

Griddy-Gibbs sampling for Bayesian P-splines models with Poisson data

Oswaldo Gressani^{1*} and Paul H.C. Eilers²

¹ Interuniversity Institute for Biostatistics and statistical Bioinformatics (I-BioStat), Data Science Institute, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium.

² Department of Biostatistics, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

Abstract

P-splines are appealing for smoothing Poisson distributed counts. They provide a flexible setting for modeling nonlinear model components based on a discretized penalty structure with a relatively simple computational backbone. Under a Bayesian inferential process relying on Markov chain Monte Carlo, estimates of spline coefficients are typically obtained by means of Metropolis-type algorithms, which may suffer from convergence issues if the proposal distribution is not properly chosen. To avoid such a sensitive calibration choice, we extend the Griddy-Gibbs sampler to Bayesian P-splines models with a Poisson response variable. In this model class, conditional posterior distributions of spline components are shown to have attractive mathematical properties. Despite their non-conjugate nature, conditional posteriors of spline coefficients can be efficiently explored with a Gibbs sampling scheme by relying on grid-based approximations. The proposed Griddy-Gibbs sampler for Bayesian P-splines (GGSBPS) algorithm is an interesting calibration-free tool for density estimation and histogram smoothing that is made available in a compact and user-friendly routine. The performance of our approach is assessed in different simulation settings and the GGSBPS algorithm is illustrated on two real datasets.

Keywords: Bayesian P-splines; Griddy-Gibbs sampler; MCMC; Poisson smoothing.

* Corresponding author: oswaldo.gressani@uhasselt.be

1 Introduction

The Poisson distribution plays an important role in statistics. Its popularity to model discrete events is owed mostly to appealing mathematical properties and to the fact that a single parameter is required to characterize the distribution. Poisson assumptions on data are often encountered in generalized linear models or in density estimation by histogram smoothing where counts associated to each histogram bin are assumed to be Poisson distributed. P-splines (Eilers and Marx, 1996) are particularly attractive for smoothing a series of counts with a number of advantages over alternative smoothers, e.g. in terms of implementation, numerical stability and moments conservation (Eilers and Marx, 2021). Moreover, P-splines are easily translated in a Bayesian setting (Lang and Brezger, 2004). When working from a Bayesian perspective, the spline coefficients and penalty parameter can be estimated jointly by exploring the posterior distribution obtained from Bayes' theorem. Frequentist statistical procedures relying on the penalized likelihood principle do not benefit from such a privilege as the penalty parameter has to be treated separately with cross-validation methods or minimization of a chosen information criterion. A Bayesian approach for P-splines naturally deals with the problem of deciding on the appropriate amount of smoothness and, as such, is a seductive argument for users looking for an automated selection of the penalty parameter.

In general, Bayesian P-splines models involve Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods to generate samples from posterior distributions and carry out inference. When Markov chain simulation becomes computationally demanding, sampling-free approaches involving Laplace approximations (Laplacian-P-splines) provide an interesting alternative (see e.g. Gressani and Lambert, 2018, 2021; Gressani et al., 2022a; Lambert and Gressani, 2023). Except for situations involving a Gaussian response, MCMC algorithms in Bayesian P-splines models traditionally sample the posterior by means of a Metropolis-within-Gibbs strategy with a Gibbs step for the penalty parameter. Spline coefficients are sampled blockwise (Bremhorst and Lambert, 2016; Lambert and Eilers, 2009; Gressani et al., 2022b) either with a (random-walk) Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Metropolis et al., 1953; Hastings, 1970) or a Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (Roberts and Tweedie, 1996).

To our knowledge, no attempts have yet been made to explore the joint posterior distribution in Bayesian P-splines models by entirely relying on the Gibbs sampler (Geman and Geman, 1984; Casella and George, 1992) when data are non-Gaussian. The reason for such a gap in the literature is very simple. In non-Gaussian situations, the model for spline components is not conjugate and conditional posterior distributions have a non-standard form. This makes sampling a rather challenging task. We solve this problem by extending the Griddy-Gibbs sampler introduced by Ritter and Tanner (1992) to Bayesian P-splines models with a particular focus on Poisson data. Griddy-Gibbs sampling is a tool to draw samples from univariate conditional posterior distributions based on a discrete approximation of conditional posterior cumulative distributions functions. It is particularly attractive for three main reasons: (1) it serves as a surrogate to the Gibbs sampler when models are not conditionally conjugate; (2) its algorithmic implementation is rather simple; and (3) grids on which to evaluate the conditionals can be flexibly modulated depending on the targeted approximation accuracy. The (Griddy-)Gibbs sampler can be seen as a special case of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Chib and Greenberg, 1995) with the key advantage that none of the generated samples are rejected, thereby avoiding computational waste. A direct consequence is that there is no need to bother about optimality of acceptance rates. Furthermore, Gibbs algorithms do not require users to calibrate a proposal distribution; an often critical choice that can severely affect sampling performance in Metropolis-type algorithms. Griddy-Gibbs thus allows to preserve the practical features of Gibbs sampling for Bayesian P-splines even in presence of conditionally non-conjugate models. We show that under a Poisson likelihood, the univariate conditional posterior distributions of the spline coefficients can be written as a product of a

Gaussian kernel with an exponential function. A detailed mathematical analysis reveals that the conditionals of the spline components are unimodal and that finite bounds encompassing the mode can be computed so as to facilitate the implementation of the posterior mode finding algorithm and subsequently to build the grid for Griddy-Gibbs. Using the latter mathematical properties, we build the Griddy-Gibbs sampler for Bayesian P-splines (GGSBPS) under a Poisson response, a simple and efficient algorithm that is made available in a user-friendly R routine. The GGSBPS algorithm can be used to smooth a series of Poisson counts with P-splines and is therefore an interesting candidate for density estimation.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the Bayesian P-splines model with a Poisson response and put particular emphasis on histogram smoothing and density estimation. Choice of penalty orders and priors is also discussed here. Section 3 contains core results related to univariate conditional posterior distributions of the spline coefficients with important mathematical properties for building an efficient Griddy-Gibbs sampler. Section 4 gives a detailed exposition of the GGSBPS algorithm along with a pseudo-code. The performance of the latter algorithm is assessed through different simulation settings in Section 5. Section 6 covers real data applications and Section 7 concludes the article with a discussion on strengths and limitations of the proposed method. Results in this paper can be reproduced with the code provided in the following repository <https://github.com/oswaldogressani/GGSBPS>.

2 Bayesian P-splines with a Poisson response

We assume a model with n i.i.d. Poisson observations denoted by $y_i \sim \mathcal{P}(\mu(x_i))$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a (random or non-random) realization in a compact set \mathcal{B} and $\mathbb{E}(y_i) = \mu(x_i) > 0$ denotes the (finite) mean of a discrete response variable $y_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The goal is to estimate the mean response function $\mu(x)$ based on a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. This setting is encountered in histogram smoothing (with assumed Poisson counts) and density estimation. Mathematically, if $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a series of counts from a histogram with bin width ω and if the data domain is partitioned as $\mathcal{B} = \cup_{i=1}^m \mathbb{B}_i$, where \mathbb{B}_i denotes a bin centered at x_i with a half-open interval $\mathbb{B}_i = [x_i - \omega/2, x_i + \omega/2)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ and a closed interval $\mathbb{B}_m = [x_m - \omega/2, x_m + \omega/2]$, then we can write $y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{B}_i)$, where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function and $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathcal{B}$ is the i th raw value used to build the histogram. The smoothed histogram corresponds to the curve $\hat{f}_H(x) = \hat{\mu}(x)$, where $\hat{\mu}$ is a point estimate of μ (at $x \in \mathcal{B}$) and the estimated density function is given by $\hat{f}(x) = (n\omega)^{-1} \hat{\mu}(x)$.

