

Posterior Projection for Inference in Constrained Spaces

Lachlan Astfalck¹, Deborshee Sen², Sayan Patra³, Edward Cripps¹, and David Dunson⁴

¹*School of Physics, Mathematics & Computing, The University of Western Australia, Australia*

²*Google LLC, Bangalore, Karnataka, India*

³*Meta Platforms, Inc., Seattle, WA, USA*

⁴*Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA*

December 20, 2024

Abstract

Estimation of parameters that obey specific constraints is crucial in statistics and machine learning; for example, when parameters are required to satisfy boundedness, monotonicity, or linear inequalities. Traditional approaches impose these constraints via constraint-specific transformations or by truncating the posterior distribution. Such methods often result in computational challenges, limited flexibility, and a lack of generality. We propose a generalized framework for constrained Bayesian inference by projecting the unconstrained posterior distribution into the space of the parameter constraints, providing a computationally efficient and easily implementable solution for a large class of problems. We rigorously establish the theoretical foundations of the projected posterior distribution, as well as providing asymptotic results for posterior consistency, posterior contraction, and optimal coverage properties. Our methodology is validated through both theoretical arguments and practical applications, including bounded-monotonic regression and emulation of a computer model with directional outputs.

Keywords: posterior projection, model constraints, monotonic regression, Stiefel manifold, directional outputs

1 Introduction

Since the early publications of the Monte Carlo method (Metropolis & Ulam, 1949; Von Neumann, 1951) to the end of the 20th century, generating pseudo-random variates has been central to the development of probability, statistics and machine learning. Non-uniform sampling methods accelerated Monte Carlo sampling (Devroye, 1986), in turn facilitating the implementation and development of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods proposed in the seminal articles of Metropolis et al. (1953), Hastings (1970), Geman & Geman (1984), Tanner & Wong (1987) and Gelfand & Smith (1991). The realization, brought upon

by MCMC, of the possibility to sample from an extremely large class of (non-standard) distributions elevated Bayesian inference to the position it holds in statistics and machine learning today (for a summary, see Brooks et al., 2011). Nevertheless, despite advances in computer hardware, software and optimization tools experienced in the 21st century, the increasing complexity of modern real world problems necessitates complex models that in practice remain difficult to sample from and so efficient solutions and implementations are required. More recently, much work has been dedicated to addressing the challenges with simulating from increasingly intricate constrained random variables, with a particular emphasis on Gaussian Process (GP) regression (Swiler et al., 2020). In what follows, we describe a unifying theory for parameter estimation in constrained spaces via a projection of an *unconstrained posterior* into the constrained space. It is a method that can be applied to a wide class of constraints, has theoretical foundations and, importantly, is computationally expedient and is easy to implement.

Efficient and practical methods for classic constraint problems have seen much attention; for instance, the probabilities in a logistic regression (Polson et al., 2013), the rate parameters in count regression (Canale & Dunson, 2013), monotonic regression functions (Riihimäki & Vehtari, 2010), and for parameters or processes that obey more complex inequalities or dynamic behavior (Da Veiga & Marrel, 2012; Pakman & Paninski, 2014; Jidling et al., 2017; Harkonen et al., 2023; Dalton et al., 2024). Furthermore, parameter constraints may imply that parameters live in a space with a lower topological dimension, as with the weights in a mixture model that reside in the simplex (Ishwaran & James, 2001) or parameters that describe directions or bearings (Byrne & Girolami, 2013; Wang & Gelfand, 2014; Navarro et al., 2017). Parameter estimation with respect to each of these constraints has a bespoke methodology designed to target the nuances of each individual problem.

To formalize, denote by θ an unknown random variable of dimension d with prior probability measure $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)$ over the (unconstrained) support $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A general methodology for specifying a prior measure on a constrained space $\tilde{\Theta} \subseteq \Theta$ is to let $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) \propto \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta) \mathbb{1}\{\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}\}$ where $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function. Given an observed set of data $x_{(n)} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, and likelihood $P(x_{(n)}|\theta)$ such a prior specification leads to the posterior distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) &\propto P(x_{(n)}|\theta)\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)\mathbb{1}\{\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}\} \\ &\propto \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})\mathbb{1}\{\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

We name constrained posterior distributions on the left hand side of (1) *truncated* posterior distributions and note that they are rarely analytically available and typically numerically approximated via rejection sampling from the unconstrained posterior distribution (Rao et al., 2016). Although in theory this offers a general solution to the problem of parameter constraints, rejection sampling becomes difficult to implement when $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ has much of its probability mass outside of $\tilde{\Theta}$, a challenge that is exacerbated with increasing dimensionality d . When $\tilde{\Theta}$ is of lower topological dimension than Θ , and so has measure-zero, rejection sampling does not work all together: for example, when θ denotes a compass bearing and so may be modeled as one-dimensional hyper-sphere $\tilde{\Theta} = \mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ in the real-valued plane $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^2$. MCMC schemes are available that target the truncated posterior directly (see, e.g. Pakman & Paninski, 2014), although these again become problem-specific and bespoke solutions that are difficult to generalize. In contrast, we propose posterior projection,

a methodology that enforces parameter constraints by projecting samples from $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ into $\tilde{\Theta}$.

The foundations of posterior projections are not new, and recent work has shown its potential. Dunson & Neelon (2003) and Gunn & Dunson (2005) consider order constrained parameters in generalized linear models and Silva & Kalaitzis (2015) study constraints for covariance matrices of latent Gaussian models for probit regression. The method is extremely well suited to constraints on GPs, as shown in Lin & Dunson (2014) and Chakraborty & Ghosal (2021) who present posterior projection methods to restrict GPs to be monotonic and Wang & Gelfand (2014) who restrict GPs to directional quantities, similar to the compass bearing example above. In these works, the projected posteriors all have better empirical and finite sample performance than the comparative truncated posteriors. Despite the appeal of the projected posterior approach, it has only been implemented for specific cases, as mentioned above, and it lacks justification as a general theory.

We rectify these gaps by presenting rigorous mathematical foundations for inference via posterior projections that extend the previous works in two ways. First, our methodology no longer relies on any one parameter constraint and can be applied as a general procedure to any of the aforementioned constraints, among many others. Second, it permits a projection operator over any valid norm $\|\cdot\|$, rather than simply as the Euclidean norm implicit in the previous works, and we show this can make a substantial improvement in performance. Similar to the works cited above, our generalized version remains easily implemented in standard software. Our results are presented as both a combination of theoretic findings and practical applications. Related to this work is Astfalck et al. (2024a), who study projected posterior beliefs for probability-free methods in Bayes linear statistics, and Everink et al. (2023) who use projections to define flexible projected prior distributions.

The contributions of the paper are organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the projected posterior distribution and provide a simple illustrative example. Further, we examine some motivations for our approach: we present a decision theoretic interpretation, show that the projected posterior is a minimizer to the Wasserstein distance between any distribution defined on $\tilde{\Theta}$ and $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$, and demonstrate the existence of an empirical Bayes prior that leads to the projected posterior distribution. In Section 3 we present some asymptotic results; including results on posterior consistency, posterior contraction, and we demonstrate optimal asymptotic coverage via a Bernstein–von Mises Theorem. This section concludes with some remarks on the comparison of the projected and truncated posterior distributions under model misspecification. In Section 4 we demonstrate the applicability of the projected posterior distribution to a number of case studies. First, we analyze the bounded-monotonic regression problem of Agrell (2019), and second, we demonstrate applicability to a real-world problem of emulating a computer model with directional outputs. Finally, we provide discussion and concluding remarks in Section 5. Throughout, we state a number of Theorems the proofs of which are all found in Appendix A.

2 The Posterior Projected Distribution

To define the posterior projected distribution of θ , we specify a number of assumptions used throughout.

