

Skew–Symmetric Approximations of Posterior Distributions

Francesco Pozza

Bocconi Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

Daniele Durante and Botond Szabo

Department of Decision Sciences and Bocconi Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

Summary. Routinely–implemented deterministic approximations of posterior distributions from, e.g., Laplace method, variational Bayes and expectation-propagation, generally rely on symmetric approximating densities, often taken to be Gaussian. This choice facilitates optimization and inference, but typically affects the quality of the overall approximation. In fact, even in basic parametric models, the posterior distribution often displays asymmetries that yield bias and reduced accuracy when considering symmetric approximations. Recent research has moved towards more flexible approximating densities that incorporate skewness. However, current solutions are model–specific, lack general supporting theory, increase the computational complexity of the optimization problem, and do not provide a broadly–applicable solution to include skewness in any symmetric approximation. This article addresses such a gap by introducing a general and provably–optimal strategy to perturb any off–the–shelf symmetric approximation of a generic posterior distribution. Crucially, this novel perturbation is derived without additional optimization steps, and yields a similarly–tractable approximation within the class of skew–symmetric densities that provably enhances the finite–sample accuracy of the original symmetric approximation, and, under suitable assumptions, improves its convergence rate to the exact posterior by at least a \sqrt{n} factor, in asymptotic regimes. These advancements are illustrated in numerical studies focusing on skewed perturbations of state–of–the–art Gaussian approximations.

Keywords: Expectation–propagation, Laplace approximation, Skew–symmetric distribution, Total variation distance, Variational Bayes, α –divergence.

1. Introduction

Deterministic approximations of intractable posterior distributions provide a routinely–implemented alternative to sampling–based methods in Bayesian inference (e.g., [Walker, 1969](#); [Minka, 2001](#); [Rue et al., 2009](#); [Blei et al., 2017](#)). Noteworthy examples within such a class are the approximations obtained under the classical Laplace method and its extensions (e.g., [Walker, 1969](#); [Tierney and Kadane, 1986](#); [Rue et al., 2009](#); [Rossell et al., 2021](#)), variational Bayes (VB) (e.g., [Opper and Archambeau, 2009](#); [Blei et al., 2017](#)) and expectation–propagation (EP) (e.g., [Minka, 2001](#); [Vehtari et al., 2020](#)); see also [Bishop \(2006, Ch. 4.4 and Ch. 10\)](#) and [Chopin and Ridgway \(2017\)](#) for a general overview. Albeit derived under different arguments and optimization strategies, these solutions share a common trade–off between the attempt to facilitate optimization and posterior inference via a sufficiently–tractable approximation, and the need to avoid an

overly-simplified characterization of the intractable posterior distribution which may undermine inference accuracy. Most of the focus to date has been on addressing the first objective at the expense of the second. This has been accomplished by searching for tractable approximating densities, often within the Gaussian family. Under the classical Laplace method such a choice is implicitly encoded in the second-order Taylor expansion of the log-posterior density (e.g., Bishop, 2006, Ch. 4.4), whereas for EP (e.g., Minka, 2001) and Gaussian VB (e.g., Opper and Archambeau, 2009; Challis and Barber, 2013) it is enforced as a constraint within a suitably-defined minimization problem seeking the closest approximating density to the target posterior under a selected divergence. Even when replacing such a density constraint in VB with mean-field factorization assumptions (e.g., Blei et al., 2017), Gaussian approximations can still arise either as a solution of the optimization problem under routinely-implemented Bayesian models, such as logit (Durante and Rigon, 2019) and probit (Consonni and Marin, 2007) regression, or as a further constraint and building block to ease optimization in more complex models (Wang and Blei, 2013; Kucukelbir et al., 2017; Carbonetto and Stephens, 2012; Ray et al., 2020; Ray and Szabó, 2022).

The aforementioned approximations yield state-of-the-art solutions which are implemented in routinely used R libraries (e.g., `rstan`) and in recently-released `julia` repositories (e.g., <https://github.com/dahtah/GaussianEP.jl>). In addition, these solutions also find theoretical justification in the asymptotic normality of the posterior distribution ensured by Bernstein-von Mises type results (see, e.g., Van der Vaart, 2000) that have been extensively studied in the context of classical Laplace (e.g., Walker, 1969; Kasprzak et al., 2023; Spokoiny, 2023), VB (e.g., Wang and Blei, 2019; Katsevich and Rigollet, 2024) and EP (e.g., Dehaene and Barthelmé, 2018) approximations. While such results yield strong theoretical support in asymptotic regimes, it is important to recognize that, in practice, the accuracy of these routinely-implemented Gaussian approximations ultimately depends on the actual shape of the posterior distribution in finite samples, which often displays non-negligible skewness that affects inference accuracy when relying on Gaussian, or other symmetric, approximations. In fact, although the development of similarly-tractable and computationally-efficient skewed approximations of posterior distributions has attracted less interest to date, available contributions along these lines have proven effective in refining the accuracy of the Gaussian counterparts (e.g., Rue et al., 2009; Ormerod, 2011; Challis and Barber, 2012; Ruli et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2020; Fasano et al., 2022; Fasano and Durante, 2022; Anceschi et al., 2023; Salomone et al., 2024; Tan and Chen, 2024; Zhou et al., 2024; Durante et al., 2024). While such gains should stimulate an increasing adoption of skewed approximations, there is still a fundamental gap between the promising methodological avenues opened by this perspective and its routine use in practice. In fact, when compared

to classical deterministic approximations based on Gaussian, or other symmetric densities, there are at least three major barriers which still undermine the routine adoption of these skewed extensions.

a) Methods: Current solutions are often developed in the context of specific models and, even when targeting more general posterior distributions, the focus remains on improving just a single strategy, often VB. Moreover, the overarching interest is on including skewness within Gaussian approximating densities via extensions of skew–normal families (e.g., [Azzalini and Dalla Valle, 1996](#); [González-Farías et al., 2004](#); [Arellano-Valle and Azzalini, 2006](#)), rather than in more general symmetric ones.

b) Computation: The resulting schemes to derive the above skewed approximations require further optimization steps that often yield substantial increments in costs and complexity. In some situations the schemes necessitate even the calculation of the exact moments for the intractable posterior, a requirement in contrast with the original motivations for considering deterministic approximations.

c) Theory: Unlike for the classical versions of Laplace method, VB and EP, current skewed extensions lack general supporting theory, both in finite samples and also in asymptotic regimes, on the accuracy in approximating the whole posterior distribution and its functionals.

Two exceptions to the last point can be found in the recent contributions by [Fasano et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#). The former proves that, in the context of Bayesian probit regression, a partially–factorized generalization of the classical mean–field VB yields a unified skew–normal (SUN) ([Arellano-Valle and Azzalini, 2006](#)) approximation that provably matches the exact posterior for fixed sample size n and dimension $d \rightarrow \infty$. The latter derives, instead, a refined version of the Bernstein–von Mises theorem (e.g., [Van der Vaart, 2000](#)) which replaces the classical Gaussian limiting law with a valid skewed perturbation — arising from a third order version of the Laplace method — to obtain an improvement in the convergence rates to the target posterior by a \sqrt{n} factor, under the total variation (TV) distance; see also [Katsevich \(2023\)](#) for alternative higher–order skewed expansions, which, however, do not provide valid approximating densities. Albeit being derived in specific models ([Fasano et al., 2022](#)) or with reference to a single approximation strategy ([Durante et al., 2024](#)), these results suggest that the inclusion of skewness in state–of–the–art symmetric approximations has concrete potentials to substantially improve inference accuracy. However, it is still not clear whether a broadly–applicable, computationally–tractable and theoretically–supported solution addressing points a)–c) above actually exists and can be effectively derived.

In this article we provide a positive and innovative answer to the above question by deriving a broadly–applicable strategy to perturb, at no additional optimization costs, any off–the–shelf symmetric approxi-

mation of a generic posterior distribution. Crucially, such a perturbation yields a skewed approximation that is similarly-tractable, yet provably more accurate. As clarified in Section 2.2, this novel solution follows by noticing that any symmetric approximation of a posterior distribution, including the routinely-implemented ones reviewed in Section 2.1, is more accurate in approximating a suitably-symmetrized version of such a posterior rather its original non-symmetrized form. This holds both under the TV distance and any α -divergence. Albeit seemingly irrelevant from a methodological perspective, such a result is, in fact, of fundamental importance. More specifically, as detailed in Section 2.2, although the final target is the original posterior and not its symmetrized version, the two corresponding densities are crucially related in a way that yields a direct strategy for perturbing any off-the-shelf symmetric approximation of a generic posterior distribution. In particular, we prove in Section 2.2 that the density of the original posterior can be expressed as the product of its symmetrized version and a skewness-inducing factor which is available in closed-form and does not depend on additional unknown parameters. This characterization relates to a fundamental existence and uniqueness result of skew-symmetric representations (Wang et al., 2004) which has been never explored within the context of Bayesian inference and approximations, despite its unique potentials. In fact, such a parallel ensures that the perturbation of the original symmetric approximation by the newly-derived skewness-inducing factor yields a density that falls within the class of skew-symmetric distributions (Azzalini and Capitanio, 2003; Wang et al., 2004; Ma and Genton, 2004; Genton and Loperfido, 2005). This class admits a closed-form normalizing constant and straightforward i.i.d. sampling schemes which facilitate effective inference via Monte Carlo evaluation of any functional of the approximate posterior. Such schemes only require simulation from the original symmetric approximation and evaluation of the analytically-available skewness-inducing factor. As shown in Section 2.2, this factor crucially depends only on ratios of posterior densities, thus allowing cancellation of the intractable normalizing constant and, hence, direct computation without additional optimization costs.

Our theoretical results within Section 3.1 show that the proposed strategy is not only computationally tractable, but also yields skew-symmetric approximating densities that are provably more accurate than the original symmetric counterpart, under any sample size n and several routinely-studied divergences. Even more, the closed-form skewness factor derived is shown to be the optimal among those yielding approximations within the tractable skew-symmetric class. This allows to formally interpret the proposed solution as the optimum of a minimization problem seeking the closest approximation to the target posterior within the class of skew-symmetric densities generated by perturbations of the known symmetric approximation to be improved. The accuracy improvements formalized in Section 3.1 are also asymptotically

quantified in Section 3.2 with a focus on perturbations of specific symmetric approximations which can be shown to improve by at least a \sqrt{n} factor the convergence rate to the target posterior relative to the original unperturbed counterpart. As illustrated within Section 4, these theoretical improvements are visible also in practice on real-data applications, for any perturbation of state-of-the-art Gaussian approximations from the Laplace method, VB and EP. Particularly remarkable is the accuracy of the skewed perturbation of Gaussian EP. These skewed versions of EP have been overlooked to date due to the apparent complexities in the optimization when replacing Gaussian sites with skew-normal ones. By considering a different perspective based on the direct perturbation of an already-available Gaussian EP approximation, the proposed strategy overcomes these complexities to derive an improved skew-symmetric approximation at no additional costs or computational challenges. Section 5 discusses research directions motivated by the broader impact of the skew-symmetric representation of posterior densities behind our contribution.

2. Skew-symmetric approximations of posterior distributions

Let $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ denote the likelihood induced by a generic statistical model characterizing the probabilistic generative mechanism for the data $\mathbf{y}_{1:n} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)$ via a family of distributions indexed by a parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. To provide inference on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, Bayesian statistics defines a prior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ which, combined with $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$, gives rise to the corresponding posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ via the Bayes rule, i.e., $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})/c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ with $c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \int_{\Theta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Such a posterior is then leveraged to evaluate functionals of interest for inference. Clearly, the feasibility of this latter task inherently depends on the tractability of the normalizing constant $c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$, which is often not available analytically. To address this issue, standard practice relies either on sampling-based methods or on tractable deterministic approximations of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In this article we consider the latter class of solutions and focus on improving those state-of-the-art symmetric approximations that routinely arise in practice.

More specifically, let $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an already-derived symmetric approximation of the intractable posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ denoting the known symmetry point, i.e., $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(-(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}))$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, or, equivalently, $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Our goal is to obtain a more accurate approximation $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ from the perturbation of $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ via a skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which does not require optimization of additional parameters and crucially preserves the inference tractability of the original symmetric approximation. Although the novel strategy we derive in Section 2.2 is guaranteed to improve the accuracy of any symmetric approximation $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, in practice it is natural to focus on perturbing the outputs of routinely-implemented Laplace, EP and Gaussian VB approximations; see Section 2.1 for a general overview of these

strategies and refer to, e.g., [Bishop \(2006, Ch. 4.4, 10\)](#), [Opper and Archambeau \(2009\)](#), [Challis and Barber \(2013\)](#) and [Vehtari et al. \(2020\)](#) for a more detailed treatment. As clarified in these contributions, such symmetric approximations provide commonly-implemented solutions which are effectively coded in routinely used platforms (e.g., STAN) and softwares (e.g., R, python and julia). Since the proposed skew-symmetric approximation arises as a direct perturbation of an already-available symmetric one, without further optimization, it is useful to place particular emphasis on those provided by state-of-the-art softwares so as to stimulate direct inclusion of the proposed perturbation within these softwares. Notice also that commonly-used symmetric approximations often depend on additional parameters beyond the symmetry point $\hat{\theta}$. For instance, Gaussian approximations also require estimation of the covariance matrix. As clarified in [Section 2.2](#), the skewness-inducing factor we propose only depends on $\hat{\theta}$ and is applied to an already-derived symmetric approximation whose parameters have been previously estimated under standard computational strategies. Therefore, to ease notation, we index $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ only by $\hat{\theta}$ and leave the remaining, already-estimated, parameters implicit. Theoretical guarantees for the finite-sample and asymptotic accuracy of the proposed approximation are derived in [Section 3](#).

