

# Modelling and computation using NCoRM mixtures for density regression

Jim E. Griffin and Fabrizio Leisen\*

University of Kent

## Abstract

Normalized compound random measures are flexible nonparametric priors for related distributions. We consider building general nonparametric regression models using normalized compound random measure mixture models. We develop a general approach to the unbiased estimation of Laplace functionals of compound random measure (which includes completely random measures as a special case). This allows us to propose a novel pseudo-marginal Metropolis-Hastings sampler for normalized compound random measure mixture models. The approach is illustrated on problems of density regression.

**Keyword:** Dependent random measures; Mixture models; Multivariate Lévy measures; Pseudo-marginal samplers; Poisson estimator.

## 1 Introduction

The problem of Bayesian nonparametric inference for distributions at different regressor values has been an extremely active area of research. Many approaches use dependent nonparametric mixture models and build on the idea of dependent Dirichlet

---

\* *Corresponding author:* Jim E. Griffin, School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NF, U.K. *Email:* jeg28@kent.ac.uk

process mixture models (MacEachern, 1999), which generalized the commonly-used Dirichlet process mixture model. A generic dependent nonparametric mixture model assumes that a sample  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  observed at regressor values  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  (where  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  for some measurable space  $\mathbb{X}$ ) is modelled as

$$y_i|x_i \sim k(y_i|\theta_{s_i}(x_i)), \quad p(s_i = k) = w_k(x_i), \quad k = 1, \dots, \infty \quad (1.1)$$

where  $k(y|\theta)$  is a distribution for  $y$  with parameter  $\theta$ ,  $w_k(x) \geq 0$  for all  $k$  and  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(x) = 1$  almost surely for all  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $\theta_1(x), \theta_2(x), \theta_3(x), \dots$  are independent realisations of a stochastic process. The model simplifies to a nonparametric mixture model if the sample is observed at a single regressor value.

Many approaches to constructing specific models in the form of (1.1) generalize the stick-breaking construction of the Dirichlet process (Sethuraman, 1994) and these were reviewed in Dunson (2010). Alternatively, processes for density regression have been defined through normalizing generalizations of completely random measures (CRM's) (Kingman, 1993). These constructions have several advantages. Firstly, the weights  $w_1(x), w_2(x), \dots$  are not ordered, as is the case with stick-breaking constructions. Secondly, dependence is defined at the level of the weights  $w_k(x)$  rather than, as is typical in stick-breaking constructions, through a non-linear transformation of the weights. Foti and Williamson (2012) defined a wide-class of such process using normalized kernel-weighted random measures, which generalize the approach to time-dependent random measures in Griffin (2011). Griffin et al. (2013) developed an approach to modelling a finite set of dependent random measures using superpositions of completely random measure (see also Lijoi and Nipoti, 2014; Lijoi, Nipoti and Prünster, 2014a,b; Chen et al, 2013). Alternatively, dependence can be modelled through a Lévy copula (Leisen and Lijoi, 2011; Leisen, Lijoi and Spano, 2013; Zhu and Leisen, 2014). Compound random measures (CoRM) (Griffin and Leisen, 2016) are a unifying framework for many dependent random measures including many of the superposition and Lévy copula approaches. They have been applied to modelling graphs for overlapping communities by Todeschini and Caron (2016). Griffin

and Leisen (2016) described posterior sampling methods for a particular class of normalized compound random measure mixtures which exploits a representation of the Laplace transform of the CoRM through a univariate integral of a moment generating function. Ranganath and Blei (2015) independently developed a normalized CoRM model where the weights depend on a Gaussian process and described a variational Bayesian algorithm for inference.

In this paper, we will consider extending the class of compound random measures (CoRM) from finite collections of distributions to infinite collections of distributions. This allows us to define CoRM models where the weights follow a time series model, the weights follow a regression model or the weights are defined through a hierarchical model. The computational algorithms in Griffin and Leisen (2016) cannot be used in this wider class of models since moment generating functions are not available in closed forms. Therefore, we develop a new MCMC algorithm for CRM-based nonparametric mixture models which uses a novel pseudo-marginal MCMC method (Andrieu and Roberts, 2009).

The paper is organized in the following way. Section 2 reviews compound random measures (CoRM) and normalized compound random measures (NCoRM). Section 3 discusses defining NCoRM mixture models. Section 4 introduces a novel computational algorithm for NCoRM mixture which can be widely applied. Section 5 illustrates how NCoRM can be used in density regression problems and how the computational algorithm performs. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 NCoRM processes and some NCoRM mixture models

In this Section, some preliminaries about vectors of random probability measures and their normalized versions are provided. In particular, we focus on the paper of Griffin and Leisen (2016) where a unifying framework for dependent Bayesian nonparametric

priors has been introduced and studied.

## 2.1 Background on NCoRM processes

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space and  $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a measure space, with  $\mathbb{Y}$  Polish and  $\mathcal{Y}$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $\mathbb{Y}$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{Y}}$  the space of boundedly finite measures on  $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ , *i.e.* this means that for any  $\mu$  in  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{Y}}$  and any bounded set  $A$  in  $\mathcal{Y}$  one has  $\mu(A) < \infty$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Y}}$  stands for the corresponding Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, see [Daley and Vere-Jones \(2003\)](#) for technical details.

**Definition 1.** Let  $\tilde{\mu}_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , be a measurable mapping from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  into  $(\mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{Y}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Y}})$  and such that for any  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  in  $\mathcal{Y}$ , with  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for any  $i \neq j$ , the random vectors  $(\tilde{\mu}_1(A_i), \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d(A_i))$  and  $(\tilde{\mu}_1(A_j), \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d(A_j))$  are mutually independent. Then we say that the vector of random measures  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  is *completely random*.

In the one-dimensional case we recover the concept of a *completely random measure* introduced by [Kingman \(1967\)](#). It is easy to prove that completely random vectors can be seen as a sum of two components, one with fixed jumps and one which has a representation through a Laplace functional transform. Throughout the paper, we will consider completely random vectors without the fixed jump part. Therefore, one has a multivariate analogue of the Lévy-Khintchine representation for the vector  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  (see [Sato \(1999\)](#), [Daley and Vere-Jones \(2003\)](#) and [Epifani and Lijoi \(2010\)](#)). Precisely, let  $\tilde{\mu}_j(f_j) = \int f_j d\tilde{\mu}_j$ ; for any set of measurable functions  $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$  such that  $f_j : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$  and  $\int |f_j| d\tilde{\mu}_j < \infty$ , the following equality holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\tilde{\mu}_1(f_1) - \dots - \tilde{\mu}_d(f_d)} \right] = \exp \left\{ -\psi_{\rho, d}^*(\mathbf{f}) \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\psi_{\rho, d}^*(\mathbf{f}) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \int_{(0, \infty)^d} \left[ 1 - e^{-s_1 f_1(y) - \dots - s_d f_d(y)} \right] \rho_d(ds_1, \dots, ds_d) \alpha(dy) \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\int_{(0,\infty)^{d-1}} \rho_d(ds_1, \dots, ds_{j-1}, A, ds_{j+1}, \dots, ds_d) = \int_A \nu_j(ds). \quad (2.3)$$

The representation (2.2) implies that the jump heights of  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  are independent from the jump locations. It is worth noting that, since  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  has independent increments, its distribution is characterized by a choice of  $f_1, \dots, f_d$  in (2.1) such that  $f_j = \lambda_j 1_A$  for any set  $A$  in  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . In this case

$$\psi_{\rho,d}^*(\mathbf{f}) = \alpha(A) \psi_{\rho,d}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$  and

$$\psi_{\rho,d}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} [1 - e^{-\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s} \rangle}] \rho_d(ds_1, \dots, ds_d)$$

where  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$  and  $\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j s_j$ .