Assumption 1. *The unconstrained sample space Θ is a separable Banach space $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$.*

Assumption 2. *The constrained sample space $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a non-empty and closed subset of Θ .*

Assumption 3. *There exists a map $T_{\tilde{\Theta}} : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Theta})$ that is unique for all $\theta \in \Theta$, where $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Theta})$ is the power set of $\tilde{\Theta}$.*

Assumption 4. *The unconstrained posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ has finite second-order moments represented by a strictly positive definite covariance operator.*

Consider a random sample $x_{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}$ drawn from a regular conditional distribution $P(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ on the sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$ with σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The parameter $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ has prior probability measure Π_{Θ} on $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}_{\Theta})$. If $P(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ is a dominated collection of measures, then there exists a density $p(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ with respect to a σ -finite dominating measure μ , typically a Radon measure, such that the map $(x_{(n)}, \theta) \mapsto p(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ is jointly measurable. As a result, $(x_{(n)}, \theta)$ has a well-defined joint distribution on the product measure space $(\mathcal{X} \times \Theta, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathcal{B}_{\Theta})$ given by $P(x_{(n)} \in A, \theta \in B) = \int_B p(A | \theta) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\Theta}$. According to Assumption 2, $\tilde{\Theta} \subseteq \Theta$ is a non-empty, closed subset representing some parameter constraint. We similarly equip $\tilde{\Theta}$ with a σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ and prior measure $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Under the prior $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}$, the posterior measure is

$$\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} | x_{(n)}) = \frac{\int_{\tilde{B}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta) d\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)}{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta) d\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)} \quad (2)$$

for all $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Since Θ is a Polish space (Assumption 1), by Alexandrov's Theorem we have $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}} = \{B \cap \tilde{\Theta} : B \in \mathcal{B}_{\Theta}\}$ ensuring (2) is well defined (Ghosal & van der Vaart, 2017). When $\tilde{\Theta} = \Theta$, (2) induces the posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$, which we refer to as the *unconstrained* posterior distribution.

To define the projected posterior distribution, we exploit the geometric properties of $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ to project the unconstrained posterior measure into $\tilde{\Theta}$. Given the associated norm $\|\cdot\|$ of the Banach space Θ , define a distance between a point $\theta \in \Theta$ and the subset $\tilde{\Theta}$ as $\text{dist}(\theta, \tilde{\Theta}) = \inf\{\|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| : \tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}\}$. We are now in a position to formally define the map in Assumption 3 as

$$T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) = \left\{ \tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} : \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| = \text{dist}(\theta, \tilde{\Theta}) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where, as per Assumption 3, we assume $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ is unique for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Remark 1. *There are a plurality of sufficient conditions on $\tilde{\Theta}$ that satisfy Assumption 3. The most common of these is to assume that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a closed convex subset and that the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is induced by an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ so that the Banach space $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ is induced by a Hilbert space $(\Theta, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. The Hilbert projection theorem then ensures Assumption 3 holds. Another well known result that satisfies Assumption 3 is when $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a Stiefel manifold endowed with the trace inner product (Absil & Malick, 2012). We provide examples of both of these conditions in the case studies in Section 4.*

Define the inverse image $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) = \{\theta \in \Theta : T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) \in \tilde{B}\}$. Due to Assumption 3, $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ is measurable as $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) \in \mathcal{B}_{\Theta}$ for all $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Thus, provided with the unconstrained

posterior measure $\Pi_{\Theta}(B \mid x_{(n)})$ on $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}_{\Theta})$, $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ induces a push-forward measure $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} \mid x_{(n)})$ on $(\tilde{\Theta}, \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}})$, such that for any $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$,

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} \mid x_{(n)}) = \Pi_{\Theta}(T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) \mid x_{(n)}). \quad (4)$$

We define the distribution induced by the measure in (4), $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$, as the *projected* posterior distribution. Note that (4) is strictly with respect to $\|\cdot\|$; however, for simplicity, we have suppressed this in the notation so that the dependency is implicit.

Remark 2. *Assumption 2 ensures $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a closed subset of Θ . This ensures that the projection defined in (3) is well defined. If we relax the requirement of $\tilde{\Theta}$ to be closed, we could alternatively define (3) as the approximate projection*

$$T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) = \left\{ \tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} : \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| < \text{dist}(\theta, \partial\tilde{\Theta}) + \epsilon \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+ \right\}$$

where $\partial\tilde{\Theta}$ is the boundary of $\tilde{\Theta}$. Such a projection operator is theoretically valid, but becomes troublesome for implementation. As a main focus of this paper is practical implementation, we assume $\tilde{\Theta}$ is closed for the remainder of this work.

2.1 A simple example

To firm ideas, we provide a simple illustrative example. Consider data $x_{(n)} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ sampled from $x_i \mid \theta \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(x; \theta, 1)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Say we have the unconstrained prior belief $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, n_0^{-1})$; this yields the unconstrained posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$ for $\theta \in \Theta = \mathbb{R}$, where $\sigma_n^2 = (n + n_0)^{-1}$, $\mu_n = \sigma_n^2(n\bar{x} + n_0\mu_0)$ and $\bar{x} = n^{-1} \sum_i x_i$. Say we believe $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta} = \mathbb{R}^+$ is the non-negative real numbers, noting that despite the open and infinite upper bound, $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a closed set, as the complement $\tilde{\Theta}^c$ is open. Denote by $\mathcal{TN}_{[a,b]}(\cdot)$ the truncated normal distribution truncated on the interval $[a, b]$; the truncated posterior is estimated by specifying the truncated prior $\mathcal{TN}_{[0,\infty)}(\mu_0, n_0^{-1}) \propto \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, n_0^{-1}) \mathbb{1}\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$ so that $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \mathcal{TN}_{[0,\infty)}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$. This posterior distribution assigns zero probability measure to the boundary $\{0\}$ and has expectation and variance

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \mu_n + \frac{\varphi(\alpha)}{1 - \Phi(\alpha)} \sigma_n, \quad \text{var}_{\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \sigma_n^2 \left[1 + \left(\frac{\varphi(\alpha)}{1 - \Phi(\alpha)} \right)^2 \right]$$

where $\alpha = -\mu_n/\sigma_n$, $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ denote the standard normal probability density function and cumulative density function, respectively, and the expectation and variance are with respect to the truncated posterior measure $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}$.

We calculate the projected posterior distribution by projecting the unconstrained posterior distribution into $\tilde{\Theta} = \mathbb{R}^+$ via the map defined in (3). To do so we would typically be required to specify $\|\cdot\|$, the associated norm of the Banach space $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$, although in this instance the problem is invariant to the specification of $\|\cdot\|$ as $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Accordingly, we leave discussion of the selection of $\|\cdot\|$ to later sections of the manuscript. The projected posterior is

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \Phi(\alpha)\delta(0) + \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\}\mathcal{TN}_{[0,\infty)}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2) \quad (5)$$

where $\delta(0)$ is the Dirac delta measure at zero. The projected posterior expectation and variance are

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\} \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}), \quad \text{var}_{\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\}^2 \text{var}_{\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}).$$

Due to the point mass at zero, the projected posterior distribution in (5) does not have a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure as with the unconstrained and truncated posteriors. However, it has the density

$$\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \Phi(\alpha) \mathbb{1}\{\theta = 0\} + \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\} \varphi_{[0, \infty)}(\theta; \mu_n, \sigma_n^2), \quad (6)$$

with respect to the Radon measure

$$\lambda_{[0, \infty)}(\tilde{B}) = \mathbb{1}\{0 \in \tilde{B}\} + \mu_{\mathbb{R}}([0, \infty) \cap \tilde{B}) \quad (7)$$

where $\mu_{\mathbb{R}}$ denotes the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R} , and $\varphi_{[0, \infty)}(\theta; \mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$ denotes the density of the $[0, \infty)$ -truncated normal distribution.

Assume that the data have been generated by some true value of θ , θ_0 . We consider the constraint to be well-specified when $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}$ and misspecified otherwise. In comparing the truncated and projected distributions, in this instance there are a number of interesting points to note. For both well-specified and misspecified constraints, the projected posterior is always closer to the unconstrained posterior, in expectation, than the truncated posterior. Further, the projected posterior has lower variance than the truncated posterior, again for both well-specified and misspecified constraints. Finally, when the constraint is misspecified we see diverging behavior between the projected and truncated posteriors. Assume $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}^c$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the projected posterior variance $\text{var}_{\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$ and the projected posterior distribution $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow \delta(0)$ in probability. Conversely, the truncated posterior variance $\text{var}_{\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow \infty$ and so the truncated posterior distribution $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(0, \infty)$ in probability where $\mathcal{U}(a, b)$ denotes the uniform distribution over the interval $[a, b]$. We generalize these observations as theoretical properties of the projected and truncated distributions in Section 3.

2.2 Motivation for the projected posterior

We now present some properties of the projected posterior distribution that motivate its use. Note, these sections do not present necessary theory for definition or implementation, but nonetheless contain some important results.