B-splines are used to approximate the (unknown) function μ . As μ is constrained to live on the (strictly) positive real line, a log-link function is used $\log \mu(x_i) = \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_k b_k(x_i) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denotes the vector of B-spline coefficients to be estimated and $\mathbf{b}(\cdot) = (b_1(\cdot), \dots, b_K(\cdot))^\top$ is (without loss of generality) a cubic B-spline basis defined on the data support \mathcal{B} . A default lower bound for K is often taken to be ten (Eilers and Marx, 2021) and we therefore assume $K \geq 10$. Working under the Bayesian paradigm, we specify our degree of belief on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ via a prior. Following Lang and Brezger (2004); Lambert (2014), a possible choice is to work with an improper prior of the form:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\lambda) \propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top P \boldsymbol{\theta}\right), \quad (1)$$

where \propto denotes equality up to a multiplicative constant, $\mathcal{R}(P)$ is the rank of the penalty matrix P and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x > 0\}$ is a penalty parameter responsible for tuning smoothness. The penalty matrix is computed as $P = D_r^\top D_r$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$ is the penalty order and D_r is the r th order difference matrix of dimension $(K - r) \times K$. We restrict our model to a penalty of order

two and three, respectively, i.e. $r \in \{2, 3\}$ as higher orders are rarely useful in practice. In that case, the difference matrices take the following form:

$$D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & -2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 3 & -3 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 3 & -3 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 & 3 & -3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The roughness penalty can be expressed as $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top P \boldsymbol{\theta} = \sum_{j=r+1}^K (\Delta^r \theta_j)^2$, where Δ^r denotes the r th order difference operator and for a penalty of order $r \in \{2, 3\}$, we have $\mathcal{R}(P) = K - r$. Following [Lambert and Eilers \(2009\)](#), we specify an uninformative Gamma prior on the penalty parameter $p(\lambda) \propto \lambda^{a_\lambda - 1} \exp(-b_\lambda \lambda)$ with shape $a_\lambda = 10^{-4}$ and rate $b_\lambda = 10^{-4}$. For alternative robust priors, the reader is directed to [Jullion and Lambert \(2007\)](#). The Poisson likelihood is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathcal{D}) \propto \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right). \quad (2)$$

The Bayesian model being fully specified, we can use Bayes' theorem to derive the univariate conditional posterior distributions of the spline coefficients $p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{k-1}, \theta_{k+1}, \dots, \theta_K)^\top$ and of the penalty parameter $p(\lambda | \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D})$.

3 Conditional posterior distributions

Using Bayes' theorem, the joint posterior is $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda | \mathcal{D}) \propto \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathcal{D}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \lambda) p(\lambda)$. The conditional posterior distribution of the penalty parameter is easily shown to be Gamma distributed:

$$(\lambda | \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}) \sim \mathcal{G} \left(0.5 \mathcal{R}(P) + a_\lambda, 0.5 \sum_{j=r+1}^K (\Delta^r \theta_j)^2 + b_\lambda \right),$$

with $r \in \{2, 3\}$ and the Bayesian model is therefore partially conditionally conjugate. Theorem 3.1 states that the univariate conditional posterior distribution of each spline component is proportional to the product of a Gaussian density function with an exponential function of the corresponding spline component.

Theorem 3.1. *The univariate conditional posterior distribution of the k th B-spline coefficient θ_k can be written as a product of a Gaussian density function p_G of θ_k ; having mean $\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)$ and variance $\mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)$; with an exponential function of θ_k :*

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda), \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)$ and $h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k})$ are real-valued functions.

Proof. See [Appendix A1](#). Being able to write the conditional posterior distribution of each B-spline coefficient as in Theorem 3.1 greatly facilitates mathematical analysis. Let us write $\varphi_k(\theta_k) := \log p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ for the log conditional posterior distribution of the k th B-spline coefficient and assume it is twice differentiable. An important summary feature of the latter function

is the modal value $\theta_k^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_k \in \mathbb{R}} p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ as it is a natural candidate to depart from when constructing a grid that supports most of the posterior probability mass; a crucial step in the Griddy-Gibbs sampler. The next result guarantees that the conditional posterior distribution of each spline coefficient admits a unique maximizer.

Theorem 3.2. *The conditional posterior distribution $p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ is unimodal.*

Proof. See [Appendix A2](#). The conditional posterior mode has no closed-form solution and we need to rely on numerical methods to approximate θ_k^* by searching an unbounded domain. The next theorem narrows down the search on the real line to find the conditional posterior mode and embodies θ_k^* in a bounded interval located in \mathbb{R}_- or \mathbb{R}_+ depending on the sign of the first derivative of φ_k evaluated at zero.

Theorem 3.3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varphi'_k(0) < 0$ is sufficient for θ_k^* to be located in the negative half-open interval $\kappa_- = [\mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0) - \varepsilon, 0)$ and $\varphi'_k(0) > 0$ is sufficient for the modal value to be situated in the positive half-open interval $\kappa_+ = (0, \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0) + \varepsilon]$.*

Proof. See [Appendix A3](#). In practical terms, Theorem 3.3 motivates to frame the mode finding problem in a root-finding problem for function φ'_k as the latter will exhibit opposite signs at the end points of the bounded interval κ_- or κ_+ . Root-finding algorithms are typically well documented, stable and fast in many softwares, e.g. the *uniroot()* function in R. Next, we show how the above results can be used to build the GGSBPS algorithm.

4 The GGSBPS algorithm

At iteration m , the GGSBPS algorithm proceeds as follows. Given $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m-1)}$, the penalty parameter $\lambda^{(m)}$ is sampled from the Gamma posterior distribution given in Section 3. Then, a loop with index k running from one to K starts sampling the conditional posterior distributions of the B-spline coefficients. For the k th B-spline coefficient, the term $\varphi'_k(0)$ is evaluated first and if $\varphi'_k(0) \neq 0$, we search for the modal value θ_k^* in either κ_- or κ_+ depending on the sign of $\varphi'_k(0)$ with a root-finding algorithm (see Theorem 3.3). Once the mode is available, we proceed with the computation of a compact interval $[\theta_k^l, \theta_k^r]$ in which to construct a grid. Bounds of the latter interval θ_k^l and θ_k^r are computed with a grid-grower (see [Ritter and Tanner, 1992](#)) that starts from the modal value θ_k^* and moves left (respectively right) until $\varphi_k(\theta_k) - \varphi_k(\theta_k^*) < c$ for a given constant c . For instance, if $c = \log(0.01)$, the grid-grower proceeds by moving in the tails of the target $p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ until reaching 1% of the maximum value $p(\theta_k^* | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$. We recommend to use a grid-grower having growing steps of size $2^j \sqrt{(-\varphi''_k(\theta_k^*))^{-1}}$ with $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. As such, the step size accounts for the (local) curvature of the target around the modal value. Next, an equidistant grid of length L , say $L = 100$, is constructed in $[\theta_k^l, \theta_k^r]$ denoted by $\theta_k^l = z_1 < \dots < z_L = \theta_k^r$ with target evaluations $w_l = p(z_l | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$. These values are used to compute the normalized weights $\tilde{w}_l = w_l / \sum_{l=1}^L w_l$, so that $\tilde{w}_l \in (0, 1)$ and $\sum_{l=1}^L \tilde{w}_l = 1$. This guarantees that the approximating discretized distribution is a valid probability mass function. From here, weights are accumulated to obtain an approximation of the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of $p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$. Finally, a value is drawn from a uniform distribution $u \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and the inverse cdf method is used to obtain $\theta_k^{(m)}$ seen as a draw from the target, i.e. $\theta_k^{(m)} \sim p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$. The k th position of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m-1)}$ is updated with $\theta_k^{(m)}$ and the loop proceeds to the next iteration, simulating a draw for the next spline component. The GGSBPS algorithm can be initialized at the zero vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, the maximum *a priori* of the B-splines coefficients. The pseudo-code below summarizes

the main steps. When the number of cycles M is large enough and after having discarded early runs (burn-in), the Markov chains in $\mathcal{S}_\theta = \{\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(M)}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_\lambda = \{\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(M)}\}$ form an approximate random sample from the joint posterior distribution $p(\theta, \lambda | \mathcal{D})$. A (sub)sample of \mathcal{S}_θ can then be used to compute a point estimate of θ , which in turn provides a point estimate for the smooth histogram $\hat{f}_H(x)$, the density function $\hat{f}(x)$ and mean function $\hat{\mu}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathcal{B}$.

