50 different split-half out-of-sample evaluations

(Liang et al. 2008). In contrast to our proposed power-conditional-expected-posterior (PCEP) prior, both the  $g$ -prior and the hyper- $g$  prior can be derived assuming fixed imaginary data.

We focus on the use of random imaginary data through the introduction of a power-expected-posterior prior conditionally on the error variance parameter within the normal linear model formulation. The induced prior is a conjugate normal-inverse-gamma prior, resulting in a variable selection procedure with similar large sample properties to BIC, supporting more parsimonious models than the approach using  $g$ -prior or hyper- $g$  prior in finite samples. The BIC asymptotic behaviour of the PCEP Bayes factors ensures consistency of the PCEP model selection approach.

Future extensions of this approach includes the introduction of an additional hyperprior on the power parameter, which plays a similar role as the “ $g$ ” parameter under the  $g$ -prior approach. We expect that this approach will retain its approximate BIC behaviour and still being more parsimonious than the corresponding procedure using hyper- $g$  prior due to the additional uncertainty introduced by the random imaginary data.

## References

Bartlett, M. (1957), ‘Comment on D.V. Lindley’s statistical paradox’, *Biometrika*, **44**, 533–534.

- Berger, J. & Pericchi, L. (1996), ‘The intrinsic Bayes factor for model selection and prediction’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **91**, 109–122.
- Casella, G. & Moreno, E. (2006), ‘Objective Bayesian variable selection’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **101**, 157–167.
- Fernandez, C., Ley, E. & Steel, M. (2001), ‘Benchmark priors for Bayesian model averaging’, *Journal of Econometrics*, **100**, 381–427.
- Fouskakis, D., Ntzoufras, I. & Draper, D. (2009), ‘Bayesian variable selection using cost-adjusted BIC, with application to cost-effective measurement of quality of health care’, *Annals of Applied Statistics*, **3**, 663–690.
- Fouskakis, D., Ntzoufras, I. & Draper, D. (2013), ‘Power-expected-posterior priors for variable selection in Gaussian linear models’, *submitted*.
- George, E. & Foster, D. (2000), ‘Calibration and empirical Bayes variable selection’, *Biometrika*, **87**, 731–748.
- George, E. & McCulloch, R. (1993), ‘Variable selection via Gibbs sampling’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **88**, 881–889.
- Harville, D. (1997), *Matrix Algebra From a Statistician’s Perspective*, Springer, New York, USA.
- Ibrahim, J. & Chen, M. (2000), ‘Power prior distributions for regression models’, *Statistical Science*, **15**, 46–60.
- Kass, R. & Raftery, A. (1995), ‘Bayes factors’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**, 773–795.
- Kass, R. & Wasserman, L. (1995), ‘A reference Bayesian test for nested hypotheses and its relationship to the Schwarz criterion’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**, 928–934.
- Ley, E. & Steel, M. (2012), ‘Mixtures of g-priors for Bayesian model averaging with economic applications’, *Journal of Econometrics* **171**, 251–266.
- Liang, F., Paulo, R., Molina, G., Clyde, M. & Berger, J. (2008), ‘Mixtures of  $g$  priors for Bayesian variable selection’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **103**, 410–423.
- Lindley, D. (1957), ‘A statistical paradox’, *Biometrika*, **44**, 187–192.
- Madigan, D. & York, J. (1995), ‘Bayesian graphical models for discrete data’, *International Statistical Review*, **63**, 215–232.
- Nott, D. & Kohn, R. (2005), ‘Adaptive sampling for Bayesian variable selection’, *Biometrika*, **92**, 747–763.
- O’Hagan, A. (1995), ‘Fractional Bayes factors for model comparison’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, **57**, 99–138.
- Pérez, J. & Berger, J. (2002), ‘Expected-posterior prior distributions for model selection’, *Biometrika*, **89**, 491–511.

- Raftery, A., Madigan, D. & Hoeting, J. (1997), ‘Bayesian model averaging for linear regression models’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**, 179–191.
- Sabanés Bové, D. & Held, L. (2011), ‘Hyper-g priors for generalized linear models’, *Bayesian Analysis* **6**, 387–410.
- Spiegelhalter, D., Abrams, K. & Myles, J. (2004), *Bayesian Approaches to Clinical Trials and Health-Care Evaluation*, Statistics in Practice, Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Vandaele, W. (1978), Participation in illegitimate activities: Ehrlich revisited, in ‘*Bayesian Statistics*’, Washington, DC: U.S. National Academy of Sciences, pp. 270–335.
- Zellner, A. (1986), On assessing prior distributions and Bayesian regression analysis using g-prior distributions, in P. Goel & A. Zellner, eds, ‘*Bayesian Inference and Decision Techniques: Essays in Honor of Bruno de Finetti*’, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 233–243.