2.2.1 Decision theoretic interpretation

Bayesian decision theory aims to minimize the expected loss of a decision with respect to the posterior distribution. Define the decision ξ and loss function $L(\theta, \xi)$. Strictly, ξ is dependent on the observed data $x_{(n)}$ and prior beliefs $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)$ but we do not include these dependencies in the notation for simplicity. The Bayes decision rule is the ξ that solves

$$\xi^* = \arg \min_{\xi} \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \xi) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}).$$

For instance, setting $L(\theta, \xi) = (\xi - \theta)^2$ as squared loss leads to the Bayes decision rule being equal to the posterior mean, $\xi^* = \mathbb{E}[\theta \mid x_{(n)}]$. The value of the expected loss given the Bayes decision rule is known as Bayes risk,

$$R(\xi^*) = \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \xi^*) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}).$$

We state the following theorem, in regards to the Bayes decision rule of the projected posterior distribution.

Theorem 1. *Given a loss function $L(\theta, \xi)$ with decision ξ , the Bayesian decision rule under $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ is equal to*

$$\xi^* = \arg \min_{\xi} \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \xi) d\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \arg \min_{\xi} \int_{\Theta} L(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \xi) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}).$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

Theorem 1 states that the Bayesian decision rule under the projected posterior distribution is equal to the Bayesian decision rule of $L(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \xi)$ under the unconstrained posterior distribution. Thus for Bayesian decision theory, the action of projecting alters the loss function from $L(\theta, \xi)$ to $L(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \xi)$ for $\theta \in \Theta$.

2.2.2 The Wasserstein distance

Denote by $\mathcal{P}_2(\tilde{\Theta})$ the set of all probability measures on $(\tilde{\Theta}, \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}})$ with finite second-order moments. Further recall that any probability measure on $(\tilde{\Theta}, \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}})$ is a valid probability measure on $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}_{\Theta})$. The Wasserstein-2 distance between any two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\Theta)$ and with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \left\{ \int_{\Theta \times \Theta} \|\theta - \theta'\|^2 d\gamma(\theta, \theta') \right\}^{1/2} \quad (8)$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is the family of all probability measures on the product space $\Theta \times \Theta$ with marginals μ and ν . The Wasserstein distance is the natural way to measure the distance between two arbitrary distributions defined on a Banach space $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$. Commonly, (8) is defined by a metric $d(\theta, \theta')$; however, given Assumption 1, here we find it to be more natural to define (8) via the norm $\|\theta - \theta'\|$. If we set μ in (8) to be the unconstrained posterior we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Given Assumptions 1–4, the projected posterior distribution is the element in $\mathcal{P}_2(\tilde{\Theta})$ that minimizes the Wasserstein-2 distance from the unconstrained posterior distribution,*

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)}) = \arg \min_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\tilde{\Theta})} \{ \mathcal{W}_2(\nu, \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})) \}$$

with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$ that defines $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$.

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

Theorem 2 implies that with respect to $\mathcal{W}_2(\cdot, \cdot)$, the projected posterior distribution is the closest distribution to the unconstrained posterior of all distributions in $\mathcal{P}_2(\tilde{\Theta})$. Thus, when the belief specifications simultaneously yield a belief in the unconstrained posterior distribution and a belief that the posterior measure must lie in $\tilde{\Theta}$, the projected posterior distribution is the optimal choice of distribution.

2.2.3 An Empirical Bayes Prior

Empirical Bayes techniques estimate the prior distribution of a statistical model from the data (Maritz, 2018). Consider a prior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)$, which combined with a likelihood and observations $x_{(n)}$ yields the unconstrained posterior $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}, \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta))$. Here, we have been explicit about the dependency of the unconstrained posterior on the prior. We show in this section that an empirical Bayes prior exists $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)$ such that the unconstrained posterior calculated under $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)$, $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}, \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta))$ is the same as the projected posterior calculated under $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta)$, $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}, \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta))$, almost everywhere. Mathematically, this implies for any $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$, $\Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{B} | x_{(n)}, \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B})) = \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} | x_{(n)}, \Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{B}))$. First, we establish the existence of a projected posterior density in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *The projected posterior distribution $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ has a density $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ given by its Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to a σ -finite reference measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on $\tilde{\Theta}$.*

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

Lemma 1 allows us to establish a data-dependent prior distribution that leads to the projected posterior density via a traditional Bayes update.

Theorem 3. *As in Lemma 1, denote by $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ the density of the projected posterior distribution given by its Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to a σ -finite reference measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on $\tilde{\Theta}$. The unconstrained posterior calculated from the prior density given by*

$$\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) := \text{p}(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1} \tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \left[\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \text{p}(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1} \tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \text{d}\tilde{\mu}(\theta) \right]^{-1}, \quad \theta \in \tilde{\Theta} \quad (9)$$

is the same as the projected posterior distribution almost everywhere.

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

The result of Theorem 3 is that the projected posterior may be viewed as a certain type of empirical Bayes posterior. For certain simple cases (9) is analytically tractable, for instance, in the example in Section 2.1. We conjecture that a functional form for (9) is available when $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a finite convex polytope, $\text{p}(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ is Gaussian and $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ is a sum of Gaussians of dimension less than or equal to $\dim(\Theta)$, including the Dirac measure. Such $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ quickly becomes laborious to compute, and for the more general case, would need to be calculated numerically.

2.3 Choosing the norm

So far we have not explicitly discussed the appropriate selection of the norm in the definition of the projected posterior. The theory and definition exists for any norm, and there are certainly situations in which the choice of one norm over another may be sensible. Indeed, this flexibility is one of advantages of our theory. However, when one does not have a strong belief as to the appropriate norm, we provide guidance on a default selection based upon the first two moments of the posterior distribution.

Let us assume, as per Assumption 4, that the unconstrained posterior has a finite second moment represented by a strictly positive covariance operator. We will further assume $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is finite dimensional so that $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and we make some comments on infinite-dimensional spaces at the end of this section. Denote by Σ the posterior variance matrix

with (i, j) th elements $\Sigma_{i,j} = \text{cov}[\theta_i, \theta_j \mid x_{(n)}]$ where θ_i is the random quantity represented by the i th dimension of Θ . Further denote by λ_i and φ_i the i th eigenvalue and eigenvector of Σ , respectively. Covariance naturally defines a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Sigma$. From Mercer's Theorem, define the RKHS defined by Σ as

$$\mathcal{H}_\Sigma := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\langle \theta, \varphi_i \rangle_2^2}{\lambda_i} < \infty \right\} \quad (10)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$ is the standard Euclidean inner product. The inner product and squared norm of \mathcal{H}_Σ are respectively

$$\langle \theta, \theta' \rangle_\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\langle \theta, \varphi_i \rangle_2 \langle \theta', \varphi_i \rangle_2}{\lambda_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\theta\|_\Sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\langle \theta, \varphi_i \rangle_2^2}{\lambda_i}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, in \mathcal{H}_Σ , the norm that defines the projection operator in (3) is given by the Mahalanobis distance,

$$\|\theta - \theta'\|_\Sigma^2 = (\theta - \theta')^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\theta - \theta'). \quad (12)$$

As the norm is defined from an RKHS, the Hilbert projection theorem states that a sufficient condition that satisfies the uniqueness requirement in Assumption 3 is that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is convex. Further, we note that we have presupposed the knowledge of the value of Σ ; however, this may not always be the case. In such circumstances, as long as Assumption 4 is satisfied, Σ may be computationally calculated to an arbitrary degree of accuracy via sampling, or approximated by the Fisher information matrix, calculated via numerical methods such as auto-differentiation.

Finally, we now provide some comments for the case when Θ is infinite dimensional, for instance when θ is a function such that Assumptions 1–3 still hold. An example is $\Theta = \mathcal{L}_2[0, 1]$, the space of square integrable bounded functions. Denote by $K(s, t) = \text{cov}[\theta(s), \theta(t)]$ the covariance function that defines a compact linear operator

$$\mathcal{K}\theta(t) = \int K(s, t)\theta(s) ds,$$

where, as per Assumption 4, \mathcal{K} is injective. As \mathcal{K} is a compact linear operator in an infinite dimensional space, its spectrum converges to zero. Consequently, \mathcal{K} can not be invertible, and so we are unable to create a direct analogue with (12). In such circumstances, extensions of the Mahalanobis norm to the functional setting provides an alternative option (see Berrendero et al., 2020).

3 Asymptotic Results

We now show some asymptotic results of the projected posterior distribution. The first three results establish posterior consistency, the posterior contraction rate, and a Bernstein–von Mises theorem for the projected posterior. In general, these findings state that if the prior beliefs on the constraints are correct, then the projected posterior distribution inherits the asymptotic properties of the unconstrained posterior distribution. Finally, we compare the projected and truncated posterior distributions under misspecified parameter constraints.