2.1. *A brief overview of symmetric approximations of posterior distributions*

When seeking a tractable symmetric approximation of a generic posterior distribution for the parameter $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, a simple option is to consider the classical Gaussian approximation arising from the Laplace method (e.g., [Bishop, 2006, Ch. 4.4](#)). Such a solution follows directly from a second-order Taylor expansion of the un-normalized log-posterior $\log[\pi(\theta)L(\theta; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})]$ at the maximum a posteriori (MAP). This yields a Gaussian approximating density centered at the MAP and with covariance matrix given by the inverse of the negative Hessian for $\log[\pi(\theta)L(\theta; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})]$, again evaluated at the MAP. Such a strategy provides, therefore, a simple approach which only requires estimation of the MAP via standard optimization schemes (see e.g., [Gelman et al., 2013, Ch. 13](#)). This has stimulated broad applicability and several extensions, including, among others, integrated nested Laplace approximation (INLA) ([Rue et al., 2009](#)) and approximate Laplace approximation (ALA) ([Rossell et al., 2021](#)). INLA provides an effective framework that combines efficient numerical integration strategies and analytical approximations to yield accurate characterizations of posterior marginals for parameters of interest, under latent Gaussian models. Such a scheme is inspired by [Tierney and Kadane \(1986\)](#) Laplace approximation of the marginal posterior density for a subset of parameters of interest, which expresses this marginal as proportional to the ratio between the joint posterior and the full conditional density of the remaining parameters, and then applies the Gaussian approxima-

tion from the Laplace method to such a latter density. Although this strategy can yield non–symmetric approximations of marginal posterior densities, it still relies on nested Gaussian approximations. Hence, the skew–symmetric approximation we derive in Section 2.2 has the potential to further improve also the accuracy of INLA. Our novel perturbation strategy can be also applied directly to improve the accuracy of the symmetric approximation underlying ALA. In fact, such a procedure does not differ from the classical Laplace method in the shape of the approximating density. Rather, it provides a scalable strategy which avoids MAP estimation when locating the symmetric approximation.

While Laplace–type schemes yield simple strategies to approximate intractable posterior densities, these solutions arise from a Taylor expansion of the log–posterior at a given point. Therefore, the resulting approximation fails to incorporate global characteristics of the posterior beyond the local behavior around such a point (Bishop, 2006, Ch. 4.4). This issue has motivated alternative approximation strategies, with an overarching focus on VB (e.g., Blei et al., 2017) and EP (e.g., Vehtari et al., 2020). VB specifies a family \mathcal{F} of tractable approximating densities and then identifies, within such a family, the one that is closest to the intractable posterior under the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence (Kullback and Leibler, 1951). The common practice in specifying \mathcal{F} relies either on parametric families, often imposing a Gaussian approximation (see e.g., Opper and Archambeau, 2009; Challis and Barber, 2013; Tan and Nott, 2018), or on mean–field assumptions (e.g., Blei et al., 2017) enforcing the joint approximating density for θ to factorize as the product of marginals for suitably–selected non–overlapping subsets of parameters. In the first case the final output of the optimization problem is, by definition, a symmetric density which can be readily improved under our proposed skew–symmetric approximation. Conversely, the second can yield skewed solutions. Indeed, as clarified in e.g., Blei et al. (2017) the optimum for each factor, under mean–field VB, has the same shape of the actual, not necessarily symmetric, full conditional density for the subset of parameters in θ comprising that factor, and the associated variational coefficients can be estimated iteratively via coordinate ascent variational inference (CAVI) algorithms (e.g., Blei et al., 2017). Nonetheless, several routine–use Bayesian models, such as logit (Durante and Rigon, 2019) and probit (Consonni and Marin, 2007) regression, admit Gaussian full–conditionals for the coefficients. Hence, the proposed perturbation might be useful even in mean–field VB to improve the accuracy of the symmetric density factors and, therefore, of the overall approximation for the entire posterior. These Gaussian approximating densities appear also in Laplace variational inference, delta–method variational inference and automatic differentiation variational inference (ADVI) (Wang and Blei, 2013; Kucukelbir et al., 2017) which are often employed to facilitate the implementation of mean–field VB. Such approximations are especially useful and popular

in complex models where CAVI does not admit simple closed-form updates.

Although VB is arguably the most widely studied and implemented deterministic approximation strategy, routine-use variational approximations often suffer from an underestimation of posterior uncertainty (e.g., [Blei et al., 2017](#); [Giordano et al., 2018](#)). This is implicit in the expression of the KL minimized under VB that penalizes densities placing mass to areas of low posterior probability, but it does not enforce a similarly-strong penalty in the opposite direction. As a consequence, minimizing such a KL yields more concentrated approximations avoiding regions where the actual posterior does not place substantial mass. While improved estimates of variances and covariances have been proposed in the context of VB ([Giordano et al., 2018](#)), another natural solution is to consider EP (e.g., [Vehtari et al., 2020](#)), which addresses such an issue by minimizing a reverse form of the KL considered under VB. This implies penalizations in the opposite direction than those of VB and, hence, a tendency to favor more global *zero-avoiding* approximations that match more closely the variability encoded in the target posterior. To obtain these approximations EP postulates that the target posterior density itself can be expressed as a product of factors — often arising as a direct consequence of the conditional independence structures within the likelihood — and then iteratively approximates each of these factors with an element of a tractable parametric family, almost always Gaussian. This results in a computational scheme updating each factor at-a-time via moment matching between the global approximating density and a hybrid one, more tractable than the target posterior, where the other factors are kept fixed at the most recent approximation (e.g., [Vehtari et al., 2020](#)). Being often Gaussian, these EP approximating densities can be readily perturbed under our proposed strategy to further improve the quality of the approximation. In fact, although several empirical studies have highlighted the remarkable accuracy of Gaussian EP (see e.g., [Chopin and Ridgway, 2017](#); [Vehtari et al., 2020](#); [Anceschi et al., 2023](#)) relative to Laplace and VB, there is still a lack of tractable solutions capable of including skewness within these Gaussian densities to further improve the quality of EP approximations. As illustrated in the empirical studies in [Section 4](#), incorporating these skewed behaviors yields further improvements over such an already-successful strategy.

Before moving to the proposed skew-symmetric perturbation in [Section 2.2](#), it is important to emphasize that our strategy applies directly to any symmetric approximation, not necessarily Gaussian. This can be useful to perturb further extensions of the aforementioned methods aimed at capturing higher-order properties (e.g., tails). For example, generalizations from Gaussian approximating densities to Student- t ones have been explored in the context of Laplace, VB and EP (see e.g., [Ding et al., 2011](#); [Futami et al., 2017](#); [Liang et al., 2022](#); [Gelman et al., 2013](#), Ch. 13), but there are no strategies, to date, for including

skewness within such extensions. Our proposed solution applies also to these symmetric approximations. As proved in Section 3.2, the perturbation of these increasingly–accurate symmetric densities opens the avenues to progressively improve the asymptotic convergence rates to the target posterior.

2.2. Skew–symmetric perturbation of symmetric approximations

As anticipated in Section 1, the newly–proposed skew–symmetric approximation arises from the perturbation of an already–derived approximating density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, which is symmetric about the point $\hat{\theta}$. Although $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ arises from the attempt to accurately approximate the target posterior density $\pi_n(\theta)$ via, e.g., one of the methods discussed in Section 2.1, the overall quality of $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ is clearly undermined by the fact that $\pi_n(\theta)$ is often skewed in practice, whereas $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ is symmetric. To this end, it is reasonable to ask whether the given density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ would rather provide a more accurate approximation for a symmetrized version $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\theta)$ of $\pi_n(\theta)$ about $\hat{\theta}$, than for the original posterior $\pi_n(\theta)$, under a suitable divergence. Lemma 1 states that this is indeed the case for the symmetrized version $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\theta)$ of the posterior defined as

$$\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\theta) = \frac{\pi_n(\theta) + \pi_n(2\hat{\theta} - \theta)}{2}, \quad (1)$$

for every parameter value $\theta \in \Theta$ and symmetry point $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$. See the Supplementary Material for proofs.

LEMMA 1. *Let $\pi_n(\theta)$ be a generic posterior density for the parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, and denote with $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ an already–derived approximation of $\pi_n(\theta)$ which is symmetric about the point $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$. Moreover, consider the symmetrized posterior density $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\theta)$ about $\hat{\theta}$ defined as in (1). Then*

$$\mathcal{D}[\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\theta) \parallel f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)] \leq \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\theta) \parallel f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)],$$

for any $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , where \mathcal{D} is either the TV distance (\mathcal{D}_{TV}) or any α –divergence (\mathcal{D}_{α}).

REMARK 1. Although other forms of symmetrization can be considered, the one defined in (1) is arguably the most natural and simple. In fact, although it has been generally overlooked and, to the best of our knowledge, never been explored in the context of Bayesian approximations, this symmetrization has been successfully employed in classical frequentist literature to improve standard estimators of empirical distribution functions associated with underlying symmetric densities (Schuster, 1975; Hinkley, 1976; Lo, 1985; Meloche, 1991). Our contribution leverages such a symmetrization in an innovative manner and with a substantially different focus. Nonetheless, as clarified in the following, its distinctive form plays a crucial

role also within our context, in that it allows to design a theoretically-supported and similarly-tractable skew-symmetric perturbation of the known $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, without additional optimization steps.

REMARK 2. Lemma 1 states a general result which applies to any symmetric approximation $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of a generic posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and holds under both the TV distance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = (1/2) \int_{\Theta} |p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - q(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and every α -divergence $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = [1/(\alpha(1-\alpha))](1 - \int_{\Theta} p(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\alpha} q(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0; 1\}$ (see e.g., [Cichocki and Amari, 2010](#); [Póczos and Schneider, 2011](#)). Note that, when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, then \mathcal{D}_{α} reduces to the KL divergences $\text{KL}[q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel p(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ and $\text{KL}[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$, respectively (e.g., [Cichocki and Amari, 2010](#)). Hence, Lemma 1, and the subsequent theoretical results we derive, hold under the most widely used divergences in the context of deterministic approximations for posterior distributions. As discussed in Section 2.1, the KL divergences $\text{KL}[q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel p(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ and $\text{KL}[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ formally enter the formulation of the minimization problems in VB and EP (e.g., [Blei et al., 2017](#); [Vehtari et al., 2020](#)), while TV is a reference distance in the study of the asymptotic accuracy of standard approximations. Recent literature has also explored variational approximations based on a generic α -divergence, beyond its limiting KL form, to obtain increased flexibility in the loss minimized ([Alquier and Ridgway, 2020](#); [Yang et al., 2020](#)). Hence, our methods and theory apply also to symmetric approximations from these strategies.

Although the result in Lemma 1 is interesting *per se*, the ultimate goal is to approximate the actual posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and not its symmetrized form $\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. With this objective in mind, Proposition 1 establishes an analytic relation among these two densities which is fundamental to derive our improved skew-symmetric approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ via a closed-form perturbation of the original $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

PROPOSITION 1 (SKEW-SYMMETRIC REPRESENTATION OF POSTERIOR DENSITIES). *Consider a generic posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})/c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, where $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the prior, $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ the likelihood, and $c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ the normalizing constant. Moreover, denote with $\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = [\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})]/2$ the symmetrized form of such a posterior density about a point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$, and let*

$$w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) + \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})}, \quad (2)$$

with the convention that $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$ if $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = 0$ (see Remark 4 for additional details). Then, the posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be equivalently re-expressed as

$$\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (3)$$

for any $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , where $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1]$ satisfies $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The proof of Proposition 1 is direct and simply requires to note that the posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be equivalently re–written as $2 \cdot \bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot [\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / (2\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]$. Therefore, replacing in the ratio $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / (2\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ the quantity $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with its expression in (1) and $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) / c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ yields the skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (2), after noticing that the intractable normalizing constant $c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ cancels out in the ratio between the target posterior density and its symmetrized form. The $[0, 1]$ range for $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the property $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ follow directly from its definition. As clarified later, such properties for $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are fundamental to ensure that the proposed perturbation for $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ belongs to a tractable class of skew–symmetric distributions (Azzalini and Capitanio, 2003; Wang et al., 2004; Ma and Genton, 2004).

As anticipated in Section 1, Proposition 1 relates to a core result in Wang et al. (2004) which establishes the existence and uniqueness of skew–symmetric representations for generic densities. This parallel ensures that the equivalent expression for $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in Proposition 1 is the one of a skew–symmetric density. According to (3), such a density is equal to the product between a tractable and analytically–available skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ — where the troublesome normalizing constant $c(\mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ crucially cancels out — and a symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ that is often as intractable as the target $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Such a latter issue prevents (3) from having a direct impact in facilitating posterior inference and, for this reason, the representation in Proposition 1 has been never explored within Bayesian statistics. Nonetheless, as clarified in Definition 1, combing (3) with Lemma 1 suggests a natural strategy to obtain the newly–proposed skew–symmetric approximation via direct perturbation of $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. More specifically, by Lemma 1, $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ approximates $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ more accurately than $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be in turn expressed via $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / [2w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ as a direct consequence of (3). Combining these two results yields $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx \bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / [2w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$, which also implies $2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Hence, setting $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, provides the newly–proposed, and improved, skew–symmetric approximation in Definition 1 below.