Now, consider a completely random vector  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  such that each component is an homogeneous completely random measure on  $\mathbb{Y}$ , *i.e.* the Lévy intensity  $\bar{\nu}_j$  of the measure  $\tilde{\mu}_j$  is

$$\bar{\nu}_j(ds, dy) = \nu_j(ds) \alpha(dy), \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

A compound random measure is one way to construct completely random vectors which satisfies (2.3) for any  $j = 1, \dots, d$ .

**Definition 2.** Suppose that  $\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d$  are homogeneous completely random measures. A *Compound Random Measure* (CoRM) is a completely random vector defined by a *score distribution*  $h$  and a *directing Lévy process* with intensity  $\nu^*$  such that

$$\rho_d(ds_1, \dots, ds_d) = \int z^{-d} h(s_1/z, \dots, s_d/z) ds_1 \cdots ds_d \nu^*(dz)$$

where  $h$  is the probability mass function or probability density function of the score distribution and  $\nu^*$  is the Lévy intensity of the directing Lévy process which satisfies the condition

$$\int z^{-d} \int \min(1, \|\mathbf{s}\|) h(s_1/z, \dots, s_d/z) ds \nu^*(dz) < \infty$$

where  $\|\mathbf{s}\|$  is the Euclidean norm of the vector  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$ .

If the marginal Lévy intensities  $\nu_j$  are fixed then we need to choose  $\nu^*$  and  $h$  such that

$$\nu_j(ds) = \int z^{-1} h_j(s/z) \nu^*(dz) ds$$

where  $h_j(s/z) = \int h(s_1, \dots, s_{j-1}, s/z, s_{j+1}, \dots, s_d) ds_1 \cdots ds_{j-1} ds_{j+1} \cdots ds_d$ .

Griffin and Leisen (2016) introduced a new class of vectors of dependent Bayesian nonparametric priors whose definition we recall here.

**Definition 3.** Let  $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_d)$  be a CoRM on  $\mathbb{Y}^d$  and let  $\tilde{p}_j = \frac{\mu_j}{\mu_j(\mathbb{Y})}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Moreover, assume that for each  $j = 1, \dots, d$ :

$$\nu_j((0, +\infty)) = \int_0^{+\infty} \int z^{-1} h_j(s/z) \nu^*(dz) ds = +\infty \quad (2.4)$$

The vector

$$\tilde{p} = (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_d)$$

is called a *Normalized Compound Random Measure* (NCoRM).

*Remark.* Condition (2.4) is a necessary requirement to ensure the existence of vector of NCoRM. If it does not hold, the normalization does not make sense since  $\tilde{\mu}_j(\mathbb{Y}) = 0$  with positive probability (Regazzini, Lijoi and Prünster, 2003).

Griffin and Leisen (2016) note an alternative representation of NCoRM processes which provides a link to models of the form in (1.1) and shows that the weights are formed by product of draws from the score distribution and the jumps of the directing Lévy process. The representation is

$$\tilde{p}_i = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{m_{ik} J_k \delta_{\theta_k}}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_{ik} J_k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_{ik} \delta_{\theta_k}$$

where  $w_{ik} = \frac{m_{ik} J_k}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_{ik} J_k}$ ,  $(m_{i1}, \dots, m_{id}) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} h$ ,  $J_1, J_2, J_3 \dots$ , are the jumps of the process with directing Lévy process  $\nu^*$  and  $\theta_k \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \tilde{\alpha}$ , with  $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha/\alpha(\mathbb{Y})$ .

Griffin and Leisen (2016) focused on the sub-class of CoRMs and NCoRMs whose scores are independent and identically distributed so that

$$h(s_1, \dots, s_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d f(s_j)$$

where  $f$  is a continuous univariate density. This implies that the marginal processes have the same Lévy intensity of the form

$$\nu_j(ds) = \nu(ds) = \int z^{-1} f(s/z) ds \nu^*(dz). \quad (2.5)$$

In particular, they considered exponential or gamma score distributions. Precisely, they focused on a gamma distribution (or density) with shape  $\phi$  and mean  $\phi$  which has density

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\phi)} x^{\phi-1} \exp\{-x\}.$$

This implies that  $z^{-1}f(s/z)$  is proportional to the density of a gamma distribution with shape parameter equal to  $\phi$  and mean  $\phi z$ . The Lévy intensities  $\nu$  and  $\nu^*$  and the score density  $f$  are linked by (2.5) and a CoRM can be defined by either deriving  $\nu^*$  for a fixed choice of  $f$  and  $\nu$  or by directly specifying  $f$  and  $\nu^*$ . In this latter case, it is interesting to consider the properties of the induced  $\nu$ . The forms for some particular choices of marginal process are shown in Table 1. A gamma marginal process arises

$\nu(s)$	$\nu^*(z)$
Gamma process	
$s^{-1} \exp\{-s\}, s > 0$	$z^{-1}(1-z)^{\phi-1}, 0 < z < 1$
$\sigma$ -stable process	
$\frac{\sigma}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} s^{-1-\sigma}, s > 0$	$\frac{\sigma\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\sigma+\phi)\Gamma(1-\sigma)} z^{-\sigma-1}, z > 0$
Generalized gamma process	
$\frac{\sigma}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} s^{-\sigma-1} \exp\{-\lambda s\}, z > 0$	$\frac{\sigma\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\sigma+\phi)\Gamma(1-\sigma)} z^{-\sigma-1} (1-\lambda z)^{\sigma+\phi-1}, 0 < z < 1/\lambda$

Table 1: The form of directing Lévy intensity in a CoRM which leads to particular marginal processes.

when the directing Lévy process is a Beta process and a  $\sigma$ -stable marginal process

arises when the directing Lévy process is also a  $\sigma$ -stable process. Generalized gamma marginal processes lead to a directing Lévy process which is a generalization of the Beta process (with a power of  $z$  which is less than 1) and re-scaled to the interval  $(0, 1/a)$ . In fact, if we use a gamma score distribution with shape  $\phi$  and mean  $a\phi$  which has density