3.1 Posterior consistency

For simplicity, here we assume the existence of a true parameter θ_0 . Many subjective Bayesians agree with such an assumption; to obtain similar proofs more in line with the subjectivist point of view, posterior consistency could be defined as convergence of posterior predictive distributions under differing prior beliefs defined on the same support (see Diaconis & Freedman, 1986), with θ_0 the center of the smallest ball that contains $0 < c < 1$ of the posterior mass as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Given θ_0 , we define posterior consistency similarly to Ghosal & van der Vaart (2017), and say that the posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ is weakly consistent at θ_0 if $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\| > \epsilon \mid x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$ in $P(x_{(n)} \mid \theta_0)$ -probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. We now state Theorem 4, which provides conditions on consistency for the projected posterior.

Theorem 4. *If Assumptions 1–3 are met, $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}$, and the unconstrained posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ is weakly consistent at θ_0 , so that $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\| > \epsilon \mid x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$ in $P(x_{(n)} \mid \theta_0)$ -probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, then the projected posterior distribution $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ is weakly consistent at θ_0 .*

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

If $\theta_0 \notin \tilde{\Theta}$ then $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ is not consistent as $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta_0) \neq \theta_0$. This property is not specific to the projected posterior distribution, but is shared with all distributions with unit measure on $\tilde{\Theta}$ including the truncated posterior distributions. This result is reassuring, as the posterior distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior. Thus, when $\theta_0 \notin \tilde{\Theta}$ the failure of the projected posterior to achieve consistency is a failure of the prior belief specification and should not be viewed as a shortcoming of the methodology.

3.2 Posterior contraction

Posterior contraction measures the rate at which the posterior distribution concentrates about θ_0 . We say that a posterior distribution $\Pi(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ has a contraction rate ϵ_n with respect to a semimetric d if

$$\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) > M_n \epsilon_n \mid x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$$

in $P(x_{(n)} \mid \theta_0)$ -probability for all $M_n \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, we make the following assumption on $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$.

Assumption 5. *The unconstrained posterior distribution has a contraction rate ϵ_n with respect to a bi-Lipschitz semimetric d on $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ such that there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ where $c^{-1} \|\theta - \theta'\| \leq d(\theta, \theta') \leq c \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$.*

We may now state the following Theorem on the contraction rate of $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$.

Theorem 5. *If $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, and Assumptions 1–3 and 5 are met, then the projected posterior distribution $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta \mid x_{(n)})$ satisfies*

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) > 2c^2 M_n \epsilon_n \mid x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$$

in probability for $c \geq 1$ and every $M_n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the projected posterior achieves a contraction rate at least that of the unconstrained posterior distribution.

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

3.3 Bernstein–von Mises Theorem

The Bernstein–von Mises Theorem describes the asymptotic behavior of the posterior distribution and states that, under certain regularity conditions, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the posterior distribution converges in distribution to a normal distribution centered at θ_0 and with variance given by the inverse Fisher information matrix. In the Assumption and Theorem that follows, denote by $\hat{\theta}_n$ the maximum likelihood estimator of θ , $\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$ the Fisher information matrix at θ_0 and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ the total variation distance.

Assumption 6. *Assume $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ satisfies the Bernstein–von Mises Theorem so that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)}|\theta_0)} \left\| \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\|_{\text{TV}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For Assumption 6 to be met, a number of regularity conditions on $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ are required; see Section 2.3 of Bochkina (2019) for a list. We may now state the following Theorem.

Theorem 6. *If $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}^\circ$ is in the interior of $\tilde{\Theta}$, and Assumptions 1–3 and 6 hold, so that the projected posterior is well-defined and the unconstrained posterior satisfies the Bernstein–von Mises Theorem, then $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ also satisfies the Bernstein–von Mises Theorem,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)}|\theta_0)} \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\|_{\text{TV}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A and is accompanied by Lemmas 2 and 3, also in Appendix A.

The Bernstein–von Mises Theorem implies that the credible intervals of the posterior distribution share the same coverage as the frequentist confidence intervals, asymptotically. Thus, the implication of Theorem 6 is that when $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}^\circ$ then the projected posterior distribution also shares the same asymptotic coverage.

3.4 Comparison with truncation under constraint misspecification

Sections 3.1–3.3 compare the behavior of the unconstrained and projected posterior distributions when $\theta_0 \in \Theta$. Similarly, when $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ we expect the truncated posterior distribution, defined in (1) and denoted by $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$, to exhibit similar behavior. So far we have argued that the main advantage of the projected posterior, over the truncated posterior, is one of convenience: if $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ is known or can easily be sampled from, then sampling from $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ is trivial; this is not necessarily the case for the truncated posterior. However, we now show that under prior misspecification when $\theta_0 \notin \tilde{\Theta}$, there are further asymptotic arguments that suggest that the projected posterior is preferable over the truncated posterior.

Theorem 7. *Define the truncated posterior distribution $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ as in (1) such that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a measurable set with respect to a σ -finite measure μ . If $\theta_0 \notin \tilde{\Theta}$, and Assumptions 1, 2 and 6 hold, we state the following two findings for $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$.*

- a) Assume $\tilde{\Theta} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded set, such that for some finite radius R and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $\|\theta - x\| < R$ for all $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ converges to a uniform measure on $\tilde{\Theta}$.
- b) Assume $\tilde{\Theta} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is unbounded, such that for a finite radius R , there exists some $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$ with $\|\theta - x\| \geq R$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ converges to the zero measure on $\tilde{\Theta}$.

The implications of Theorem 7 are that if our prior belief of the constraint is misspecified, then the truncated posterior grows increasingly more diffuse over $\tilde{\Theta}$. Compare this with the projected posterior distribution, when $\theta_0 \notin \Theta$, the projected posterior $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\delta(\theta_0))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For the projected posterior, all the mass gathers at the boundary of $\tilde{\Theta}$ that minimizes $\text{dist}(\theta_0, \tilde{\Theta})$ and the variance shrinks to zero.

4 Case Studies

The generality of our method allows it to be applied to a large array of applications, and so exhaustive empirical demonstration of the methodology is not plausible. We attempt to focus on case studies that are pertinent to this journal’s expected readership and, accordingly, we focus on two distinct applications of GP regression. As we have discussed, the projected posterior may inherit many of the computational benefits of the unconstrained posterior; this is particularly so with GP regression where the conditional distribution is analytical. The first case study examines GPs subject to inequality constraints, where we repeat the analysis of Agrell (2019). The second case study presents a use of the projected posterior to emulate a computer model with directional outputs.

4.1 Linear inequality constrained Gaussian processes

It is a common desire in non-parametric regression to restrict the function to a class of shapes or inequalities. We demonstrate our methodology in the case study used in Agrell (2019), which involves an unknown function with a linear inequality constraint. We use the projected posterior under a GP prior. Linear inequality constraints imply that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is convex (Boyd & Vandenberghe, 2004), thus Assumption 3 is satisfied when Θ is a Hilbert space endowed with an inner product, via the Hilbert projection theorem. Agrell (2019) define the true function over x as $f(x) = \frac{1}{3}[\tan^{-1}(20x - 10) - \tan^{-1}(-10)]$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, and impose a minimum bound of $l(x) = 0$, and an upper bound of $u(x) = \frac{1}{3} \log(30x + 1) + 0.1$. Seven noiseless observations are provided from $f(x)$ at the locations $x_i = 0.1 + 1/(i + 1)$ for $i \in [1, \dots, 7]$. The true model $f(x)$, the lower and upper bounds, and the observations are shown in the top left panel of Figure 1.

In Agrell (2019), the GP fit is constrained to satisfy monotonicity $df/dx \geq 0$ and boundedness $l(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x)$. Furthermore, the unconstrained GP is parameterized as a zero-mean process with covariance given by a squared-exponential kernel $k_{SE}(x, x') = \sigma^2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{x-x'}{l})^2)$ with amplitude $\sigma = 0.5$ and length scale $l = 0.1$. The fit of the unconstrained GP model is shown in the top right panel of Figure 1; the thick blue line is the posterior mean, the shaded region represents the 90% predictive interval, and the yellow lines are three samples drawn randomly. In plotting this figure, we drew 1000 independent

samples; none respect the monotonicity and boundedness desired by the model setup, so rejection sampling is highly inefficient.