DEFINITION 1 (SKEW–SYMMETRIC APPROXIMATION OF POSTERIOR DENSITIES). *Denote with $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ a generic posterior density for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and let $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an already–derived approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is symmetric about the point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$. Moreover, denote with $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1]$ the skewness–inducing factor in (2). Then, the skew–symmetric approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ arising from the perturbation of $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is defined as*

$$q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) + \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})}, \quad (4)$$

for every known symmetry point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , where $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ denote, respectively, the prior and the likelihood inducing the target posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

REMARK 3. Notice that the skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (4) admits a natural interpretation, in that it coincides with the relative proportion of the posterior density at $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ with respect to the total assigned to such a $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and its symmetric counterpart $2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}$. This yields a skewing function which quantifies differences in the posterior density at symmetric points $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. Hence, if the posterior is actually symmetric about $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, then $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, which implies that $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$, and, therefore, $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ reduces to $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, as expected. Conversely, whenever there are asymmetries in $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, it follows that $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ is not necessarily equal to $\pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. As a result, the original symmetric approximation $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is re-weighted by $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in order to properly re-distribute the total density at each symmetric pair $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ according to the one assigned by the actual posterior to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}$. This yields an improved approximation $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which incorporates the skewness of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with respect to the known symmetry point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. For instance, if $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, then, by definition, also $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, whereas $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ by construction.

REMARK 4. In Proposition 1 we rely on the convention that $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$ if $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = 0$, where the latter equality also implies $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$. In such a setting, which arises, for example, when the support of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is bounded, both the numerator and the denominator of the skewness-inducing factor in (2) are zero, and hence, $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is undefined, thus requiring an alternative specification. Notice that such an alternative specification is not necessary to guarantee the validity of the skew-symmetric representation for $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, provided that also the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is zero whenever $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$. Therefore, in (3) different values of $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are irrelevant at these zero-density points. However, $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ does not necessarily imply that $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$. This case commonly arises, for example, when Gaussian approximations are considered for parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with bounded support. As such, when $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ and $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$, the skewness-inducing factor must be specified alternatively so as to guarantee that $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (4) is a valid skew-symmetric density. Recalling Proposition 1, a core condition for this result to hold is that $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1]$ and $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for every point satisfying $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$. To this end, setting $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$ whenever $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ and $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$ is arguably the most direct strategy to meet such a condition. Recalling Remark 3, $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$ implies that $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, and hence, the convention that $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0.5$ if $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_n(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ is also the most natural one.

As clarified in Definition 1 and in Remark 3, the proposed approximation $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ results from the re-weighting of the known $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ by a skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ via a strategy which does not necessari-

tates additional optimization costs relative to those required for deriving the original $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. In fact, the expression for $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ in (2) does not depend on additional unknown parameters beyond $\hat{\theta}$, which is in turn available as the output of the already–solved optimization problem that targeted the posterior $\pi_n(\theta)$ via the symmetric density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ to be perturbed. Proposition 2 below guarantees that, albeit more flexible and sophisticated than the original $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, the deterministic approximation $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ in Definition 1 still preserves similar tractability in inference, in that it belongs to the known class of skew–symmetric densities (Azzalini and Capitanio, 2003; Wang et al., 2004; Ma and Genton, 2004; Genton and Loperfido, 2005).

PROPOSITION 2. *The expression for $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ given in equation (4) coincides with the density of a skew–symmetric distribution with symmetric component $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ and skewing function $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$.*

Proposition 2 follows directly from the general definition of skew–symmetric densities in, e.g., Wang et al. (2004), after noticing that, by construction, $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ is symmetric about $\hat{\theta}$ and, as proved in Proposition 1, $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ has support in $[0, 1]$ and satisfies $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta) = 1 - w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(2\hat{\theta} - \theta)$. As anticipated in Section 1, the connection with skew–symmetric distributions established in Proposition 2 is crucial in facilitating inference also under $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. More concretely, such a class admits a straightforward and rejection–free i.i.d. sampling scheme (e.g., Wang et al., 2004). This scheme is outlined in Algorithm 1 with a specific focus on the proposed approximation. As a consequence, it allows tractable and effective Monte Carlo evaluation of any functional of interest under the improved approximation $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$.

Note that Algorithm 1 only requires simulation from the original symmetric approximation $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ and the computation of the skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, which is analytically–available in Definition 1 and does not depend on intractable quantities. The first task is straightforward whenever the perturbed density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ arises from one of the routinely–implemented approximation schemes discussed in Section 2.1, and, when the interest is in more complex functionals, it is often required also for inference under $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. The second, requires instead the evaluation of the likelihood, which enters the definition of $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. Although this yields some increment in sampling costs relative to inference under $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, as illustrated in the empirical studies in Section 4, the gains obtained in approximation accuracy often justify this additional cost.

Algorithm 1: i.i.d. sampling from the approximating distribution with density $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ in (4)

For $s = 1, \dots, N_{\text{SAMPL}}$ **do:**

1. Sample $\theta_{\text{TEMP}}^{(s)}$ from the distribution with symmetric density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ and draw $u^{(s)} \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$.
2. If $u^{(s)} \leq w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta_{\text{TEMP}}^{(s)})$ set $\theta^{(s)} = \theta_{\text{TEMP}}^{(s)}$, otherwise set $\theta^{(s)} = 2\hat{\theta} - \theta_{\text{TEMP}}^{(s)}$.

Output: i.i.d. samples $\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(N_{\text{SAMPL}})}$ from the skew–symmetric approximating density $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$.

Moreover, as clarified in Section 2.3, in several routinely–implemented models such as, e.g., generalized linear models, it is possible to devise computationally–efficient strategies for evaluating $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

It shall be also emphasized that the aforementioned likelihood evaluations are standard in state–of–the–art sampling–based inference schemes, such as, for example, importance sampling, Metropolis–Hastings, Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and sequential Monte Carlo (e.g., [Chopin and Ridgway, 2017](#); [Chopin and Paspiliopoulos, 2020](#)). However, unlike for Algorithm 1, these schemes introduce additional complexities, which often require further tuning and do not ensure a rejection–free i.i.d. sampling strategy. To this end, Algorithm 1 achieves a sensible balance between the tractability ensured by $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the increased accuracy associated with state–of–the–art sampling schemes targeting the exact posterior density.

2.3. Efficient evaluation of the skewness–inducing factor

Recalling the above discussion, inference under the newly–proposed skew–symmetric approximation $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ requires the evaluation of the two un–normalized posterior densities $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ and $\pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ in the skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. As such, the increments in cost relative to performing inference under $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ mainly depend on those of evaluating the two likelihoods $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ and $L(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$. For several models of practical interest these evaluations can be performed efficiently and with a cost that is negligible compared to simulating a sample from $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Nevertheless, in case of expensive likelihoods, it is crucial to provide strategies that can reduce such a computational cost. This is the case, for example, of high–dimensional (i.e., large d) models, with the parameters entering the likelihood function through a linear predictor (as in routinely–implemented generalized linear models).

Under the above setting, Algorithm 2 provides an efficient approach for computing $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ at a cost which is essentially that of a single likelihood evaluation instead of the two required in the expression of $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. More specifically, Algorithm 2 can be applied to the broad class of models whose log–likelihood $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$

Algorithm 2: Efficient evaluation of $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in models with linear predictors

Require: $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{\theta}}$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and the design matrix \mathbf{X} with rows \mathbf{x}_i^\top .

Do:

1. Evaluate $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} = \mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$.
2. Compute $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{\theta}, i} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i})$ and $\ell(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{\theta}, i} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i})$.

Output:

$$w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\exp(\log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}))}{\exp(\log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})) + \exp(\log \pi(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \ell(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}))}.$$

can be expressed as $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{y}_i, \eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, i})$, where $g_i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, denote functions that can be evaluated with limited computational effort, while $\eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, i} = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are linear predictors depending on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and on a vector of explanatory variables $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Within this context, for (at least moderately) large d , the most expensive operation is the evaluation of the linear predictor. Algorithm 2 reduces the cost required for computing $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ by exploiting the fact that $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{y}_i, \eta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i} + \eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i})$ and $\ell(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{y}_i, \eta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i} - \eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i})$ where $\eta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i} = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and $\eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, i} = \mathbf{x}_i^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Crucially, the vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} = (\eta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, 1}, \dots, \eta_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, n})^\top$ can be pre-computed, meaning that only a single evaluation of the vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} = (\eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, 1}, \dots, \eta_{\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, n})^\top$ is required in order to compute the skewness inducing factor. As a result, since the cost of $\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $g_i(\cdot)$ is $O(d)$ and $O(1)$, respectively, Algorithm 2 allows to evaluate $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in a number of operations which, for d large, is essentially reduced by a factor of two.

3. Theoretical properties of skew–symmetric approximations

Sections 3.1–3.2 clarify that the skew–symmetric approximation $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ derived in Section 2 (see also Definition 1) is not only tractable from both an optimization and inference perspective, but also yields a provably more accurate characterization of the exact posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. See the Supplementary Material for proofs.

3.1. Finite–sample properties and optimality

The original motivation for the skew–symmetric approximation $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (4) is to improve the accuracy of the unperturbed $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Theorem 1 provides theoretical support in finite samples to this accuracy improvement and clarifies that the quality of $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ solely depends on how accurate $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is in approximating the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (1). These results are deepened in Theorem 2 which proves that the skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in Definition 1 is optimal among all those yielding a skew–symmetric approximation for $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, with $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as symmetric component.

THEOREM 1 (FINITE–SAMPLE ACCURACY). *Let $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be a generic posterior density for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and denote with $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ an already–derived approximation for $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is symmetric about the point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$. Moreover, let $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, with $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as in (2). Then, for any symmetry point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , it holds*

$$\mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathcal{D}[\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{D} denotes either the total variation distance (\mathcal{D}_{TV}) or any α –divergence (\mathcal{D}_α), whereas $\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is

the symmetrized posterior density defined in (1). In view of Lemma 1, this implies also

$$\mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (6)$$

for any $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and n .

Theorem 1 states two important results. First, as clarified in (5), the overall quality of $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ actually coincides with the one achieved by the original, unperturbed, $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (1). Second, according to (6), $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is, provably, never less accurate than the original $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, irrespectively of the chosen $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, its symmetry point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, and the sample size n . Notice also that (5) is not only an intermediate step to obtain (6), but it is of direct practical interest. Indeed, among the approximating densities $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with the same symmetry point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, it suggests to prioritize those that give a more accurate approximation of the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (1), rather than the original $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Therefore, although this objective goes beyond our original scope of perturbing an already-available $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, equations (5) and (6) stimulate the development of novel symmetric approximations explicitly targeting $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ rather than the original posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In fact, as a consequence of (5)–(6), the perturbation of these approximations under the proposed strategy can yield an increasingly accurate characterization of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The results in Theorem 1 follow from the specific form of the skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (2). Theorem 2 proves the optimality of such a factor.

THEOREM 2 (OPTIMALITY OF THE SKEWNESS-INDUCING FACTOR). *Let $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ denote a generic posterior density for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and let $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an already-derived approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is symmetric about $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$. Furthermore, denote with $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ the skew-symmetric approximation introduced in Definition 1, and define with $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ an alternative skew-symmetric perturbation of $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ corresponds to a generic skewing function such that $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1]$ and $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then, for every $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

for any $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , where \mathcal{D} is either the TV distance (\mathcal{D}_{TV}) or any α -divergence (\mathcal{D}_{α}).

According to Theorem 2, the skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (2) is guaranteed to provide a perturbed version $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ that is never less accurate in approximating the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ when compared to any other skew-symmetric density $q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with symmetric component $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and generic skew-

ing function $w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Notice that to ensure $q_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a skew–symmetric density it suffices that the skewing function satisfies $w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1]$ and $w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\theta}}(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Hence, in principle, there are infinitely–many options to perturb the original symmetric approximation so that the resulting density falls in the skew–symmetric class. Some interesting examples of skewing functions have been derived in [Azzalini and Capitanio \(2003\)](#); [Ma and Genton \(2004\)](#) and [Genton and Loperfido \(2005\)](#) with a focus on generalizations of skew–normal and skew–elliptical densities which belong to the broader skew–symmetric family. According to [Theorem 2](#), all these options would be suboptimal relative to the proposed skewing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Intuitively, this is because, unlike for other skewing functions, $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ exactly matches the skewness factor of the target posterior, when expressed in a skew–symmetric form as in [Proposition 1](#).

Besides proving the optimality of the skewness–inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, [Theorem 2](#) further allows to formalize the proposed skew–symmetric approximation in [Definition 1](#) as the solution of a well–defined optimization problem. This result is stated in [Corollary 1](#) and is useful to establish connections with state–of–the–art approximation strategies arising from optimization of specific divergences, e.g., VB ([Blei et al., 2017](#)) and EP ([Vehtari et al., 2020](#)). In addition, as discussed in [Remark 5](#), it provides the premises to further expand the scope of the perspective considered in this article.

COROLLARY 1. *Consider the generic posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for the parameter of interest $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and let $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an already–derived approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is symmetric about the point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$. Moreover, denote with $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ the proposed skewed approximation in [Definition 1](#), and define with $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) : w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in [0, 1], w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w_{\hat{\theta}}(2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})\}$ the family of skew–symmetric densities that arise from the perturbation of $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ via a generic skewing function $w_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then*

$$q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{q_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

for any $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ and sample size n , where \mathcal{D} is either the TV distance (\mathcal{D}_{TV}) or any α –divergence (\mathcal{D}_{α}).

