

Parallelizing MCMC with Machine Learning Classifier and Its Criterion Based on Kullback–Leibler Divergence

Tomoki Matsumoto *

Yuichiro Kanazawa †

June 18, 2024

Abstract

In the era of Big Data, analyzing high-dimensional and large datasets presents significant computational challenges. Although Bayesian statistics is well-suited for these complex data structures, Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, which are essential for Bayesian estimation, suffers from computation cost because of its sequential nature. For faster and more effective computation, this paper introduces an algorithm to enhance a parallelizing MCMC method to handle this computation problem. We highlight the critical role of the overlapped area of posterior distributions after data partitioning, and propose a method using a machine learning classifier to effectively identify and extract MCMC draws from the area to approximate the actual posterior distribution. Our main contribution is the development of a Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence-based criterion that simplifies hyperparameter tuning in training a classifier and makes the method nearly hyperparameter-free. Simulation studies validate the efficacy of our proposed methods.

*Corresponding author: T.Matsumoto, Dr. of Engineering, Assistant Professor (Specially Appointed), School of Economics, University of Toyama, 3190 Gofuku, Toyama City, Toyama, 930-8555, Japan, E-mail: t.matsumoto514@gmail.com, 16-digit ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5680-7431

†Y.Kanazawa, Ph.D. in Statistics, Professor, Public Policy and Social Research, Graduate School, International Christian University, 3-10-2 Osawa, Mitaka, Tokyo, 181-8585, Japan, Visiting Professor, the Center for Digital Green-innovation, Nara Institute of Science and Technology, 8916-5 Takayamacho, Ikoma City, Nara, 630-0192, Japan, E-mail: yukanazawa@icu.ac.jp, 16-digit ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3655-733X

1 Introduction

Advancements in information technology have enabled the collection of high-dimensional and voluminous “Big Data” across various fields such as finance, healthcare, and social media. Bayesian statistics, known for handling uncertainty and flexible model building, is well-suited for these complex data structures. However, Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, often used in Bayesian estimation and crucial for generating random variables from specified posterior distributions, face significant challenges when applied to large datasets due to their inherently sequential nature, often resulting in prolonged computational times.

Some strategies for faster MCMC have been proposed to address this problem through parallel computing. However, naive parallelization algorithms incur high communication costs between machines, undermining efficiency (Scott et al. (2016)). Similarly, the methods by Nishihara et al. (2014) also suffer from considerable inter-machine communication, creating bottlenecks. Stochastic gradient MCMC methods also require communication between machines (detailed in Winter et al. (2023)).

To overcome these machine communication issues, Scott et al. (2016), Neiswanger et al. (2014), and Wang and Dunson (2014) have demonstrated effective parallelization with minimal communication under the independent product equation (IPE) condition, detailed in subsection 2. Their approach allows dividing data into batches processed independently across different processors or machines and implementing MCMC independently for each processor, without the need for communication until the final combining of multiple results from each processor. It facilitates “one-shot learning” as referred to by Winter et al. (2023). Thus, the main interest is how the multiple results should be combined to achieve one-shot parallelizing MCMC.

Several methods have been developed under the IPE to achieve one-shot parallelizing MCMC. Scott et al. (2016) introduced Consensus Monte Carlo (CMC), combining sub-posterior draws by weighted averaging, assuming normal distribution approximations based on the Bernstein–von Mises theorem (van der Vaart (1998)). Neiswanger et al. (2014) proposed an embarrassingly parallel MCMC method using kernel density estimation for posterior approximation. Wang and Dunson (2014) introduced the Weierstrass rejection sampler, employing the Weierstrass transform to approximate posterior distribution and the Gibbs sampler to sample from the approximated distribution for result aggregation. These approaches require careful kernel bandwidth selection. Nemeth and Sherlock (2018) generalized CMC by modeling log sub-posterior density with a Gaussian process, necessitating ad-hoc adjustments for the mean function and kernel for the covariance matrix. These methods generally suffer from hyperparameter-tuning challenges.