Lin & Dunson (2014) present a methodology to define a monotonically projected GP by projecting samples $w(x) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu(x), k(x, x'))$, indexed on $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, from the unconstrained GP into the monotonic cone $\mathcal{M} = [0, 1]^d$. Focusing here on the case of $d = 1$, they define their projection operator by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}(w(x)) = \arg \min_{F \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x) - F(x))^2 dx$$

with analytical solution

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}(w(x)) = \inf_{v \geq x} \sup_{u \leq x} \frac{1}{v - u} \int_u^v w(x) dx. \quad (13)$$

The posterior moments of the Lin & Dunson (2014) model are shown in the bottom left panel of Figure 1, and the samples shown correspond to the projection of the samples shown




Figure 1: The model of Agrell (2019) and three different functional estimations, posterior expectations are blue solid lines, and bands denote 90% predictive intervals. Top left: the solid line is the true function, the dashed lines the bounds, and the points the observed data. Top right: the fit of a zero-mean GP with no monotonicity or boundedness constraints, parameterized by a squared-exponential kernel with parameters $\sigma = 0.5$ and $l = 0.1$. Bottom left: monotonic projections of the unconstrained GP (top right) as per Lin & Dunson (2014). Bottom right: monotonic and bounded projections of the unconstrained GP (top right) in the Banach space defined by $\|\cdot\|_{\Sigma}$ in (12), with Σ set as the conditional variance of the unconstrained GP.

in the unconstrained model. Sample projection is an embarrassingly parallel problem and, here, requires ~ 5 ms per sample on an Apple M2 Pro processor with 32GB RAM. Although Lin & Dunson (2014) provides a neat analytical solution to monotonic regression, the projected posterior is unfaithful to the initial prior specifications, as seen by the discontinuous derivatives in the samples. The model of Lin & Dunson (2014) is subsumed by our theory by setting $\tilde{\Theta} = \mathcal{M}$ and specifying the Banach space by the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, and so the projection does not respect correlation between locations in \mathcal{X} . Furthermore, by requiring the posterior projections to respect the bounds, (13) no longer holds as an analytical solution, and so this theory does not satisfy the full requirements of the problem.

We project the unconstrained Gaussian process using the projection (3) depending on $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$ as defined in (12) in Section 2.3, where here Σ is the conditional variance of the unconstrained Gaussian process. The results are shown in the bottom right panel of Figure 1. Due to the convexity of $\tilde{\Theta}$ in this problem, we may guarantee both the existence and uniqueness of the solution. It is apparent in Figure 1 that we successfully obey the monotone and boundedness constraints. Further, each of our generated samples (also projected from the unconstrained samples) provides a much closer representation to the prior beliefs imparted by the squared-exponential, thus providing evidence of the value of appropriate norm specification. Projections were calculated by `cvxr`, a bespoke package for convex optimization (Fu et al., 2017); projection of each sample required ~ 40 ms. With the aid of `cvxr`, the extra code required for the projections is simple and only comprises ~ 4 extra lines of code; our code is available at `github/astfalckl/projector`, and CVX also has packages in `MATLAB` and `python` that efficiently solve convex optimization problems (see Grant & Boyd, 2014; Diamond & Boyd, 2016). This stands in comparison to methodologies such as Agrell (2019) or Wang & Berger (2016), bespoke solutions to the problem of linearly constrained Gaussian processes, who require relatively complex code for implementation.

4.2 Computer emulation of directional outputs

We now present an application of our methodology to the emulation of a computer model with directional outputs. Directional quantities are not straightforward to represent in a statistical model for a number of reasons. First, as the direction θ ‘wraps’ around 0 and 2π , the distance on the circle must be parameterized appropriately, such as geodesic distance, and covariance functions must be defined that are positive semi-definite over the circular domain (Gneiting, 2013). Although this solves the problem when the inputs are directional (see Astfalck et al., 2019), for circular outputs, it remains difficult to define a coherent statistical process directly. The most common methods wrap a distribution defined in \mathbb{R} around the circle (Jona-Lasinio et al., 2012), or similar to what we propose, project a distribution from \mathbb{R}^2 onto the circle (Wang & Gelfand, 2014; Mastrantonio et al., 2016). In fact, as with the methodology of Lin & Dunson (2014) in Section 4.1, the methodology of Wang & Gelfand (2014) can be seen as a special case of ours with the norm of the Banach space defined by $\|\cdot\|_2$.

Directional quantities are a special case of a Stiefel manifold, defined as $\text{St}(p, m)$, for $p, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq p \leq m$ as the subspace of all orthonormal p -frames of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$,

$$\text{St}(p, m) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p} : \theta^\top \theta = \mathbf{I}_p\}$$

where I_p is the $p \times p$ identity matrix. When $p = 1$, the manifold $\text{St}(1, m)$ describes a $(m - 1)$ -dimensional hypersphere, for example, $m = 2$ defines a single direction in $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as with our example of vessel heading, and $m = 3$ describes a bearing in $\mathcal{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ as would be experienced in flight navigation. Proposition 4.9 of Eleonora & Giuseppe (2017) states that the projection, with respect to the trace inner product, of any $\theta \in \Theta_p = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p} : \text{rank}(\theta) = p\}$ into $\text{St}(p, m)$ is unique. When $p = 1$, the trace inner product induces the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\Theta_1 = \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$; that is, the only point that does not respect uniqueness is the origin.

We may also generalize the conditions under which the projection is unique for the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$ for $p = 1$. Define $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{m-1}$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}$ as the first $m - 1$ eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the matrix Σ^{-1} that defines $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$, and define

$$\Theta_\varphi = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m : \theta = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} t_i \varphi_i, \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} t_i^2 \lambda_i < 1 \right\}. \quad (14)$$

For example, when $m = 2$ as in our application, (14) corresponds to the locations bounded within the circle in the linear subspace that runs perpendicular to the major axis of Σ . Similarly, when $m = 3$, (14) describes the locations bounded within the sphere and on the plane perpendicular to the major axis of Σ . The projection into $\text{St}(1, m)$ is unique for all $\theta \in \Theta = \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_v$. To satisfy Assumption 3, the unconstrained posterior must place its entire measure on $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_v$. In this application, we wish to build a GP emulator to the computer model, and so the unconstrained posterior is continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure μ on \mathbb{R}^m . As $\mu(\Theta_v) = 0$, sampling from \mathbb{R}^m is equivalent, with respect to μ , to sampling from $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_v$.

The computer simulator of interest models a moored vessel that is free to weathervane, or rotate, about its mooring. The vessel is subject to wind and current forcings, and achieves a heading that balances the rotational moments on the vessel, induced by wind and current forcing measured as vectors with components in the easting and northing directions. See Milne et al. (2016) for further details and an example of the application. We show a simple example of the output of the model with respect to a single input in Figure 2. The thick black arrows are the model output at wind easting components of $-20, -10, 10$ and 20 ms^{-1} , with a constant wind northing component of 10 ms^{-1} and current easting and northings of 0.3 ms^{-1} . The model output is a direction and the arrows lie on the unit circle, although the choice of arrow length is arbitrary. In the top plot of Figure 2, we model the directional output as a bivariate GP, assumed independent between the output dimensions, and predict the computer model over a dense grid of wind easting values. The true directions, unobserved by the GP, of the model are shown by the thin black arrow, the predicted values are the colored arrows, and the uncertainty of the prediction is represented by the shaded regions that denote the 80% centered prediction interval. As expected, the GP predictions do not lie in the unit circle. Wang & Gelfand (2014) propose a methodology that projects the samples from the bivariate GP onto the unit circle, in effect, sampling the angles of the bivariate vectors. As noted above, this is equivalent to our methodology in $\|\cdot\|_2$, and is shown in the middle plot of Figure 2. The bottom plot of Figure 2 shows the result of projecting samples from the bivariate GP with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$. Interpretation of the middle and bottom plots is much the same as the top; although uncertainty of the directional quantities is now represented by the shaded arcs around the predictions. Our

methodology supports the use of the norms $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$; in this instance, a better mean performance is observed under $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$ with a root-mean-square error of 1.9 deg, as opposed to under $\|\cdot\|_2$ with root-mean-square error of 6.5 deg. The differences are most noticeable between the values of -10 and 10 ms^{-1} .