Although the skew–symmetric approximation derived in [Section 2](#) is not explicitly obtained as the solution of a suitably–defined optimization problem, [Corollary 1](#) clarifies that, in fact, the proposed $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be formalized also under such a perspective. In particular, the skew–symmetric density $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in [Definition 1](#) actually coincides with the solution of the constrained minimization for a suitable divergence \mathcal{D} between the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and a given approximating density $q_{\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ within the family \mathcal{Q} of skew–symmetric densities with symmetric component fixed at the original approximating density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This interpretation allows us to establish connections with the optimization–based perspectives underlying VB (e.g., [Blei et al., 2017](#)) and EP (e.g., [Vehtari et al., 2020](#)) solutions. However, unlike these methods,

Corollary 1 holds under a broader class of divergences, rather than a specific one, and, when compared to routinely-implemented VB and EP schemes yielding symmetric approximations, it considers an expanded family which ensures improvements in accuracy. Notice that, consistent with the focus of this article, $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ and, as a consequence, $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$ are known and fixed in Corollary 1. Therefore, the only quantity to be derived is the skewness-inducing factor. Crucially, as clarified in Theorem 2, the solution $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ to such a minimization with respect to $w_{\hat{\theta}}(\theta)$ does not require optimization of additional parameters beyond the already-available $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$. Although extending the optimization problem in Corollary 1 to the case in which also $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ is unknown goes beyond the scope of our contribution, as clarified in Remark 5 below, such a direction can be of substantial interest to further improve the accuracy of $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, and our results open several avenues to stimulate future advancements along these lines.

REMARK 5. As already discussed, the overarching focus of this article is to improve the accuracy of state-of-the-art symmetric approximations of posterior distributions via a broadly-applicable perturbation scheme which can be derived at no additional optimization costs and applied directly to the output $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ of standard implementations. To this end, $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ is kept fixed and known in our derivations. However, although the optimization of such a symmetric component goes beyond the scope of our contribution, combining the results in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 with the skew-symmetric representation of posterior densities in Proposition 1, opens promising directions to further improve the approximation accuracy via the additional optimization of the symmetric component. In particular, notice that as a consequence of Corollary 1 and equation (5), $\min_{q_{\hat{\theta}}(\theta) \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\theta) \parallel q_{\hat{\theta}}(\theta)] = \mathcal{D}[\pi_n(\theta) \parallel q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)] = \mathcal{D}[\bar{\pi}_{n, \hat{\theta}}(\theta) \parallel f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)]$, for any, possibly unknown, $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. Hence, when solving the minimization problem in Corollary 1 also with respect to $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$, it suffices to find the closest symmetric density to the symmetrized posterior in equation (1) and then perturb such a density via the already-derived optimal skewness-inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$. This is expected to further improve accuracy relative to perturbations of currently-implemented symmetric approximations that target the actual posterior instead of its symmetrized version. In fact, to our knowledge, such a different target has never been considered and, hence, our results can open unexplored avenues to derive improved classes of tractable deterministic approximations, along with novel computational methods to obtain these approximations. When specializing \mathcal{D} to the KL minimized under VB — which is a limiting case of α -divergences — a promising direction could be to solve such an optimization problem via automatic differentiation variational inference schemes (Kucukelbir et al., 2017).

Section 3.2 below quantifies the aforementioned accuracy gains of $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\theta)$ in asymptotic settings.

3.2. Asymptotic properties

Theorems 1–2 provide finite–sample theoretical guarantees for the improved approximation accuracy of the newly–developed skew–symmetric solution $q_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ compared to its symmetric counterpart $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. However, these results do not quantify the magnitude of such improvements. Below, we address this important point from an asymptotic perspective for $n \rightarrow \infty$. This perspective further clarifies how the overall quality of the proposed skew–symmetric approximation crucially depends on the one achieved by its symmetric counterpart $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

To address the aforementioned objectives, we study the skewed perturbations of two particular symmetric approximations, both centered at the posterior mode $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (i.e., $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$), and approximating the target posterior density $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with the same rate. Since the symmetry points coincide, the perturbations of these two symmetric approximations share the same skewness inducing factor $w_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, as a direct consequence of (2). Nonetheless, as clarified below, the resulting skew–symmetric perturbations achieve substantially different rates in approximating $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. These rates coincide with those obtained by the symmetric counterparts in approximating the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, which can be substantially different from those achieved when the target is the actual posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Notice that, unlike for the finite sample properties in Section 3.1 — which hold broadly for any skew–symmetric approximation — the asymptotic analysis we consider below focuses on the sub–class of skewed perturbations of Gaussians or higher–order extensions of these Gaussians, both centered at the posterior mode. Although generalizations of such an asymptotic theory to the general class of skew–symmetric approximations can be envisioned, the focus on this sub–class facilitates theoretical derivations and allows to leverage available results on the rates of Gaussian approximations. In addition, these Gaussian approximations and the corresponding higher–order versions are directly related to Laplace–type methods, and hence, are ubiquitous in Bayesian inference. Therefore, it is natural to deepen the asymptotic analysis of the skew–symmetric approximations arising from the perturbation of such symmetric densities. Notice that, although we consider the posterior mode as the symmetry point, the theory derived below relies on assumptions which allow direct extensions to situations in which such a symmetry point is a generic efficient estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

To derive the asymptotic results discussed above, let us denote with $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) = \log L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ the log–likelihood function evaluated at $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and with $\ell_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(k)} = (\partial^{\otimes k} / \partial^{\otimes k} \boldsymbol{\theta}) \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ the d^k –dimensional array of its partial k –th order derivatives at the same point $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Similarly, the log–prior density and the d^k –dimensional array containing the associated k –th order partial derivatives at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are indicated, respectively, with $\log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(k)} = (\partial^{\otimes k} / \partial^{\otimes k} \boldsymbol{\theta}) \log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Under these settings, the first symmetric density

whose skewed perturbation is studied in asymptotic regimes is the Gaussian approximation obtained from the Laplace method. Namely,

$$f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi_d(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1}), \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} = -(\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2)} + \log \pi_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2)})$. The second is, instead, a novel higher-order extension of such a Gaussian which belongs to the family of semi-nonparametric distributions ([Gallant and Nychka, 1987](#)) and has density

$$f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi_d(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1})P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})/\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1}}[P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})], \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1}}[P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] = \int \phi_d(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{-1})P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the normalizing constant, while $P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is a non-negative polynomial obtained from a fourth-order expansion of the symmetrized log-posterior distribution at $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ that yields

$$P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = 1 + \frac{1}{24}\langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{\otimes 4} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{24}\langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{\otimes 4} \rangle \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{6}\langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}, (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{\otimes 3} \rangle \right]^2.$$

In the above expression the generic quantity $\langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{\otimes k} \rangle$ denotes the polynomial term associated to the k -th element of the Taylor expansion of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ at $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Note that, by Lemma B.2 in Appendix B of the Supplementary Material, $P(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is always non negative and, hence, $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a proper density function symmetric about $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Although (8) is of less direct applicability than (7), such a higher-order approximating density can capture the behavior of the symmetrized posterior distribution at the tails more accurately than the Gaussian in (7). Hence, it provides an interesting alternative to (7) for quantifying the gains of the proposed skew-symmetric family of approximations when applied to symmetric densities achieving different accuracies in capturing the behavior of the symmetrized posterior. Note that, since (7)–(8) share the same symmetry point $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the two resulting skew-symmetric approximations $q_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, respectively, have the same skewness-inducing factor $w_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The above discussions are formalized in Theorem 3 below. When the dimension d is fixed, this theorem guarantees that the TV distance between the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the skew-symmetric perturbation $q_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of (7) converges to zero in probability with rate $1/n$, up to a logarithmic term, which substantially improves the $1/\sqrt{n}$ rate of the unperturbed Gaussian approximation $f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This accuracy gain is further refined by $q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which achieves a $1/n^2$ rate, again up to a logarithmic term. Such a latter result is even more remarkable, provided that $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ has the same rate of $f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This is due to the fact that both $f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are not able to capture the skewness of the

posterior distribution. However, when the target is the symmetrized posterior $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (i.e., the skewness is removed in the target), the higher–order extension $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of $f_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ improves the rates of such a latter Gaussian approximation. Combining this result with Theorem 1, the same level of accuracy is maintained by $q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This explains the improved rates of $q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ relative to $q_{\tilde{\theta},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and provides a result with important methodological consequences. In particular, it suggests to target the symmetrized posterior rather than the original one with state–of–the–art symmetric approximations, and then perturb these approximations with the proposed skewness–inducing factor.

Theorem 3 is proved in Appendix A of the Supplementary Material under a number of regularity conditions listed below. These conditions are similar to those recently considered by Durante et al. (2024) for deriving a skewed extension of the celebrated Bernstein–von Mises theorem (e.g., Van der Vaart, 2000). Recalling related discussions in Durante et al. (2024), we shall emphasize that Assumptions 1–5 provide natural extensions of standard conditions in asymptotic studies of this type, and hold in several, commonly adopted, regular statistical models, such as generalized linear models.

ASSUMPTION 1. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the observed data $\mathbf{y}_{1:n}$ are realizations from a sequence of random variables $\mathbf{Y}_{1:n}$ with true underlying distribution P_0^n which may not be necessarily included in the parametric family $\{P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^n, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\}$ defining the assumed statistical model with log–likelihood $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Moreover, the Kullback–Leibler projection $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_*}^n$ of P_0^n into $\{P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^n, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\}$, is unique.*

ASSUMPTION 2. *The log–prior density $\log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is four times continuously differentiable inside a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$, and $0 < \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) < \infty$.*

ASSUMPTION 3. *For every $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ there exists a positive constant c_1 such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0^n \{ \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\| > M_n \sqrt{d}/\sqrt{n}} \{ \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) \} / n < -c_1 M_n^2 d / n \} = 1.$$

ASSUMPTION 4. *The MAP estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{ \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \}$, satisfies $\mathbb{E}_0^n \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2 = O(d/n)$.*

ASSUMPTION 5. *There exist two positive constants $\bar{\eta}_1$ and $\bar{\eta}_2$ such that the event $\tilde{A}_{n,0} = \{ \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}/n) > \bar{\eta}_1 \} \cap \{ \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}/n) < \bar{\eta}_2 \}$ holds with probability $P_0^n \tilde{A}_{n,0} = 1 - o(1)$. Moreover, there exist two positive constants $\delta > 0$ and $L > 0$ such that the inequalities $\|\ell^{(3)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})/n\| < L$, $\|\ell^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})/n\| < L$ and $\|\log \pi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < L$, hold uniformly over $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in B_{\delta}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\| < \delta \}$, with P_0^n –probability tending to one, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the spectral norm. When $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is considered, for the same $\delta > 0$ and $L > 0$ as above, also the inequalities $\|\ell^{(5)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})/n\| < L$, $\|\ell^{(6)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})/n\| < L$, $\|\log \pi^{(3)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < L$ and $\|\log \pi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < L$, hold uniformly over $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in B_{\delta}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$, with P_0^n –probability tending to one.*

Assumptions 1–3 are needed to guarantee that the assumed model is sufficiently regular and that the induced posterior distribution $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ concentrates asymptotically fast enough around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$. Similarly, for d fixed, Assumption 4 provides the parametric $1/\sqrt{n}$ concentration rate of the posterior mode (i.e., the MAP) $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$, required to control the likelihood around the random location $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Finally, Assumption 5 presents requirements on the regularity of the prior and the likelihood, depending on the approximation procedure considered. For the second, more complex, approximation $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ a stronger control is required, but the corresponding rates are also faster. These conditions allow us to control the accuracy of the Taylor expansion of the log-posterior up to the required order and its approximation with $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The combination of Assumptions 1–5 described above allows us to state the following theorem regarding the asymptotic accuracy of $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in approximating the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

THEOREM 3 (ASYMPTOTIC ACCURACY). *Under Assumptions 1–5, it holds*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{c_3} d^3/n), \quad (9)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{c_4} d^6/n^2), \quad (10)$$

with $M_n = \sqrt{c_0 \log n}$ and some fixed constants $c_0, c_3, c_4 > 0$.

REMARK 6. *Under the same assumptions, it is possible to prove that the rate of convergence of the symmetric components $f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to the target $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is $O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{c_5} d^{3/2}/\sqrt{n})$, for some $c_5 > 0$. The difference in (9) and (10) are thus entirely due to how each symmetric component approximates $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.*

Note that $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},1}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is closely related to the skew-modal approximation recently introduced in [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#). These two approximations share the same mode, covariance matrix of the Gaussian component, and order of convergence to the target posterior, but differ in the form of the skewness-inducing factor. In [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#) this quantity is derived using asymptotic arguments that involve the evaluation of third-order log-likelihood derivatives at $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Conversely, the perturbation factor $w_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of the skew-symmetric approximating family introduced in this article depends only on the un-normalized posterior density, and hence, is usually simpler to implement. Moreover, while the focus of [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#) is on perturbing Gaussian approximations from the Laplace method to refine the classical Bernstein–von Mises theorem, the newly-proposed skew-symmetric approximations broadly apply to any symmetric density, beyond Gaussians centered at the MAP. Besides its practical consequences illustrated in [Section 4](#) below, this generality yields also theoretical gains which are evident in (10). This latter result clarifies that

the rates derived in [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#) can be further improved, while remaining in the skew–symmetric family, through the perturbation of more accurate symmetric approximations than the Gaussian one.