GGSBPS algorithm to sample $p(\theta, \lambda | \mathcal{D})$

- 1: Fix initial value $\theta^{(0)}$ and chain length M .
 - 2: **for** m in 1 to M **do**:
 - 3: Sample $\lambda^{(m)} \sim \mathcal{G}\left(0.5\mathcal{R}(P) + a_\lambda, 0.5 \sum_{j=r+1}^K \left(\Delta^r \theta_j^{(m-1)}\right)^2 + b_\lambda\right)$.
 - 4: **for** k in 1 to K **do**:
 - 5: Compute $\varphi'_k(0)$ and if $\varphi'_k(0) \neq 0$ search for the modal value θ_k^* of φ_k in κ_- or κ_+ .
 - 6: Compute left bound of the grid θ_k^l satisfying $\varphi_k(\theta_k^l) - \varphi_k(\theta_k^*) < c$ with left grid-grower.
 - 7: Compute right bound of the grid θ_k^r satisfying $\varphi_k(\theta_k^r) - \varphi_k(\theta_k^*) < c$ with right grid-grower.
 - 8: Construct an equidistant grid $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_L\}$ in $[\theta_k^l, \theta_k^r]$.
 - 9: Evaluate $p(\theta_k | \theta_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$ at \mathcal{Z} , yielding $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_L\}$.
 - 10: Use \mathcal{W} to approximate the cdf of the target $p(\theta_k | \theta_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$.
 - 11: Sample $u \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and use the inverse cdf method to obtain a draw $\theta_k^{(m)} \sim p(\theta_k | \theta_{-k}^{(m-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D})$.
 - 12: Replace the k th entry of $\theta^{(m-1)}$ by $\theta_k^{(m)}$.
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: Set $\theta^{(m)} = \theta^{(m-1)}$.
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: Output samples $\mathcal{S}_\theta = \{\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(M)}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_\lambda = \{\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(M)}\}$.
-

5 Simulation study

The performance of the GGSBPS algorithm is assessed in four different simulation scenarios. The first two scenarios cover a density estimation problem where the target density is a mixture of three Gaussians $f(x) = 0.25\mathcal{N}(0.10, (0.03)^2) + 0.50\mathcal{N}(0.50, (0.06)^2) + 0.25\mathcal{N}(0.90, (0.03)^2)$. A total of $n = 100$ data points $\tilde{x}_i \sim f$ are simulated in Scenario A and Scenario B has $n = 300$. All data are generated in the unit interval, i.e. $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$. For the latter scenarios, we use a penalty of order $r = 3$ to preserve the first and second moments of the underlying raw histogram (Eilers and Marx, 2021) and a bin width $\omega = 0.01$. The remaining scenarios involve a Poisson response $y_i \sim \mathcal{P}(\mu(x_i))$ with $x_i \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and $\mu(x)$ a nonlinear target function to be estimated in $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$. We use $n = 100$ (Scenario C) and $n = 300$ (Scenario D) with a second order penalty $r = 2$.

In all scenarios, we use $K = 10$ B-spline basis functions and simulate $S = 100$ samples. For each generated dataset, the MCMC chain length is fixed to $M = 1000$ and half of it is discarded as burn-in. The bias, empirical standard error (ESE) and root mean square error (RMSE) of the estimated target function (see detailed formulas in Appendix A4) for selected points in \mathcal{B} are given in Table 1. Figure 1 shows the estimated curves in each scenario together with the pointwise median over S replications.

Scenario A			Scenario B			
x	Bias	ESE	RMSE	Bias	ESE	RMSE
0.1	-0.252	0.682	0.724	-0.151	0.389	0.415
0.2	0.069	0.055	0.088	0.067	0.027	0.072
0.3	0.010	0.017	0.020	0.010	0.009	0.013
0.4	-0.256	0.185	0.315	-0.195	0.121	0.229
0.5	0.223	0.437	0.489	0.255	0.240	0.349
0.6	-0.209	0.193	0.283	-0.210	0.122	0.242
0.7	0.008	0.013	0.016	0.009	0.010	0.014
0.8	0.064	0.039	0.075	0.067	0.029	0.073
0.9	-0.181	0.627	0.650	-0.090	0.441	0.448
Scenario C			Scenario D			
x	Bias	ESE	RMSE	Bias	ESE	RMSE
0.1	0.089	0.736	0.738	-0.034	0.414	0.413
0.2	-0.190	0.786	0.805	0.020	0.464	0.462
0.3	-0.402	0.452	0.603	-0.337	0.301	0.451
0.4	0.193	0.311	0.365	0.098	0.174	0.199
0.5	0.226	0.244	0.332	0.187	0.152	0.240
0.6	-0.301	0.439	0.531	-0.203	0.324	0.381
0.7	-0.213	0.593	0.627	-0.122	0.344	0.363
0.8	0.135	0.676	0.686	0.139	0.371	0.395
0.9	-0.225	0.764	0.792	-0.103	0.452	0.462

Table 1: Bias, ESE and RMSE of the estimated target function in Scenarios A-D with the GGSBPS algorithm for selected points $x \in \mathcal{B}$. Results are for $S = 100$ replications.

6 Illustration on real data

Our methodology is applied on two datasets available in the JOPS package <https://psplines.bitbucket.io/>. The first is a classic dataset on eruption times of the Old Faithful geyser in Yellowstone National Park. Figure 2 shows a histogram of this data with bin width $\omega = 0.05$. The smoothed histogram obtained with the GGSBPS algorithm using a chain of length $M = 10000$ (and a burn-in of 5000) is compared with a penalized likelihood fit computed with the *psPoisson()* routine of the JOPS package. In both settings, we use a second order penalty and $K = 20$ (cubic) B-splines basis functions. The penalty parameter minimizing the AIC criterion in the penalized likelihood approach is given by $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{AIC}} = 0.063$ and the posterior mean estimate obtained from the GGSBPS algorithm is $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{GGSBPS}} = 0.160$. This means that both models suggest more or less the same amount smoothing as highlighted by the similar curves in Figure 2.

The second dataset is about thickness of stamp paper from the 1872 Hidalgo issue of Mexico (Basford et al., 1997). The histogram of this data with a bin width of $\omega = 1$ is shown in Figure 3. We compare the fit obtained with our GGSBPS algorithm using a chain of length $M = 10000$ (and a burn-in of 5000) against a fit obtained with an approximate Bayesian approach relying on Laplace approximations (Laplacian-P-splines) by means of the *LAPS_dens()* routine of the JOPS package with a harmonic penalty (Eilers and Marx, 2021). In both cases, $K = 30$ B-splines are used together with a second order penalty. The first two peaks of the smoothed histogram are more pronounced with GGSBPS as compared to the approximate Bayesian approach. This is because GGSBPS selects a slightly smaller penalty parameter than the method based on Laplace approximations ($\hat{\lambda}_{\text{GGSBPS}} = 0.422$ versus $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{LAPS}} = 1.641$).




