

# A Conservation Law for Posterior Predictive Variance

Dean Dustin<sup>1</sup>, Bertrand Clarke<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Charles Schwab Financial, Denver, CO e-mail: [ddustin8@huskers.unl.edu](mailto:ddustin8@huskers.unl.edu)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE, USA, 68583-0963 e-mail: [bclarke3@unl.edu](mailto:bclarke3@unl.edu)

**Abstract:** We use the law of total variance to generate multiple expressions for the posterior predictive variance in Bayesian hierarchical models. These expressions are sums of terms involving conditional expectations and conditional variances. Since the posterior predictive variance is fixed given the hierarchical model, it represents a constant quantity that is conserved over the various expressions for it. The terms in the expressions can be assessed in absolute or relative terms to understand the main contributors to the length of prediction intervals. Also, sometimes these terms can be interpreted in the context of the hierarchical model. We show several examples, closed form and computational, to illustrate the uses of this approach in model assessment.

**MSC2020 subject classifications:** Primary 62F15; secondary 62J10.

**Keywords and phrases:** prediction interval, posterior predictive variance, law of total variance, Bayes model averaging.

## 1. The Setting and Intuition

Consider a generic Bayesian hierarchical model for a response  $Y = y$  given  $V = V_K = (V_1, \dots, V_k, \dots, V_K)^T$  taking values  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_K)^T$  for some  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &\sim w(v_1) \\ V_2 &\sim w(v_2|v_1) \\ &\vdots \\ V_K &\sim w(v_K|v_1, \dots, v_{K-1}) \\ Y &\sim p(y|v), \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where the  $w$ 's represent prior densities for the  $V_k$ 's as indicated by their arguments and  $p(\cdot|v)$  is the likelihood. All densities are with respect to Lebesgue measure when the random variable is continuous. For discrete random variables we regard the density as being taken with respect to counting measure. We denote  $n$  outcomes of  $Y$  by  $Y^n = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^T$  with outcomes  $y^n = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ .

It is common practice to adopt an estimation perspective. That is, choose a parameter, here one of the  $V_k$ 's, and obtain credibility sets for it from the

posterior  $w(v_k|y^n)$ . If the credibility set for a given  $V_k$  is sufficiently small as determined by hypothesis testing, say, then it may make sense to drop the  $k$ -th level of the hierarchy. However, it is unclear in the abstract how to compare the length of a credibility set for one  $V_k$  to the length of a credibility set for  $V_{k'}$  for  $k \neq k'$ . Aside from asymptotics usually based on the Fisher information, there is no common scale on which the variances of different  $V_k$ 's can be compared. The reason is that the size of  $\text{Var}(V_k|y^n)$  is unrelated to the size of  $\text{Var}(V_{k'}|y^n)$ . Nothing necessarily ties the  $K$  marginal posteriors  $w(v_k|y^n)$  together with a common scale p[re-asymptotically. Indeed, when estimating a value of  $v_k$ , it is not in general clear how the sizes of other  $v_{k'}$ 's affect it.

An alternative analysis of hierarchical models follows from a predictive perspective. Instead of looking at posterior variances, we look at terms that sum to the posterior predictive variance and compare their relative importance. Without further discussion, we assume that posterior means and variances in general are the right quantities to study. This is true under squared error loss. However, other choices of loss function would yield different, but analogous, reasoning.

Given  $y^n$ , we assign the posterior predictive density to future values  $Y_{n+1}$ , that is

$$Y \sim p(y_{n+1}|y^n) = \int p(y_{n+1}|v)w(v|y^n)dv, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $w(v|y^n)$  is the posterior density and  $dv$  is summation or integration as appropriate. At this point the posterior predictive variance within the context of the model (1.1) is fixed. Denote it  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$ . When a random variable in the top  $K$  levels of the hierarchy is visible we say it is explicit. Otherwise we say it is implicit. Thus,  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$  depends implicitly on the top  $K$  levels of (1.1).

Recall the standard probability theory result called the Law of Total Variance (LTV). Generically, for random variables  $W$  and  $Z$  on the same probability space it is

$$\text{Var}(W) = E[\text{Var}(W|Z)] + \text{Var}[E(W|Z)]. \quad (1.3)$$

By reinterpreting (1.3) in the posterior context we have

$$\text{Var}(W|y^n) = \text{Var}_{W|y^n}(W|y^n) = E_{Z|y^n}[\text{Var}(W|Z, y^n)] + \text{Var}_{Z|y^n}[E(W|Z, y^n)], \quad (1.4)$$

assuming that  $W$  and  $Z$  are functions on the same probability space as used to write (1.1). In (1.4) the outer expectations on the right, usually suppressed, are indicated and both sides are functions of  $y^n$ .

The predictive approach takes  $W$  to be a future value  $Y_{n+1}$ , rather than any of the  $v_k$ 's. For generality, we will also take  $y^n$  to be the pre- $n + 1$  data, and hence condition on  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_n$ . In contrast to  $y^n$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  may include values of explanatory variables for each time step. Unless stated otherwise, we assume the data is independent from time step to time step. Now we have

$$\text{Var}_{Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}) = E_{Z|\mathcal{D}}[\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|Z, \mathcal{D})] + \text{Var}_{Z|\mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|Z, \mathcal{D})]. \quad (1.5)$$

Independent of the choice of  $Z$ , the left hand side of (1.5) is a constant depending only on the hierarchy (1.1) and  $\mathcal{D}$ . That is, (1.5) is a conservation law for the posterior predictive variance over choices of conditioning. We can choose  $Z$  to be any function of a subset of the entries of  $V$ . In particular, if  $Z = V_1$ , we get

$$\text{Var}_{Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}) = E_{V_1|\mathcal{D}}[\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D})] + \text{Var}_{V_1|\mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D})]. \quad (1.6)$$

More is true. The LTV can be applied iteratively to the terms in (1.5). It is seen that  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|Z, \mathcal{D})$ , the first term on the right in (1.5), is of the same form as the left hand side of (1.5) – simply replace  $\mathcal{D}$  by  $(Z, \mathcal{D})$ . If we take  $Z = V_1$ , condition on  $V_1 = v_1$ , and use another instance of the LTV, this time with  $Z = V_2$ , we get

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|v_1, \mathcal{D}) = E_{V_2|v_1, \mathcal{D}}[\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})] + \text{Var}_{V_2|v_1, \mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})]. \quad (1.7)$$

Using (1.7) in (1.5) we get, with some simplification of notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}) &= E_{V_1|\mathcal{D}}E_{V_2|V_1, \mathcal{D}}[\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})] \\ &\quad + E_{V_1|\mathcal{D}}\text{Var}_{V_2|V_1, \mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})] \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_{V_1|\mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D})]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

Now, (1.6) and (1.8) are two expressions for the same  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D})$ . They are generic in that the role of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  can be played by any two functions of entries of  $V$ . That is, the posterior predictive variance admits a very large number of two term and three term generic expressions.