This paper proposes a parallelizing MCMC method using classification models from the machine learning field. We emphasize the importance of the overlapped area of sub-posteriors, which we call the reconstructable area, in combining results from each MCMC. To specify the reconstructable area, our method utilizes machine learning classifiers, especially random forests, known for their effectiveness in handling high-dimensional data (Breiman (2001)), to combine sub-posterior draws, offering a practical approach to parallelizing MCMC under the one-shot learning framework.

The most significant contribution in this paper is the development of a criterion based on Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence for selecting machine learning classifiers for implementing parallelizing MCMC. This criterion simplifies hyperparameter-tuning in training classifiers and effectively makes the proposed parallelizing MCMC method hyperparameter-free. To validate our method, we conducted two simulation studies: the first simulation in a multivariate posterior case demonstrated that our KL-based criterion correlates well with the value of KL between true posterior and approximated posterior distributions; the second simulation also showed that the proposed method could combine sub-posteriors well, even if the posterior distribution has multimode.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The next subsection explains the IPE condition, which is essential for parallelizing MCMC methods with minimal communication. Section 2 describes the proposed parallelizing MCMC method, including the reconstructable area, extracting posterior samples with machine learning classifiers, and the KL-based criterion for classifier selection. Section 3 presents simulation studies validating the proposed method. Finally, Section 4 concludes the paper with a discussion of drawbacks.

1.1 Parallelizing MCMC under the independent product equation

For later discussion, we need to explain what parallelizing MCMC means in terms of avoiding high communication costs. By parallelizing MCMC, communications between the master node and each processor or machine can be kept minimal, and almost all procedures can be independently performed within each processor. The basic idea of minimum communication, that is, one-shot parallelizing MCMC, is to divide data into m mutually independent subset data and draw MCMC samples from each processor.

Let us define a set of new notations for a parametric model $\pi(X|\theta)$. Let X be $n \times l$ data matrix, and θ be d dimensional parameter vector for the model $\pi(X|\theta)$. Let also

us divide X into m row-wise sub-matrices X_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, where X_i is $n_i \times l$ sub-data matrix and $\sum_{i=1}^m n_i = n$. We assume that m sub-datasets X_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, are independent¹ (conditional on parameter θ). Now, we define $\pi(\theta)$ as the prior distribution for the full-dataset X and $\pi_i(\theta)$ as the prior distribution for the subset X_i .

The posterior distribution $\pi(\theta|X)$ for the full-dataset X can be expressed by the posterior distributions $\pi(\theta|X_i)$ for each subset X_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta|X) &\propto \pi(X|\theta)\pi(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^m \pi(X_i|\theta) \cdot \pi(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{\pi(\theta|X_i)\pi(X_i)}{\pi_i(\theta)} \cdot \pi(\theta) \\ &\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \pi(\theta|X_i) \right\} \left\{ \frac{\pi(\theta)}{\prod_{i=1}^m \pi_i(\theta)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Now, when we further require $\pi(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^m p_i(\theta)$, equation (1) above becomes

$$\pi(\theta|X) \propto \prod_{i=1}^m \pi(\theta|X_i). \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) means that under the independence assumption of the data partition and a little prior modification, the posterior density $\pi(\theta|X)$ of the full-data can be represented by the product of sub-posterior distributions $\pi(\theta|X_i)$ if the subsets together form a partition of the original set, and this should make the computation of the posterior much faster. Wang and Dunson (2014) calls equation (2) above the independent product equation (IPE). Parallelizing MCMC is the name given to the collection of several methods combining posterior draws based on the subsets to manufacture draws based on the full-dataset, taking advantage of structures like (2). After constructing sub-posterior distributions under the IPE, we sample MCMC draws from each sub-posterior and combine them.

2 Machine learning classifier based method and Kullback-Leiber based criterion

This section proposes a method combining multiple sets of MCMC draws from sub-posterior distributions via a machine learning classifier. We explain that the area where multiple MCMC draws from $\pi(\theta|X_i)$, $i = 1 \dots, m$, overlap is the only support needed in reconstructing the full-posterior. We then show how to identify such support.

¹We can also assume, more strongly, that rows of X are independent.