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{a^\phi \Gamma(\phi)} x^{\phi-1} \exp\{-x/a\},$$

the directing Lévy intensity is a stable Beta (Teh and Görür, 2009) of the form

$$\nu^*(z) = \frac{a^{\sigma+1} \sigma}{\phi} \frac{\Gamma(\phi+1)}{\Gamma(\phi+\sigma)\Gamma(1-\sigma)} z^{-\sigma-1} (1-z)^{\sigma+\phi-1}, \quad 0 < z < 1.$$

Table 1 allows the multivariate Lévy intensity  $\rho_d$  to be derived for some fixed marginal process. For instance, if the CoRM process has gamma process marginals then

$$\rho_d(s_1, \dots, s_d) = \frac{(\prod_{j=1}^d s_j)^{\phi-1}}{[\Gamma(\phi)]^{d-1}} |\mathbf{s}|^{-\frac{d\phi+1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{s}|}{2}} W_{\frac{(d-2)\phi+1}{2}, -\frac{d\phi}{2}}(|\mathbf{s}|) \quad (2.6)$$

where  $|\mathbf{s}| = s_1 + \dots + s_d$  and  $W$  is the Whittaker function. If the CoRM process has  $\sigma$ -stable process marginals then

$$\rho_d(s_1, \dots, s_d) = \frac{(\prod_{j=1}^d s_j)^{\phi-1}}{[\Gamma(\phi)]^{d-1}} \frac{\sigma \Gamma(\sigma + d\phi)}{\Gamma(\sigma + \phi)\Gamma(1-\sigma)} |\mathbf{s}|^{-\sigma-d\phi}. \quad (2.7)$$

The CoRM structure is also convenient when deriving the Laplace transform. Indeed, it can be expressed in terms of an integral with respect to the directing Lévy measure  $\nu^*$ . Precisely, consider a CoRM process with independent  $\text{Ga}(\phi, 1)$  distributed scores. Suppose  $\phi \geq 1$  such that  $\phi \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$  be a vector such that it consists of  $l \leq d$  distinct values denoted as  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_l)$  with respective multiplicities  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_l)$ . Then

$$\psi_{\rho,d}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \psi_{\rho,d}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \mathbf{n}) = \frac{[\Gamma(\phi)]^l}{\prod_{i=1}^l [\tilde{\lambda}_i^{\phi-1} \Gamma(n_i \phi)]} \left( \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{\partial^{(n_i-1)\phi}}{\partial^{(n_i-1)\phi} \tilde{\lambda}_i} \right) \left( \Upsilon_l^\phi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \prod_{i=1}^l \tilde{\lambda}_i^{n_i \phi - 1} \right),$$

where

$$\Upsilon_l^\phi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \int \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{(1+z\tilde{\lambda}_i)^\phi} \right) \nu^*(z) dz.$$

Explicit expressions of  $\Upsilon_l^\phi$  are available in Griffin and Leisen (2016), in particular when  $\phi = 1$ . The next Section will be devoted to illustrating some applications of CoRMs to regression, time series, Gaussian processes and hierarchical modelling.



### 3 Modelling with normalized compound random measure mixtures

We will consider mixture models of the form in (1.1) with  $\theta_k(x) = \theta_k$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ , leading to a mixture model with weights which vary over  $\mathbb{X}$ . The model is

$$y_i|x_i \sim k(y_i|\theta_{s_i}), \quad p(s_i = k) = w_k(x_i), \quad k = 1, \dots, \infty$$

which is a special case of (1.1). We define a normalized compound random measure prior for  $w_1(x), w_2(x), w_3(x), \dots$  of the form

$$w_k(x) = \frac{m_k(x)J_k}{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} m_l(x)J_l}$$

where  $m_k(x)$  is a random function on  $\mathbb{X}$  for which  $m_k(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  and the function  $m_k$  is independent of  $m_l$ ,  $J_1, J_2, J_3 \dots$ , are the jumps of the process with directing Lévy process  $\nu^*$  and  $\theta_k \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \tilde{\alpha}$ . We will concentrate on models where  $m_l(x) = \exp\{r_l(x)\}$  and  $r_l(x)$  is a random function on  $\mathbb{X}$  taking value on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Griffin and Leisen (2016) considered using the variance of the ratio of the same jump at values  $a$  and  $b$  as a simple measure of the strength of dependence between the (unnormalized) random measure at values  $a$  and  $b$ . In this case, the ratio is  $\zeta(a, b) = m_l(a)/m_l(b) = \exp\{r_l(a) - r_l(b)\}$  and the distribution of  $\zeta(a, b)$  will often be easy to work with. For example,  $\zeta(a, b)$  will be log normally distributed if  $r_l(a)$  and  $r_l(b)$  have a bivariate normal marginal distribution.

The model reduces to the NCoRM models considered by Griffin and Leisen (2016) if  $\mathbb{X}$  is a finite set. Suppose that the  $\mathbb{X} = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$  where  $c_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . They concentrate on the case where  $r_l(c_1), \dots, r_l(c_k)$  are independent. In this paper, we will consider model in which  $r_l(x)$  is a stochastic process for which  $E[r_l(x)] = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ . This gives CoRM models a high degree of flexibility. Two particular choices for the function  $r_l(x)$ , which are considered in the examples, are:

- **Regression:**  $r_1(x), r_2(x), r_3(x), \dots$  are independent Gaussian processes with covariance function  $\sigma_0^2 \kappa(a, b)$  where  $\kappa(a, b)$  is a correlation function for which

$\log \zeta(a, b)$  follows a normal distribution with mean zero and variance  $2\sigma_0^2$ .

- **Linear Model:**  $r_l(x) = \alpha_{x_{i,1}}^{(l)} + \beta_{x_{i,2}}^{(l)} + \gamma_{x_{i,1},x_{i,2}}^{(l)}$  where

$$\alpha_j^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_1^2), \quad \beta_j^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_2^2), \quad \gamma_{i,j}^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_{1,2}^2).$$

Posterior inference is challenging using existing methods and the following Section describes a general purpose algorithm for NCoRM mixture models.

## 4 Computational methods

Posterior inference for nonparametric mixture models is challenging due to the infinite-dimensional random probability measure in the model. To address this problem, two main MCMC approaches to define a finite-dimensional target have been developed. Firstly, marginal methods integrate the random probability measure from the posterior. Secondly, conditional methods truncate the random probability measure. These methods can be further divided into exact methods which use a random truncation to sample exactly from the posterior and method which fix the level of truncation leading to some truncation error. [Griffin and Leisen \(2016\)](#) suggest a marginal method and an exact conditional method (a slice sampler). The availability of an analytical expression for the moment generating function for the score distribution is key to their sampling methods but this is impossible to evaluate in closed form for the more general NCoRM models described in this paper. We propose a hybrid conditional-marginal sampler using pseudo-marginal Metropolis-Hastings ([Andrieu and Roberts, 2009](#)).