This procedure can be iterated in multiple ways to include any other  $V_k$ , thereby generating even more expressions for  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D})$ . Indeed, every time an expression of the form  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|W, \mathcal{D})$  for any suitable random variable  $W$  occurs from using the LTV, the LTV can be applied again provided a further suitable conditioning variable  $Z$  can be found. That is, the conservation law for posterior predictive variance in (1.6) extends to a far larger class of sums of terms involving conditional expectations and variances than (1.5) initially suggests.

We call the collection of expressions for the posterior predictive variance in a fixed hierarchical model its LTV-scope. Thus, the posterior predictive variance is invariant or conserved over its scope. We regard the introduction of an extra level in a hierarchical model as creating a new model and hence a new LTV-scope. The point of this work is not only to look within the LTV-scope of one hierarchical model but to compare LTV-scopes across models. Expressions in the scope of a hierarchical model also admit an interpretation in terms of analysis of variance and associated frequentist testing, see [Dustin and Clarke \(2023\)](#), but we do not discuss this here. Fixing a hierarchical model and looking at the scope of its posterior predictive variance lets us choose which decomposition has the interpretation we want to use to decide which ‘components’ are more important than other components in relative or absolute terms. Otherwise put, we can examine and compare multiple decompositions of the posterior variance for the

same hierarchical model and then compare decompositions across hierarchical models because it is fair to compare posterior predictive variances across models.

Expressions like (1.8) may be useful in a practical sense as well because predictive intervals (PI's) for  $Y_{n+1}$  can be derived from the distribution of

$$\frac{Y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(Y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)|\mathcal{D}_n)}} = \frac{Y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)}}. \quad (1.9)$$

The denominator on the right in (1.9) is the posterior predictive variance and controls the length of the PI. Our expressions for it allow us to identify the relative sizes of their terms. That is, because the posterior predictive variance ties multiple sources of variability together, within a hierarchical model, we can look at relative contributions of terms to the PI. For instance, it is meaningful to compare the sizes of terms such as

$$\frac{E_{V_1|\mathcal{D}} E_{V_2|V_1,\mathcal{D}}[\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})]}{\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D})} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{E_{V_1|\mathcal{D}} \text{Var}_{V_2|V_1,\mathcal{D}}[E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, V_2, \mathcal{D})]}{\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D})}.$$

A relative assessment of their contributions to the posterior predictive variance allows us to identify the biggest contributions to the length of a PI. Terms that do not contribute much, relatively, can be omitted thereby identifying which terms are driving the width of PI's. We see an instance of this in an example in Sec. 4.

This decomposition is similar to [Gustafson and Clarke \(2004\)](#) who expanded the posterior variance  $\text{Var}(\Theta|y^n)$ . However, ours is predictive, on a common scale, and hence directly useful in expressions for PI's from, say, (1.9). Moreover, in [Gustafson and Clarke \(2004\)](#), the terms were forced into a single 'standard error' interpretation rather than treated as distinct patterns of expectations and variances that could be interpreted in the context of quantifying the variability in the levels of the hierarchy.

Another way these decompositions may be useful is in terms of reducing the number of levels in the hierarchy. Consider the last term in (1.8). There are two basic ways we can get  $\text{Var}_{V_1|\mathcal{D}_n}(E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D}_n)) = 0$ . First, the distribution of  $V_1$  concentrates at a single value  $V_1 = v_1$ . Second, the models i.e., values of  $V_1$  that get non-zero weights, give the same predictions given  $\mathcal{D}$ . That is,

$$E(Y_{n+1}; V_1 = v_1, \mathcal{D}) = E(Y_{n+1}; V_1 = v_2, \mathcal{D}) \quad (1.10)$$

for any  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  getting positive weight. Identifying these sets is essentially intractable. However, by carefully selecting the models  $V = v$  to ensure they are different and having a large enough  $n$  the chance of satisfying (1.10) for two values of  $V_1$  will be vanishingly small. Thus, on pragmatic grounds, with some foresight, if the last term on the right is chosen so it explicitly depends only on a single component of  $V$  and that term drops out i.e., is close to zero, we can simply set  $V_1$  to be a constant meaning that level of modeling drops out. In a three term case we would be left with only the first two terms on the right hand side that depend on  $V_2$  in which  $V_1$  was a constant. The resulting expression reduces to (1.6) but with  $V_2$  in place of  $V_1$ .

The rest of this paper explores expressions such as (1.6) and (1.8). In Sec. 2, we present a variety of examples of instances of our conservation of posterior predictive variance law. In Sec. 3 we present some generic results on expressions in the LTV-scope of a posterior predictive variance.. In Sec. 4, we revisit two examples from Draper (1995) and by using an extension of his setting show how the relative sizes of terms in our decompositions can behave in simulations. In a concluding section, Sec. ??, we discuss the methodological implications of our representations for the posterior predictive variance.

## 2. Generic Examples

The reasoning in Sec. 1 uses a generic hierarchical model. There is no constraint on the levels in the hierarchy except that they combine properly on one probability space. That is, the whole inferential structure satisfies the containment principle. of BAYesian statistics. Even within the containment principle, the range of choices for  $(K, V)$  is vast and two plausible hierarchical models may have very different behaviors. In addition, as will be seen in Sec. 4, conditioning variables need not have any correlate in reality; they may be aspects of modeling more commonly thought to be part of the likelihood. So, each hierarchical model and its LTV-scope must be examined individually before being compared with another.

The point of this section is to present a series of examples of hierarchical models that are amenable to our LTV iterative procedure and to give a sense for their LTV-scopes. We begin with the simplest cases and move on to more complicated cases to develop intuition for what the expressions in the LTV-scope of a hierarchical model mean.