4. Empirical studies

Sections 4.1–4.3 provide empirical evidence for the accuracy gains achieved by the proposed skew–symmetric correction when applied to routinely–implemented deterministic approximations discussed in Section 2.1. These include the Gaussian approximation from the Laplace method (LA) (see, e.g., [Gelman et al., 2013](#), Ch. 13), Gaussian variational Bayes with full covariance matrix (GVB) ([Opper and Archambeau, 2009](#)), and Gaussian expectation propagation (GEP) ([Minka, 2001](#)). To quantify the magnitude of these accuracy gains, the three resulting skew–symmetric approximations (SKEW–LA, SKEW–GVB and SKEW–GEP) are compared against the original unperturbed Gaussian counterparts (LA, GVB and GEP).

In accomplishing the above goal, we first consider two widely–used generalized linear models, namely Poisson regression, and logistic regression applied to datasets with different ratios among the sample size n and parameter dimension d . Inference under the target posterior, which provides the benchmark to assess the accuracy of the approximations analyzed, proceeds via Monte Carlo methods leveraging 4 chains of length 10,000 under Hamiltonian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (HMC) from the R package `rstan`. This package is also employed for obtaining the LA and GVB approximations, via the functions `optimizing` and `vb`, respectively. The GEP solution is instead derived under the Julia function `ep_glm`. Once these three symmetric approximations are available, the corresponding skew–symmetric counterparts can be obtained as in Definition 1, and i.i.d. sampling from these skewed corrections proceeds as in Algorithm 1.

Notice that in these Poisson and logistic examples, the skew–symmetric correction is applied to improve the Gaussian approximations of the joint posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for the entire vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. As such, in practice, the resulting skew–symmetric approximations are expected to provide a more accurate representation of posterior functionals involving the entire model parameter, while, especially in high–dimensional settings, the improvements may be moderate if one is interested in functionals involving only low–dimensional marginals of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In fact, in these situations the optimal solution would be to directly perturb a marginal symmetric approximation for the subset of parameters of interest with the corresponding marginal skewness inducing factor. Unfortunately, the latter factor might be difficult to obtain in general, as it usually depends on quantities that cannot be integrated out analytically from the un–normalized joint posterior density. Nonetheless, such an issue can be circumvented in models where the nuisance component of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be integrated out from the likelihood either analytically or with simple, low–dimensional, numerical inte-

gration. This perspective is illustrated in Section 4.3 with a focus on semi-parametric hierarchical probit regression where the nuisance component consists in group-specific random intercepts.

In Sections 4.1–4.3, the quality of the different approximations is assessed by comparing several posterior summary statistics for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ evaluated via Monte Carlo from 10,000 samples drawn under each of these approximations against the corresponding benchmark summaries computed via HMC sampling from the target posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In particular, the focus is on the posterior mean ($\text{MEAN}.\boldsymbol{\theta}$) and the quartiles ($\text{Q1}.\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\text{MEDIAN}.\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\text{Q3}.\boldsymbol{\theta}$) for each parameter in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. For these summaries we study the absolute difference, averaged over the d parameters, between the estimate provided by the approximations analyzed and the benchmark value obtained from the HMC samples under $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Note that these quantities summarize properties of the marginals of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. As discussed previously, this fails to provide a comprehensive assessment on the quality of approximations targeting the entire posterior, rather than its marginals. Hence, we expand the analysis by studying also the accuracy in approximating functionals which depend, non-linearly, on the entire posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In particular, we consider the vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = [\mu_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}(y_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, \mu_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}(y_n | \boldsymbol{\theta})]$, and study the accuracy in approximating the posterior mean ($\text{MEAN}.\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) and the three quartiles ($\text{Q1}.\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\text{MEDIAN}.\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\text{Q3}.\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) for each element in $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This is accomplished again by computing the absolute difference, averaged over the n data points, between the estimates provided by the approximations considered and the benchmark values obtained under the HMC samples from $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

REMARK 7. In interpreting the results in Sections 4.1–4.3 (see Tables 1–3) it is important to emphasize that the proposed optimization-free skewness-inducing mechanism is constrained to redistribute the density of the symmetric approximation only among pairs $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. As such, the systematic improvements achieved by the proposed skew-symmetric approximations in Tables 1–3, including those of limited magnitude, are arguably remarkable when accounting for the simplicity of the perturbation strategy adopted. These results suggest future research to devise more sophisticated skewness-inducing mechanisms redistributing the density at more flexible configurations than the pairs $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. Such extensions should, however, account for tractability of the resulting skew-symmetric approximation. Recalling Section 2.2 and Remark 1, this is a distinctive property of the simple, optimization-free, skewed perturbation proposed, which is fundamental to facilitate its broad and direct applicability.

4.1. Poisson regression

As a first example, let us consider a simple Poisson regression applied to a survey study in which 2276 high school students were asked whether they had ever used alcohol, cigarettes, or marijuana (see, e.g. [Agresti](#),

Table 1. Approximation errors for the Poisson regression in Section 4.1: For LA, GVB, GEP and the corresponding skew–symmetric counterparts SKEW–LA, SKEW–GVB, SKEW–GEP, averaged absolute errors in approximating the eight functionals of the target posterior for θ discussed in Section 4. The bold values indicate the best performance for each pairs of symmetric and skewed approximation.

	Q1. θ	MEDIAN. θ	Q3. θ	MEAN. θ	Q1. $\mu(\theta)$	MEDIAN. $\mu(\theta)$	Q3. $\mu(\theta)$	MEAN. $\mu(\theta)$
LA	0.0112	0.0092	0.0104	0.0121	0.1481	0.1520	0.2350	0.2250
SKEW–LA	0.0030	0.0017	0.0027	0.0024	0.0382	0.0249	0.0654	0.0286
GVB	0.0081	0.0060	0.0058	0.0068	0.3014	0.2958	0.2676	0.2628
SKEW–GVB	0.0044	0.0034	0.0050	0.0032	0.1181	0.0641	0.1355	0.0587
GEP	0.0046	0.0052	0.0030	0.0023	0.0667	0.0997	0.0914	0.0529
SKEW–GEP	0.0017	0.0009	0.0015	0.0009	0.0373	0.0310	0.0493	0.0160

2015, Ex. 7.2.6). The resulting dataset, which is also available in the R package `MLGdata`, consists of $n = 32$ entries representing all the possible combinations of the five binary explanatory variables, namely alcohol (Y/N), cigarettes (Y/N), marijuana (Y/N), gender (M/F) and race (WHITE/OTHER). The response variable of interest is $y_i =$ “number of students in the i -th combination of the five predictors”, for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For the above data, we assume a Poisson regression, where each y_i is an independent realization from a $\text{Pois}(\exp(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}))$, where the predictors vector \mathbf{x}_i comprises the intercept, the five binary explanatory variables and all the corresponding interactions, whereas $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{16}$ is the vector of regression coefficients. To perform Bayesian inference we follow common practice and consider a Gaussian prior $\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim N_{16}(\mathbf{0}, 4 \cdot \mathbf{I}_{16})$ with independent components. Table 1 summarizes the accuracy of the different schemes under analysis in approximating the induced posterior distribution. Consistent with the theoretical results in Section 3, Table 1 clarifies that the proposed skew–symmetric approximations systematically outperform the corresponding symmetric counterparts for all the summaries considered. As anticipated in Section 4, these gains are more noticeable when considering functionals that depend on the entire posterior, rather than its marginals. In such a latter case, the symmetric approximations already achieve a satisfactory accuracy. Hence, while it is possible to improve this accuracy even further under the proposed skew–symmetric approximations, such a gain is less remarkable as it aims at reducing an already–small error; see also Remark 7.

Note also that, among the deterministic approximations in Table 1, the skewed perturbation of EP provides the most competitive strategy in terms of overall accuracy across the different summaries. Recalling, e.g., Vehtari et al. (2020), EP already provides highly-accurate deterministic approximations in its standard Gaussian form. As such, perturbing these symmetric densities through the proposed skewness–inducing factor yields even more accurate and state–of–the–art skew–symmetric approximations.

4.2. Logistic regression

The Poisson regression in Section 4.1 is characterized by a relatively small dimension d and a limited sample size n . Let us now focus on three different logistic regression models applied to datasets (GLIOMA, MUSK,

Table 2. Approximation errors for the three logistic regressions in Section 4.2: For LA, GVB, GEP and the corresponding skew–symmetric counterparts SKEW–LA, SKEW–GVB, SKEW–GEP, averaged absolute errors in approximating the eight functionals of the target posterior for θ discussed in Section 4. In the logistic regression setting $\mu(\theta)$ refers to Bernoulli success probabilities expressed as percentages. The bold values indicate the best performance for each pairs of symmetric and skewed approximation.

	Q1. θ	MEDIAN. θ	Q3. θ	MEAN. θ	Q1. $\mu(\theta)$	MEDIAN. $\mu(\theta)$	Q3. $\mu(\theta)$	MEAN. $\mu(\theta)$
Datset: GLIOMA								
LA	0.0736	0.0686	0.0748	0.0814	0.6780	0.6771	0.7611	0.7864
SKEW–LA	0.0301	0.0264	0.0321	0.0339	0.2631	0.2778	0.3045	0.2976
GVB	0.0621	0.0406	0.0394	0.0395	1.0785	0.7032	0.4217	0.7177
SKEW–GVB	0.0456	0.0255	0.0332	0.0251	0.4928	0.2746	0.3797	0.2597
EP	0.0103	0.0157	0.0094	0.0052	0.0726	0.0897	0.0764	0.0532
SKEW–GEP	0.0055	0.0027	0.0058	0.0031	0.0453	0.0297	0.0464	0.0271
Datset: MUSK								
LA	0.1981	0.1967	0.1997	0.1988	2.9152	2.6533	3.7721	3.9261
SKEW–LA	0.1670	0.1642	0.1674	0.1653	2.3542	2.1452	2.8651	3.0132
GVB	0.7514	0.7232	0.7410	0.7221	4.3149	4.2556	4.5501	4.5104
SKEW–GVB	0.6953	0.6663	0.6859	0.6653	3.8270	3.7553	4.0234	3.9902
GEP	0.0164	0.0170	0.0175	0.0111	0.2171	0.3165	0.2793	0.1980
SKEW–GEP	0.0172	0.0145	0.0175	0.0110	0.1687	0.2249	0.2298	0.1092
Datset: SONAR								
LA	0.0267	0.0265	0.0264	0.0263	5.9286	3.0078	6.9156	8.2429
SKEW–LA	0.0238	0.0234	0.0236	0.0233	4.5607	2.5149	5.1326	6.4999
GEP	0.0061	0.0054	0.0061	0.0044	0.4024	0.4696	0.4229	0.5903
SKEW–GEP	0.0058	0.0051	0.0057	0.0040	0.3795	0.3736	0.4017	0.3163

SONAR) with configurations of n and d that are more representative in real–data applications. These three datasets can be retrieved from the UCI Machine Learning data repository and are among the benchmark ones considered by [Chopin and Ridgway \(2017\)](#) in the extensive empirical analyses of deterministic approximations and sampling–based methods for Bayesian binary regression. For both the GLIOMA ($n = 839$, $d = 24$) and MUSK ($n = 476$, $d = 167$) datasets the assumed model is a logistic regression with independent Gaussian priors $N(0, 4)$ on the coefficients in θ . For SONAR ($n = 208$, $d = 1831$) the original number of predictors is significantly increased by including also pairwise interactions. For this reason, a more informative Gaussian prior $N(0, 0.25)$ is assumed for each regression coefficient to enforce shrinkage in such a higher–dimensional model. This high dimension led also to challenges in obtaining the GVB approximation in the SONAR dataset with the `rstan` function `vb`. For this reason, GVB and its skewed version SKEW–GVB are not considered in such a latter dataset.

Table 2 confirms the results and conclusions of Table 1. In particular, also in this case the skew–symmetric approximations systematically improve the accuracy of the original, unperturbed, symmetric counterparts, with gains that are more visible when the focus is on quantities depending on the entire posterior (i.e., $\text{MEAN}.\mu(\theta)$, $\text{Q1}.\mu(\theta)$, $\text{MEDIAN}.\mu(\theta)$, $\text{Q3}.\mu(\theta)$). The accuracy improvements for quantities characterizing properties of the marginals, while present, are less remarkable. As discussed in Section 4.1, this is again due to the fact that the symmetric approximations to be perturbed are already accurate in characterizing these functionals, and hence, there is limited space to further reduce these already–small er-

rors remarkably; see also Remark 7. Recalling Section 4, one possibility to achieve more tangible improvements in approximating functionals based on marginals is to devise skew–symmetric corrections targeting directly such marginals, rather than the joint posterior distribution. Section 4.3 illustrates and assesses this perspective with a focus on hierarchical semi–parametric probit regression.

4.3. Hierarchical semi–parametric probit regression

Let us conclude by illustrating in a demographic application the use of the skew–symmetric correction to target specific marginals of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ referred to a subset of parameters of interest. The data are retrieved from the HDS II survey whose focus, among others, is to study women contraceptive choices in 33 Indian states. Recently, this dataset has been analyzed by Rigon et al. (2019) through a Bayesian semi–parametric sequential logistic regression to investigate how different demographic factors affect the probability of four different contraceptive choices (including `no contraceptive`). In the following, we consider a simplified analysis on the subset of $n = 329$ non–Hindu women, and study the binary decision on whether to use or not contraceptives as a function of state of residence, age, education (a factor with four levels), religion (a factor with three levels), and area (urban or rural).