Following [Griffin and Leisen \(2016\)](#), it is convenient to use an augmented form of the likelihood which introduces an allocation variable for each observation. Let  $n_k$  be the number of observations allocated to the  $k$ -th jump, we order the jumps so that  $J_1, \dots, J_K$  have points allocated to them (*i.e.*  $n_k > 0$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ) and  $J_{K+1}, J_{K+2}, \dots$  have no points allocated to them (*i.e.*  $n_k = 0$  for  $k > K$ ). Marginalizing over jumps which have no points allocated and the location of all

atoms and writing  $M = \alpha(\mathbb{Y})$  and  $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha/\alpha(\mathbb{Y})$  gives

$$M^K \prod_{k=1}^K \left\{ J_k^{n_k} \left[ \prod_{i=1; s_i=k}^n m_k(x_i) \right] \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} h(m_k) \nu^*(J_k) \right\} L \prod_{k=1}^K k(y^{(k)})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} \right] \\ &= \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -z \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} \right) p(m) \nu^*(z) dz dm \right\}, \quad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

$$k(y) = \int \prod k(y_i|\theta) \tilde{\alpha}(\theta) d\theta.$$

and  $y^{(k)} = \{y|s_i = k, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ . [Griffin and Leisen \(2016\)](#) use the analytical expression for  $L$  and integrals over  $J_1, \dots, J_K$  to define a marginal sampler. In general, these integrals are not analytically available to us. We replace  $L$  by an unbiased estimate  $\hat{L}$  (a possible unbiased estimator is discussed in the next Section) to define the following target

$$M^K \prod_{k=1}^K \left\{ J_k^{n_k} \left[ \prod_{i=1; s_i=k}^n m_k(x_i) \right] \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} h(m_k) \nu^*(J_k) \right\} \hat{L} \prod_{k=1}^K k(y^{(k)}).$$

Finally, we assume that  $h$  has parameters  $\tau$  and  $\nu^*$  has parameters  $\xi$  on which we want to make inference and define the target

$$\begin{aligned} &p(\tau)p(\xi)p(M)M^K \prod_{k=1}^K \left\{ J_k^{n_k} \left[ \prod_{i=1; s_i=k}^n m_k(x_i) \right] \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} h(m_k|\tau) \nu_{\xi}^*(J_k) \right\} \\ &\times \hat{L} \prod_{k=1}^K k(y^{(k)}). \end{aligned}$$

We propose a novel sampling strategy for the variable  $s$  in a nonparametric mixture model and a novel computational algorithm to deal with the Laplace transform component of the target above. This algorithm can be applied to posterior inference for a wide variety of Bayesian nonparametric processes beyond NCoRM processes.

## Updating $s$

To update  $s_i$ , we write the full conditional distribution as proportional to

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K_i^-} (J_k m_k(x_i) k(\{y_j | s_j = k\} \cup y_i))^{I(s_i=k)} \left( M m_{K_i^-+1} \gamma(m_{K_i^-+1}) k(y_i) \right)^{I(s_i=K_i^-+1)} \\ \times p\left(J_{K_i^-+1} \mid m_{K_i^-+1}\right) h\left(m_{K_i^-+1} \mid \tau\right)$$

where  $K_i^-$  is the number of distinct values in  $s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_n, (J_1, m_1), \dots, (J_K, m_K)$  are ordered so that  $s_i = K$ ,

$$\gamma(m) = \int z \exp\left\{-z \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i)\right\} \nu_\xi^*(z) dz$$

and

$$p\left(J_{K_i^-+1} \mid m_{K_i^-+1}\right) = \frac{J_{K_i^-+1} \exp\left\{-J_{K_i^-+1} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m_{K_i^-+1}(x_i)\right\} \nu_\xi^*(J_{K_i^-+1})}{\gamma(m_{K_i^-+1})}.$$

A new value of  $J_{K_i^-+1}$  is sampled from this full conditional distribution leading to an algorithm which is similar to Algorithm 8 of [Neal \(2000\)](#) (see [\(Favaro and Teh, 2013\)](#) for extensions to normalized random measure mixtures) for non-conjugate mixtures.

If the  $i$ -th observation was allocated to a singleton cluster in the previous iteration, the full conditional distribution of  $s_i$  is

$$p(s_i = j) \propto \begin{cases} J_j m_j(x_i) \frac{k(\{y_k | s_k = j\} \cup y_i)}{k(\{y_k | s_k = j\})} & j = 1, \dots, K_i^- \\ M m_j(x_i) \gamma(m_j(x_i)) k(\{y_i\}) & j = K_i^- + 1 = K \end{cases}$$

If the  $i$ -th observation was not allocated to a singleton cluster in the previous iteration, we propose  $m_{K_i^-+1} \sim h\left(m_{K_i^-+1} \mid \tau\right)$  and  $J_{K_i^-+1} \sim p\left(J_{K_i^-+1} \mid m_{K_i^-+1}\right)$ , then

$$p(s_i = j) \propto \begin{cases} J_j m_j(x_i) \frac{k(\{y_k | s_k = j\} \cup y_i)}{k(\{y_k | s_k = j\})} & j = 1, \dots, K_i^- \\ M m_{K_i^-+1}(x_i) \gamma\left(m_{K_i^-+1}\right) k(\{y_i\}) & j = K_i^- + 1 \end{cases}.$$

In [Appendix B](#) we provide the details of the full conditional distributions for the variables  $J_k, m_k, v_i, \xi, M$  and  $\tau$ . The next Section will introduce the novel pseudo-marginal Metropolis-Hastings algorithm used to address the intractability of the Laplace transform part of the target distribution.

## 4.1 Unbiased estimation of the Laplace functional

Andrieu and Roberts (2009) introduced a sampling scheme, called *pseudo-marginal* Metropolis-Hastings, which allows sampling from distributions which cannot be evaluated pointwise. The main idea of the method is to replace the target distribution with a nonnegative unbiased estimator.

In our framework, we are often interested in evaluating objects such as the expectation in (4.1),

$$L = \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -z \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} \right) p(m) \nu^*(z) dz dm \right\}.$$

We will use the Poisson estimator (Papaspiliopoulos, 2011) which has been successfully used in MCMC approaches for diffusions (see *e.g.* Fearnhead et al., 2010).