We now emulate the full computer model over the four dimensional input space defined by the wind and current vector components. We train to simulation outputs from a regular grid between -20 and 20 ms^{-1} for the wind components and -0.5 and 0.5 ms^{-1} for the current components. In regions of zero forcing, or when the wind and current fields directly oppose each other, the model is ill-defined. Consequently, we exclude these regions from the predicted locations. Figure 3 shows a slice of the emulated output corresponding to the wind-only loading case, that is, zero current components. The interpretation of this graph is the same as in Figure 3, with the unconstrained bivariate GP shown on the left and the projected process on the right. For this particular slice of the input space, the origin corresponds to the zero-loading case, and so it, and surrounding regions, is not included in the predicted locations. As in the example provided in Figure 2, the bivariate GP predictions do not lie on the unit circle, although there is valuable information in the predicted angles. In the plot of the projected process, the true simulator values have also been plotted but are almost completely covered by the predicted expectations. As our methodology subsumes that of Wang & Gelfand (2014), it inherits the ability to model




Figure 2: GP emulation of a computer simulation of vessel headings over a single input with a bivariate GP and the corresponding projections onto the unit circle, projected with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$ (middle) and $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$ (bottom). Observed values from the computer simulation are shown by the thick black arrows, the respective mean predictions are shown by the colored arrows, the true (unobserved) values from the computer simulation are shown by the thin black arrows. Prediction uncertainty is denoted by the shaded regions: shaded circles for the bivariate GP, and shaded arcs for the projected processes.




Figure 3: A 2D slice in the input space of a computer emulation of a vessel heading model, emulated over a four dimensional input space represented by the wind and current vector forcings. The slice corresponds to zero current forcing. The left plot is the emulation with a simple bivariate GP, and the right the projected process with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\Sigma}$. Interpretation of the plot is as in Figure 2.

directional bimodality and skewness through richer classes of unconstrained GPs that are not isotropic in the output dimensions, allowing the representation of more complex facets of the directional process.

5 Discussion

This paper presents a unified framework for Bayesian inference in constrained parameter spaces via posterior projection. Unlike existing approaches, which often rely on bespoke methodologies tailored to specific constraints, our method generalizes to a wide range of parameter constraints, is robust to the choice of norm, and is easily implemented. We establish theoretical guarantees, including posterior consistency, contraction, and optimal asymptotic coverage via a Bernstein–von Mises theorem. In addition, we demonstrate the practicality and flexibility of our approach through two case studies. The proposed methodology avoids the challenges of truncation-based methods, which can be computationally prohibitive to sample from or infeasible for measure-zero constraints, and has significant implications for both theory and practice. Practically, the flexibility to define projections over arbitrary norms allows practitioners to tailor the methodology to specific problem domains. By avoiding rejection sampling or bespoke MCMC schemes, the projected posterior offers a computationally efficient alternative that scales well to higher dimensions.

Despite the apparent strengths of this theory, there remain some limitations. The computational cost of projecting samples in very high-dimensional settings may still be prohibitive, especially under $\|\cdot\|_{\Sigma}$ if the inverse of Σ is dense. Such circumstances may be solved with an approximate sparse matrix inversion, for example, via the Vecchia approxi-

mation (Katzfuss & Guinness, 2021). We also note that the calculation of the projections is embarrassingly parallel over each sample, and so the computational architecture could be exploited if many samples are required. In addition, we note that this methodology does not protect against model misspecification. Imposing a parameter constraint represents a strong prior belief on the model, and the burden of correctly specifying constraints lies with the modeler not the model.

We provide some asymptotic guarantees and empirical evidence, but there remain exciting avenues for further exploration. From a theoretical perspective, extensions to the Bernstein–von Mises theorem presented in Theorem 6 are particularly intriguing. For instance, allowing for $\theta \in \partial\tilde{\Theta}$, that is, when θ lies on the boundary of $\tilde{\Theta}$. This would naturally extend to also providing results when $\tilde{\Theta}$ has zero measure in Θ , as with the example in Section 4.2. Additionally, we conjecture that stronger results on frequentist coverage of the credible intervals can be shown. Specifically, let $q_\alpha(x_{(n)})$ and $\tilde{q}_\alpha(x_{(n)})$ denote the α th quantile of the unconstrained and projected posterior for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, respectively, and define the coverage probabilities $c_\alpha = P(q_{\alpha/2}(x_{(n)}) < \theta_0 < q_{1-\alpha/2}(x_{(n)}) \mid \theta_0)$ and $\tilde{c}_\alpha = P(\tilde{q}_{\alpha/2}(x_{(n)}) < \theta_0 < \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha/2}(x_{(n)}) \mid \theta_0)$. We hypothesize that $|c_\alpha - \tilde{c}_\alpha| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, providing further justification for the validity of projected posteriors in large-sample settings. From an application perspective, there is potential to expand the framework to more complex constraint structures, such as those arising in hierarchical models where constraints operate at multiple levels, for example, in the application of Astfalck et al. (2024b). Identifying broader families of constraints that satisfy Assumption 3 or exploring constraints with dynamic or time-varying characteristics could also enhance the versatility of the approach.

In summary, this paper establishes posterior projection as a rigorous, versatile, and practical approach to inference in constrained parameter spaces. The combination of theoretical guarantees, computational efficiency, and broad applicability positions it as a valuable tool for modern Bayesian analysis and machine learning research.

Acknowledgement

LA and EC are supported by the ARC ITRH for Transforming energy Infrastructure through Digital Engineering (TIDE), Grant No. IH200100009. DS acknowledges support from the Statistical and Applied Mathematics Institute (SAMSI), Grant No. DMS-1638521. DD was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health (grant ID R01ES035625), by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 856506), and by the Office of Naval Research (N00014-21-1-2510).

A Proofs

Proof. (of Theorem 1) For $\theta \in \Theta$, define the loss function

$$\tilde{L}(\theta, \xi) = L(T_\Theta(\theta), \xi) + h(\theta, T_\Theta(\theta))$$

where $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a non-negative function with $h(\theta, \theta) = 0$. A sufficient choice is $h(\cdot, \cdot) = \text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined as in (3). When $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$, we have $\tilde{L}(\theta, \xi) = L(\theta, \xi)$ and so

$$\int_{\Theta} \tilde{L}(\theta, \xi) d\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \xi) d\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \quad (15)$$

as $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ is only measurable in $\tilde{\Theta}$. The expected loss of $\tilde{L}(\theta, \xi)$ under the unconstrained posterior is

$$\int_{\Theta} \tilde{L}(\theta, \xi) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \int_{\Theta} L(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \xi) + \text{dist}(\theta, T_{\Theta}(\theta)) d\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}). \quad (16)$$

For a given decision ξ and samples $\tilde{\theta}^{[i]} \sim \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$, the integral in (15) is numerically calculated as

$$\tilde{R}(\xi) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M L(\tilde{\theta}^{[i]}, \xi) \quad (17)$$

and becomes exact as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, given samples $\theta^{[i]} \sim \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$, the integral in (16) is numerically calculated as

$$R(\xi) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M L(T_{\Theta}(\theta^{[i]}), \xi) + \text{const} \quad (18)$$

where the constant is equal to the expectation of $\text{dist}(\theta, T_{\Theta}(\theta))$ and is invariant in ξ . From the definition of $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$, setting $\tilde{\theta}^{[i]} := T_{\Theta}(\theta^{[i]})$ provides valid samples from $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$. Hence, (17) and (18) are equal up to a constant, are thus minimized by the same value ξ^* , and the proof of the theorem is obtained. ■

Proof. (of Theorem 2) From Villani et al. (2009), a proof to Theorem 2 is obtained when both $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ and $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ are valid probability measures on Θ , and by showing that $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ in (3) is a pushforward map between $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ and ν , is unique for all $\theta \in \Theta$, and minimizes Monge's formulation of (8),

$$T_{\tilde{\Theta}} = \arg \min_T \int_{\Theta} \|\theta - T(\theta)\|^2 d\mu(\theta). \quad (19)$$

The unconstrained and projected posterior distributions are measurable as defined in the main body of the text. Assumption 3 ensures uniqueness of the projection, and as a consequence $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ is defined as the pushforward map in (4). Finally, $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ minimizes (19) as $\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex and, by definition, $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ minimizes the norm in (3). ■