# Appendix to “Power-Conditional-Expected Priors: Using $g$ -priors with Random Imaginary Data for Variable Selection”, by D. Fouskakis and I. Ntzoufras

## A Derivation of the marginal likelihood $m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$

*Proof.* The marginal likelihood  $m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$  under the baseline prior (2) and the power-likelihood (8), conditional on  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) &= \int f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*) d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell \\ &= \int f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}) f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \mathbf{0}, g_0(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2) d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell \\ &= \int f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}) f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \mathbf{0}, \frac{g_0}{\delta}(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \delta \sigma^2) d\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

From the above we have the expression of the marginal likelihood of the usual Gaussian regression model with known error variance  $\delta \sigma^2$  and a normal conjugate prior with mean zero and variance equal to  $g_0 \delta^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \delta \sigma^2$ . Thus, the marginal likelihood is given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) &= f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{0}, (\mathbf{I}_{n^*} + \frac{g_0}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T}) \delta \sigma^2) \\ &= f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{0}, \delta (\mathbf{I}_{n^*} + \frac{g_0}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T}) \sigma^2) \\ &= f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{0}, \Lambda_\ell^{*-1} \sigma^2) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\ell^{*-1} &= \delta \left( \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + \frac{g_0}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \right) = \delta \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + g_0 \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \Leftrightarrow \\ \Lambda_\ell^* &= \delta^{-1} \left( \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + \frac{g_0}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \right)^{-1} = \delta^{-1} \left( \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - \frac{g_0/\delta}{g_0/\delta+1} \mathbf{H}_\ell^* \right) = \delta^{-1} \left( \mathbf{I}_{n^*} - \frac{g_0}{g_0+\delta} \mathbf{H}_\ell^* \right) \\ &= \delta^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_{n^*} - w \mathbf{H}_\ell^*) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathbf{H}_\ell^* = \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T}$ .

□

## B Derivation of the conditional posterior $\pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell|\mathbf{y}^*, \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell|\mathbf{y}^*, \sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) &= \frac{f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)}{m_\ell^N(\mathbf{y}^*|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)} \\ &\propto f(\mathbf{y}^*|\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \sigma^2, m_\ell; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta) \pi_\ell^N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell|\sigma^2; \mathbf{X}_\ell^*) \\ &\propto f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}) f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \mathbf{0}, g_0(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2) \\ &\propto f_{N_{n^*}}(\mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell, \delta \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n^*}) f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; \mathbf{0}, \frac{g_0}{\delta}(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \delta \sigma^2) \\ &= f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; w \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^*, w(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \delta \sigma^2) \\ &= f_{N_{d_\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\ell; w \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\ell^*, \delta w(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \sigma^2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $w = \frac{g_0/\delta}{g_0/\delta + 1} = \frac{g_0}{g_0 + \delta}$ . □

## C Model search algorithm

For any number of variables  $p$  under consideration in our model uncertainty problem, the number of models for which we need to evaluate the marginal likelihood is equal to  $2^p$ . Reasonably when  $p$  is even moderately large, the number of models under consideration grows tremendously. As a result, full enumeration of the marginal likelihoods and the corresponding posterior model weights needed in Bayesian variable selection and evaluation problems becomes infeasible. For this reason, in such problems, advanced MCMC methods are used, as model search algorithms, to trace the most important models and variables. Estimation of posterior model weights and posterior model odds can be then made efficiently within reduced model spaces in which unimportant variables have been excluded according to our model search algorithm; see Fouskakis, Ntzoufras & Draper (2009) for an example of such practice.

When the marginal likelihood is given in a closed form, we may use the Markov chain Monte Carlo model composition ( $MC^3$ , Madigan & York 1995). Posterior model weights can be estimated by both considering the marginal likelihoods of the visited and proposed models stored in step 2 (of the algorithm presented below) or by a simple frequency tabulation of the visited models given by the output of the MCMC sampler.