Consider, the equation

$$L_\phi = \exp \left\{ - \int_D \phi(x) dx \right\} \leq 1 \quad (4.2)$$

for  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  where  $\phi(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in D$  and  $\int_D \phi(x) dx < \infty$ . The Poisson estimator of (4.2) is introduced in the following Theorem where some properties are described. The proof of the Theorem can be found in the Appendix.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider the following estimator,*

$$\hat{L}_\phi = \prod_{i=1}^K \left( 1 - \frac{\phi(x_i)}{aM \kappa(x_i)} \right) \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\kappa$  is a p.d.f. on  $D$ ,  $M > \frac{\phi(x)}{\kappa(x)}$  for  $x \in D$ ,  $a > 1$ ,  $K \sim Pn(aM)$  and  $x_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \kappa$ .

Then,

$$E[\hat{L}_\phi] = \exp \left\{ - \int_D \phi(x) dx \right\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V[\hat{L}_\phi] &= L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \frac{\phi(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - 1 \right) \\ &\leq L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{a} \int_D \phi(x) dx \right\} - 1 \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The estimator has the useful property that it is always positive. This contrasts with other approaches which define unbiased estimators of infinite sums using random truncation where it is difficult to ensure that estimates are always positive (see *e.g.* [Rhee and Glynn, 2015](#); [Lyne et al., 2015](#)).

Returning to the expression in (4.1), this can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -z \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} \right) p(m) \nu^*(z) dz dm \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^n v_k m(x_k) \int_0^z \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} dt p(m) \nu^*(z) dz dm \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^n v_k m(x_k) p(m) \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} \int_t^\infty \nu^*(z) dz dt dm \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^n v_k m(x_k) p(m) \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} T_{\nu^*}(t) dt dm \right\} \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^n L_k. \tag{4.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $T_{\nu^*}(t) = \int_t^\infty \nu(z) dz$  is the tail mass function for the Lévy process and

$$L_k = \exp \left\{ - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^p} \int_0^\infty v_k m(x_k) p(m) \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} T_{\nu^*}(t) dt dm \right\}.$$

The expression for  $L_k$  is (4.3) with  $x = (z, m)$ ,  $D = (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{+n}$  and

$$\phi(z, m) = v_k m(x_k) h(m) \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^n v_i m(x_i) \right\} T_{\nu^*}(t).$$

Clearly  $\int_D \phi(x) dx < \infty$ . A suitable density is  $\kappa(z, m) = \kappa_{\tilde{\nu}}(z) \frac{m(x_k) h(m)}{\mathbb{E}[m(x_k)]}$  where  $\kappa_{\tilde{\nu}}(z) > T_{\nu}(z)$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Suitable forms of  $\kappa_{\tilde{\nu}}$  for some popular nonparametric processes are given in Section 4.1.1.

In computation for more usual normalized random measures ([Griffin and Walker, 2011](#); [Favaro and Teh, 2013](#)), we are interested in

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{-vJ\}] = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\infty (1 - \exp\{-vz\}) \nu(z) dz \right\} \leq 1 \tag{4.5}$$

where  $\nu(z)$  is a Lévy process and the expectation is taken over all jumps on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . This expectation can, similarly, be re-expressed as

$$= \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\infty (1 - \exp\{-vz\}) \nu(z) dz \right\} = \exp \left\{ -v \int_0^\infty T_{\nu}(t) \exp\{-vt\} dt \right\}$$

which is (4.2) with  $x = z$ ,  $D = \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\phi(z) = vT_\nu(z, \infty) \exp\{-vx\}$ . Clearly  $\int_D f(x) dx < \infty$ . The estimator in (4.3) provides an unbiased estimator of (4.4) and (4.5) which can be used in the sampler described in this Section.

### 4.1.1 Examples

Brix (1999) provides a bound for the tail-mass integral of the generalized gamma process which is extended to the stable-Beta process by Arbel and Prünster (2016). However, their bounds are not tight and we suggest a tighter bounds for both processes.

#### *Generalized gamma process*

The generalized gamma process has Lévy density  $\nu(y) = \frac{\sigma}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} y^{-1-\sigma} \exp\{-\lambda y\}$  and the tail-mass functions  $T_\nu(t)$  is an incomplete gamma function. A suitable bounding p.d.f. is

$$\kappa(t) \propto \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma}(t^{-\sigma} - 1) & t < b \\ \frac{1}{\sigma}(b^{-\sigma} - 1) \exp\{-\lambda(t - b)\} & t \geq b \end{cases}$$

where  $b = 0.65$ . The normalizing constant is  $\frac{1}{\sigma} \left[ \frac{b^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - b + b^{-\sigma} - 1 \right]$ . Consider the density truncated to  $t < b$ , taking the transformation  $y = \frac{1}{\sigma}(t^{-\sigma} - 1)$  leads to the density  $\kappa(y) \propto y(\sigma y + 1)^{-1/\sigma}$  truncated to  $y > \frac{1}{\sigma}(b^{-\sigma} - 1)$ . This can be expressed as a mixture of gamma distributions where  $y|m \sim \Gamma(2, m)$ ,  $m \sim \Gamma(1/\sigma, 1/\sigma)$ .

As  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  for  $\lambda = 1$ , the generalized gamma process converges to the gamma process which has Lévy density  $\nu(z) = z^{-1} \exp\{-z\}$  and  $T_\nu(t) = \int_t^\infty \nu(y) dy = E_1(t)$  where  $E_1(t)$  is the exponential-integral function. Both the bounding p.d.f. and simulation scheme for  $t < b$  also converge. The bounding p.d.f. is

$$\kappa(t) \propto \begin{cases} -\log t & t < b \\ -(\log b) \exp\{-(t - b)\} & t \geq b \end{cases}.$$

which has normalizing constant is  $b - b \log b - \log b$ . The appropriate transformation for  $t < b$  is  $y = -\log(t)$  which has p.d.f.  $z \exp\{-z\}$ , *i.e.*  $z \sim \Gamma(2, 1)$  truncated to  $y > -\log b$ .

If  $\lambda = 0$ , the generalized gamma process is stable process. However, the tail mass function is infinite for a stable process and this simulation scheme is not possible.

### *Stable-Beta process*

The stable-Beta process has Lévy density  $\nu(z) = \frac{\sigma\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\sigma+\phi)\Gamma(1-\sigma)}z^{-\sigma-1}(1-\lambda z)^{\sigma+\phi-1}$  for  $0 < z < 1/\lambda$ . A suitable bounding p.d.f. is

$$\kappa(t) \propto \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma}(t^{-\sigma} - 1) & t < b \\ \frac{1}{\sigma}(b^{-\sigma} - 1)\frac{(1-\lambda t)^{\gamma+\sigma}}{(1-\lambda b)^{\gamma+\sigma}} & t \geq b \end{cases}$$

where  $b < 0.65$ . The normalizing constant is  $\frac{1}{\sigma} \left[ \frac{b^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} - b + \frac{b^{-\sigma-1}}{\lambda(\gamma+\sigma+1)}(1-\lambda b) \right]$ . The truncated distribution  $-\log t$  can be simulated using the method for the bounding p.d.f. designed for the gamma process.