Figure 1: Estimated curves (gray) for Scenarios A-D. The dashed curve is the pointwise median of the $S = 100$ estimated curves and the solid black curve is the target function.




Figure 2: GGSBPS algorithm used on the Old Faithful geyser data and compared with a penalized likelihood routine.




Figure 3: GGSBPS algorithm used on the Hidalgo stamps data and compared with the Laplacian-P-splines fit.

7 Conclusion

Bayesian P-splines models are often partially conditionally conjugate when the underlying data are non-Gaussian. A consequence is that sampling from univariate conditional posterior distributions of spline components θ_k is not a trivial task as the Gibbs sampler is not directly applicable. Hence, in most cases, traditional Metropolis-type MCMC algorithms are required to carry out Bayesian inference. This paper extends the Griddy-Gibbs sampler of Ritter and Tanner (1992) to Bayesian P-splines models with a Poisson response and thereby permits to conserve the practical benefits of Gibbs sampling in this model class. Our approach is calibration-free in the sense that it avoids the choice and calibration of a proposal distribution as required by classic Metropolis-Hastings algorithms and is therefore an appealing tool for users with little statistical expertise. The proposed GGSBPS algorithm is translated in a compact and user-friendly R routine that makes our methodology ready to use for practical problems covering histogram smoothing and density estimation with Bayesian P-splines.

The main limitation of our approach is the price to pay in terms of analytical derivations required to obtain $\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)$, the core functions guiding the implementation of the GGSBPS algorithm. These functions depend on the likelihood of the model and on the chosen penalty order. As such, if the Poisson assumption is to be replaced with another more flexible assumption, e.g. negative binomial, then the derivations shown in appendix have to be updated according to the chosen modeling assumption on the data and the chosen order of the differences in the penalty. This is also true when alternative penalty structures as the ones considered in this manuscript are required by the modeler. For instance, with P-splines, one may adapt the penalty structure for harmonic smoothing or circular smoothing (Eilers and Marx, 2021). This would require again a special treatment to derive the functions involved in the GGSBPS algorithm. Fortunately, the cost related to analytical derivations has to be paid only once for the Griddy-Gibbs sampler to be available in a particular model.

From here, several research directions are worth exploring. We can for instance investigate the possibility to derive a general formulation for the functions involved in Theorem 3.1 with an arbitrary penalty order r . From a purely algorithmic perspective, it can also be interesting to code the costly parts of the GGSBPS algorithm in C++ to gain further computational performance. Also, in its current version, the latter algorithm works with an equidistant grid, which is a sub-optimal setting. A more efficient approach would be to place more points around the modal value (where most of the posterior probability mass is concentrated) and less points in the tails of the conditional posterior distributions of the spline coefficients.

Data availability

Simulation results and real data applications in this paper can be fully reproduced with the code available on GitHub <https://github.com/oswaldogressani/GGSBPS>.

Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

Basford, K., McLachlan, G., and York, M. (1997). Modelling the distribution of stamp paper thickness via finite normal mixtures: The 1872 Hidalgo stamp issue of Mexico revisited. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 24(2):169–180.

- Bremhorst, V. and Lambert, P. (2016). Flexible estimation in cure survival models using Bayesian P-splines. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 93:270–284.
- Casella, G. and George, E. I. (1992). Explaining the Gibbs sampler. *The American Statistician*, 46(3):167–174.
- Chib, S. and Greenberg, E. (1995). Understanding the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. *The American Statistician*, 49(4):327–335.
- Eilers, P. H. C. and Marx, B. D. (1996). Flexible smoothing with B-splines and penalties. *Statistical Science*, 11(2):89–121.
- Eilers, P. H. C. and Marx, B. D. (2021). *Practical smoothing: The joys of P-splines*. Cambridge University Press.
- Geman, S. and Geman, D. (1984). Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, (6):721–741.
- Gressani, O., Faes, C., and Hens, N. (2022a). Laplacian-P-splines for Bayesian inference in the mixture cure model. *Statistics in Medicine*, 41(14):2602–2626.
- Gressani, O. and Lambert, P. (2018). Fast Bayesian inference using Laplace approximations in a flexible promotion time cure model based on P-splines. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 124:151–167.
- Gressani, O. and Lambert, P. (2021). Laplace approximations for fast Bayesian inference in generalized additive models based on P-splines. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 154:107088.
- Gressani, O., Wallinga, J., Althaus, C. L., Hens, N., and Faes, C. (2022b). EpiLPS: A fast and flexible Bayesian tool for estimation of the time-varying reproduction number. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 18(10):e1010618.
- Hastings, W. (1970). Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57:97–109.
- Jullion, A. and Lambert, P. (2007). Robust specification of the roughness penalty prior distribution in spatially adaptive Bayesian P-splines models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(5):2542–2558.
- Lambert, P. (2014). Spline approximations to conditional Archimedean copula. *Stat*, 3(1):200–217.
- Lambert, P. and Eilers, P. H. (2009). Bayesian density estimation from grouped continuous data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(4):1388–1399.
- Lambert, P. and Gressani, O. (2023). Penalty parameter selection and asymmetry corrections to Laplace approximations in Bayesian P-splines models. *Statistical Modelling*, 23(5-6):409–423.
- Lang, S. and Brezger, A. (2004). Bayesian P-splines. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 13(1):183–212.
- Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A. W., Rosenbluth, M. N., Teller, A. H., and Teller, E. (1953). Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21(6):1087–1092.

Ritter, C. and Tanner, M. A. (1992). Facilitating the Gibbs sampler: the Gibbs stopper and the Griddy-Gibbs sampler. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(419):861–868.

Roberts, G. O. and Tweedie, R. L. (1996). Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363.

Appendix A1: Proof of Theorem 3.1

Second-order penalty $r = 2$

We start by expressing the discrete roughness penalty as follows $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top P \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top D_2^\top D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta} = (D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top (D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Also, we can easily verify that:

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta} &= (\theta_3 - 2\theta_2 + \theta_1, \theta_4 - 2\theta_3 + \theta_2, \dots, \theta_K - 2\theta_{K-1} + \theta_{K-2})^\top \\ &= (\Delta^2 \theta_3, \Delta^2 \theta_4, \dots, \Delta^2 \theta_K)^\top, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta^2 \theta_j$ is the second-order difference operator. For first-order, we have $\Delta \theta_j = \theta_j - \theta_{j-1}$ and thus for second-order $\Delta^2 \theta_j = \Delta(\Delta \theta_j) = \Delta(\theta_j - \theta_{j-1}) = \Delta \theta_j - \Delta \theta_{j-1} = \theta_j - 2\theta_{j-1} + \theta_{j-2}$. It follows that $\|D_2 \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 = \sum_{j=3}^K (\Delta^2 \theta_j)^2$. For a given subscript $j \in \{3, \dots, K\}$, we develop the square:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta^2 \theta_j)^2 &= (\theta_j - 2\theta_{j-1} + \theta_{j-2})(\theta_j - 2\theta_{j-1} + \theta_{j-2}) \\ &= \theta_j^2 - 2\theta_j \theta_{j-1} + \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 2\theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 4\theta_{j-1}^2 - 2\theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 2\theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + \theta_{j-2}^2 \\ &= \theta_j^2 - 4\theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 2\theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4\theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + 4\theta_{j-1}^2 + \theta_{j-2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The (improper) prior on the B-spline coefficients (1) with $r = 2$ becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\lambda) &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=3}^K (\theta_j^2 - 4\theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 2\theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4\theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + 4\theta_{j-1}^2 + \theta_{j-2}^2)\right) \\ &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the above result and Bayes' theorem, the joint posterior for $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda)$ is written extensively as:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda | \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left.+ 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2\right)\right) \lambda^{a_\lambda - 1} \exp(-b_\lambda \lambda) \\ &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2 + a_\lambda - 1} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left.+ 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2\right) - b_\lambda \lambda\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The term $\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2}$ in (4) can be written as $\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1} \theta_{j-2} = \theta_2 \theta_1 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} - \theta_K \theta_{K-1}$, so that the joint posterior becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda | \mathcal{D}) &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4 \left(\theta_1 \theta_2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} - \theta_K \theta_{K-1} \right) + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right) - b_\lambda \lambda \right) \\
&\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4\theta_1 \theta_2 - 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 4\theta_K \theta_{K-1} + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right) - b_\lambda \lambda \right) \\
&\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 + 4 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 8 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 2 \sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 4\theta_1 \theta_2 + 4\theta_K \theta_{K-1} \right) - b_\lambda \lambda \right). \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_1 with $r = 2$