Let \mathbf{x}_{ik}^\top be the 6–dimensional vector comprising the binary encoding of the variables education, religion and area for the i –th woman in state $k = 1, \dots, K$. To define the model let us exploit the hierarchical structure of the data by assuming that, for each woman, the binary response $y_{ik} \in \{0; 1\}$ is the realization of a Bernoulli random variable with probability π_{ik} of using contraceptives defined as

$$\pi_{ik} = \Phi(\alpha_k + g(\text{age}_{ik}) + \mathbf{x}_{ik}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n_k, \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K,$$

where n_k denotes the number of observation within state k ($K = 27$ is the number of Indian states with at least one observation in the sub–sample considered), α_k is a state–specific random effect, $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^6$ denotes a vector encoding the fixed effects, whereas $g(\cdot)$ is a flexible functional effect for the variable age. Following Rigon et al. (2019), $g(\cdot)$ is defined via a linear combination of B–spline functions $B_m(\cdot)$, $m = 1, \dots, M$, so that $g(\text{age}_{ik}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \gamma_m B_m(\text{age}_{ik})$ with $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Bayesian inference under this model proceeds via Gaussian priors for the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$. More specifically, we let $\boldsymbol{\beta} \sim N_6(\mathbf{0}, 4 \cdot \mathbf{I}_6)$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_K)$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim N_M(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\gamma)$ with the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\gamma$ specified as in Rigon et al. (2019) in order to enforce similar coefficient values for contiguous splines. In the following, rather than studying the entire joint posterior $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we treat $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ as nuisance state–specific random effects, thus motivating a focus on skew–symmetric approximations targeting directly the marginal $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ for the sub–vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}' = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$. This requires, however, the availability of a tractable un–normalized posterior for $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$. More

Table 3. Approximation errors for the hierarchical semi-parametric probit regression in Section 4.3: For LA, GEP and the corresponding skew-symmetric counterparts SKEW-LA, SKEW-GEP, averaged absolute errors in approximating the eight functionals of the target posterior marginal for θ discussed in Section 4. In this setting $\mu(\theta')$ refers to Bernoulli success probabilities expressed as percentages. The bold values indicate the best performance for each pairs of symmetric and skewed approximation.

	Q1. θ'	MEDIAN. θ'	Q3. θ'	MEAN. θ'	Q1. $\mu(\theta')$	MEDIAN. $\mu(\theta')$	Q3. $\mu(\theta')$	MEAN. $\mu(\theta')$
LA	0.2048	0.1793	0.1894	0.2167	0.3735	0.6313	1.1014	0.9029
SKEW-LA	0.0656	0.0480	0.0423	0.0652	0.1458	0.1964	0.2751	0.2249
GEP	0.0255	0.0502	0.0474	0.0251	0.0647	0.1121	0.2061	0.1349
SKEW-GEP	0.0179	0.0130	0.0239	0.0081	0.0406	0.0362	0.0904	0.0507

specifically, $\pi_n(\theta') \propto \phi_6(\beta; \mathbf{0}, 4 \cdot \mathbf{I}_6) \phi_M(\gamma; \mathbf{0}, \Sigma_\gamma) \int \prod_{i=1}^{n_k} \Phi[(2y_{ik} - 1)(\alpha_k + \mathbf{b}_{ik}^\top \gamma + \mathbf{x}_{ik}^\top \beta)] \phi_K(\alpha; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_K) d\alpha$, where \mathbf{b}_{ik} denotes for the i -th observation within group k the vector associated to the spline basis. Recalling Lemma 7.1 of [Azzalini and Capitanio \(2013\)](#) (see also [Durante \(2019\)](#)), such an integral can be written as $\prod_{k=1}^K \Phi_{n_k}(\text{diag}(2\mathbf{y}_k - 1)(\mathbf{B}_k \gamma + \mathbf{X}_k \beta); \Sigma_k)$, where \mathbf{B}_k and \mathbf{X}_k denote design matrices with rows \mathbf{b}_{ik}^\top and \mathbf{x}_{ik}^\top , $i = 1, \dots, n_k$, respectively, while $\Phi_{n_k}(\cdot; \Sigma_k)$ corresponds to the cumulative distribution function of a n_k -dimensional Gaussian with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma_k = \mathbf{I}_{n_k} + \text{diag}(2\mathbf{y}_k - 1) \mathbb{1}_{n_k} \mathbb{1}_{n_k}^\top \text{diag}(2\mathbf{y}_k - 1)$. In this latter expression, $\mathbb{1}_{n_k}$ is a $n_k \times 1$ vector of ones, whereas $\text{diag}(2\mathbf{y}_k - 1)$ denotes the $n_k \times n_k$ diagonal matrix containing the values of the binary responses for group k . As a result, the marginal skewness-inducing factor $w_{\theta'}^*(\theta')$ for perturbing a symmetric approximation of $\pi_n(\theta')$ can be evaluated. By exploiting the results in [Anceschi et al. \(2023\)](#), these symmetric approximations for $\pi_n(\theta')$ (in particular LA and GEP) can be straightforwardly derived in the above probit regression.

Table 3 displays the comparison between marginal LA and GEP approximations and the corresponding skew-symmetric versions. Similarly to the results in Tables 1 and 2, correcting for asymmetry yields also in this case approximations which systematically outperform the accuracy of the original symmetric counterparts. Crucially, in this example, targeting directly the posterior marginals provides evident gains for both $\text{MEAN}.\mu(\theta')$, $\text{Q1}.\mu(\theta')$, $\text{MEDIAN}.\mu(\theta')$, $\text{Q3}.\mu(\theta')$ and also $\text{MEAN}.\theta'$, $\text{Q1}.\theta'$, $\text{MEDIAN}.\theta'$, $\text{Q3}.\theta'$.

5. Discussion

This article introduces a novel and broadly-applicable strategy to perturb any given symmetric approximation of a generic posterior density for obtaining an improved, yet similarly-tractable, skew-symmetric approximation. Such a newly-proposed approximation is shown to improve, both theoretically and practically, the accuracy of the original symmetric density which is perturbed. Unlike recently-developed deterministic approximations based on generalizations of skew-normal distributions, the proposed solution [i] applies to generic posterior densities and to any symmetric approximation of such densities, from e.g., Laplace, VB and EP, [ii] does not imply additional optimization costs relative to those required for ob-

taining the original symmetric approximation to be improved, [iii] is substantially simpler and can be applied directly to any output of state-of-the-art softwares yielding symmetric approximations of posterior densities, [iv] has strong theoretical guarantees in terms of accuracy, and, finally, [v] it arises from a yet-unexplored skew-symmetric representation of posterior densities in Proposition 1 that is of independent interest and can open broader directions of future research.

Besides addressing an important gap in the literature, our contribution can also stimulate similarly-relevant, and yet unexplored, directions for future advancements. A promising one is discussed in Remark 5 and refers to the case in which also the symmetric approximating density $f_{\hat{\theta}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is unknown and part of the novel optimization problem formalized in Corollary 1. This extension, combined with our results in Section 2, interestingly supports a change of perspective that suggests to focus on symmetrized posterior densities as in (1), rather than on the original posterior, as the target of symmetric approximations. To the best of our knowledge, such a perspective has not been considered so far and, hence, it could stimulate active research motivated by the novel questions associated with this task. For instance, this would require extracting a suitable symmetric component from the target posterior density, which is both as close as possible to such a posterior and can be also accurately approximated by a tractable symmetric density whose perturbation yields the final skew-symmetric approximation of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. A related problem can be found in classical, yet overlooked, literature aimed at improving estimators of empirical distribution functions for symmetric densities (Schuster, 1975; Hinkley, 1976; Lo, 1985; Schuster, 1987; Meloche, 1991). Inheriting these results within our newly-developed framework for Bayesian deterministic approximations provides, therefore, a promising direction to address the objectives discussed in Remark 5.

The above perspective is also useful to further extend the theoretical results within Section 3.2 on the asymptotic accuracy of skew-symmetric approximations. In particular, as a consequence of the proof of Theorem 3, a natural and feasible direction is to show that these approximations can be made arbitrarily accurate via higher order approximations only for the symmetrized component. From a more practical perspective, another important direction is to study and illustrate the empirical performance of the proposed skew-symmetric approximations when applied to other symmetric densities beyond those considered in Section 4. Notice that our focus in Section 4 on Gaussian approximations arising from commonly-adopted Laplace, VB and EP methods is motivated by the attempt to stimulate rapid implementation of the proposed skew-symmetric approximation in routinely-used softwares. Nonetheless, showcasing the empirical improvements of our proposal within the broader context of symmetric approximations discussed in Section 2.1 (e.g., ALA, ADVI, t -exponential approximating families, Laplace variational inference and

delta–method variational inference), is a natural direction of future research which could further boost the impact of our contribution. To this end, given the remarkable empirical accuracy in Section 4 of the proposed perturbation of Gaussian EP, a promising direction is to devote particular attention in deepening the study of skewed EP approximations which have been generally overlooked to date. Finally, our numerical results on high–dimensional examples discussed in Sections 4.2–4.3 suggest that additional gains in approximation accuracy can be achieved by considering perturbation mechanisms acting on specific subsets of parameters of interest. Thus, our contribution has the potential to stimulate further progress in the field that lies at the intersection of Bayesian computation and the development of flexible families of probability distributions.

A. Appendix: Proof

Appendix A contains the proofs of Lemma 1 and Theorems 1–3. Those of Proposition 1–2 and Corollary 1 are direct and already discussed in the article. In the subsequent proofs we assume without loss of generality that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, for notational convenience we omit $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ from $\bar{\pi}_{n,\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $f_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $w_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In addition, we consider the partition $\Theta = \Theta_+ \cup \Theta_-$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_+$ implies $-\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_-$.

A.1. Proof of Lemma 1

PROOF. Let us first prove Lemma 1 under the α –divergence $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(\cdot || \cdot)$ for some fixed $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0; 1\}$. In view of the skew–symmetric representation (3) of the posterior distribution $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, combined with the fact that both $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are symmetric and $w^*(-\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $0 \leq w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \int [\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} - \{2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha}] d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Theta_+} [2 - \{2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\alpha - \{2(1-w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\}^\alpha] \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

To proceed with the proof, note that the first two derivatives of the function $k \mapsto \kappa(k) = [2 - (2k)^\alpha - \{2(1-k)\}^\alpha] / \{\alpha(1-\alpha)\}$ are $2\{-(2k)^{\alpha-1} + \{2(1-k)\}^{\alpha-1}\} / (1-\alpha)$ and $4\{(2k)^{\alpha-2} + \{2(1-k)\}^{\alpha-2}\}$, respectively. Observe that the first derivative is zero if and only if $k = 0.5$, whereas the second derivative is positive for $k \in (0, 1)$, implying that $k = 0.5$ is a point of minimum. Since $\kappa(0.5) = 0$ and $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} > 0$ the last integral in (A.1) is non–negative. This implies $\mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq 0$, and hence

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) || f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \tag{A.2}$$

for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0; 1\}$.

To conclude the analysis under the α –divergence let us study the two limiting cases $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. To this end, recall that, for two generic densities $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{D}_\alpha[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \text{KL}[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}_\alpha[p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \text{KL}[q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel p(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ (e.g., [Cichocki and Amari, 2010](#)). As a consequence, by exploiting again $w^*(-\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $0 \leq w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$ and the symmetry of $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} (\mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]) &= \text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \text{KL}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \int \left[2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \log[2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \right] \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \int_{\Theta_+} \left[2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \log[2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + 2(1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \log[2\{1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}] \right] \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the first and second derivatives of the function $k \mapsto \kappa_1(k) = 2k \log(2k) + 2(1 - k) \log[2(1 - k)]$ are $2[\log(k) - \log(1 - k)]$ and $2[1/k + 1/(1 - k)]$, respectively. Since the second derivative is positive for every $k \in (0, 1)$ and the first derivative is zero if and only if $k = 0.5$, $\kappa_1(\cdot)$ has a minimum in $k = 0.5$. Therefore, combining such a result with the fact that $\kappa_1(0.5) = 0$ and $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$, implies that the last integral in the above expression is non–negative. Hence, $\text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \text{KL}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq 0$, which leads to

$$\text{KL}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Finally, if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, it is possible to apply a similar reasoning as above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \int \log(2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \int_{\Theta_+} \left[-\log(2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \log(2[1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]) \right] f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, the function $k \mapsto \kappa_2(k) = -[\log(2k) + \log(2(1 - k))]$, has first derivative $-1/k + 1/(1 - k)$ which is zero if and only if $k = 0.5$, while the second derivative $1/k^2 + 1/(1 - k)^2$ is positive for $k \in (0, 1)$. Hence, the minimum of $\kappa_2(\cdot)$ is $\kappa_2(0.5) = 0$. Such a result, together with the fact that $f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$, implies that $\text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq 0$, and therefore

$$\text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The statement of Lemma 1 regarding the α –divergences follows by combining (A.2), (A.3) and (A.4).

Let us conclude the proof by proving that the same inequality holds under the TV distance. Also in this case, in view of the skew–symmetric representation (3) of the posterior distribution $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, combined with the fact that both $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are symmetric and $w^*(-\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $0 \leq w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$, we obtain,

leveraging the triangle inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - 2 \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\
&= \int_{\Theta_+} \left[|2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + |2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})(1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \right] d\boldsymbol{\theta} - 2 \int_{\Theta_+} |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
&\geq 2 \int_{\Theta_+} |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} - 2 \int_{\Theta_+} |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$, which concludes the proof.