Under the PCEP approach, the marginal likelihood is analytically given by expression (14). Hence  $MC^3$  can be directly used to explore the model space. Here we consider the following modified approach of the  $MC^3$  in which we sample the binary vector  $\gamma$ , indicating the variables included in the model (see for example George & McCulloch 1993), using a Metropolis within Gibbs approach.

1. For the current model  $m_\ell$ , corresponding to the set of variable inclusion indicators  $\gamma_\ell$  repeat the following:

For  $j = 1, \dots, p$  (selected in random order) repeat the following steps:

- (a) Propose  $\gamma'_j = 1 - \gamma_j$  with probability equal to one.
- (b) Set the remaining covariates the same i.e.  $\gamma'_l = \gamma_l$  for all  $l \neq j$ .
- (c) Identify  $m_{\ell'}$  that corresponds to the vector  $\gamma_{\ell'}$  with elements  $\gamma'_{k'}, k = 1, \dots, p$ .
- (d) If  $m_{\ell'}$  is not previously visited, calculate and store its marginal likelihood  $m_{\ell'}^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}_{\ell'}, \mathbf{X}_{\ell'}^*, \delta)$  given by (14).
- (e) Set  $m_\ell = m_{\ell'}$  (i.e. accept the proposed model  $m_{\ell'}$ ) with probability

$$\alpha = \min \left( 1, \frac{\pi(m_{\ell'} | \mathbf{y})}{\pi(m_\ell | \mathbf{y})} \right) \equiv \min \left( 1, \frac{m_{\ell'}^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}_{\ell'}, \mathbf{X}_{\ell'}^*, \delta)}{m_\ell^{PCEP}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}_\ell, \mathbf{X}_\ell^*, \delta)} \times \frac{\pi(m_{\ell'})}{\pi(m_\ell)} \right) \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where  $\pi(m_\ell)$  is the prior probability of model  $m_\ell$ .

2. Store  $m_\ell$  as the current model.
3. Repeat steps 1–2 until a sufficient number of models is visited.

## D Derivations for Section 5

### Derivation of equation 15

The matrix determinant Lemma (Harville 1997, p. 416) states that

$$|\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^T| = |\mathbf{B}| |\mathbf{A}| |\mathbf{B}^{-1} + \mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{C}| \quad (\text{D.1})$$

for any A and B square invertible matrices. Therefore, we have that

$$|\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| = |\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}| |\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{X}_\ell^T|. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Similarly from (13) and (D.1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^*| &= \delta^{d_\ell} \left| w^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right|^{-1} \\ &= \delta^{d_\ell} w^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell|^{-1} |\delta \Lambda_0|^{-1} |\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell| \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{H}_\ell = \mathbf{X}_\ell (\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T$  and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| &= \left| \delta^{-1} w^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \delta^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1 + \delta w}{\delta w} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \delta^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right| \\ &= \left( \frac{1 + \delta w}{\delta w} \right)^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell| |\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell|^{-1} \left| \delta \Lambda_0 + \left( \frac{\delta w^2}{1 + \delta w} \right) \mathbf{H}_\ell \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Returning back to (D.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| &= \delta^{d_\ell} w^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell|^{-1} |\delta \Lambda_0|^{-1} |\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell| \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1 + \delta w}{\delta w} \right)^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell| |\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell|^{-1} \left| \delta \Lambda_0 + \left( \frac{\delta w^2}{1 + \delta w} \right) \mathbf{H}_\ell \right| \\ &= (1 + \delta w)^{d_\ell} |\Lambda_0|^{-1} \left| \Lambda_0 + \left( \frac{w^2}{1 + \delta w} \right) \mathbf{H}_\ell \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $w = g_0/(g_0 + \delta)$ , for  $g_0 \gg \delta$ ,  $w \approx 1$  and  $|\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T| = (1 + \delta)^{d_\ell} |\Lambda_0|^{-1} \left| \Lambda_0 + \left( \frac{1}{1 + \delta} \right) \mathbf{H}_\ell \right|$  which becomes approximately equal to  $(1 + \delta)^{d_\ell}$  for reasonably large values of  $\delta$ .