2.1 Strategy of combining posterior draws

The Weierstrass transform is a convolution of a normal distribution with bandwidth h to a probability distribution. Thus, as $h \rightarrow 0$, the Weierstrass transform recovers the original distribution. By reinterpreting Wang and Dunson (2014), this subsection shows that the overlapped area of the sub-posterior distributions plays an important role in our parallelizing MCMC method by exploring how the full-posterior distribution is recovered when the Weierstrass transform is adopted to the sub-posterior and bandwidth parameters move to 0 under the IPE.

Under the IPE, d dimensional full-posterior can be approximated via the (multi-variate) Weierstrass transform with a common bandwidth h used for all dimensions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi(\theta|X) &= \prod_{i=1}^m \pi(\theta|X_i) \approx \prod_{i=1}^m W_h \pi(\theta|X_i) \\
 &= \prod_{i=1}^m \int \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} |h^2 I|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\theta - r_i)^\top (\theta - r_i)}{2h^2} \right\} \pi(r_1|X_1) \cdots \pi(r_m|X_m) dr \\
 &\propto \int \exp \left\{ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (\theta - r_i)^\top (\theta - r_i)}{2h^2} \right\} \pi(r_1|X_1) \cdots \pi(r_m|X_m) dr, \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

where I is $d \times d$ identity matrix. For the inside of the braces in (3), we can calculate further as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^m (\theta - r_i)^\top (\theta - r_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^m (\theta^\top \theta - \theta^\top r_i - r_i^\top \theta + r_i^\top r_i) \\
 &= m \left(\theta^\top \theta - \theta^\top \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m r_i - \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m r_i^\top \right) \theta + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m r_i^\top r_i \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{R} = 1/m \sum_{i=1}^m r_i$, and $\bar{R}^2 = 1/m \sum_{i=1}^m r_i^\top r_i$, then the expression above is rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (\theta - r_i)^\top (\theta - r_i) = m (\theta - \bar{R})^\top (\theta - \bar{R}) + m (\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R}). \tag{4}$$

Hence, with C_1 and C_2 being normalizing constants, equation (3) along with (4) can

be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& W_h \pi(\theta|X) \\
= & C_1^{-1} \int \exp \left\{ -\frac{m(\theta - \bar{R})^\top (\theta - \bar{R}) + m(\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R})}{2h^2} \right\} \cdot \pi(r_1|X_1) \cdots \pi(r_m|X_m) dr \\
= & C_1^{-1} \int \exp \left\{ -\frac{m(\theta - \bar{R})^\top (\theta - \bar{R})}{2h^2} \right\} \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{m(\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R})}{2h^2} \right\} \cdot \pi(r_1|X_1) \cdots \pi(r_m|X_m) dr \\
= & C_2^{-1} \int \mathcal{N} \left(\theta \middle| \bar{R}, \frac{h^2}{m} I \right) \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{m(\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R})}{2h^2} \right\} \cdot \pi(r_1|X_1) \cdots \pi(r_m|X_m) dr. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

The normalizing constant C_2 can be calculated as

$$C_2 = E^{\pi(r|X)} \left[\exp \left\{ -\frac{m(\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R})}{2h^2} \right\} \right], \tag{6}$$

where $E^{\pi(r|X)}[\cdot]$ expresses an expectation of an expression within a bracket under the full-posterior distribution and with the IPE.

It is well known that $W_h \pi(\theta|X)$ converges to $\pi(\theta|X)$ pointwise as $h \rightarrow 0$. In the braces within the exponential of (6), however, when $\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R} > 0$, then $\exp \left\{ -m(\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R})/(2h^2) \right\} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. This means that, since the normalizing constant C_2 cannot zero, we need to look into the area where $\bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R} = 0$. With an additional assumption of interchangeability between integration and taking a limit, this means that the supports of integration with respect to r in (6) can be reduced considerably to $\mathcal{E} = \{(r_1, \dots, r_m) | \bar{R}^2 - \bar{R}^\top \bar{R} = 0\}$, or within the area \mathcal{E} , the Weierstrass transform is valid. Thus, to the extent the Weierstrass transform is applicable and integration and taking limit can be interchanged, we only need to worry about the set \mathcal{E} when we reconstruct the full-posterior from the posterior based on $X_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ and we call this area “reconstructible area.”²

2.2 Definition of reconstructable area on posterior samples

As described in the previous subsection, the posterior distribution based on a full-dataset X can be part of what overlaps all posterior distributions based on X_i . Hence, our task to complete parallelizing MCMC is constructing the distribution on the reconstructible area from posterior draws based on X_i .