A.2. Proof of Theorem 1

PROOF. First notice that Lemma 1 combined with the result in (5) directly imply (6). Hence we are left to prove (5). To this end, let us first consider the TV distance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$. Leveraging (3)–(4), along with $w^*(-\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $0 \leq w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$, and the symmetry of $\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \frac{1}{2} \int |2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - 2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Theta_+} [2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + 2(1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}))|\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})|] d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
&= \int_{\Theta_+} |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \frac{1}{2} \int |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})],
\end{aligned}$$

which coincides with (5) under the TV distance. Similar arguments lead also to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \left[1 - \int 2w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \left[1 - 2 \int_{\Theta_+} \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right] = \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})],
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

provided that $2 \int_{\Theta_+} \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta} = 2(1/2) \int \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta}$. To conclude the proof, notice that (A.5) holds also for $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 1$.

A.3. Proof of Theorem 2

PROOF. Let us first prove Theorem 2 for the TV distance. In view of the skew-symmetric representation in (3) of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the triangle inequality, and equation (5) in Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \frac{1}{2} \int |2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - 2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Theta_+} |2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - 2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + |2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})(1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - 2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})(1 - w(\boldsymbol{\theta}))| d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int |\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \frac{1}{2} \int |\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})| d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathcal{D}_{\text{TV}}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})],
\end{aligned}$$

which proves Theorem 2 under the TV distance. Let us now consider the α -divergence for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0; 1\}$.

Then, combining results in (3), (4), and (5), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \left[\int \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta} - \int [2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^\alpha [2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right] \\ &= \frac{2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Theta_+} [1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha w(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} - [1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^\alpha [1 - w(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^{1-\alpha}] \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha} d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the function $v \mapsto \kappa_3(k, v) = [1 - k^\alpha v^{1-\alpha} - (1-k)^\alpha (1-v)^{1-\alpha}] / [\alpha(1-\alpha)]$ satisfies for all $k \in (0, 1)$

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow 1^-} \kappa_3(k, v) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, $v \mapsto \kappa_3(k, v)$ is continuous in $(0, 1)$ with first derivative $[-k^\alpha v^{-\alpha} + (1-k)^\alpha (1-v)^{-\alpha}] / \alpha$ which is zero if and only if $k = v$ and second derivative $k^\alpha v^{-(\alpha+1)} + (1-k)^\alpha (1-v)^{-(\alpha+1)} \geq 0$ for $v \in (0, 1)$. Since $\kappa_3(k, k) = 0$, this implies $\kappa_3(k, v) \geq 0$ for all $k, v \in (0, 1)$. Hence, it remains to investigate $\kappa_3(k, v)$ at the boundaries.

First notice that $k = v = 0$ is discarded, since it corresponds to the case $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$. Next, for $k \rightarrow 0^+$ and $v \in (0, 1)$ fixed, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) \geq 0$ if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) = +\infty$ if $\alpha < 0$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) \geq 0$ if $\alpha > 1$. The same limits hold for $k \rightarrow 1^-$ and $v \in (0, 1)$ fixed. Furthermore, $\lim_{k \rightarrow 1^-, v \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) = 1$ if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow 1^-, v \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_3(k, v) = +\infty$ if $\alpha \notin [0, 1]$.

Finally, for $k \rightarrow 1^-$, $v \rightarrow 1^-$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we get $\lim_{k \rightarrow 1^-, v \rightarrow 1^-} \kappa_3(k, v) = 0$. At the same time, for $\alpha \notin [0, 1]$, we have $-(1-k)^\alpha (1-v)^{1-\alpha} / [\alpha(1-\alpha)] \geq 0$, hence $\kappa_3(k, v) \geq (1 - k^\alpha v^{1-\alpha}) / [\alpha(1-\alpha)]$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow 1^-, v \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - k^\alpha v^{1-\alpha}) / [\alpha(1-\alpha)] = 0$. Thus, combining the above results, implies, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0; 1\}$,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})].$$

To conclude the proof, it remains to consider the limits $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 1$. As in the proof of Lemma 1 let us leverage again the connection with Kullback–Leibler divergences. For $\alpha \rightarrow 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \int \log \left(\frac{2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right) 2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &= \int \log \left(\frac{2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right) 2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} + \int \log \left(\frac{2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right) 2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &= \text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel 2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \text{KL}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \text{KL}[\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \text{KL}[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

where the second equality follows by adding and subtracting $\int \log(2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w(\boldsymbol{\theta})) 2\bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, whereas the third by the definition of KL divergence, together with $w^*(-\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - w^*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The inequality is the result

of the positive definiteness of the KL divergence. Finally, the last equality follows from equation (5) in Theorem 1. Reversing the role $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and leveraging a similar reasoning as in (A.6), we have also

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}_\alpha[\pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel q(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \text{KL}[q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \text{KL}[f^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \bar{\pi}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \text{KL}[q^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \parallel \pi_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

A.4. Proof of Theorem 3

PROOF. Let us focus on proving the rates in (10). The proof for (9) follows as a direct consequence leveraging simpler arguments and derivations. Moreover, in view of the scale and location invariance of the TV distance, let us consider, for convenience, the re-parameterization $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$. Note that the density $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ takes the form $2\phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}})P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})w_0^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\}$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} = \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}/n$, $w_0^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = w_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n})$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\} = \int P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}})d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ and

$$P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = 1 + \frac{1}{24n} \left\langle \frac{\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}}{n}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{24n} \left\langle \frac{\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}}{n}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \right\rangle \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{n}} \left\langle \frac{\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}}{n}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 3} \right\rangle \right)^2. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Let us define the event $B_n = \{\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\| \leq M_n\sqrt{d/n}\}$ together with the sets $\tilde{K}_n = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\| < 2M_n\sqrt{d}\}$ and $K_n = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*)\| < M_n\sqrt{d}\}$. Then, by the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\int |\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \leq \int |\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - \pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \int |\pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \int |q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = \pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} / \int_{\tilde{K}_n} \pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ and $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} / \int_{\tilde{K}_n} q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$, are the restrictions of $\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ and $q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ to the set \tilde{K}_n . Furthermore, notice that $w_0^*(-\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = 1 - w_0^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, and that \tilde{K}_n is symmetric about $\mathbf{0}$ (when expressed as a function of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$). Therefore, the normalizing constant of the restricted skew-symmetric approximation is $\int_{\tilde{K}_n} q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \int_{\tilde{K}_n} \phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}})P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\}d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$.

Let us now deal with each of the three terms on the right hand side of (A.8) separately. In view of a standard inequality of the TV distance we have $\int |\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - \pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \leq 2\Pi_n(\tilde{K}_n^c)$. Moreover, combining Assumption 4, with the triangle and Markov's inequality, yields

$$\Pi_n(\tilde{K}_n^c)\mathbb{1}_{B_n} \leq \Pi_n(K_n^c)\mathbb{1}_{B_n},$$

with $P_0^n(B_n) = 1 - o(1)$. From Lemma B.1, for a sufficiently large choice of c_0 in M_n , the right-hand-side

of the above display is of order $O_{P_0^n}(n^{-2})$. This implies, in turn,

$$\int |\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - \pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = O_{P_0^n}(n^{-2}). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

To deal with the third term in the right–hand–side of (A.8), let us exploit the same TV inequality. This, the symmetry of the set \tilde{K}_n^c around 0 (when expressed as a function of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$) and the skew–symmetric invariance with respect to even functions (see e.g., [Azzalini and Capitanio, 2013](#), Prop. 1.4) give

$$\begin{aligned} \int |q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} &\leq 2 \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}: \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}} q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = 2 \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}: \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}} \phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}) P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) / \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\} d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}. \\ &:= 2P_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}, P(\cdot)}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, in view of $\tilde{\Omega}^{-1} = \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\theta}}/n$ and $\tilde{A}_{n,0} = \{\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\Omega}^{-1}) > \bar{\eta}_1\} \cap \{\lambda_{\max}(\tilde{\Omega}^{-1}) < \bar{\eta}_2\}$, it follows that, conditioned on $\tilde{A}_{n,0}$, the quantity $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\}$ lies on a bounded positive range and, for n sufficiently large, $1 - \log\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\}/(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{\Omega}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/2) > 0.5$, uniformly in $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n^c$. As a consequence, for large n ,

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}: \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}} \phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}) P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) / \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}}\{P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\} d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,0}} \lesssim \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}: \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}} \phi_d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}; \mathbf{0}, 2\tilde{\Omega}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,0}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Moreover, for every $\epsilon > 0$, Assumption 5, the tail behavior of the Gaussian distribution, see e.g., Lemma C.4 in [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#) and (A.10), imply, for a sufficiently large choice of c_0 in $M_n = \sqrt{c_0 \log n}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^n(n^2 P_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}, P(\cdot)}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}) > \epsilon) &= P_0^n(\{n^2 P_{\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Omega}, P(\cdot)}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| > 2M_n\sqrt{d}) > \epsilon\} \cap \tilde{A}_{n,0}) + o(1) \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

By combining the above results we obtain

$$\int |q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = O_{P_0^n}(n^{-2}). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

To conclude the proof, it remains to deal with the second term in the right–hand–side of (A.8). With this goal in mind, let us define the event

$$\tilde{A}_{n,1} = \tilde{A}_{n,0} \cap \left\{ \int_{\tilde{K}_n} \pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} > 0 \right\} \cap \left\{ \int_{\tilde{K}_n} q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} > 0 \right\}.$$

Note that, as a consequence of Lemma B.1, $P_0^n\{\int_{\tilde{K}_n} \pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} > 0\} = 1 - o(1)$. Similarly, assertions (A.10)–(A.11) imply that $P_0^n\{\int_{\tilde{K}_n} q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} > 0\} = 1 - o(1)$ and $P_0^n \tilde{A}_{n,1} = 1 - o(1)$, respectively. Furthermore,

recall that $\pi_n(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = 2\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})w_0^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, and define with $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ and $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ the symmetrized posterior density and the symmetric component of $q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, respectively, both restricted within the set \tilde{K}_n . By the symmetry of $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ and $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, we have

$$\int |\pi_n^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - q_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \int |\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}.$$

From here onwards we can adapt the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [Durante et al. \(2024\)](#) to our setting. In particular, let us consider

$$\int |\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,1}} = \int_{\tilde{K}_n} \left| 1 - \int_{\tilde{K}_n} \frac{f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})}{f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')} \frac{\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})}{\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')} f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}' \right| \bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,1}}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where the ratios $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')$ and $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')$ in the above expression are equal to their unrestricted versions $f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')$ and $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})/\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')$, for $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}' \in \tilde{K}_n$, respectively. This result, together with Jensen's inequality, imply that (A.13) is upper bounded by

$$\int_{\tilde{K}_n \times \tilde{K}_n} \left| 1 - \frac{f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})}{f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^*(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')} \frac{\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')}{\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})} \right| \bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}'\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,1}}.$$

Now, recall that $\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \propto [\pi(\tilde{\theta} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n})L(\tilde{\theta} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n}) + \pi(\tilde{\theta} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n})L(\tilde{\theta} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})]/[2\pi(\tilde{\theta})L(\tilde{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})]$.

Hence, leveraging Lemma B.2, together with the definitions of $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, and the expansion $e^x = 1 + x + e^{\beta x}x^2/2$, for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})|d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,1}} &\leq \int_{\tilde{K}_n \times \tilde{K}_n} \left| 1 - e^{\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}') - \tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})} \right| \bar{\pi}_{n,\tilde{\theta}}^{\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) f_{\tilde{\theta},2}^{*,\tilde{K}_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}')d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}d\tilde{\mathbf{h}}'\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{A}_{n,1}} \\ &\leq 2\tilde{r}_{n,2} + 2\exp(2\beta\tilde{r}_{n,2})\tilde{r}_{n,2}^2 = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{\tilde{c}_2}d^6/n^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $\tilde{r}_{n,2} = \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} |\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{\tilde{c}_2}d^6/n^2)$ (see Lemma B.2). Setting $c_4 = \tilde{c}_2$ and recalling the scale and location invariance of the TV distance concludes the proof.

B. Appendix: Technical lemmas

LEMMA B.1 (POSTERIOR CONTRACTION). *Let $K_n = \{\theta \in \Theta : \|\theta - \theta_*\| < M_n\sqrt{d/n}\}$. Under Assumptions 3, 4 and 5, we have, for c_0 sufficiently large (not depending on n and d) and $M_n = \sqrt{c_0 \log n}$, that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0^n \{ \Pi_n(K_n^c) < 2n^{-dc_0c_1/2} \} = 1,$$

where K_n^c denotes the complement of K_n .

PROOF. Lemma B.1 is a direct consequence of Lemma C.5 in Durante et al. (2024) when the focus is on asymptotic regimes. As such, its proof follows from related reasoning and derivations as those considered to prove Lemma C.5, after noticing that Assumptions 4–5 imply Assumption 5 in Durante et al. (2024).