We start by deriving the conditional posterior distribution of the first B-spline coefficient θ_1 . First, note that the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)$ in (5) can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i (\theta_1 b_1(x_i) + \cdots + \theta_k b_k(x_i) + \cdots + \theta_K b_K(x_i)) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i \theta_1 b_1(x_i) + \cdots + y_i \theta_k b_k(x_i) + \cdots + y_i \theta_K b_K(x_i) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \theta_k b_k(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i \theta_1 b_1(x_i) + \cdots + y_i \theta_{k-1} b_{k-1}(x_i) + y_i \theta_{k+1} b_{k+1}(x_i) + \cdots + y_i \theta_K b_K(x_i) \right) \\
&= \theta_k \sum_{i=1}^n y_i b_k(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \neq k}}^K \theta_{k'} b_{k'}(x_i) \\
&= \theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \neq k}}^K \theta_{k'} b_{k'}(x_i) \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k := \sum_{i=1}^n y_i b_k(x_i)$. Based on the joint posterior in (5), the conditional posterior distribution of θ_1 can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_1 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} (\theta_1^2 + 2\theta_1 \theta_3 - 4\theta_1 \theta_2) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(\theta_1 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_1^2 - \lambda \theta_1 \theta_3 + 2\lambda \theta_1 \theta_2 \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_1^2 + \theta_1 (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \lambda \theta_3 + 2\lambda \theta_2) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the term $g(\theta_1) = \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2}\theta_1^2 + \theta_1(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \lambda\theta_3 + 2\lambda\theta_2)\right)$ is the exponential of a quadratic form in θ_1 which corresponds to the kernel of a Gaussian density. To find the mean μ_{θ_1} of the underlying Gaussian distribution, we simply solve:

$$\frac{\partial \log(g(\theta_1))}{\partial \theta_1} = -\lambda\theta_1 + f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu_{\theta_1} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda)}{\lambda},$$

where we defined $f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \lambda\theta_3 + 2\lambda\theta_2)$. The variance is then simply equal to:

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2 \log(g(\theta_1))}{\partial \theta_1^2}\right)^{-1} = \sigma_{\theta_1}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Hence, the conditional posterior distribution of θ_1 can be written as the product of two terms, one of which is simply a Gaussian density:

$$p(\theta_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_1; \mu_{\theta_1} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda)}{\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_1}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right).$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_2 with $r = 2$

Based on the joint posterior (5), the conditional posterior distribution of θ_2 is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp\left(\theta_2 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2}(4\theta_2^2 + \theta_2^2 - 8\theta_2\theta_3 + 2\theta_2\theta_4 - 4\theta_1\theta_2)\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(\theta_2 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - \frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_2^2 + 4\lambda\theta_2\theta_3 - \lambda\theta_2\theta_4 + 2\lambda\theta_1\theta_2\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_2^2 + \theta_2(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 + 4\lambda\theta_3 - \lambda\theta_4 + 2\lambda\theta_1)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_2^2 + \theta_2 f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we defined $f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 + 4\lambda\theta_3 - \lambda\theta_4 + 2\lambda\theta_1)$. Again, we recognize that $g(\theta_2) = \exp\left(-\frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_2^2 + \theta_2 f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda)\right)$ is the kernel of a Gaussian. Using the same arguments as before, we can write:

$$p(\theta_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_2; \mu_{\theta_2} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda)}{5\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_2}^2 = \frac{1}{5\lambda}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right).$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_k , $k = 3, \dots, K - 2$ with $r = 2$

For index $k \in \{3, \dots, K - 2\}$ the conditional posterior distribution of θ_k has a generic formula for $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)$. To show this, we first need to decompose the terms $\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1}$ and $\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2}$ in (5) and isolate θ_k . These decompositions will be valid for any $k \in \{3, \dots, K\}$. Let us start by decomposing:

$$\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} = \theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k < K) + \left(\sum_{j=3}^{k-1} \theta_j \theta_{j-1}\right) \mathbb{I}(3 < k \leq K) + \left(\sum_{j=k+2}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1}\right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K - 2), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Likewise, for the second term we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} &= \theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-1) \\
&+ \left(\sum_{j=k+3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(k=K). \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for the sums involving quadratic terms in (5) note that we can also isolate θ_k as follows:

$$\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_j^2 = \theta_k^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j^2, \tag{8}$$

$$\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 = \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-1) + \theta_2^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^{K-1} \theta_j^2, \tag{9}$$

$$\sum_{j=3}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 = \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) + \theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^{K-2} \theta_j^2. \tag{10}$$

Using (6-10), the conditional posterior of θ_k for $k \in \{3, \dots, K\}$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ \theta_k^2 + 4\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-1) + \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) \right. \right. \\
&- 8 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k < K) + \left(\sum_{j=3}^{k-1} \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 < k \leq K) + \left(\sum_{j=k+2}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) \right) \\
&+ 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-1) \right. \\
&\left. \left. + \left(\sum_{j=k+3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=3 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(k=K) \right) + 4\theta_K \theta_{K-1} \right\}. \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

The conditional posterior in (11) can be drastically simplified by noting that all the terms involving summations except $\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))$ do not involve the term θ_k and thus they vanish into the multiplicative constant. This allows us to write a lighter version:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ \theta_k^2 + 4\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-1) + \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) \right. \right. \\
&\left. \left. - 8 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k < K) \right) + 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) \right) + 4\theta_K \theta_{K-1} \right\} \right). \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

As all the indicator functions in (12) are all equal to one for $k \in \{3, \dots, K-2\}$, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ 6\theta_k^2 - 8 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1} \theta_k \right) + 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2} \theta_k \right) \right\} \right) \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ 6\theta_k^2 - 8\theta_k (\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) + 2\theta_k (\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) \right\} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(-3\lambda\theta_k^2 + \theta_k \left(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - \lambda(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) \right) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(-3\lambda\theta_k^2 + \theta_k f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \{3, \dots, K-2\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - \lambda(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2})$, which leads to:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mu_{\theta_k} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{6\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_k}^2 = \frac{1}{6\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \{3, \dots, K-2\}.$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_{K-1} with $r = 2$

The conditional posterior distribution of θ_{K-1} easily follows from (12). Keeping the terms for which the indicator function equals one yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ 5\theta_k^2 - 8 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1} \theta_k \right) + 2\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + 4\theta_k \theta_{K-1} \right\} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ 5\theta_k^2 - 8\theta_k \left(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1} \right) + 2\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + 4\theta_k \theta_{K-1} \right\} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(-\frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_k^2 + \theta_k \left(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - \lambda\theta_{k-2} - 2\lambda\theta_K \right) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(-\frac{5}{2}\lambda\theta_k^2 + \theta_k f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \quad k = K-1,
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - \lambda\theta_{k-2} - 2\lambda\theta_K$, which leads to:

$$p(\theta_{K-1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-(K-1)}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_{K-1}; \mu_{\theta_{K-1}} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^{K-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-(K-1)}, \lambda)}{5\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_{K-1}}^2 = \frac{1}{5\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^{K-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-(K-1)}, \lambda) = \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{K-1} + 4\lambda\theta_{K-2} + 2\lambda\theta_K - \lambda\theta_{K-3}$.