As  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  for  $\lambda = 1$ , the stable-Beta process converges to the Beta process which has Lévy density  $\nu(y) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma)}y^{-1}(1-y)^{\gamma-1}$  for  $0 < y < 1$ . The bounding p.d.f. converges to

$$\kappa(t) \propto \begin{cases} -\log t & t < b \\ \frac{-\log b}{(1-b)^\gamma}(1-t)^\gamma & t \geq b \end{cases}$$

whose normalizing constant is  $b - b \log b - \frac{\log b}{\gamma+1}(1-b)$ .

### **4.1.2 Setting the parameter $a$**

The parameter  $a$  can be used to the precision of the estimator since  $V[\hat{L}_\phi] \rightarrow 0$  as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \frac{\phi(x)}{\int_D \phi(x) dx} = \frac{\phi(x)}{-\log L}$  then

$$V[\hat{L}_\phi] = L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{aM} \int_D \frac{\tilde{\phi}(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - 1 \right).$$

The number of evaluations of  $\phi(x)$  is Poisson distributed with mean  $aM$  and  $aM$  controls the computational cost. For a fixed  $d = aM$  (*i.e.* fixed computational budget), we have

$$V[\hat{L}_\phi] = L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{d} \eta(\tilde{\phi}, \kappa) \right\} - 1 \right)$$



where  $\eta(\tilde{\phi}, \kappa)$  is the variance of an importance sampler for  $\phi$  with importance density  $\kappa$  and so this is minimised by  $\kappa = \tilde{\phi}$  for which

$$V[\hat{L}_\phi] = L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{aM} \right\} - 1 \right).$$

The parameter  $a$  controls the variability of the estimator. An alternative method for controlling the variability involves defining the estimator  $\hat{L}_\phi^{AVE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{L}_\phi^{(i)}$  where  $\hat{L}_\phi^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{L}_\phi^{(N)}$  are independent realisations of  $\hat{L}_\phi$  which has variance

$$V[\hat{L}_\phi^{AVE}] = \frac{L_\phi^2}{N} \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{aM} \int_D \frac{\tilde{\phi}(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - 1 \right).$$

For this estimator, the number of evaluations of  $\phi(x)$  has mean  $aMN$  and variance  $aMN$ . In this case, for fixed computational budget  $d = aMN$ , we have

$$V[\hat{L}_\phi^{AVE}] = \frac{L_\phi^2}{N} \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{N(\log L_\phi)^2}{d} \int_D \frac{\tilde{\phi}(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - 1 \right)$$

which is proportional to  $\frac{1}{N}(\exp\{cN\} - 1)$ . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N+1}(\exp\{c(N+1)\} - 1) &= \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c^k (N+1)^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c^k (N+1)^{k-1}}{k!} \\ &> \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c^k N^{k-1}}{k!} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c^k N^k}{k!} = \frac{1}{N}(\exp\{cN\} - 1) \end{aligned}$$

and so the variance is always an increasing function  $N$  for fixed  $d$  and the optimal choice is  $N = 1$ . Using the notation of Doucet *et al* (2014), the variance of the noise  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{aM} \int_D \frac{\tilde{\phi}(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx.$$

Therefore, for fixed  $\kappa$ , we could choose

$$a_{opt} = \frac{(\log L_\phi)^2}{\sigma_{opt}^2 M} \int_D \frac{\tilde{\phi}(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx.$$

In practice, we would want to choose a value of  $a_{opt}$  which works for a range of  $(\phi(x), \kappa(x))$  combinations.

## 5 Illustrations

### 5.1 Example 1: Linear model

The algorithms developed in this paper are illustrated using an analysis of hematological data arising from a dose-escalation study which has previously been analysed by Müller and Rosner (1997). The data are white blood cell counts over time for a sample of 52 patients receiving different levels of two treatments: cyclophosphamide (CTX) and a second drug (GM-CSF). Müller and Rosner (1997) fit a non-linear regression model with seven parameter to the time profile for each patient and treated the estimated parameters as a seven-dimensional observations for that patient. De Iorio et al. (2004) applied an ANOVA-DDP model to these data which assumes a mixture model with constant weights but assume an ANOVA model for the locations for each treatment. In contrast, we fit a mixture model whose weights vary with the treatment combination but whose locations are fixed for each treatment level. Specifically, we assume that  $y_i$  are the estimated parameters for the  $i$ -th patient and that  $x_{i,1}$  is the level of CTX and  $x_{i,2}$  is the level of GM-CSF. The model is

$$y_i | s_i \sim N(\mu_{s_i}, a\sigma^2)$$

$$p(s_i = k) = \frac{J_k \exp \left\{ \alpha_{x_{i,1}}^{(k)} + \beta_{x_{i,2}}^{(k)} + \gamma_{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}}^{(k)} \right\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} J_l \exp \left\{ \alpha_{x_{i,1}}^{(l)} + \beta_{x_{i,2}}^{(l)} + \gamma_{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}}^{(l)} \right\}}$$

$$\alpha_j^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_1^2), \quad \beta_j^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_2^2), \quad \gamma_{i,j}^{(k)} \sim N(0, \sigma_{1,2}^2).$$

The directing Lévy process is taken to be a gamma process. The model assumes a two-way ANOVA model with interaction for the logarithm of the weights. This does not place restriction on the combination of weights but does encourage similar weights for similar combinations of levels. The priors were  $\sigma_1^2 \sim \text{Ga}(1, 2)$ ,  $\sigma_2^2 \sim \text{Ga}(1, 2)$ ,  $\sigma_{1,2}^2 \sim \text{Ga}(1, 2)$  and  $M \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ . The MCMC algorithms was a total of 35 000 iterations. The first 5 000 were used as a burn-in with the subsequent values thinned every fifth sample. This gave a sample of 6 000 values.




Figure 1: Posterior mean probability density of  $z_1$  for three levels of GM and four levels of CTX shown as: solid line (CTX=1.5), dashed line (CTX=3.0), dot-dashed line (CTX=4.5) and dashed line (CTX=6.0)




Figure 2: Posterior mean probability density of  $z_2$  for three levels of GM and four levels of CTX shown as: solid line (CTX=1.5), dashed line (CTX=3.0), dot-dashed line (CTX=4.5) and dashed line (CTX=6.0)

The inference about the marginal probability of two parameters  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  in their model are shown in Figures 1 and 2. In both cases the marginal distribution is bi-

modal. The size of the smaller mode increases with GM-CSF for  $z_1$  and decreases with GM-CSF for  $z_2$ .




Figure 3: Trace plots of the parameters  $M$ ,  $\sigma_1^2$ ,  $\sigma_2^2$  and  $\sigma_{1,2}^2$ .