Proof. (of Lemma 1) Define μ and ν as two measures on Θ such that μ dominates ν , mathematically expressed as $\nu \ll \mu$. This implies that ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ so that for some $B \in \mathcal{B}$, if $\mu(B) = 0$ then $\nu(B) = 0$. We further define $\tilde{\nu} = T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\nu)$ and $\tilde{\mu} = T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\mu)$ as the projection of ν and μ onto $\tilde{\Theta}$, respectively. Letting $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B}) = 0$, this implies $\mu(T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}(\tilde{B})) = 0 \implies \nu(T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}(\tilde{B})) = 0$ and so $\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{B}) = 0$. Equate ν and $\tilde{\nu}$ with the unconstrained and projected posterior measures, respectively. By definition, the unconstrained posterior measure is absolutely continuous with respect to a σ -finite dominating measure μ , and so there exists a σ -finite dominating measure $\tilde{\mu}$ that dominates $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} | x_{(n)})$. The remainder of Lemma 1 is given by the Radon-Nikodym Theorem. ■

Proof. (of Theorem 3) As defined in the main text, recall that $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)$ is the prior density on $\tilde{\Theta}$ that we seek, $p(x_{(n)} | \theta)$ is the likelihood, $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ is the projected posterior density, and $\tilde{\mu}$ is a σ -finite reference measure on $\tilde{\Theta}$ that dominates the posterior (and hence prior) measure $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\tilde{B} | x_{(n)})$ for $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. From Bayes' rule, we seek some $\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)$ so that

$$\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \frac{p(x_{(n)} | \theta)\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)}{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta)\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta)} \quad (20)$$

holds. Consider the prior density

$$\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) = \frac{p(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})}{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta)} \quad (21)$$

where according to Lemma 1, (21) is well defined, and it is simple to see that it is a probability density as $\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta) = 1$. Substituting (21) into the denominator of (20) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta)\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta) &= \frac{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta)}{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\int_{\tilde{\Theta}} p(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) d\tilde{\mu}(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta)}{p(x_{(n)} | \theta)^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})}, \end{aligned}$$

which substituting back into (20) achieves the proof. \blacksquare

Proof. (of Theorem 4) Proposition 6.2 of Ghosal & van der Vaart (2017) states that posterior consistency at θ_0 is achieved if and only if $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightsquigarrow \delta(\theta_0)$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This follows from the Portmanteau Theorem. If $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\Theta}$, then similarly $\tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightsquigarrow \delta(\theta_0)$ as the projection $T_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta_0) = \theta_0$. \blacksquare

Proof. (of Theorem 5) For any $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}$, we have

$$\|T_{\Theta}(\theta) - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq \|T_{\Theta}(\theta) - \theta\| + \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq 2\|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\|. \quad (22)$$

Here, the first inequality is due to the triangle inequality, and the second inequality is due to the definition of the projection operator. Next, due the Assumption of bi-Lipschitz continuity in Assumption 5,

$$c^{-2}d(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \tilde{\theta}) \leq c^{-1}\|T_{\Theta}(\theta) - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq 2c^{-1}\|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\| \leq 2d(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \quad (23)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}$. Thus, we may write

$$T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}\{\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} : d(\tilde{\theta}, \theta_0) \geq 2c^2M_n\epsilon_n\} = \{\theta \in \Theta : d(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \theta_0) \geq 2c^2M_n\epsilon_n\} \quad (24)$$

$$\subseteq \{\theta \in \Theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) \geq M_n\epsilon_n\} \quad (25)$$

where (24) is by definition of the projection operator, and (25) is due to the first and last expressions in (23). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}\left(\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} : d(\tilde{\theta}, \theta_0) > 2c^2M_n\epsilon_n \mid x_{(n)}\right) &= \Pi_{\Theta}\left(T_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{-1}\{\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} : d(\tilde{\theta}, \theta_0) > 2c^2M_n\epsilon_n\} \mid x_{(n)}\right) \\ &= \Pi_{\Theta}\left(\theta \in \Theta : d(T_{\Theta}(\theta), \theta_0) > 2c^2M_n\epsilon_n \mid x_{(n)}\right) \\ &\leq \Pi_{\Theta}\left(\theta \in \Theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) > M_n\epsilon_n \mid x_{(n)}\right) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ in probability for every } M_n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

\blacksquare

Lemma 2. *Given the assumptions in Theorem 6, and denote by $\tilde{\Theta}^c = \Theta \setminus \tilde{\Theta}^\circ$ the complement of the interior of $\tilde{\Theta}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)}|\theta_0)} \left[\mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (26)$$

where, here, $\mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right)$ is the measure on $\tilde{\Theta}^c$ parameterized by a Normal distribution with mean $\hat{\theta}_n$ and variance $\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0)$.

Proof. (of Lemma 2) All expectations in the following proof are with respect to $\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)} | \theta_0)$; this dependency is suppressed in the notation for simplicity. Define a sample $z \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right)$, thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \right]. \quad (27)$$

Define $\mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon) = \{\theta \in \Theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\| < \epsilon\}$ as an open ball around θ_0 for some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon) \subset \tilde{\Theta}$. Partition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_n \in \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)\} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_n \notin \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)\} \right]. \quad (28)$$

First consider the first term on the right-hand side of the equality. For every $\hat{\theta}_n \in \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)$ we may define an open ball $\mathbb{B}(\hat{\theta}_n, \delta) \subset \tilde{\Theta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Due to consistency, as $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(z \notin \mathbb{B}(\hat{\theta}_n, \delta))] \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, thus $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_n \in \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)\} \right] \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mathbb{B}(\hat{\theta}_n, \delta) \cap \tilde{\Theta}^c = \emptyset$. Next consider the last term of (28),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_n \notin \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)\} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_n \notin \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_n \notin \mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$ as $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0))$ and so $\hat{\theta}_n$ converges weakly to a Dirac measure at θ_0 . Thus $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(z \in \tilde{\Theta}^c) \right] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and a proof to the Lemma via (27) is obtained. \blacksquare

Lemma 3. *Given the assumptions in Theorem 6, the expectation of the unconstrained posterior measure over $\tilde{\Theta}^c$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)}|\theta_0)} \left[\Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) \right] \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and where $\tilde{\Theta}^c$ is as defined in Lemma 2.

Proof. (of Lemma 3) All expectations in the following proof are with respect to $\mathbb{P}(x_{(n)} | \theta_0)$; this dependency is suppressed in the notation for simplicity. By definition of the total variation norm

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\| \right],$$

and so by Assumption 6,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\| \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 2 establishes

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{N} \left(\tilde{\Theta}^c; \hat{\theta}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\| \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and so $\mathbb{E} \left[\Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) \right] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and a proof to the Lemma is obtained. \blacksquare

Proof. (of Theorem 6) In the proof that follows, assume all expectations are with respect to $P(x_{(n)} | \theta_0)$ and all norms are the total variation norm. For simplicity, we have suppressed this in the notation. Via the triangle inequality, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\theta_0, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\| &\leq \\ \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \right\| + \mathbb{E} \left\| \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \mathcal{N} \left(\theta_0, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0) \right) \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We establish a proof to the Theorem by showing that both terms on the right-hand side of the inequality converge to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. First, we note that the final term of (29) converges to zero by Assumption 6. Next, as $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ for $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}^\circ$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \right\| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) \right].$$

From Lemma 3, $\mathbb{E} \left[\Pi_{\Theta}(\tilde{\Theta}^c | x_{(n)}) \right] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and so

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) - \Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \right\| \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and a proof to the Theorem is obtained. \blacksquare

Proof. (of Theorem 7) By Assumption 6 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the unconstrained posterior distribution $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\theta_0, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0))$. Therefore, the truncated posterior distribution $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{TN}_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta_0, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0))$, a multivariate normal distribution with mean θ_0 and variance $\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0)$, truncated to $\tilde{\Theta}$.

Define an open ball $\mathbb{B}(\theta, r) = \{s \in \Theta : \|s - \theta\| < r\}$ with complement $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta, r) = \{s \in \Theta : \|s - \theta\| \geq r\}$. By Assumption 6, the posterior becomes increasingly concentrated at θ_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with variance decreasing as n^{-1} . Thus, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\mathbb{B}(\theta_0, \epsilon) | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 1$ in $P(x_{(n)} | \theta_0)$ -probability for any $\epsilon > 0$, and so $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon) | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$.

Define the unconstrained posterior distribution, truncated to $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon)$, as

$$\Pi_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) = \frac{\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta | x_{(n)})}{\Pi_{\Theta}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon) | x_{(n)})}, \quad \theta \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon),$$

with $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon)$ as a σ -algebra on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}$. As $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon) | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$, the variance $\text{var}[\Pi_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}(\theta | x_{(n)})] \rightarrow \infty$. Excluding θ_0 in the truncation leads the posterior distribution to flatten over $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon)$ and $\Pi_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ tends to a uniform measure on $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon)$, such that

$$\Pi_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}(B | x_{(n)}) = \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}(B \cap \bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon))}{\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, \epsilon))} \quad \text{for } B \in \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}},$$

where $\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d .