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_K with $r = 2$

The conditional posterior for the last B-spline coefficient θ_K also easily follows from (12). Keeping the terms for which the indicator function equals one yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp\left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ \theta_k^2 - 8\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + 2\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + 4\theta_k \theta_{K-1} \right\}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \\
&\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_k^2 + \theta_k \left(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda \theta_{k-1} - \lambda \theta_{k-2} - 2\lambda \theta_{K-1}\right)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \\
&\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_k^2 + \theta_k f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \quad k = K,
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 4\lambda \theta_{k-1} - \lambda \theta_{k-2} - 2\lambda \theta_{K-1}$ which leads to:

$$p(\theta_K | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-K}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_K; \mu_{\theta_K} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^K(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-K}, \lambda)}{\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_K}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right),$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^K(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-K}, \lambda) = \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^K - \lambda \theta_{K-2} + 2\lambda \theta_{K-1}$.

Summary for $r = 2$

A compact summary of the univariate conditional posteriors for the B-spline coefficient with a second-order penalty $r = 2$ can be obtained by defining the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{k,2}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) &:= \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + \lambda \left((2\theta_{k+1} - \theta_{k+2})\mathbb{I}(k=1) + (2\theta_{k-1} + 4\theta_{k+1} - \theta_{k+2})\mathbb{I}(k=2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (4(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - (\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}))\mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) + (4\theta_{k-1} + 2\theta_{k+1} - \theta_{k-2})\mathbb{I}(k=K-1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (2\theta_{k-1} - \theta_{k-2})\mathbb{I}(k=K) \right), \\
\mathcal{I}_{k,2}(\lambda) &:= \lambda \left(\mathbb{I}(k \in \{1, K\}) + 5\mathbb{I}(k \in \{2, K-1\}) + 6\mathbb{I}(3 \leq k \leq K-2) \right), \\
h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &:= \exp\left(\sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \neq k}}^K \theta_{k'} b_{k'}(x_i)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The conditional posterior distributions of the B-spline coefficients are written compactly as:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_k; \mathcal{S}_{k,2}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \mathcal{I}_{k,2}^{-1}(\lambda), \mathcal{I}_{k,2}^{-1}(\lambda)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k})\right) \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Next, we do the same exercise for a third-order penalty.

Third-order penalty $r = 3$

We start by expressing the discrete roughness penalty as $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top P \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top D_3^\top D_3 \boldsymbol{\theta} = (D_3 \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top (D_3 \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|D_3 \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2$. Also, we can easily verify that:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 \boldsymbol{\theta} &= (-\theta_1 + 3\theta_2 - 3\theta_3 + \theta_4, \dots, -\theta_{K-3} + 3\theta_{K-2} - 3\theta_{K-1} + \theta_K)^\top \\
&= (\Delta^3 \theta_4, \dots, \Delta^3 \theta_K)^\top,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta^3\theta_j = \theta_j - 3\theta_{j-1} + 3\theta_{j-2} - \theta_{j-3}$. For a given subscript $j \in \{4, \dots, K\}$, we develop the square:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta^3\theta_j)^2 &= (\theta_j - 3\theta_{j-1} + 3\theta_{j-2} - \theta_{j-3})(\theta_j - 3\theta_{j-1} + 3\theta_{j-2} - \theta_{j-3}) \\
&= \theta_j^2 - 3\theta_j\theta_{j-1} + 3\theta_j\theta_{j-2} - \theta_j\theta_{j-3} - 3\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-1} + 9\theta_{j-1}^2 - 9\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} + 3\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} \\
&\quad + 3\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-2} - 9\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-1} + 9\theta_{j-2}^2 - 3\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3} - \theta_{j-3}\theta_{j-3} + 3\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} - 3\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3} + \theta_{j-3}^2 \\
&= \theta_j^2 + 9\theta_{j-1}^2 + 9\theta_{j-2}^2 + \theta_{j-3}^2 - 6\theta_j\theta_{j-1} + 6\theta_j\theta_{j-2} - 2\theta_j\theta_{j-3} - 18\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} + 6\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} - 6\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The (improper) prior on the B-spline coefficients (1) with $r = 3$ becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\lambda) &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=4}^K \left(\theta_j^2 + 9\theta_{j-1}^2 + 9\theta_{j-2}^2 + \theta_{j-3}^2 - 6\theta_j\theta_{j-1} + 6\theta_j\theta_{j-2} - 2\theta_j\theta_{j-3} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 18\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} + 6\theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} - 6\theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3}\right)\right) \\
&\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-3}^2 - 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-2} - 2\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-3} - 18\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} + 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} - 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above result and Bayes' theorem, the joint posterior for $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda)$ is written extensively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda|\mathcal{D}) &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-3}^2 - 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} + 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-2} - 2\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-3} - 18\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} - 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3}\right) - b_\lambda \lambda\right). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

The term $\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2}$ in (13) can be written as $\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-2} = \theta_2\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} - \theta_K\theta_{K-1}$. Likewise, we have $\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}\theta_{j-3} = \theta_1\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-2} - \theta_K\theta_{K-2}$ and $\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}\theta_{j-3} = \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} - \theta_{K-1}\theta_{K-2} - \theta_K\theta_{K-1}$, so that the joint posterior becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \lambda|\mathcal{D}) &\propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + 9\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-3}^2 - 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} + 6\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-2} - 2\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-3} - 18\left(\theta_2\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} - \theta_K\theta_{K-1}\right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 6\left(\theta_1\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-2} - \theta_K\theta_{K-2}\right) - 6\left(\theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2\theta_3 + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j\theta_{j-1} - \theta_{K-1}\theta_{K-2} - \theta_K\theta_{K-1}\right)\right) - b_\lambda \lambda\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \propto \lambda^{\mathcal{R}(P)/2+a_\lambda-1} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j^2 + 9 \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 + 9 \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 \right. \right. \\
& + \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-3}^2 - 30 \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} + 12 \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} - 2 \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3} - 6\theta_1 \theta_2 + 6\theta_1 \theta_3 - 24\theta_2 \theta_3 + 24\theta_K \theta_{K-1} \\
& \left. \left. + 6\theta_{K-1} \theta_{K-2} - 6\theta_K \theta_{K-2} \right) - b_\lambda \lambda \right). \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_1 with $r = 3$

We start by deriving the conditional posterior distribution of the first B-spline coefficient θ_1 when $r = 3$. Again, note that the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)$ in (14) can be decomposed as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i) = \theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \neq k}}^K \theta_{k'} b_{k'}(x_i) \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\},$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k := \sum_{i=1}^n y_i b_k(x_i)$. Based on the joint posterior in (14), the conditional posterior distribution of θ_1 can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) & \propto \exp \left(\theta_1 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} (\theta_1^2 - 2\theta_4 \theta_1 - 6\theta_1 \theta_2 + 6\theta_1 \theta_3) \right) \\
& \propto \exp \left(\theta_1 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_1^2 + \lambda \theta_1 \theta_4 + 3\lambda \theta_1 \theta_2 - 3\lambda \theta_1 \theta_3 \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
& \propto \exp \left(- \frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_1^2 + \theta_1 (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 + \lambda \theta_4 + 3\lambda \theta_2 - 3\lambda \theta_3) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same arguments as before, we note that $g(\theta_1) = \exp \left(- \frac{\lambda}{2} \theta_1^2 + \theta_1 (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 + \lambda \theta_4 + 3\lambda \theta_2 - 3\lambda \theta_3) \right)$ is the exponential of a quadratic form in θ_1 which corresponds to the kernel of a Gaussian density. After identical derivations as for the case with $r = 2$, we recover:

$$p(\theta_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_1; \mu_{\theta_1} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda)}{\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_1}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),$$

where we defined $f_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-1}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^1 + \lambda \theta_4 + 3\lambda \theta_2 - 3\lambda \theta_3)$.