²The same discussion applies to (5).

Suppose we have N MCMC draws $\theta_i^{(t)}$, $t = 1, \dots, N$, from $p(\theta|X_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta^\top &= (\theta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \theta_1^{(N)}, \dots, \theta_m^{(1)}, \dots, \theta_m^{(N)}) \\ &= (\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_N^*, \dots, \theta_k^*, \dots, \theta_{(m-1)N}^*, \dots, \theta_{mN}^*),\end{aligned}$$

hence Θ is $mN \times d$ matrix. We re-index the column vector inside $mN \times d$ matrix above so that its k -th column vector is now indexed by k so that $k = 1, \dots, N, N + 1, \dots, 2N, \dots, (m - 1)N, (m - 1)N + 1, \dots, mN$.

We expect to determine if θ_k^* belongs to the “reconstructible area” or not: if θ_k^* could have belonged equally to any one of $i = 1, \dots, m$ sub-processes, then we are able to say that θ_k^* belongs to the “reconstructible area.” Our basic idea to construct the distribution above is based on the following assumption: if we can calculate the probability that θ_k^* could have come from any one of m processes with probability is $1/m$, then we regard θ_k^* with the draw from the reconstructible area.

2.3 Probability calculation by random forest

Although there are a lot of other candidate methods, we use random forest (Breiman (2001)) to calculate the probability $\Pr(z = i|\theta_k^*)$. Random forest is one of the ensemble learning of decision trees. Roughly speaking, a decision tree can be learned by splitting the feature values. Random forest also can output classification probability $p(z = i|\theta_k^*)$.

The attractive point of random forests is that they are an ensemble of decision trees that can inherently partition the parameter space effectively. This characteristic makes them particularly well-suited for identifying regions within the sub-posterior distributions where overlaps occur, which are essential for accurately reconstructing the full-posterior distribution. Furthermore, the ability of random forest to handle high-dimensional data relatively easily makes them suitable for this task. Its non-parametric nature allows it to adapt seamlessly to the complexity and intricacies of sub-posterior landscapes, which are often non-linear and multi-modal. Actually, Wang et al. (2015) used random partition trees, which is similar to random forest, and showed these efficiencies. As a result, our method identifies the reconstructible area among sub-posterior distributions and preserves the nuances of these distributions, facilitating a more accurate reconstruction of the full-posterior distribution.

2.4 Posterior approximation and KL-based criterion

We already explain that the probability calculation of belonging to the reconstructable area can be calculated by machine learning classifiers, especially, random forest. However, training a classifier model requires some parameter tuning. We use random forests for parallelizing MCMC not for simple classification tasks; thus, an optimization criterion is needed for parallelizing MCMC. In this subsection, we introduce a method to extract the reconstructable area using the proposed probability calculation and approximate the full-posterior distribution. We also propose an optimization criterion for training random forest: an upper bound of Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL) between full-posterior and approximated posterior distributions only using the probabilities from a classifier $\Pr(z_k = i|\theta_k^*)$ and sub-posterior density values. In almost all MCMC methods, like the Metropolis-Hastings and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods, sub-posterior density values are already obtained after each MCMC is completed.