### 2.1. A Two Level Hierarchical Model

The simplest hierarchical model has two levels i.e., has  $K = 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta &\sim w(\theta) \\ Y &\sim p(y|\theta),\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

where  $w$  is the density of a real parameter  $\Theta = \theta$  and  $p(\cdot|\theta)$  is the conditional density of  $Y = y$ , both with respect to Lebesgue measure. The posterior density is

$$w(\theta|y^n) \propto w(\theta)p(y^n|\theta)$$

with normalizing constant

$$m(y^n) = \int w(\theta)p(y^n|\theta)d\theta.\tag{2.2}$$

The posterior predictive density is now

$$p(y_{n+1}|y^n) = \int p(y_{n+1}|\theta)w(\theta|y^n)d\theta$$

with mean

$$E(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = \int y_{n+1}p(y_{n+1}|y^n)dy_{n+1}$$

and

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = \int (y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|y^n))^2 p(y_{n+1}|y^n) dy_{n+1}.$$

So, the LTV gives the posterior predictive variance as

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = E_{\Theta}(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n)|y^n) + \text{Var}_{\Theta}(E(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n)|y^n). \quad (2.3)$$

The first term on the right is the variability of the high posterior probability predictive distributions. The second term on the right is an assessment of how important the model used for prediction is. This interpretation is, in fact, independent of the fact that  $\Theta$  is a real parameter. Only two-term examples i.e., one usage of the LTV, admit a concise interpretation in general. We will see that with two or more usages of the LTV and so  $K \geq 2$ , we get three or more terms and the interpretation is much more complex and depends on the choice of conditioning variables.

In some cases, (2.3) can be worked out explicitly. Let  $Y_i \sim N(\theta, \sigma)$  be independent and identically distributed (IID) for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  where  $\theta \sim N(\theta_0, \tau^2)$  and  $\theta_0, \sigma$  and  $\tau$  are known. It is easy to see that

$$p(y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n) = \frac{p(y^{n+1}, \theta)}{p(y^n, \theta)} = p(y_{n+1}|\theta),$$

where  $\sigma$  has been suppressed in the notation. So, it is also easy to see that

$$E(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n) = \theta \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n) = \sigma^2.$$

Since  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  is a constant, its expectation under the posterior for  $\theta$  is unchanged. Thus, the first term on the right in (2.3) is

$$E_{\Theta|y^n} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n) = \sigma^2.$$

For the second term on the right in (2.3) recall the posterior for  $\theta$  given  $y^n$  is

$$w(\theta|y^n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau_n^2}} e^{-(1/2\tau_n^2)(\theta-\theta_n)^2}$$

where

$$\theta_n = \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\tau^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{n}{\sigma^2} \left( \bar{y} + \frac{\theta_0}{\tau^2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_n^2 = \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\tau_0^2} \right)^{-1}.$$

Now,

$$\text{Var}_{\Theta|y^n}(E(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n)) = \text{Var}_{\Theta|y^n}(\Theta) = \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\tau_0^2} \right)^{-1},$$

and (2.3) is

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = \sigma^2 + \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\tau_0^2} \right)^{-1} = \sigma^2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n).$$

This reasoning extends to the case that  $\sigma$  is assigned an inverse-Gamma distribution.

Another specific example that can be evaluated in closed form sets  $Y_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  to be IID for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  with the usual priors  $\mu \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  and  $\sigma^2 \sim \text{InvGamma}(\alpha, \beta)$  for  $\alpha > 2$  and  $\beta > 0$ . For contrast, note that a different problem with the Beta-Binomial gives that the ‘Var-E’ term dominates; see Casella and Berger (2002), p. 168.

Draper (1995) argues that the first term on the right (a sequence of conditional expectations following a conditional variance) is the main assessment of variability that authors consider. This is consistent with the normal example above and holds more generally. Indeed, the first term on the right in (2.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \int ((y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n))^2 p(y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)) dy_{n+1} w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \\ &= \int \int ((y_{n+1} - E(Y_{n+1}|\theta))^2 p(y_{n+1}|\theta)) dy_{n+1} w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \\ &= \int \text{Var}_\theta(Y_{n+1}) w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

and the second term on the right in (2.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_\Theta(E(Y_{n+1}|\Theta)|y^n) \\ &= \int \left( E(Y_{n+1}|\theta) - \int E(Y_{n+1}|\theta) w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \right)^2 w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \\ &= \int E^2(Y_{n+1}|\theta) w(\theta|y^n) d\theta - \left( \int E(Y_{n+1}|\theta) w(\theta|y^n) d\theta \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

When the posterior concentrates at a true value  $\theta_0$ , in distribution,  $L^1$  or a.e., as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , (2.4) converges to  $\text{Var}_{\theta_0}(Y_{n+1})$  and (2.5) converges to zero in the same mode. So, the first term asymptotically dominates. This reasoning holds anytime the posterior concentrates as it typically does in  $\mathcal{M}$ -closed problems; more generally, see Berk (1966). However, this says little about the relative sizes of the two terms in finite samples.

In the general case, the inner expressions on the right in (2.3) are  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  and  $E(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  and they have different meanings. In particular, the first term is small when  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  is small over the typical region of  $\theta$  under the posterior and the second term is small when  $E(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$ , as a function of  $\theta$ , changes little, again over the typical region of  $\theta$ . Loosely, the difference is whether the variance is small or the mean changes little.

If we know for sure that the mean changes little, i.e.,  $E(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  is nearly constant over the range of  $\theta$ 's most likely under the posterior, then

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) \approx E_\Theta(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n)|y^n).$$

This latter expression is essentially what is observed in Sec. 4 of [Dustin and Clarke \(2023\)](#). However, if we know for  $y^n$  that the variance is small, i.e., for the  $\theta$ 's most likely under the posterior we have that  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\theta, y^n)$  is small, then

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) \approx \text{Var}_{\Theta}(E(Y_{n+1}|\Theta, y^n)|y^n).$$

Another way to interpret (2.3) is as follows. When the ‘E-Var’ term is large, relative to the ‘Var-E’ term, there is more variability in the predictive distributions from the high posterior probability models than there is variability across models so the model doesn’t matter very much; all the commonly occurring models (high posterior probability) are good. When the ‘Var-E’ term is large relative to the ‘E-Var’ term it means that the specific model used for prediction is much more important than the variability within models used for prediction.

## 2.2. Bayesian Model Averages I

One step up from (2.1) we can consider a Bayesian model average (BMA). Let  $j = 1, \dots, J$  index a collection of models  $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \dots, M_J\}$ . Assume each  $M_j$  consists of a likelihood  $p(y|\theta_j)$  and a prior  $w(\theta_j, j) = w(\theta_j|j)w(j)$  where the across models prior  $w(j)$  is discrete. Writing  $J$  for  $j$  as a random variabell as well as for the number of models will cause no confusion because the context will indicate which is meant. Now, we can represent this as a two level hierarchical model

$$\begin{aligned} (J, \theta_J) &\sim w(\theta_j, j) \\ Y &\sim p(y|\theta_j). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Now, the  $L^2$  BMA predictor is

$$E(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = \sum_{j=1}^J E(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j)W(M_j|y^n). \tag{2.7}$$

In (2.7), the two conditioning random variables, namely  $J$  and  $\theta_j$  are treated explicitly and implicitly, respectively. In this case, it is not hard to see that one usage of the LTV recovers the usual formula for the posterior variance.