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_2 with $r = 3$

Based on the joint posterior (14), the conditional posterior distribution of θ_2 is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) & \propto \exp \left(\theta_2 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} (10\theta_2^2 + 12\theta_2 \theta_4 - 2\theta_2 \theta_5 - 6\theta_1 \theta_2 - 24\theta_2 \theta_3) \right) \\
& \propto \exp (\theta_2 \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 5\lambda \theta_2^2 - 6\lambda \theta_2 \theta_4 + \lambda \theta_2 \theta_5 + 3\lambda \theta_1 \theta_2 + 12\lambda \theta_2 \theta_3) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
& \propto \exp (-5\lambda \theta_2^2 + \theta_2 (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 6\lambda \theta_4 + \lambda \theta_5 + 3\lambda \theta_1 + 12\lambda \theta_3)) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
& \propto \exp (-5\lambda \theta_2^2 + \theta_2 f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda)) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we defined $f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 6\lambda\theta_4 + \lambda\theta_5 + 3\lambda\theta_1 + 12\lambda\theta_3)$. It follows that:

$$p(\theta_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_2; \mu_{\theta_2} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-2}, \lambda)}{10\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_2}^2 = \frac{1}{10\lambda}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right).$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_3 with $r = 3$

Based on the joint posterior (14), the conditional posterior distribution of θ_3 is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta_3|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-3}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp\left(\theta_3\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^3 - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2}(19\theta_3^2 - 30\theta_3\theta_4 + 12\theta_3\theta_5 - 2\theta_3\theta_6 + 6\theta_1\theta_3 - 24\theta_2\theta_3)\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{19}{2}\lambda\theta_3^2 + \theta_3(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^3 + 15\lambda\theta_4 - 6\lambda\theta_5 + \lambda\theta_6 - 3\lambda\theta_1 + 12\lambda\theta_2)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{19}{2}\lambda\theta_3^2 + \theta_3 f_{\mathcal{D}}^3(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-3}, \lambda)\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we defined $f_{\mathcal{D}}^3(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-3}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^3 + 15\lambda\theta_4 - 6\lambda\theta_5 + \lambda\theta_6 - 3\lambda\theta_1 + 12\lambda\theta_2)$. It follows that:

$$p(\theta_3|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-3}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G\left(\theta_3; \mu_{\theta_3} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^3(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-3}, \lambda)}{19\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_3}^2 = \frac{1}{19\lambda}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))\right).$$

Conditional posterior distribution of θ_k , $k = 4, \dots, K-3$ with $r = 3$

For index $k \in \{4, \dots, K-3\}$ the conditional posterior distribution of θ_k (when $r = 3$) has a generic formula for $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)$. To show this, we first need to decompose several terms in (14) and isolate θ_k . The decompositions below are valid for any $k \in \{4, \dots, K\}$:

$$\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} = \theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k < K) + \left(\sum_{j=4}^{k-1} \theta_j \theta_{j-1}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 < k \leq K) + \left(\sum_{j=k+2}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2), \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Also, note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} &= \theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-2}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-1) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{j=k+3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2}\right) \mathbb{I}(k = K). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3} &= \theta_k \theta_{k-3} + (\theta_{k+3} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+2} \theta_j \theta_{j-3}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{j=k+4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3}\right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-4) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-3}\right) \mathbb{I}(k = K-1) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3}\right) \mathbb{I}(k = K). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Moreover, for the sums involving quadratic terms in (14), we have:

$$\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_j^2 = \theta_k^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j^2, \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-1}^2 = \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-1) + \theta_3^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{K-1} \theta_j^2, \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-2}^2 = \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \theta_2^2 + \theta_3^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{K-2} \theta_j^2, \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{j=4}^K \theta_{j-3}^2 = \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) + \theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 + \theta_3^2 + \sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{K-3} \theta_j^2. \quad (21)$$

Using (15-21), the conditional posterior of θ_k for $k \in \{4, \dots, K\}$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp\left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ \theta_k^2 + 9\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-1) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 9\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - 30 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k < K) + \left(\sum_{j=4}^{k-1} \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 < k \leq K) + \left(\sum_{j=k+2}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-1} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 12 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-1) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(\sum_{j=k+3}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-2} \right) \mathbb{I}(k=K) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-3} + (\theta_{k+3} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+2} \theta_j \theta_{j-3} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) + \left(\sum_{j=k+4}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3} \right) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-4) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^{k+1} \theta_j \theta_{j-3} \right) \mathbb{I}(k=K-1) + \left(\sum_{\substack{j=4 \\ j \neq k}}^K \theta_j \theta_{j-3} \right) \mathbb{I}(k=K) \right) + 24\theta_K \theta_{K-1} + 6\theta_{K-1} \theta_{K-2} - 6\theta_K \theta_{K-2} \right\}. \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

The conditional posterior (22) can be further simplified by noting that all the terms involving summations except $\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i))$ do not involve θ_k when $k \in \{4, \dots, K\}$. We thus have:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ \theta_k^2 + 9\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-1) + 9\theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \theta_k^2 \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) - 30 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + (\theta_{k+1} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k < K) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 12 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + (\theta_{k+2} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-2) \right) - 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-3} + (\theta_{k+3} \theta_k) \mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K-3) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 24\theta_K \theta_{K-1} + 6\theta_{K-1} \theta_{K-2} - 6\theta_K \theta_{K-2} \right\} \right). \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

As all indicators functions in (23) are all equal to one when $k \in \{4, \dots, K-3\}$, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) &\propto \exp \left(\theta_k \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\theta_k^2 + 9\theta_k^2 + 9\theta_k^2 + \theta_k^2 - 30 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1} \theta_k \right) + 12 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2} \theta_k \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 2 \left(\theta_k \theta_{k-3} + \theta_{k+3} \theta_k \right) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(- 10\lambda \theta_k^2 + \theta_k \left(\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 15\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 6\lambda(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) + \lambda(\theta_{k-3} + \theta_{k+3}) \right) \right) \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \\
&\propto \exp \left(- 10\lambda \theta_k^2 + \theta_k f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \{4, \dots, K-3\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 15\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 6\lambda(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) + \lambda(\theta_{k-3} + \theta_{k+3}))$. Hence, for $k \in \{4, \dots, K-3\}$ the (univariate) conditional posterior of θ_k is given by:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mu_{\theta_k} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{20\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_k}^2 = \frac{1}{20\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right).$$

Based on (23), we can easily find the conditional posteriors for θ_k when $k \in \{K-2, K-1, K\}$. For $k = K-2$, we obtain:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mu_{\theta_k} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{19\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_k}^2 = \frac{1}{19\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),$$

with $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 15\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 6\lambda(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) - 3\lambda\theta_{k+1} + 3\lambda\theta_{k+2})$. For $k = K-1$, we get:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mu_{\theta_k} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{10\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_k}^2 = \frac{1}{10\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),$$

with $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + 15\lambda(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 12\lambda\theta_{k+1} - 3\lambda\theta_{k-1})$. Finally, for $k = K$, we get:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G \left(\theta_k; \mu_{\theta_k} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\lambda}, \sigma_{\theta_k}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(x_i)) \right),$$

with $f_{\mathcal{D}}^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) := (\psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k - 12\lambda\theta_{k-1} + 3\lambda\theta_{k-2})$.