We assume Q and P are categorical distributions with category size m , respectively. From the information geometry and the theory of large deviation (Amari (2016)), the probability that P is equal to Q is given by

$$\Pr(P = Q) = \exp(-\text{KL}(Q||P)),$$

where KL means Kullback–Leibler divergence between Q and P . Now, for $j = 1, \dots, m$, we define $Q(z = j) = 1/m$, which means the baseline probability distribution for searching the reconstructable area. We also define $P_i^{(t)}(z = j) = \Pr(z = j|\theta_i^{(t)})$. Then, the probability above given a posterior sample $\theta_i^{(t)}$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, is

$$\Pr(P_i^{(t)} = Q) = \exp\left(\log m + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \log \Pr(z = j|\theta_i^{(t)})\right).$$

This probability can be interpreted as follows: the closer $\Pr(P_i^{(t)} = Q)$ is to 1, the more probable $\theta_i^{(t)}$ is a sample from the reconstructable area, and vice versa because $P_i^{(t)}(z = j)$ would close to $1/m$ in that case. By normalizing the probability for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $t = 1, \dots, N$, we obtain a discrete distribution with the probability of $\theta_i^{(t)}$ occurring give by

$$f(\theta = \theta_i^{(t)}) = \frac{\Pr(P_i^{(t)} = Q)}{\sum_{i'} \sum_{t'} \Pr(P_{i'}^{(t')} = Q)} = \frac{\Pr(P_i^{(t)} = Q)}{C_f}, \quad (7)$$

where $C_f = \sum_{i'} \sum_{t'} \Pr \left(P_{i'}^{(t')} = Q \right)$. We assume that the distribution approximates the full-posterior distribution $\pi(\theta|X)$.

In general, when we implement MCMC methods (in parallel), we calculate the value of density $\pi(\theta_i^{(t)}|X_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$, thus we can use them after implementing each MCMC process. Let f_π be the discrete full-posterior distribution as

$$f_\pi \left(\theta_i^{(t)} \right) = \frac{\pi \left(\theta_i^{(t)} | X \right)}{C_\pi},$$

where $C_\pi = \sum_{i'} \sum_{t'} \pi \left(\theta_{i'}^{(t')} | X \right)$. Let also $C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}} = \sum_{i'} \sum_{t'} \pi \left(\theta_{i'}^{(t')} | X_{i'} \right)$. With these values, we can evaluate the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $f_\pi(\theta)$ and $f(\theta)$.

Theorem 2.1. A constant H , which is unrelated to a classifier model $\Pr(z|\theta)$, exists and $\text{KL}(f_\pi||f)$ is bounded as

$$\frac{1}{H} \text{KL}(f_\pi||f) \leq \log \frac{C_f}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi \left(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i \right)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \sum_{j=1}^m \log \Pr \left(z = j | \theta_i^{(t)} \right).$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Remark 2.2. The constant H is not related to the model $\Pr(z|\theta_k^*)$, therefore in the comparison of different approximated posteriors f and f' , we can just use the right-hand side of the Theorem 2.1 without considering the difference of models $\Pr(z|\theta_i^{(t)})$.

Remark 2.3. The upper bound of KL in Theorem 2.1 requires sub-posterior density values but needs no calculation of full-posterior density values. Generally, we have already obtained sub-posterior density values after implementing MCMC for each batch of data. Thus, we can use the upper bound of KL without additional calculation of posterior density values.

As a summary of this section, we propose a parallelizing MCMC algorithm, and the following Algorithm 1 shows the details.

3 Simulation

This section evaluates the proposed parallelizing MCMC method using simulated datasets. First, we implement a multivariate normal distribution case where a posterior distribution is multivariate normal. Second, we simulate a mixed normal distribution case with a multimodal posterior. We use the `{ranger}` package (Wright and Ziegler (2017)) in R programming language to train random forests.