Indeed, using the expression for posterior variance from p. 383 of [Hoeting et al. \(1999\)](#), we find that (2.7) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) &= \sum_{j=1}^J \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j)W(M_j|y^n) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^J E(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j)^2W(M_j|y^n) - E(Y_{n+1}|y^n)^2 \\ &= E(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|M_J, y^n)|y^n) + \text{Var}(E(Y_{n+1}|M_J, y^n)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$



So (2.8) is the result of using the LTV and conditioning on  $M_k$ . We have treated  $\theta_j$  implicitly by integrated over it before conditioning on the  $M_j$ 's. Reversing this i.e., integrating over  $j$  and using the LTV with  $\Theta_k$ 's would have been inappropriate for BMA. However, we shall see that different treatments of conditioning variables, when they make sense, typically give different terms for the same  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$ .

Let us interpret (2.8) similarly to how we interpreted (2.3) but using the  $M_k$ 's, not the  $\theta_k$ 's. When the first term on the right 'E-Var' is large, we see most variability is in the predictive distributions from the high posterior probability models rather than from the variability across models. The second term on the right being small means that it doesn't matter very much which model you use for prediction. On the other hand, if Var-E is large, model selection is important but the smallness of the E Var term means the high posterior probability models are good.

For the sake of completeness, let us record another two term expression in the scope of (2.6) but conditioning on  $(J, \Theta_J)$  as a two dimensional random variable:

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) = \text{Var}_{\Theta_K, K}(E(Y_{n+1}|\Theta_K, K, y^n)) + E_{\Theta_K, K}(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\Theta_K, K, y^n)). \quad (2.9)$$

This is different from (2.8) where we mixed out over the  $\Theta_j$ 's before examining the variability in  $M_J$ . That is, in (2.8),  $\Theta_j$ 's are implicit whereas in (2.9) they are explicit.

### 2.3. Bayesian Model Averages II: Three Level Hierarchical Model

Now write (2.6) as an equivalent three level hierarchical model

$$\begin{aligned} J &\sim w(j) \\ \theta_j|J=j &\sim w(\theta_j|j) \\ Y &\sim p(y|\theta_j). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

If we apply the law of total variance first to bring  $M_j$  into  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$  we get (2.8). If we then use the LTV again in the first term on the right in (2.8) to bring in  $\theta_j$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j) &= E_{\Theta_j|y^n, M_j} \text{Var}_{Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j, \Theta_j}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j, \Theta_j = \theta_j, ) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_{\Theta_j|y^n, M_j} E_{Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j, \Theta_j}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_j, \Theta_j = \theta_j). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Using (2.11) in (2.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n) &= E_J E_{\Theta_J|y^n, M_J} \text{Var}_{Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_J, \Theta_J}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_J, \Theta_J) \\ &\quad + E_J \text{Var}_{\Theta_J|y^n, M_J} E_{Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_J, \Theta_J}(Y_{n+1}|y^n, M_J, \Theta_J) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_J(E(Y_{n+1}|M_J, y^n)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

an instance of (1.8).

In (2.12) we conditioned first on  $M_J$  and then on  $\Theta_J$  because the  $\Theta_j$ 's is naturally nested in the  $M_j$ 's. There is nothing to prevent us from setting up a mathematical structure in which we can condition on  $\Theta_j$  first and  $M_j$  second but that is not the natural way to think about this situation. We will see an example in Subsec. 4.2 where either order of conditioning makes sense. In general, however, it can be seen that the order of conditioning affects which terms appear but the value of  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$  on the left is fixed once the hierarchy is fixed. In particular, the two models (2.6) and (2.10) are the same so the posterior variances on the left in (2.8) and (2.12) are equal pointwise in  $y^n$ . Hence the the expressions on the right are equal albeit different and are in the scope of the model. We can choose whichever sums of term in the scope of a given model we want depending on the variabilities of modeling quantities that concern us most.

It is seen from (2.12) that a three level hierarchy can lead to a three term expression for the posterior predictive variance because we have used the law of total variance twice, one for each level of the hierarchy above the likelihood. In general, each usage of the LTV generates one extra term.

We can also apply the law of total variance to the second term in (2.3), i.e., the last term on the right in (2.12). However, that will bring in the conditional expectation of a conditional variance of a conditional expectation which will not simplify. Such terms while mathematically correct are very difficult to handle. Moreover, the terms in (2.8) treat the  $\Theta$  as latent and so depend on its distribution even though it is not explicitly indicated. For this reason, here, we only apply the LTV to the variances that occur in the leading term, i.e., the one of the form ' $E \text{ Var}$ ', not any that have a ' $\text{Var } E$ '. That is, while the full scope of a posterior predictive variance contains many terms from using the LTV in all possible ways, we focus on the subset of the scope where each term has exactly one variance operation that moves from left to right with appropriate conditioning. By analogy of such sums of terms with ANOVA decompositions, see Dustin and Clarke (2023) we call this this the Cochran Scope or C-Scope for short and henceforth limit our attention to sums of that form.

In this treatment of posterior variance the relative size of the terms is a tradeoff among the size of model list, the proximity of the parametric models on the list to each other, the across-models prior weights on models on the list, and the within-model priors. It's no longer purely a probabilistic model. We have to choose which terms we want to control in our model selection.

Another hierarchical model to which our considerations apply is studied in Subsec. 4.2. It conditions an outcome on possible sets of selected variables and on three possible link functions in a generalized linear model. This is quite different from (2.10) because the levels in the hierarchy include aspects of modeling typically associated with likelihoods not priors. However, our generic decompositions of posterior predictive variances accommodates these possibilities readily.

### 3. Generic Decompositions for the Posterior Predictive Variance: C-scope case

Recall the generic hierarchical model (1.1). Limiting attention to  $V_1$ , the LTV can be applied to give

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) = E(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D}_n)) + \text{Var}(E(Y_{n+1}|V_1, \mathcal{D}_n)). \quad (3.1)$$

In (3.1),  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)$  looks the same as in other expressions such as (2.3) and (2.12) but in fact it depends on the full hierarchy in (1.1) because the posterior predictive variance ties all levels of the hierarchy together. That is levels 2 through  $K$  in (1.1) affect the posterior predictive variance on the left – and the terms on the right – even though they are suppressed in the notation.