LEMMA B.2. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ denotes the MAP, and $\tilde{K}_n = \{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} : \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| < 2M_n\sqrt{d}\}$ with $M_n = \sqrt{c_0 \log n}$ for some $c_0 > 0$. Moreover, let $\tilde{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}_{1:n})$ be the un-normalized log-posterior and

$$\tilde{r}_{n,1}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) := \log([\exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} + \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\}]/2) + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/2, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) := \log([\exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} + \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\}]/2) + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/2 - \log P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} = \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}/n$, and $P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ in (A.7). Then, under Assumption 5, there are constants $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2 > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{r}_{n,1} := \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} |\tilde{r}_{n,1}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{\tilde{c}_1} d^3/n), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and

$$\tilde{r}_{n,2} := \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} |\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{\tilde{c}_2} d^6/n^2). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

PROOF. Let us focus on proving (B.4). The proof of (B.3) follows in a similar manner, leveraging simpler derivations. Consistent with this goal, recall that under Assumption 4 the event $\{\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\| \leq \delta\}$ has, for any $\delta > 0$, a probability tending to 1. As a consequence, from Assumption 5 the log-likelihood ratio around $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ can be expanded as

$$\log \frac{p_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}}(X^n)}{p_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}} = \sum_{k=1}^5 \frac{\langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes k} \rangle}{k!n^{k/2}} + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^6 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right).$$

Similarly, the Taylor expansion of the log-prior takes the form

$$\log \frac{\pi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n})}{\pi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\langle \log \pi_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes k} \rangle}{k!n^{k/2}} + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^4 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right).$$

Combining the above displays, the log-posterior ratio can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=1}^5 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes k} \rangle}{k!n^{(k-2)/2}} + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^6 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

with $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)} = (\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)} + \log \pi_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)})/n$, if $k \leq 3$, and $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)} = \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}/n$ otherwise. Moreover, since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is the MAP, $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(1)} = 0$.

Therefore, in view of (B.5) and $e^x = 1 + O(x)$, for $x \rightarrow 0$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} + \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} \\
&= \left[\exp\left(\sum_{k=2}^5 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes k} \rangle}{k!n^{(k-2)/2}}\right) + \exp\left(\sum_{k=2}^5 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)}, -\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes k} \rangle}{k!n^{(k-2)/2}}\right) \right] \times \left[1 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^6 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right) \right], \\
&= \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 2k} \rangle}{(2k)!n^{k-1}}\right) \left[\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) + \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, -\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \left[1 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^6 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right) \right]. \tag{B.6}
\end{aligned}$$

In view of Assumption 5, we have $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(k)} = O_{P_0^n}(1)$, for $k \geq 2$. Therefore, by $e^x = 1 + x + x^2/2 + x^3/6 + O(x^4)$, the two summands in the right-hand-side of (B.6) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{6} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} \right)^3 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, -\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) &= 1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} \right)^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{6} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} \right)^3 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, and recalling the asymptotic behaviour of $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(\cdot)}$, for $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \left[\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) + \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, -\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}}\right) \right] \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2k+1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes(2k+1)} \rangle}{(2k+1)!n^{(2k-1)/2}} \right)^2 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right) \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{n}} \langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle \right)^2 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right) \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{n}} \langle \frac{\ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}}{n}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle \right)^2 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right), \tag{B.7}
\end{aligned}$$

with the last line following by the fact that, from Assumption 5, $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}/(6\sqrt{n}) = \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}/(6n^{3/2}) + O_{P_0^n}(n^{-3/2})$.

Combining the above displays with $e^x = 1 + x + x^2/2 + O(x^3)$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{2k} x^i/i! > 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} + \frac{1}{2} \exp\{\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}/\sqrt{n}) - \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\} \\
 &= \exp\left(\frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 2} \rangle}{2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \rangle}{24n} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \rangle}{24n}\right)^2 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^3}\right)\right) \\
 & \quad \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{n}} \langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle\right)^2 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right)\right) \left[1 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^6 \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right)\right] \\
 &= \exp\left(\frac{\langle a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 2} \rangle}{2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{24n} \langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{24n} \langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 4} \rangle\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{n}} \langle \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(3)}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle\right)^2\right) \\
 & \quad \times \left[1 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right)\right] \\
 &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\right) P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \left[1 + O_{P_0^n}\left(\frac{\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}}{n^2}\right)\right],
 \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows from $a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)} = \ell_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(4)}/n$ and the last from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} = -a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{(2)}$ and the definition of $P(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$. Thus, in view of $\log(1+x) = O(x)$ for $x \rightarrow 0$, $\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ defined in (B.2) satisfies $\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = O_{P_0^n}(\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^{12} \vee 1\}/n^2)$, which in turn implies $\tilde{r}_{n,2} := \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \tilde{K}_n} |\tilde{r}_{n,2}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})| = O_{P_0^n}(M_n^{12} d^6/n^2)$. Setting $\tilde{c}_2 = 12$, concludes the proof.

Acknowledgement

Francesco Pozza is funded by the European Union (ERC, PrSc-HDBayLe, GA number 101076564). Botond Szabo is co-funded by the European Union (ERC, BigBayesUQ, GA number: 101041064). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. Daniele Durante acknowledges the support by the MUR–PRIN 2022 project “CARONTE” (2022KBTEBN, funded by the European Union, Next Generation EU).

References

- Agresti, A. (2015) *Foundations of Linear and Generalized Linear Models*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Alquier, P. and Ridgway, J. (2020) Concentration of tempered posteriors and of their variational approximations. *The Annals of Statistics*, **48**, 1475–1497.
- Anceschi, N., Fasano, A., Durante, D. and Zanella, G. (2023) Bayesian conjugacy in probit, tobit, multinomial probit and extensions: A review and new results. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **118**, 1451–1469.
- Arellano-Valle, R. B. and Azzalini, A. (2006) On the unification of families of skew-normal distributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **33**, 561–574.
- Azzalini, A. and Capitanio, A. (2003) Distributions generated by perturbation of symmetry with emphasis on a multivariate skew t-distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **65**, 367–389.

- (2013) *The Skew-Normal and Related Families*. Cambridge University Press.
- Azzalini, A. and Dalla Valle, A. (1996) The multivariate skew-normal distribution. *Biometrika*, **83**, 715–726.
- Bishop, C. (2006) *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer.
- Blei, D. M., Kucukelbir, A. and McAuliffe, J. D. (2017) Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **112**, 859–877.
- Carbonetto, P. and Stephens, M. (2012) Scalable variational inference for Bayesian variable selection in regression, and its accuracy in genetic association studies. *Bayesian Analysis*, **7**, 73–108.
- Challis, E. and Barber, D. (2012) Affine independent variational inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **25**, 1–9.
- (2013) Gaussian Kullback–Leibler approximate inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **14**, 2239–2286.
- Chopin, N. and Papaspiliopoulos, O. (2020) *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer.
- Chopin, N. and Ridgway, J. (2017) Leave pima indians alone: Binary regression as a benchmark for Bayesian computation. *Statistical Science*, **32**, 64–87.
- Cichocki, A. and Amari, S.-I. (2010) Families of alpha-beta-and gamma-divergences: Flexible and robust measures of similarities. *Entropy*, **12**, 1532–1568.
- Consonni, G. and Marin, J.-M. (2007) Mean-field variational approximate Bayesian inference for latent variable models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **52**, 790–798.
- Dehaene, G. and Barthelmé, S. (2018) Expectation propagation in the large data limit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **80**, 199–217.
- Ding, N., Qi, Y. and Vishwanathan, S. (2011) t-divergence based approximate inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **24**, 1–9.
- Durante, D. (2019) Conjugate Bayes for probit regression via unified skew-normal distributions. *Biometrika*, **106**, 765–779.
- Durante, D., Pozza, F. and Szabo, B. (2024) Skewed Bernstein-von Mises theorem and skew-modal approximations. *The Annals of Statistics*, In press.
- Durante, D. and Rigon, T. (2019) Conditionally conjugate mean-field variational Bayes for logistic models. *Statistical Science*, **34**, 472–485.
- Fasano, A. and Durante, D. (2022) A class of conjugate priors for multinomial probit models which includes the multivariate normal one. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **23**, 1–26.
- Fasano, A., Durante, D. and Zanella, G. (2022) Scalable and accurate variational Bayes for high-dimensional binary regression models. *Biometrika*, **109**, 901–919.
- Futami, F., Sato, I. and Sugiyama, M. (2017) Expectation propagation for t-exponential family using q-algebra. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **30**, 1–10.
- Gallant, A. R. and Nychka, D. W. (1987) Semi-nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation. *Econometrica*, **55**, 363–390.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S. and Rubin, D. B. (2013) *Bayesian Data Analysis (Third Edition)*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Genton, M. G. and Loperfido, N. M. (2005) Generalized skew-elliptical distributions and their quadratic forms. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **57**, 389–401.
- Giordano, R., Broderick, T. and Jordan, M. I. (2018) Covariances, robustness and variational Bayes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **19**, 1–49.
- González-Farías, G., Dominguez-Molina, A. and Gupta, A. K. (2004) Additive properties of skew normal random vectors. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **126**, 521–534.
- Hinkley, D. (1976) On estimating a symmetric distribution. *Biometrika*, **63**, 680–681.
- Kasprzak, M. J., Giordano, R. and Broderick, T. (2023) How good is your gaussian approximation of the posterior? finite-sample computable error bounds for a variety of useful divergences. *arXiv:2209.14992*.
- Katsevich, A. (2023) Tight skew adjustment to the Laplace approximation in high dimensions. *arXiv:2306.07262*.
- Katsevich, A. and Rigollet, P. (2024) On the approximation accuracy of Gaussian variational inference. *Annals of Statistics*, In press.
- Kucukelbir, A., Tran, D., Ranganath, R., Gelman, A. and Blei, D. M. (2017) Automatic differentiation variational inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **18**, 1–45.
- Kullback, S. and Leibler, R. A. (1951) On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **22**, 79–86.
- Liang, F., Mahoney, M. and Hodgkinson, L. (2022) Fat-tailed variational inference with anisotropic tail adaptive flows. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, **162**, 13257–13270.
- Lo, S.-H. (1985) Estimation of a symmetric distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, **13**, 1097–1113.
- Ma, Y. and Genton, M. G. (2004) Flexible class of skew-symmetric distributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **31**, 459–468.
- Meloche, J. (1991) Estimation of a symmetric density. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **19**, 151–164.
- Minka, T. P. (2001) Expectation propagation for approximate Bayesian inference. *Proceedings of Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, **17**, 362–369.
- Opper, M. and Archambeau, C. (2009) The variational Gaussian approximation revisited. *Neural Computation*, **21**, 786–792.
- Ormerod, J. T. (2011) Skew-normal variational approximations for Bayesian inference. *Technical Report, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney*.
- Póczos, B. and Schneider, J. (2011) On the estimation of α -divergences. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 609–617.
- Ray, K. and Szabó, B. (2022) Variational Bayes for high-dimensional linear regression with sparse priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **117**, 1270–1281.
- Ray, K., Szabó, B. and Clara, G. (2020) Spike and slab variational Bayes for high dimensional logistic regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **33**, 14423–14434.
- Rigon, T., Durante, D. and Torelli, N. (2019) Bayesian semiparametric modelling of contraceptive behaviour in india via sequential logistic regressions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, **182**, 225–247.
- Rossell, D., Abril, O. and Bhattacharya, A. (2021) Approximate Laplace approximations for scalable model selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **83**, 853–879.

- Rue, H., Martino, S. and Chopin, N. (2009) Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **71**, 319–392.
- Ruli, E., Sartori, N. and Ventura, L. (2016) Improved Laplace approximation for marginal likelihoods. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **10**, 3986–4009.
- Salomone, R., Yu, X., Nott, D. J. and Kohn, R. (2024) Structured variational approximations with skew normal decomposable graphical models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, In press.
- Schuster, E. F. (1975) Estimating the distribution function of a symmetric distribution. *Biometrika*, **62**, 631–635.
- (1987) Identifying the closest symmetric distribution or density function. *The Annals of Statistics*, **15**, 865–874.
- Smith, M. S., Loaiza-Maya, R. and Nott, D. J. (2020) High-dimensional copula variational approximation through transformation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **29**, 729–743.
- Spokoiny, V. (2023) Inexact laplace approximation and the use of posterior mean in bayesian inference. *Bayesian Analysis*, **1**, 1–28.
- Tan, L. S. and Chen, A. (2024) Variational inference based on a subclass of closed skew normals. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 1–24.
- Tan, L. S. and Nott, D. J. (2018) Gaussian variational approximation with sparse precision matrices. *Statistics and Computing*, **28**, 259–275.
- Tierney, L. and Kadane, J. B. (1986) Accurate approximations for posterior moments and marginal densities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **81**, 82–86.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000) *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., Sivula, T., Jylänki, P., Tran, D., Sahai, S., Blomstedt, P., Cunningham, J. P., Schiminovich, D. and Robert, C. P. (2020) Expectation propagation as a way of life: A framework for Bayesian inference on partitioned data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **21**, 1–53.
- Walker, A. M. (1969) On the asymptotic behaviour of posterior distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **31**, 80–88.
- Wang, C. and Blei, D. M. (2013) Variational inference in nonconjugate models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **14**, 1005–1031.
- Wang, J., Boyer, J. and Genton, M. G. (2004) A skew-symmetric representation of multivariate distributions. *Statistica Sinica*, **14**, 1259–1270.
- Wang, Y. and Blei, D. M. (2019) Frequentist consistency of variational Bayes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **114**, 1147–1161.
- Yang, Y., Pati, D. and Bhattacharya, A. (2020) α -variational inference with statistical guarantees. *The Annals of Statistics*, **48**, 886–905.
- Zhou, J., Grazian, C. and Ormerod, J. T. (2024) Tractable skew-normal approximations via matching. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **94**, 1016–1034.