Algorithm 1 Parallelizing MCMC algorithm based on machine learning classifier with the upper bound of KL

```

1: procedure MACHINELEARNINGPARALLELIZINGMCMC( $X$ , params)
2:   Divide data  $X$  into sub-data  $X_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ 
3:   for  $i = 1$  to  $m$  do
4:      $\theta_i, \pi(\theta|X_i) \leftarrow \text{MCMC}(X_i)$ 
5:     Store  $i, \theta_i, \pi(\theta|X_i)$ 
6:   end for
7:   Initialize collection arrays  $z = [], \Theta = [], p = []$ 
8:   for  $i = 1$  to  $m$  do
9:     Append  $i$  to  $z$ 
10:    Append  $\theta_i$  to  $\Theta$ 
11:    Append  $\pi(\theta|X_i)$  to  $p$ 
12:  end for
13:  Initialize collection arrays  $\text{Pr} = [], \text{UKL} = []$ 
14:  for  $j = 1$  to  $|\text{params}|$  do
15:    Append  $\text{CLASSIFIER}(\text{params}[j], z, \Theta)$  to  $\text{Pr}$ 
16:    Append  $\text{UPPERBOUNDKL}(p, \text{Pr}[j])$  to  $\text{UKL}$ 
17:  end for
18:   $k \leftarrow \text{argmin UKL}$ 
19:  Construct approximated posterior with (7),  $\text{Pr}[k]$ , and  $\theta_i$ 's.
20: end procedure

```

3.1 Multivariate normal distribution case

This subsection shows that the proposed upper bound of KL works through sampling from a multivariate normal posterior.

3.1.1 Simulation settings

In this case, we sample N data points from d dimensional multivariate normal described as

$$X \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$$

where μ (unknown) and Σ (known) represent the mean vector and covariance matrix of the distribution, respectively. This dataset is then divided into m subsets to implement the proposed parallelizing MCMC method. We set the prior distributions of the parameters to be uniform as

$$\pi(\mu) \propto \text{constant}. \quad (8)$$

After the data partitioning, we compute the full-posterior distribution using the undivided dataset and m sub-posterior distributions using the m divided subsets. Given m data partitioning $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m\}$ and the prior distributions, the full-posterior distribution is derived as follows:

$$\pi(\mu|X) \sim N(\mu_{\text{post}}, \Sigma_{\text{post}}),$$

where $\mu_{\text{post}} = \sum_{x \in X} x/N$ and $\Sigma_{\text{post}} = \Sigma/N$. The sub-posterior distributions for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ are also calculated as:

$$\pi(\mu|X_i) \sim N(\mu_{\text{post},i}, \Sigma_{\text{post},i}),$$

where N_i is the number of data in X_i , $\mu_{\text{post},i} = \sum_{x_i \in X_i} x_i/N_i$, and $\Sigma_{\text{post},i} = \Sigma/N_i$.

After implementing the proposed parallelizing MCMC method, we calculate the distance between the full-posterior and the approximated posterior by the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL) as true KL and the proposed upper bound of KL. Let $\theta_{\text{full}}^{(t)}$ and $\theta_{\text{approx}}^{(t)}$ be t -th full-posterior draw and approximated posterior draw by the proposed parallelizing MCMC method, respectively. Also let $\hat{\mu}_{\text{full}}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\text{approx}}$ be these posterior means and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{approx}}$ be these posterior covariance matrices. The KL between normal distributions can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\pi||f) = & \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{approx}}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}) + (\hat{\mu}_{\text{approx}} - \hat{\mu}_{\text{full}})^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{approx}}^{-1} (\hat{\mu}_{\text{approx}} - \hat{\mu}_{\text{full}}) \right. \\ & \left. - d + \log \frac{|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{approx}}|}{|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}|} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where π and f are the full- and approximated posterior distributions, respectively.

To implement this experiment, we set $m = 5$, $d = 10$, and $\mu = \mathbf{0}$, which is d dimensional zero vector. We also set that the (g, l) element of Σ is $0.8 \times |g - l|$. For checking the relationship between the true KL and the proposed upper bound of KL, we perform to train random forest 50 times following the hyperparameters and their candidate values:

- Friction: 0.8 to 0.999 in steps of 0.001. This parameter controls the subsampling fraction of the data used in each tree.
- Number of Trees: 10 to 100 in steps of 1. This parameter specifies the total number of trees to grow in the forest.
- Minimum Node Size: 5 to 50 in steps of 1. This parameter sets the minimum size of terminal nodes.
- `mtry`: 1 to the number of dimensions ($d = 10$ in this case) in steps of 1. This parameter determines the number of variables to grow a tree.
- Replacement Policy: TRUE or FALSE. This parameter specifies whether sampling of the data should be done with replacement.
- Weight Adjustment Method: TRUE or FALSE. This parameter indicates the method used to adjust the weights of the observations. We use weights based on the value of log sub-posterior density.