We can now apply the law of total variance iteratively to itself, i.e., to the first term – ‘E Var’ – in (3.1) by introducing conditioning on  $V_2$ . We can do the same in the new ‘E E Var’ term with  $V_3$  and so on, generating one new term for each  $V_k$  at each iteration. Overall, this gives us  $K + 1$  terms involving means and variances. The expression for  $K = 2$  is now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) &= E_{V_1} E_{V_2} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, V_2) + E_{V_1} \text{Var}_{V_2} E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, V_2) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_{V_1} E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The left hand is a constant (given  $\mathcal{D}_n$ ) independent of the order of conditioning on the right although different orders of conditioning will give different terms and of course, different hierarchical models will have different posterior variances.

#### 3.1. Overall Structure

To generalize this and hence quantify the uncertainty of the subjective choices we must make, recall  $V = (V_1, \dots, V_K)$ , where  $V_k$  represents the values of the  $k$ -th potential choice that must be made to specify a predictor. Analogous to terminology in ANOVA, we call  $V_k$  a *factor* in the prediction scheme, and we define the levels of  $V_k$  to be  $v_{k1}, \dots, v_{km_k}$ . That is,  $v_{k\ell}$  is a specific value  $V_k$  may assume. Thus, we take  $V$  to be discrete having probability mass function  $W(v) = W(V_1 = v_1, \dots, V_K = v_K)$ . Effectively we are assuming that any continuous parameters are at the first level of the hierarchy above the likelihood and have been integrated out as in the BMA example in Subsec. 2.2. The  $V_k$ 's are not in general independent and  $W$  corresponds to a prior on  $V$ . Define our chosen model list by

$$\mathcal{V}^K = \{v_{11}, \dots, v_{1m_1}\} \times \dots \times \{v_{K1}, \dots, v_{Km_K}\}.$$

There are  $m_1 \times \dots \times m_K$  distinct models in  $\mathcal{V}^K$  and they may or may not have a hierarchical structure.

Our first result gives a decomposition of the posterior predictive variance by conditioning on  $V$ . The general  $K$  case is seen in Clause (i) of Prop. 3.1.

However, the order of conditioning will give different terms on the right. The ordering is chosen so that the most important terms to the analyst can be readily assessed. Permuting the  $V_k$ 's generates all the decompositions in the  $C$ -scope of the posterior predictive variance from the BHM. Recall (1.4) and (1.8). These are one and two conditioning variable versions of decompositions in the  $C$ -scope of a posterior predictive variance. Clause (ii) of Prop. 3.1 is a variant on Clause (i) from collapsing all the levels in the hierarchy above the likelihood into a single conditioning variable.

**Proposition 3.1.** *We have the following two expressions for the posterior predictive variance when the factors correspond to a model list.*

*Clause (i): For  $K = 1$  in (1.1) we have*

$$\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) = E(\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|V, \mathcal{D}_n)) + \text{Var}(E(Y_{n+1}|V, \mathcal{D}_n)). \quad (3.3)$$

*and, for  $K \geq 2$  in (1.1), the posterior predictive variance of  $Y_{n+1}$  as function of the factors defining the predictive scheme is*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)(\mathcal{V}^K) &= E_{(V_1, \dots, V_K)} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, \dots, V_K) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=2}^K E_{(V_1, \dots, V_{k-1})} \text{Var}_{V_k} E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, \dots, V_k) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_{V_1} E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

*Clause (ii): For any  $K$ , the posterior predictive variance  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)(\mathcal{V}^K)$  can be condensed into a two term decomposition:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)(\mathcal{V}^K) &= E_{(V_1, \dots, V_K)} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, \dots, V_K) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_{(V_1, \dots, V_K)} E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, \dots, V_K). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* The proof of *Clause i)* is a straightforward iterated application of the law of total variance and *Clause ii)* follows from the law of total variance simply treating  $V$  as a vector rather than as the string of its components.  $\square$

As the number of conditioning variables increases, conditional variances tend to decrease. Here, however, that intuition breaks down because we condition on all  $V_k$ 's. The question is the effect of the relative placement of the expectations relative to the variances. In a limiting sense, one expects that with IID data expectations will converge to well-defined limits, even if they are random variables due to the conditioning thereby giving nonzero variances. In our work we have focused on the last term in (3.4), often finding it to be small. This may be an artifact of the examples we have examined. On the other hand, our intuition is that typically the leading term in (3.4) should dominate, see Subsec. 2.1, because the posterior for  $V_1, \dots, V_K$  should concentrate at a fixed value, namely the true value if it is reachable and the value closest to the true value (in relative entropy sense) if it is not.

A key question is what the cardinality of the  $C$ -scope is. Consider (1.8) or equivalently (3.4) with  $K = 2$ . There are five cases. The first is (3.2) in which  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are treated as individual conditioning variables. The second is the same but with  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  interchanged. The third is (3.1) where  $V_1$  is replaced by  $(V_1, V_2)$ , i.e.,  $(V_1, V_2)$  is regarded as a single random variable that happens to be bivariate. The fourth is (3.1) in which  $V_2$  is regarded as integrated out before conditioning. In this case, we say  $V_2$  is latent and  $V_1$  is manifest. The fifth case is the reverse, i.e., we treat  $V_1$  as latent and  $V_2$  as manifest. Expression (2.8) is an example of this if  $V_2 = \Theta_K$  and  $V_1 = K$ . In all five cases,  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|y^n)$  is the same even though the decompositions are different. So, we have five different ways to model the posterior variance in the same hierarchical model. While they are equivalent mathematically and come from the same hierarchical model they are not equivalent statistically. This counting argument can be generalized to arbitrary  $K$ . (Write out new proposition giving  $\#(C - \text{scope})$  as a function of  $K$ .)

### 3.2. Choosing $V_K$

In the usual physical modeling scenario the decompositions presented here will be of limited use largely because scientists don't often include irrelevant quantities in their models. However, when the BHM is not physically motivated, e.g., the  $V_k$ 's are mathematical aspects of the likelihood, it will often not be clear which  $V_k$ 's or values of  $V_k$ 's are important to retain. Reducing the number of values of a  $V_k$  is not as important as dropping a  $V_k$ , but as in the factor levels of ANOVA can be useful.

An example may help. One choice of  $V_K$ , with  $K = 2$ , that can often be used to expand a model list to capture more possibilities and then winnow down to the most successful of them is the following. Consider trying to assess the importance of sets of variables. Suppose we have a list of models  $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, \dots, m_q\}$  and a set of explanatory variables  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_p\}$ . If  $q = 2$ , we may have  $m_1$  as the linear model and  $m_2$  as some choice of non-linear model. Write  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) = \{\{X\}_1, \dots, \{X\}_{2^p}\}$  to mean the power set of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Now we can consider each model with each subset of explanatory variables as inputs to the modeling. Here,  $V_1$  corresponds to the uncertainty in the predictive problem due to the models and  $V_2$  corresponds to the variable selections we use in the models. We use a version of this in Subsec. 4.1.2. The idea is that the experimenter has little information about which variables are included so the formal mathematical approach is to include all the a priori plausible ones and examine the predictive properties of the resulting model.