Figure 3 shows trace plots for the total mass parameter  $M$  and the three parameters controlling the differences between jumps at each treatment level. These clearly shows good performance of the sampler for this problem.

## 5.2 Example 2: Regression

A regression model is used to define an infinite mixture model with regressor dependent weights. We observe pairs  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$  where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and use the model

$$y_i \sim N(\theta_{s_i}, a\sigma^2)$$

$$p(s_i = k) = \frac{J_k \exp\{r_k(x_i)\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} J_l \exp\{r_l(x_i)\}}$$

where  $r_1(x), r_2(x), r_3(x), \dots$  are independent Gaussian processes. A gamma directing Lévy process is used.

We apply the model to data from a simulated motorcycle accident used to test crash helmets (Silverman, 1985), which are available as the `mcycle` data frame in the

R package MASS. The data are head accelerations (in  $g$ ) measured at different times in milliseconds after impact. We assume that the Gaussian processes have covariance function  $C(x, y) = \phi \exp\left\{-\frac{\|x-y\|}{L}\right\}$  where  $\|\cdot\|$  is Euclidean distance and  $L$  is the lengthscale. The priors are  $L \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ ,  $M \sim \text{Ga}(1, 1)$ , and  $\phi^{-1} \sim \text{Ga}(1, 4)$ . The prior for  $\phi$  is chosen so that  $\log m_k(x_i)$  typically takes values in  $(-4, 4)$ . The MCMC algorithm was a total of 33 000 iterations. The first 3 000 were used as a burn-in with the subsequent values thinned every third sample. This gave a sample of 10 000 values.




Figure 4: Motorcycle data: Data (dots) and posterior mean density of  $y|x$  (darker colours show larger density).

Figure 4 shows the posterior mean of the conditional density of head acceleration given time from impact with the data superimposed. The model is able to follow the data and capture the changing heterogeneity in the variance.

Trace plots for the three parameters  $M$ ,  $\phi$  and  $L$  are shown in figure 5. These clearly show that the parameters are mixing well across the MCMC chain.




Figure 5: Motorcyle data: Trace plots of the parameters  $M$ ,  $\phi$  and  $L$ .

## 6 Summary

Normalized compound random measures are a large class of dependent nonparametric processes. The jumps of the processes are expressed as the product of a jump from a Lévy process and a random variable. This allows dependence of nonparametric processes to be modelled through the dependence in the random variables. In this paper, we have developed Markov chain Monte Carlo methods to estimate nonparametric mixture models where the mixing measure is given a normalized compound random measure prior with a wide-range of dependences between the underlying random variables. The example illustrate priors constructed using linear models and Gaussian processes. Other types of dependence could be included such as time series models, spatial models or hierarchical models. The MCMC methods are efficient and depend on approximating the tail mass integral of a Lévy process. Examples of appropriate approximation are given for the most popular classes of Lévy processes used in Bayesian nonparametrics.

## References

- J. Arbel and I. Prünster (2016). A moment-matching Ferguson & Klass algorithm. *arXiv: 1606.02566*.
- C. Andrieu and G. O. Roberts (2009). The pseudo-marginal approach for efficient Monte Carlo computations. *Ann. Statist.*, 37, 697–725.
- Y. F. Atchadé and J. S. Rosenthal (2005). On Adaptive Markov Chain Monte Carlo Algorithms. *Bernoulli*, 11, 815–828.
- A. Brix (1999). Generalised gamma measures and shot-noise Cox processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 31, 929–953.
- C. Chen, V. A. Rao, W. Buntine and Y. W. Teh (2013). Dependent Normalized Random Measures, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones (2003). *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. 1*. Springer, New York.
- M. De Iorio, P. Müller, G. L. Rosner and S. N. MacEachern (2004). An ANOVA model for dependent random measures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 99, 205–215.
- D. B. Dunson (2010). Nonparametric Bayes applications to biostatistics. In N. L. Hjort, C. C. Holmes, P. Müller and S. G. Walker, editors, *Bayesian Nonparametrics*, Cambridge University Press.
- I. Epifani and A. Lijoi (2010). Nonparametric priors for vectors of survival functions. *Statistica Sinica* 20, 1455–1484.
- S. Favaro and Y. W. Teh (2013). MCMC for Normalized Random Measure Mixture Models. *Statistical Science*, vol. 28, 335–359.

- P. Fearnhead, O. Papaspiliopoulos, G. O. Roberts and A. Stuart (2010). Random-weight particle filtering of continuous time processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 74, 497–512.
- N. Foti and S. Williamson (2012). Slice sampling normalized kernel-weighted completely random measure mixture models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, (F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou and K. Q. Weinberger, Eds.), 2240–2248.
- J. E. Griffin (2011). The Ornstein-Uhlenback Dirichlet process and other time-varying processes for Bayesian nonparametric inference. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **141**, 3648–3664.
- J. E. Griffin, M. Kolossiatis and M. F. J. Steel (2013). Comparing Distributions By Using Dependent Normalized Random-Measure Mixtures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 75, 499–529.
- J. E. Griffin and F. Leisen (2016). Compound Random Measures and their use in Bayesian nonparametrics. Forthcoming in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*.
- J. E. Griffin and S. G. Walker (2011). Posterior simulation of normalized random measure mixtures. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **20**, 241–259.
- J. F. C. Kingman (1967). Completely Random Measures. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, **21**, 59–78.
- J. F. C. Kingman (1993). *Poisson processes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- F. Leisen and A. Lijoi (2011). Vectors of Poisson-Dirichlet processes. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **102**, 482–495.
- F. Leisen, A. Lijoi and D. Spano (2013). A Vector of Dirichlet processes. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **7**, 62–90.



- A. Lijoi, and B. Nipoti (2014). A class of hazard rate mixtures for combining survival data from different experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **109**, 802–814.
- A. Lijoi, B. Nipoti and I. Prünster (2014a). Bayesian inference with dependent normalized completely random measures. *Bernoulli*, **20**, 1260–1291.
- A. Lijoi, B. Nipoti and I. Prünster (2014b). Dependent mixture models: clustering and borrowing information. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **71**, 417–433.
- A.-M. Lyne, H. Strathmann, D. Simpson and Y. Atchade (2015). On Russian roulette estimates for Bayesian inference with doubly-intractable likelihoods. *Statistical Science*, **30**, 443–467
- S. N. MacEachern (1999). Dependent nonparametric processes. In *ASA Proceedings of the Section on Bayesian Statistical Science*, Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.
- P. Müller and G. Rosner. (1997). A Bayesian population model with hierarchical mixture priors applied to blood count data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**, 1279–1292.
- R. M. Neal (2000). Markov chain sampling methods for Dirichlet process mixture models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **9**, 249–265.
- O. Papaspiliopoulos (2011). A methodological framework for Monte Carlo probabilistic inference for diffusion processes. In *Bayesian Time Series Models* (D. Barber, A. Taylan Cemgil and S. Chippia, Eds), Cambridge University Press.
- R. Ranganath and D. M. Blei (2015). Correlated Random Measures. *arXiv:1507.00720*