As $\theta_0 \notin \tilde{\Theta}$ there exists some $r > 0$ so that $\mathbb{B}(\theta_0, r)$ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ are mutually exclusive, implying $\tilde{\Theta} \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{B}}(\theta_0, r)$. Thus, the truncated posterior distribution $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)})$ may be expressed as the truncation of $\Pi_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}(B | x_{(n)})$ to $\tilde{\Theta}$ with measure

$$\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(B | x_{(n)}) = \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}(B \cap \tilde{\Theta})}{\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\tilde{\Theta})} \quad \text{for } B \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbb{B}}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ is a σ -algebra on $\tilde{\Theta}$.

For a bounded set $\tilde{\Theta}$, (30) is a valid measure, with density $\pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(\theta | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 1/\text{vol}(\tilde{\Theta})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Conversely, for an unbounded $\tilde{\Theta}$, the mass in (30) can not be normalized, yielding $\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\tilde{\Theta}) = \infty$. Thus, $\Pi_{\tilde{\Theta}}(B | x_{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. This concludes the proof. ■

References

- ABSIL, P.-A. & MALICK, J. (2012). Projection-like retractions on matrix manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **22**, 135–158.
- AGRELL, C. (2019). Gaussian processes with linear operator inequality constraints. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **20**, 1–36.
- ASTFALCK, L., BIRD, C. & WILLIAMSON, D. (2024a). Generalised Bayes linear inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14145* .
- ASTFALCK, L., CRIPPS, E., GOSLING, J. P. & MILNE, I. (2019). Emulation of vessel motion simulators for computationally efficient uncertainty quantification. *Ocean Engineering* **172**, 726–736.
- ASTFALCK, L., WILLIAMSON, D., GANDY, N., GREGOIRE, L. & IVANOVIC, R. (2024b). Coexchangeable process modeling for uncertainty quantification in joint climate reconstruction. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **119**, 1751–1764.
- BERRENDERO, J., BUENO-LARRAZ, B. & CUEVAS, A. (2020). On Mahalanobis distance in functional settings. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**, 1–33.
- BOCHKINA, N. (2019). Bernstein–von Mises theorem and misspecified models: A review. *Foundations of Modern Statistics* , 355–380.
- BOYD, S. & VANDENBERGHE, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press.
- BROOKS, S., GELMAN, A., JONES, G. & MENG, X.-L. (2011). *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- BYRNE, S. & GIROLAMI, M. (2013). Geodesic Monte Carlo on embedded manifolds. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **40**, 825–845.
- CANALE, A. & DUNSON, D. (2013). Nonparametric Bayes modelling of count processes. *Biometrika* **100**, 801–816.
- CHAKRABORTY, M. & GHOSAL, S. (2021). Convergence rates for Bayesian estimation and testing in monotone regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15**, 3478–3503.

- DA VEIGA, S. & MARREL, A. (2012). Gaussian process modeling with inequality constraints. *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse : Mathématiques* **21**, 529–555.
- DALTON, D., LAZARUS, A., GAO, H. & HUSMEIER, D. (2024). Boundary constrained Gaussian processes for robust physics-informed machine learning of linear partial differential equations. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **25**, 1–61.
- DEVROYE, L. (1986). *Non-Uniform Random Variate Generation*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- DIACONIS, P. & FREEDMAN, D. (1986). On the consistency of Bayes estimates. *The Annals of Statistics* , 1–26.
- DIAMOND, S. & BOYD, S. (2016). CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17**, 1–5.
- DUNSON, D. & NEELON, B. (2003). Bayesian inference on order-constrained parameters in generalized linear models. *Biometrics* **59**, 286–295.
- ELEONORA, B. & GIUSEPPE, M. A. C. (2017). Probability measures on infinite-dimensional Stiefel manifolds. *Journal of Geometric Mechanics* **9**, 291–316.
- EVERINK, J., DONG, Y. & ANDERSEN, M. (2023). Bayesian inference with projected densities. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* **11**, 1025–1043.
- FU, A., NARASIMHAN, B. & BOYD, S. (2017). Cvxr: An R package for disciplined convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.07582* .
- GELFAND, A. & SMITH, A. (1991). Gibbs sampling for marginal posterior expectations. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* **20**, 1747–1766.
- GEMAN, S. & GEMAN, D. (1984). Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* , 721–741.
- GHOSAL, S. & VAN DER VAART, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*. Cambridge University Press.
- GNEITING, T. (2013). Strictly and non-strictly positive definite functions on spheres. *Bernoulli* **19**, 1327 – 1349.
- GRANT, M. & BOYD, S. (2014). CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. <https://cvxr.com/cvx>.
- GUNN, L. & DUNSON, D. (2005). A transformation approach for incorporating monotone or unimodal constraints. *Biostatistics* **6**, 434–449.
- HARKONEN, M., LANGE-HEGERMANN, M. & RAITA, B. (2023). Gaussian process priors for systems of linear partial differential equations with constant coefficients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR.
- HASTINGS, W. (1970). Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications .

- ISHWARAN, H. & JAMES, L. (2001). Gibbs sampling methods for stick-breaking priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**, 161–173.
- JIDLING, C., WAHLSTRÖM, N., WILLS, A. & SCHÖN, T. (2017). Linearly constrained Gaussian processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **30**.
- JONA-LASINIO, G., GELFAND, A. & JONA-LASINIO, M. (2012). Spatial analysis of wave direction data using wrapped Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **6**, 1478 – 1498.
- KATZFUSS, M. & GUINNESS, J. (2021). A general framework for Vecchia approximations of Gaussian processes. *Statistical Science* **36**, 124 – 141.
- LIN, L. & DUNSON, D. (2014). Bayesian monotone regression using Gaussian process projection. *Biometrika* **101**, 303–317.
- MARITZ, J. (2018). *Empirical Bayes Methods with Applications*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- MASTRANTONIO, G., JONA LASINIO, G. & GELFAND, A. (2016). Spatio-temporal circular models with non-separable covariance structure. *Test* **25**, 331–350.
- METROPOLIS, N., ROSENBLUTH, A., ROSENBLUTH, M., TELLER, A. & TELLER, E. (1953). Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **21**, 1087–1092.
- METROPOLIS, N. & ULAM, S. (1949). The Monte Carlo method. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **44**, 335–341.
- MILNE, I., DELAUX, S. & MCCOMB, P. (2016). Validation of a predictive tool for the heading of turret-moored vessels. *Ocean Engineering* **128**, 22–40.
- NAVARRO, A., FRELLSEN, J. & TURNER, R. (2017). The multivariate generalised von Mises distribution: inference and applications. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31.
- PAKMAN, A. & PANINSKI, L. (2014). Exact Hamiltonian Monte Carlo for truncated multivariate Gaussians. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **23**, 518–542.
- POLSON, N., SCOTT, J. & WINDLE, J. (2013). Bayesian inference for logistic models using Pólya–Gamma latent variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**, 1339–1349.
- RAO, V., LIN, L. & DUNSON, D. (2016). Data augmentation for models based on rejection sampling. *Biometrika* **103**, 319–335.
- RIIHIMÄKI, J. & VEHTARI, A. (2010). Gaussian processes with monotonicity information. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, vol. 9 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*.
- SILVA, R. & KALAITZIS, A. (2015). Bayesian inference via projections. *Statistics and Computing* **25**, 739–753.
- SWILER, L., GULIAN, M., FRANKEL, A., SAFTA, C. & JAKEMAN, J. (2020). A survey of constrained Gaussian process regression: Approaches and implementation challenges. *Journal of Machine Learning for Modeling and Computing* **1**, 119–156.

- TANNER, M. & WONG, W. H. (1987). The calculation of posterior distributions by data augmentation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **82**, 528–540.
- VILLANI, C. et al. (2009). *Optimal transport: old and new*. Springer.
- VON NEUMANN, J. (1951). Various techniques used in connection with random digits. *National Bureau of Standards Applied Math Series* **12**, 5.
- WANG, F. & GELFAND, A. (2014). Modeling space and space-time directional data using projected Gaussian processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109**, 1565–1580.
- WANG, X. & BERGER, J. (2016). Estimating shape constrained functions using Gaussian processes. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* **4**, 1–25.