Now, we can use the decomposition in Subsec. 2.2 or 2.3. In addition, using a Bayes model average we write the posterior predictive density

$$p(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^q p(m_i|\mathcal{D}_n) \sum_{j=1}^{2^p} p(\{X\}_j|\mathcal{D}_n, m_i) p(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, \{X\}_j, m_i), \quad (3.6)$$

generically denoting densities as  $p$ . Now, we can calculate the posterior probability for each set of explanatory variables from

$$p(\{X\}_j|\mathcal{D}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^q p(m_i|\mathcal{D}_n)p(\{X\}_j|\mathcal{D}_n, m_i).$$

This posterior probability is a measure of “variable set importance”. A similar expression gives a measure of importance for an individual model. Thus, we anticipate that when the levels in the BHM represent mathematical quantities that we do not have a physical basis for including or excluding we can use our decompositions to assess whether factors  $V_k$  or factor levels of a  $V_k$  are worth including.

We can represent any conditioning quantity as  $V = (V_1, \dots, V_K)^T$ . As in Subsec. 2.1 for  $K = 1$ ,  $V_1$  might simply be a parameter. As in Subsec. 2.3, for  $K = 2$ ,  $V_1$  might be a model and  $V_2$  might correspond to a parameter. Or, as in Sec. 4,  $V_1$  may correspond to the choice of link function in a GLM while  $V_2$  may correspond to selections of explanatory variables (as above). Thus, we must choose a  $K$  and we can regard each  $V_k$  as an aspect of a modeling strategy. For instance, if  $K = 2$ ,  $V_1$  may be a ‘scenario’ and  $V_2$  may be a ‘model’ in the sense of Draper (1995), a parallel we develop in Sec. 4.1. We will write as if the  $V_k$ ’s are discrete modeling choices remembering that the law of total variance applies for continuous random variables as well.

Note that the sort of hierarchical modeling we advocate here can be artificial in the sense that we use mathematical modeling, simplify the model down to the quantities that seem to matter predictively, and then use the resulting model to form PI’s. Once good prediction has been achieved the quest for a more realistic model (that probably will not perform as well predictively) can begin and compared with the formal model our approach should yield. Consequently, we advocate the generation of multiple BHM’s, using different mathematical features. In Sec. 4, we use link functions in a GLM as a conditioning variable. In Dustin and Clarke (2023), we used a single  $V$  to represent the choice of a shrinkage method in penalized linear regression.

Typically, one of the most important levels in a BHM is the selection over models. We can enlarge model list simply by including more plausible models. However, this may lead to problems such as dilution; see George (2010). So, we want to assess the effect of a model list on the variance of predictions. Consider a model list  $\mathcal{M}$  and suppose we don’t believe it adequately captures the uncertainty (including mis-specification) of the the predictive problem. We can expand the list by including other competing models and this can be done by adding more models to it or by embedding the models on the list in various ‘scenarios’ as is done in Draper (1995). Once a new model list  $\mathcal{M}'$  is constructed, if it contains new models with positive posterior probability, the posterior predictive distribution  $p(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)$  resulting from  $\mathcal{M}'$  will be differ from  $p(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)$  resulting from  $\mathcal{M}$ . Hence, we can use the decompositions here to help decide which of model  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}'$  is more reasonable and hope that both simplify to the same predictor.

In reality, the relative sizes of terms in the various decompositions of the form (3.4) depend heavily on the choice of  $K$ ,  $V_K$ , and the likelihood. Fortunately, in practice, we usually only have one largest  $V_K$  that we most want to consider even though different orderings of the  $V_k$ 's will affect which terms appear in the decomposition. One benefit of more elaborate hierarchical models is that we can use the levels to specify a likelihood so that features of the likelihood can be examined via our decompositions. Once  $K$  and  $V_K$  have been chosen, the posterior predictive variance decomposition based on  $V_K$  can be generated and examined for which terms are important. We regard the selection of  $V$  in general as an aspect of mathematical modeling in that it seem hard to propose a univereal method. The appropriate choice of levels in the BHM will be data set dependent. We have given examples here to show the flexibility of the approach.

Using stacking – or any other model averaging procedure – in place of the BMA leads to results analogous to Prop. 3.1; see Dustin and Clarke (2023).

#### 4. Draper's Work on Model Uncertainty

Here we redo and extend some of the key examples developed by Draper.

##### 4.1. *Revisiting Draper (1995)*

Here we apply our techniques to two examples given in Draper (1995) and one further example that his second example motivates. The first example involves predicting the price of oil; the second example involves predicting the chance of failure of O-rings in a space shuttle at a new temperature. Our third example for this section is an extension of the latter data type with a more difficult variable selection problem. Draper's main point was when making predictions, we need to consider the uncertainty of the 'structural' choices we make or we can be lead to bad decisions. Here, we have formalized Draper's concept of structural choices in our conditioning variable  $V$ . One danger in poor structural choices is that a PI may be found that is unrealistically small leading to over-confidence.

###### 4.1.1. *Oil Prices*

In the oil prices example in Draper (1995) there are two structural components to the modeling namely, 12 economic scenarios with 10 economic models nested inside them. These components represent 120 models and hence introduce model uncertainty that must be quantified to generate good PI's.

In Draper's analysis each model was used given the parameters of each scenario. This corresponds to  $K = 2$  and a three term posterior predictive variance decomposition. Let  $s_i$  denote scenario  $i$  and  $m_{ij}$  be model  $j$  within scenario  $i$ . Write  $s_i \in S$  and  $m_{ij} \in M_i \subset M$  where  $M_i$  is the set of models for scenario  $i$

and  $M$  is the union of the  $M_i$ 's. Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)(S, M) &= E_S E_M \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, S, M) \\ &\quad + E_S \text{Var}_M(E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, S, M)) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}_S(E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, S)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The corresponding decomposition given by Draper is  $\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) = 178 + 363 + 354 = 895$ . We cannot recompute this example because neither the data nor the details on the scenarios or models are available to us. However, in this case it is seen that the between-scenarios variance, i.e., term (4.1), contributes about 40% to the posterior predictive variance. The second term on the right, the between-models within scenarios variance, is also about 40%. The variance attributable to the predictions within models and scenarios is about 20%. (See Table ?? for the definition of terms.) Thus all the three terms must be used when forming PI's.