- E. Regazzini, A. Lijoi and I. Prünster (2003). Distributional results for means of normalized random measures with independent increments. *Ann. Statist.* **31**, 560–585.
- C.-H. Rhee and P. W. Glynn (2015). Unbiased estimation with square root convergence for SDE models. *Operations Research*, **63**, 1026–1043.
- K. Sato (1999). *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge University Press.
- J. Sethuraman (1994). A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors. *Statistica Sinica*, **4**, 639–650.
- B. W. Silverman (1985). Some aspects of the spline smoothing approach to non-parametric curve fitting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **47**, 1–52.
- Y. W. Teh and D. Görür (2009). Indian Buffet Processes with Power-law Behavior. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 22* (Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. D. Lafferty, C. K. I. Williams and A. Culotta, Eds.), 1838–1846.
- A. Todeschini and F. Caron (2016). Exchangeable random measures for sparse and modular graphs with overlapping communities. *arXiv: 1602.0211*.
- Y. Yu and X.-L. Meng (2011). To Center or Not to Center: That is Not the Question – An Ancillarity-Sufficiency Interweaving Strategy (ASIS) for Boosting MCMC Efficiency. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 20, 531–570.
- W. Zhu and F. Leisen (2014). A multivariate extension of a vector of Poisson-Dirichlet processes. To appear in the *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*.

## A Proofs

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(x_i)}{aM\kappa(x_i)} \right] &= 1 - \frac{1}{aM} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\phi(x_i)}{\kappa(x_i)} \right] = 1 - \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \frac{\phi(x_i)}{\kappa(x_i)} \kappa(x_i) dx_i = 1 - \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \phi(x_i) dx_i \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{1}{aM} \frac{\phi(x_i)}{\kappa(x_i)} \right)^2 \right] &= 1 - 2 \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \phi(x_i) dx_i + \frac{1}{a^2 M^2} \int_D \frac{\phi(x_i)^2}{\kappa(x_i)} dx_i. \end{aligned}$$

If  $k \sim \text{Pn}(\mu)$

$$\mathbb{E}[(1-b)^k] = \exp\{-\mu b\}$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_\phi] = \exp \left\{ - \int_D \phi(x) dx \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{V}[\hat{L}_\phi] &= \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_\phi^2] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_\phi]^2 \\ &= \exp \left\{ -2 \int_D \phi(x) dx + \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \frac{\phi(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - \exp \left\{ -2 \int_D \phi(x) dx \right\} \\ &= L_\phi^2 \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{aM} \int_D \frac{\phi(x)^2}{\kappa(x)} dx \right\} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

□

## B Additional details of computational methods

### Updating $J_k$

Update  $J_k$  from the full conditional distribution proportional to

$$J_k^{n_k} \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} \nu_\xi^*(J_k).$$

This variable can be updated in closed form if  $\nu_\xi^*$  is the Lévy density of a generalized gamma process or by an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk ([Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005](#)) if the full conditional does not have closed form.

## Updating $m_k$

Update  $m_k$  from the full conditional distribution proportional to

$$\prod_{i=1; s_i=k}^n m_k(x_i) \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} h(m_k|\tau).$$

This variable can be updated using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk (Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005) if the full conditional does not have closed form.

## Updating $v_i$

The full conditional distribution is

$$\exp \left\{ -v_i \prod_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} \hat{L}.$$

The parameter  $v_i$  is updated using an interweaving step (Yu and Meng, 2011). The first part of the step updates using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk (Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005). A new value  $v'_i$  is proposed and a new estimate  $\hat{L}'$  conditional on  $v'_i$  is calculated. The proposed values  $v'_i$  and  $\hat{L}'$  are accepted with probability

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{\exp \left\{ -v'_i \prod_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} \hat{L}'}{\exp \left\{ -v_i \prod_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_i) \right\} \hat{L}} \right\}.$$

The second part of the step using the re-parameterization  $\tilde{J}_i = v_1 J_i$  and  $\tilde{v}_i = \frac{v_i}{v_1}$  for  $i > 1$  which implies that  $\tilde{J}_j \tilde{v}_i = J_j v_i$ . The full conditional of  $v_1$  (conditioning on  $\tilde{v}_i$  and  $\tilde{J}_i$ ) has density proportional to

$$v_1^{-K} \left\{ \exp \left\{ -v_1 \sum_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_1) \right\} \nu_\xi^* \left( \frac{\tilde{J}_k}{v_1} \right) \right\} \hat{L}.$$

The parameter is update using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk (Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005) where a  $v'_1$  and  $L'$  is calculated conditional on  $v'_1$  and  $\tilde{v}_i$  for  $i > 1$ . The proposed values are accepted with probability

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{v_1'^{-K} \left\{ \exp \left\{ -v_1' \sum_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_1) \right\} \nu_\xi^* \left( \frac{\tilde{J}_k}{v_1'} \right) \right\} \hat{L}'}{v_1^{-K} \left\{ \exp \left\{ -v_1 \sum_{k=1}^K J_k m_k(x_1) \right\} \nu_\xi^* \left( \frac{\tilde{J}_k}{v_1} \right) \right\} \hat{L}} \right\}.$$

## Updating $\xi$

The full conditional distributions of  $M$  has density proportional to

$$\hat{L} p(\xi) \prod_{k=1}^K \nu_{\xi}^*(J_k).$$

This parameter can be updated using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk ([Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005](#)).

## Updating $M$

The full conditional distributions of  $M$  has density proportional to

$$p(M) \hat{L} M^K.$$

This parameter can be updated using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk ([Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005](#)).

## Updating $\tau$

The full conditional distribution of  $\tau$  has density proportional to

$$p(\tau) \hat{L} \prod_{k=1}^K p(m_k | \tau)$$

These parameters can be updated using an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings random walk ([Atchadé and Rosenthal, 2005](#)). We have found that an interweaved update ([Yu and Meng, 2011](#)) can lead to much better mixing. If  $m_k(x)$  is a Gaussian process and  $\tau$  is the stationary variance then we can write  $m_k(x) = \sqrt{\tau} m_k^s(x)$ . The interweaved update uses an adaptive Metropolis-Hastings step where  $\hat{L}$  is calculated for the proposed value  $\tau'$  and the full conditional density is sampled

$$p(\tau) \hat{L} \tau^{n/2} \exp \left\{ -\sqrt{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i J_k m_k^s(x_i) \right\}.$$

The exact form of this step for two examples models are given in the appendix.