We randomly selected hyperparameters in each iteration from sets above, trained the model, and assessed the correlation between the true KL and the proposed upper bound of KL. When sampling from the approximated posterior, we implemented data augmentation. After training a random forest, we augmented the sub-posterior draws $\theta_i^{(t)}$'s by multiplying them by random numbers generated from $\text{Uniform}(1/3, 3)$ and subjected them to sampling from the approximated posterior to reduce duplication of samples in re-sampling.

3.1.2 Result

Figure 1 shows how the proposed upper bound of KL works. The proposed upper bound of KL well correlates with the true KL between the full-posterior and the proposed approximated posterior distribution. This means we can use the proposed KL criterion to select machine learning classifiers for calculating the probability of belonging to the reconstructable area.




Figure 1: Between true posterior and approximated posterior, the scatter plot of the proposed upper bound of KL and true KL.

3.2 Mixture normal case

This subsection shows that the proposed parallelizing MCMC method works through sampling from a mixture normal posterior with multi-modes.

3.2.1 Simulation settings

We adapted our methods and preceding methods to a mixture of normal distribution cases in which a posterior is multimodal. Assume that we get 10,000 data from

$$X \sim \frac{1}{4}N(-3, 1) + \frac{1}{2}N(0, 1) + \frac{1}{4}N(3, 1). \quad (10)$$

Now, let us call the components on the right-hand side in (10) the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd components from left to right. Suppose we also know that X is sampled from which component in (10). Let $L \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be the label that expresses from which component X is sampled. We eventually obtain 10,000 samples of $D = (X, L)$.

With obtained D 's, we equally divide D 's into 5 subsets, $D_i = (X_i, L_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$, then we construct sub-posterior distributions with three modes as follows:

$$\pi(\theta|D_i) = \frac{1}{4}N\left(\theta \left| \bar{X}_{i1}, \frac{1}{N_{i1}}\right.\right) + \frac{1}{2}N\left(\theta \left| \bar{X}_{i2}, \frac{1}{N_{i2}}\right.\right) + \frac{1}{4}N\left(\theta \left| \bar{X}_{i3}, \frac{1}{N_{i3}}\right.\right),$$




Figure 2: The density traces of the full-posterior and approximated posterior by the proposed parallelizing MCMC method.

where \bar{X}_{ic} , $c = 1, 2, 3$, is the mean of c -th component of X_i and N_{ic} is the number of data of c -th component in i -th data partition. Thus, suppose that the independent product equation is held, and the full-posterior can be written as

$$\pi(\theta|D) \propto \prod_{i=1}^5 \pi(\theta|D_i).$$

When implementing the proposed parallelizing MCMC method, we used random forests to calculate the probability of belonging to the reconstructable area and determine the hyperparameters through random search in the same way in subsection 3.1 to select the model with the minimum proposed upper bound of KL in the random search.

Result

It is difficult to measure the distance between the full-posterior and approximated posterior distributions in a multimodal case. Hence, we give only their density traces in Figure 2. As Figure 2 shows, the proposed method captures the modes very well.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we explained the importance of the reconstructable area, which is the area where the posterior distributions overlap after data partitioning in parallelizing MCMC. Specifically, the reconstructable area identifies the dispersed information due to data partitioning. We proposed a method for extracting samples from the reconstructable area using a classifier in machine learning, especially random forest, and an algorithm for parallelizing MCMC. We also proposed an upper bound of KL as a criterion for training classifiers. The upper bound of KL provides a quantifiable measure to assess the discrepancy between full-posterior and approximated posterior distributions. The criterion is attractive because it can be calculated using only information on sub-posterior MCMCs. This upper bound of KL helps us tune hyperparameters of machine learning models. Simulation studies confirmed that each of the proposed methods effectively worked.