#### 4.1.2. Challenger Disaster

Making the decision to launch the space shuttle at an ambient temperature at which the various components had not been tested ended up being catastrophic – and could have been avoided had a proper uncertainty analysis had been done. Statistically, the error of the decision makers was to choose a single model from a model list rather than incorporating all sources of predictive uncertainty into their analysis. The goal of this example originally was to show that a correct analysis of the various sources of uncertainty would have led to a PI for  $p_{t=31}$ , the probability of an O-ring failure (at 31°) of  $(.33, 1]$  i.e., too high for a launch to be safe. Our goal in re-analyzing Draper's example is to identify which sources of uncertainty can be neglected.

We have 23 observations of the number of damaged O-rings ranging from zero to six (because each shuttle had six O-rings). Each observation also has a temperature  $t$  and a 'leak-check' pressure  $s$ . Following Draper's analysis we also use  $t^2$  as an explanatory variable. Thus we have 24 vectors, each of length four.

We assume the number of damaged O-rings follows a *Binomial*(6,  $p$ ) distribution where  $p$  is a function of the explanatory variables via one of three link functions, logit,  $c \log \log$ , and probit. Thus, we have structural uncertainty in the choice of variables and in the choice of link function. In our notation, we set  $V_1 = \{L, C, P\}$  for the choice of link function, logit,  $c \log \log$ , and probit respectively. Also let  $V_2 = \{t, t^2, s, \text{no effect}\}$  where no effect means an intercept-only model. The 24 models are summarized in 1.

In fact, Draper did not consider all of these models. Essentially he put zero prior probability on all models except for  $m_1, m_4, m_5, m_7, m_8$ , and  $m_{15}$ . Accordingly, he only considered the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, m_4, m_5, m_7, m_8, m_{15}\}$$



TABLE 1

**List of models for the Challenger disaster data:** This table lists all 24 models under consideration broken down by their structural choices – link functions and explanatory variables.

$\mathcal{V}^{(2)}$	$m_1$	$m_2$	$m_3$	$m_4$	$m_5$	$m_6$	$m_7$	$m_8$	$m_9$	$m_{10}$	$m_{11}$	$m_{12}$	$m_{13}$
$V_1$	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	C	C	C	C	C
$V_2$	$t$	$t^2$	$s$	$t, t^2$	$t, s$	$t^2, s$	$t, t^2, s$	no effect	$t$	$t^2$	$s$	$t, t^2$	$t, s$
$\mathcal{V}^{(2)}$	$m_{14}$	$m_{15}$	$m_{16}$	$m_{17}$	$m_{18}$	$m_{19}$	$m_{20}$	$m_{21}$	$m_{22}$	$m_{23}$	$m_{24}$		
$V_1$	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
$V_2$	$t^2, s$	$t, t^2, s$	no effect	$t$	$t^2$	$s$	$t, t^2$	$t, s$	$t^2, s$	$t, t^2, s$	no effect		

with a uniform prior. Draper then gave a table of posterior quantities for the structural choices, and a posterior predictive variance decomposition for within-structure and between-structure variances as

$$Var(p_{t=31}|\mathcal{D}_{23}) = Var_{within} + Var_{between} = 0.0338 + 0.0135 = 0.0473. \quad (4.2)$$

That is, even though there were two structural choices, Draper used a decomposition appropriate for one. This corresponds to using our result Clause (ii) in Prop. 3.1. Draper’s conclusion was that  $.0135/.0473 \approx 28.5\%$  so the uncertainty represented by the second term in (4.2) could not be neglected.

Here we extend Draper’s analysis and confirm that structural uncertainty should not be ignored. For our implementation, we use the full set of 24 models but do not employ the same approximations. Then, we use the BMA package in R to get the posterior distributions of the parameters of the models and the posterior weights for  $V_2$ . We also use the rjmc package to get the posterior weights for  $V_1$ . The resulting posterior distributions are qualitatively similar to Draper’s approximate posteriors.

Considering all sources of uncertainty yields a posterior predictive variance decomposition of

$$\begin{aligned} Var(p_{t=31}|\mathcal{D}_{23}) &= E_{V_1} E_{V_2} Var(p_{t=31}|\mathcal{D}_{23}, V_1, V_2) + E_{V_1} Var_{V_2} E(p_{t=31}|\mathcal{D}_{23}, V_1, V_2) \\ &\quad + Var_{V_1} E(p_{t=31}|\mathcal{D}_{23}, V_1) \\ &= 0.01469 + 0.0996 + 0.0017 \\ &= 0.11599. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

This is almost three times the variance as obtained by Draper. We confirm his intuition that structural uncertainty was much greater than assumed when making the decision to launch the shuttle. Moreover, Draper commented that other analyses could lead to larger posterior variances. So, (4.3) is consistent with his intuition.

Looking at the numbers in (4.3) we can see the last is an order of magnitude smaller than the other two. Thus, we conclude that the terms representing the between-models within-link functions variance and the between-predictions within-models and links variance are terms that must be retained. A frequentist testing approach confirms this; see Dustin and Clarke (2022). So, we would be led to consider a new hierarchical model that did not include  $V_1$  but had a two term decomposition with a new value of  $Var(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n)$  and we would compare

it with the first two terms on the right in (4.3) to see which expression for the posterior predictive variance was more convincing.

#### 4.2. Simulated binomial example

Finally, we study a simulated example following the same structure as the Challenger data. That is we simulated  $n$  observations from a binomial generalized linear model

$$Y_i|p_i \sim \text{Binomial}(30, p_i),$$

where  $p_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{-X_i'\beta}}$ , in which  $X_i' \sim N(0, 1)$  is a  $1 \times 10$  vector of explanatory variables, and

$$\beta = (0.75, 0.25, -0.3, 0.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$$

is a  $10 \times 1$  vector of true regression parameters. Here we let 6 entries in  $\beta$  be zero to represent a meaningful model selection problem. In this problem, we again recognize three sources of structural uncertainty: predictive uncertainty across-models and link functions ('predictions'), models across link functions ('models',  $V_2$ ), and link functions ('links',  $V_1$ ). Our goal is to study the effect of the sample size on each each term in the posterior predictive variance decomposition, as well as each of the test statistics.

We continue to use a three term decomposition like that in Subsec. 4.1.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n) &= E_{V_1}E_{V_2}\text{Var}(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, V_2) + E_{V_1}\text{Var}_{V_2}E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1, V_2) \\ &+ \text{Var}_{V_1}E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{D}_n, V_1) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

but our ' $Y_{n+1}$ ' here is the number of successes in 30 trials, a random variable, as opposed to a probability such as  $p_{t=31}$ . In order, the three terms are predictions, models, and links.