Summary for $r = 3$

A compact summary of the univariate conditional posteriors for the B-spline coefficients with a third-order penalty $r = 3$ can be obtained by defining the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{k,3}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) &:= \psi_{\mathcal{D}}^k + \lambda \left((\theta_{k+3} + 3\theta_{k+1} - 3\theta_{k+2})\mathbb{I}(k = 1) \right. \\ &\quad + (\theta_{k+3} - 6\theta_{k+2} + 3\theta_{k-1} + 12\theta_{k+1})\mathbb{I}(k = 2) \\ &\quad + (15\theta_{k+1} - 6\theta_{k+2} + \theta_{k+3} - 3\theta_{k-2} + 12\theta_{k-1})\mathbb{I}(k = 3) \\ &\quad + (15(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 6(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) + (\theta_{k-3} + \theta_{k+3}))\mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K - 3) \\ &\quad + (15(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 6(\theta_{k-2} + \theta_{k+2}) - 3\theta_{k+1} + 3\theta_{k+2})\mathbb{I}(k = K - 2) \\ &\quad \left. + (15(\theta_{k-1} + \theta_{k+1}) - 12\theta_{k+1} - 3\theta_{k-1})\mathbb{I}(k = K - 1) + (3\theta_{k-2} - 12\theta_{k-1})\mathbb{I}(k = K) \right), \\ \mathcal{I}_{k,3}(\lambda) &:= \lambda \left(\mathbb{I}(k \in \{1, K\}) + 10\mathbb{I}(k \in \{2, K - 1\}) + 19\mathbb{I}(k \in \{3, K - 2\}) + 20\mathbb{I}(4 \leq k \leq K - 3) \right), \\ h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &:= \exp \left(\sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \neq k}}^K \theta_{k'} b_{k'}(x_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The conditional posterior distributions of the B-spline coefficients with a third-order penalty $r = 3$ are written compactly as:

$$p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda, \mathcal{D}) \propto p_G(\theta_k; \mathcal{S}_{k,3}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \mathcal{I}_{k,3}^{-1}(\lambda), \mathcal{I}_{k,3}^{-1}(\lambda)) \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \right) \quad k = 1, \dots, K \quad \square$$

Appendix A2: Proof of Theorem 3.2

We use basic properties of real-valued functions to show that the log conditional posterior distribution of the k th B-spline coefficient $\varphi_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (seen as a function of θ_k) has a unique mode (maximum). The function of interest is given by:

$$\varphi_k(\theta_k) \doteq - \frac{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)}{2} \theta_k^2 + \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \theta_k - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}),$$

where \doteq denotes equality up to an additive constant. Since φ_k is assumed to be twice differentiable, the following derivatives exist:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k'(\theta_k) &= -\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda) \theta_k + \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) b_k(x_i) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}), \\ \varphi_k''(\theta_k) &= - \left(\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_k b_k(x_i)) b_k^2(x_i) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the function involving the penalty parameter is strictly positive $\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda) > 0$ and that the terms involved in the summation are non-negative since $b_k(x_i) \geq 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and all $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $\varphi_k''(\theta_k) < 0$ for all $\theta_k \in \mathbb{R}$, a sufficient condition for strict concavity of φ_k . Said differently, $p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)$ is a strictly log-concave function of θ_k and therefore admits a unique mode (maximum) denoted by $\theta_k^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_k \in \mathbb{R}} p(\theta_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) \quad \square$

Appendix A3: Proof of Theorem 3.3

We start with $\varphi'_k(0) < 0$. Since φ_k is a strictly concave function in \mathbb{R} (see Theorem 3.2), the first derivative φ'_k is a strictly decreasing function in \mathbb{R} . Thus, when $\varphi'_k(0) = \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) < 0$, the critical point θ_k^* (satisfying $\varphi'_k(\theta_k^*) = 0$) must lie in $(-\infty, 0)$. Finding a finite lower bound for θ_k^* is equivalent to find a $\tilde{\theta}_k \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_k(\tilde{\theta}_k) &= -\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)\tilde{\theta}_k + \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) > 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\theta}_k &< \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}). \end{aligned}$$

As $\tilde{\theta}_k$ must lie in $(-\infty, 0)$, it follows that $\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i) \leq 0$ as $b_k(x_i) \geq 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and all $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and so $\exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i)) \leq 1$ for all $\tilde{\theta}_k \in (-\infty, 0)$. This permits to write the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda) \left(\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \right) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing a $\tilde{\theta}_k$ satisfying $\tilde{\theta}_k < \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0)$ implies that $\tilde{\theta}_k < \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k})$, and so any $\tilde{\theta}_k$ satisfying $\tilde{\theta}_k < \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0)$ also satisfies $\varphi'_k(\tilde{\theta}_k) > 0$. One particular such point is thus $\tilde{\theta}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0) - \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. As such, the critical point belongs to the (strictly) negative half-open interval $\kappa_- = [\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)^{-1}\varphi'_k(0) - \varepsilon, 0)$.

Let us now consider the case with $\varphi'_k(0) > 0$. Again, because φ'_k is a strictly decreasing function in \mathbb{R} , when $\varphi'_k(0) > 0$, the critical point θ_k^* must lie in $(0, +\infty)$. Finding a finite upper bound is equivalent to find a $\tilde{\theta}_k \in (0, +\infty)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_k(\tilde{\theta}_k) &= -\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)\tilde{\theta}_k + \mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) < 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\theta}_k &> \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\theta}_k$ must lie in $(0, +\infty)$, it follows that $\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i) \geq 0$ as $b_k(x_i) \geq 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and all $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and so $\exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i)) \geq 1$ for all $\tilde{\theta}_k \in (0, +\infty)$. We can thus write:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &\leq \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda) \left(\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^n b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) \right) \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{S}_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}, \lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i))b_k(x_i)h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k}) &\leq \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing a $\tilde{\theta}_k$ satisfying $\tilde{\theta}_k > \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0)$ implies that $\tilde{\theta}_k > \frac{S_{k,r}^{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k},\lambda)}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\theta}_k b_k(x_i)) b_k(x_i) h_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-k})$, and so any $\tilde{\theta}_k$ satisfying $\tilde{\theta}_k > \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0)$ also satisfies $\varphi'_k(\tilde{\theta}_k) < 0$. One particular such point is $\tilde{\theta}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k,r}^{-1}(\lambda)\varphi'_k(0) + \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. As such, the critical point belongs to the (strictly) positive half-open interval $\kappa_+ = (0, \mathcal{I}_{k,r}(\lambda)^{-1}\varphi'_k(0) + \varepsilon]$ \square

Appendix A4: Formulas for Bias, ESE and RMSE

Let $g(x)$ denote the target function with $x \in \mathcal{B}$. The bias, empirical standard error (ESE) and root mean square error (RMSE) of the estimator $\hat{g}(x)$ obtained with GGSBPS based on S samples are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bias}(\hat{g}(x)) &:= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left(\hat{g}^{(s)}(x) - g(x) \right), \\ \text{ESE}(\hat{g}(x)) &:= \sqrt{\frac{1}{S-1} \sum_{s=1}^S \left(\hat{g}^{(s)}(x) - \bar{\hat{g}}(x) \right)^2}, \\ \text{RMSE}(\hat{g}(x)) &:= \sqrt{\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left(\hat{g}^{(s)}(x) - g(x) \right)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{g}^{(s)}(x)$ is the estimate of g at x at iteration s and $\bar{\hat{g}}(x) = S^{-1} \sum_{s=1}^S \hat{g}^{(s)}(x)$.