## Derivation of equation 16

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{X}_\ell \mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T)^{-1} \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{y}^T \left( \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}_\ell (\mathbf{V}_{\beta_\ell}^{-1} + \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \right) \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell (\delta^{-1} \{ \mathbf{X}_\ell^T [w^{-1} \mathbf{I}_n - (\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1}] \mathbf{X}_\ell \} + \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \delta \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell (w^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\delta \Lambda_0 + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell + \delta \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \delta \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell \left( \left[ \frac{1 + \delta w}{w} \right] \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \mathbf{X}_\ell^T ([\mathbf{I}_n - w \mathbf{H}_0] + w \mathbf{H}_\ell)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \frac{w \delta}{1 + w \delta} \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}_\ell \left( \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{X}_\ell - \frac{w}{1 + w \delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T (\mathbf{I}_n + w [\mathbf{H}_\ell - \mathbf{H}_0])^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^T \mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

For the derivation of the first expression, Woodbury's matrix identity (Harville 1997, p. 423–426) has been used.

## Derivation of equation 19

Using (D.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_\ell^{PCEP}| &= \delta^{d_\ell} \left\{ |w^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*| |(-1)(\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*)|^{-1} | -(\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*) + w\mathbf{X}_\ell^*(\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*) \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} | \right\}^{-1} \\ &= \delta^{d_\ell} w^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \frac{|\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*|}{|\delta\Lambda_0^*|}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

But  $|\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*|$  can be simplified to

$$|\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*| = |\delta\Lambda_0^*| |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* + w\delta^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \Lambda_0^{*-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|$$

using (D.1). Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*| &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \left| \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* + \frac{w}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \left( \delta \mathbf{I}_{n^*} + g_0 \mathbf{X}_0^* (\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \right) \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \right| \\ &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \left| (w+1) \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* + \frac{wg_0}{\delta} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* (\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* \right| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} (w+1)^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*| |\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*|^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left| \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* + \frac{wg_0}{\delta(w+1)} \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* \right| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

using again (D.1) in the last determinant of (D.4). If we further consider that

$$\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^* (\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* = \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{H}_\ell^* \mathbf{X}_0^* = \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*,$$

since  $\mathbf{X}_0^T \mathbf{H}_\ell = \mathbf{X}_0^T$  for any sub-matrix  $\mathbf{X}_0$  of  $\mathbf{X}_\ell$ , equation D.5 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\Lambda_0^* + w\mathbf{H}_\ell^*| &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*|^{-1} \left| \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* + \frac{wg_0}{\delta(w+1)} \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* \right| \\ &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^*|^{-1} \left| \frac{\delta w + \delta + wg_0}{\delta(w+1)} \mathbf{X}_0^{*T} \mathbf{X}_0^* \right| \\ &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell - d_0} \left( \frac{\delta w + \delta + wg_0}{\delta} \right)^{d_0} \\ &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell - d_0} \left( \frac{(g_0 + \delta) \frac{g_0}{g_0 + \delta} + \delta}{\delta} \right)^{d_0} \\ &= |\delta\Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell - d_0} \left( \frac{g_0 + \delta}{\delta} \right)^{d_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Substituting (D.6) in (D.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Sigma_\ell^{PCEP}| &= \delta^{d_\ell} w^{d_\ell} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \frac{|\delta \Lambda_0^*| (w+1)^{d_\ell-d_0} \left(\frac{g_0+\delta}{\delta}\right)^{d_0}}{|\delta \Lambda_0^*|} \\
&= \delta^{d_\ell} w^{d_\ell} (w+1)^{d_\ell-d_0} \left(\frac{g_0+\delta}{\delta}\right)^{d_0} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \\
&= \delta^{d_\ell-d_0} w^{d_\ell} (w+1)^{d_\ell-d_0} (g_0+\delta)^{d_0} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \\
&= [\delta w (w+1)]^{d_\ell-d_0} w^{d_0} (g_0+\delta)^{d_0} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1} \\
&= [\delta w (w+1)]^{d_\ell-d_0} g_0^{d_0} |\mathbf{X}_\ell^{*T} \mathbf{X}_\ell^*|^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

## References in the Appendix

- Fouskakis, D., Ntzoufras, I. & Draper, D. (2009), ‘Bayesian variable selection using cost-adjusted BIC, with application to cost-effective measurement of quality of health care’, *Annals of Applied Statistics*, **3**, 663–690.
- George, E. & McCulloch, R. (1993), ‘Variable selection via Gibbs sampling’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **88**, 881–889.
- Harville, D.A. (1997), *Matrix Algebra From a Statistician’s Perspective*, Springer, New York, USA.
- Madigan, D. & York, J. (1995), ‘Bayesian graphical models for discrete data’, *International Statistical Review*, **63**, 215–232.