As sample size increases, the link functions proportionately contribute more and more to the overall variance where as the models contribute less and the predictions are stable. We comment that the overall variance actually decreases with sample size so the relative importance of, say, links, may increase even as its absolute importance decreases.

These conclusions are reinforced by Fig. 1. On the left panel we see that all four variances decrease with  $n$ , the top curve representing the sum of the three lower curves. The right panel shows that as expected the relative contribution of models decreases monotonically. It also shows that as  $n$  increases, the curves for links and predictions approach each other. In simulation results not shown here, the two curves actually cross around  $n = 475$  and suggest that by  $n = 900$  or so that the curve for predictions will indicate a relatively small contribution to the decreasing total variance curve compared to the relative contribution of links. However, by this point, the total variance is so small that the relative contributions of the terms is not important.

Overall interpretation: Models Term: The models term decreases fast in both figures. We think this means that variable selection is fast so its contribution




FIG 1. *Plots of posterior predictive variances as a function of  $n$  for each term in the decomposition.* Left: The actual values of the terms in the total posterior predictive variance. Right: The proportions each term contributes to the total variance. Both sets of curves show the results for link function, models, and predictions.

to the posterior variance is small. Links term: The term for links on the left stabilizes quickly so as the other terms decrease absolutely it increases relatively. Predictions term: This decreases on the left but more slowly or from a higher start than the other curves. Then it decreases faster than the links term. So because of the rates, it increases and decreases relatively in the right.

## 5. Discussion

The main point of this paper is to provide a decomposition of posterior predictive variances for a future value from a Bayesian hierarchical model. This is important because the posterior predictive variance controls the width of prediction intervals and we want to know what aspects of variance are contributing most to the width. Our decompositions use a fixed BHM and hence decompose a fixed posterior variance into terms using the law of total variability iteratively. There are many possible decompositions for a posterior variance; they depend on the ordering of the conditioning features in the BHM and whether features are grouped together or not. We focus on what we call the  $C$ -scope of a BHM. This is the collection of decompositions of the posterior predictive variance that arise from using the law of total variance only on terms in which an expectation of a variance appears.

In examples, we have shown how some of these decompositions behave. The idea is to propose a BHM with levels that are mathematical and perhaps essentially artificial but nevertheless gives good predictions. Then our approach can winnow down the conditioning variables to simplify the model and identify which terms contribute most to the width of PIs.

One drawback of the method is that it is unclear how to assess the relative contributions of terms in the decomposition. This is so because in general we do not have a likelihood for these terms and therefore cannot do Bayes testing directly. OTOH, there are techniques that avoid the specification of likelihoods

and priors relying instead on a loss function structure to produce a viable posterior. We have not investigated this possibility, but it is promising as it is in the spirit of the mathematical modeling we advocate here, namely being willing to use mathematical quantities without physical motivation as a way to produce predictive analyses.

Implicit in our work is the view that we should construct BHM not by identifying levels with priors but rather by conditioning. We can arbitrarily write condition expectations and variance without concerning our selves with prior selection. We will have to assign priors at some point – often simply uniform since most of the levels in the BHM will be discrete. That is, rather than thinking our way physically to what a given  $V_k$  should mean we can proceed artificially choosing  $V_k$ 's to condition on simply by letting them correspond to mathematical features of models such as variable selection, choice of prior, choice of decay parameter in shrinkage models, etc. etc. By ignoring physical modeling we are free to construct any class of predictors we please and assess them. We call this conditional modeling as opposed to hierarchical modeling because it is a change in perspective even if the resulting models are mathematically equivalent. One obvious benefit of conditional modeling is that the components of modeling correspond directly to the components of the variance decomposition. We would expect that the ‘right’ variance decomposition would use the level of the BHM in the same order as they appear in the BHM. That is, we would imagine conditioning first on the top level, second on the level below it and so on.

One of the unexpected effects of our approach is that by using variances we are focusing on the metric properties of a model, not just its probabilistic properties. After all, hierarchical models are strictly probabilistic whereas our assessment of variances is based on size. Thus, we are converting a probabilistic modeling strategy into a metric modeling strategy.

We conclude with two entertaining observations. First, for  $K = 1$ ,  $V$  may represent the choice of a shrinkage method i.e., a penalty term in penalized linear regression. The penalty corresponds to a prior, so our method includes a technique for assessing the variability due to prior selection, i.e., it can directly assess how much a level in the hierarchy that correspond to a prior contributes. As such it can be used to assess prior selection provided there is a hyperparameter above it in the hierarchy. In a sense, we can assign a sort of standard error to prior selection in terms of how much wide it makes a PI.

Second, the treatment we have given for variance can, in principle, be extended to higher level moments even though it looks hard. For instance, [Brillinger \(1969\)](#) gives a way to calculate cumulants of a distribution that can be a posterior quantity. He gives a formula similar to our Prop. 3.1 and gives examples using this result for sums of variables and mixture distributions. The order of the cumulants is arbitrary but lower orders would likely be easier to use.

## Acknowledgments

Dustin acknowledges funding from the University of Nebraska Program of Excellence in Computational Science. Both authors acknowledge computational

support from the Holland Computing Center at the University of Nebraska.

## References

- Berk, R. (1966). “Limiting Behavior of Posterior Distributions when the Model is Incorrect.” *An. Math. Stat.*, 37: 51–58. [7](#)
- Brillinger, D. (1969). “The calculation of cumulants by conditioning.” *Ann. Inst. Math. Stat.*, 21: 215–218. [20](#)
- Casella, G. and Berger, R. (2002). *Statistical Inference 2nd Edition*. Duxbury, Australia. [7](#)
- Draper, D. (1995). “Assessment and Propagation of Model Uncertainty.” *J. R. S. S. B*, 57(1): 45–97. [5](#), [7](#), [14](#), [15](#)
- Dustin, D. and Clarke, B. (2022). “Testing for the Important Components of Posterior Predictive Variance.” *arXiv:2209.00636*. [17](#)
- (2023). “Finding the Important Components of Predictive Variance by P-ANOVA.” *Submitted to Stat. Anal. Data Mining*. [3](#), [8](#), [10](#), [14](#), [15](#)
- George, E. (2010). “Dilution priors: Compensating for model space redundancy.” In *IMS Collections Vol. 6*, 158–165. Inst. Math. Statist. [14](#)
- Gustafson, P. and Clarke, B. (2004). “Decomposing Posterior Variance.” *J. Stat. Planning and Inference*, 119: 311–327. [4](#)
- Hoeting, J., Madigan, D., Raftery, A., and Volinsky, C. (1999). “Bayesian Model Averaging: A Tutorial.” *Statist. Sci.*, 14(4): 382–417. [8](#)