We explain some drawbacks of the proposed method. First, efficient data augmentation methods are needed to explore posterior samples from the proposed method. Simply resampling samples from the sub-posterior distributions based on the proposed method result in many duplicate resamples, which may be difficult to use these samples in the analysis. To address this issue, we performed data augmentation by minor modifications to the samples from the sub-posterior distributions as described in subsection 3.1. However, for machine learning classifiers, this data augmentation can lead to partial extrapolation, especially affecting the tail of the approximated posterior distribution. The method in Wang and Dunson (2014) did not encounter this problem because the method obtained new approximate posterior samples through Gibbs sampling. Since we saw in subsection 3.2 that partitioning the parameter space by machine learning classifiers is useful, future proposed algorithms should include a theoretically consistent data augmentation mechanism.

Second, studies of parallelizing MCMC methods need to overcome the curse of dimensionality. This curse of dimensionality is a frequent problem in many areas of statistics and machine learning, and this parallelizing MCMC is no exception. As the model’s dimensionality increases, the posterior samples in the parameter space become sparsely distributed. This property makes it impossible to extract the reconstructable areas for high-dimensional models, which may require a reasonable iteration for each MCMC. In such a case, dividing data and performing MCMC may weaken the usefulness of parallelizing MCMC to reduce the overall computational costs. Addressing this issue is important for parallelizing MCMC to be practical.

A Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. Let $C'_\pi = \sum_{i'} \sum_{t'} \prod_j \pi(\theta_{i'}^{(t')} | X_j)$, and $C'_\pi = C_\pi$ because of the IPE. We can obtain a constant H such that

$$\max_{i,t} \left\{ \frac{\prod_j \pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_j)}{C'_\pi} \right\} \leq H \times \min_{i,t} \left\{ \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \right\},$$

because the number related to i and t is finite at most. Hence, note that $\log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) < 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i \sum_t \left\{ \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} - \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \right\} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_t \left\{ \frac{\prod_j \pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_j)}{C'_\pi} - \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \right\} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \\ &\geq (H - 1) \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$H \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \leq \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}). \quad (11)$$

By using (11), we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(f_\pi || f) &= \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} \log \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} - \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \\ &\leq - \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X)}{C_\pi} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \\ &\leq -H \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \log f(\theta_i^{(t)}) \\ &= H \left\{ \log \frac{C_f}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\pi(\theta_i^{(t)} | X_i)}{C_{\pi_{\text{sub}}}} \sum_{j=1}^m \log \Pr(z = j | \theta_i^{(t)}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

References

- Amari, S.-I. (2016). *Information Geometry and Its Applications*. Springer Japan <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-4-431-55978-8>.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>.
- Neiswanger, W., Wang, C., & Xing, E. P. (2014). Asymptotically exact, embarrassingly parallel MCMC. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence* <https://doi.org/10.5555/3020751.3020816>.
- Nemeth, C. & Sherlock, C. (2018). Merging MCMC Subposteriors through Gaussian-Process Approximations. *Bayesian Analysis*, 13(2), 507 – 530, <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-BA1063>.
- Nishihara, R., Murray, I., & Adams, R. P. (2014). Parallel MCMC with generalized elliptical slice sampling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, <https://doi.org/10.5555/2627435.2670318>.
- Scott, S. L., Blocker, A. W., Bonassi, F. V., Chipman, H. A., George, E. I., & McCulloch, R. E. (2016). Bayes and big data: the consensus Monte Carlo algorithm. *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management*, 11(2), 78–88, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17509653.2016.1142191>.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511802256>.
- Wang, X. & Dunson, D. B. (2014). Parallelizing MCMC via Weierstrass sampler. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1312.4605>.
- Wang, X., Guo, F., Heller, K. A., & Dunson, D. B. (2015). Parallelizing mcmc with random partition trees. In *Neural Information Processing Systems* <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7973300>.
- Winter, S., Campbell, T., Lin, L., Srivastava, S., & Dunson, D. B. (2023). Machine learning and the future of bayesian computation <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.11251>.
- Wright, M. N. & Ziegler, A. (2017). ranger: A fast implementation of random forests for high dimensional data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 77(1), 1–17, <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v077.i01>.