

A partial likelihood approach to tree-based density modeling and its application in Bayesian inference

Li Ma*

Department of Statistical Science
Duke University

Benedetta Bruni†

Department of Statistical Science
Duke University

December 17, 2024

Abstract

Tree-based models for probability distributions are usually specified using a predetermined, data-independent collection of candidate recursive partitions of the sample space. To characterize an unknown target density in detail over the entire sample space, candidate partitions must have the capacity to expand deeply into all areas of the sample space with potential non-zero sampling probability. Such an expansive system of partitions often incurs prohibitive computational costs and makes inference prone to overfitting, especially in regions with little probability mass. Existing models typically make a compromise and rely on relatively shallow trees. This hampers one of the most desirable features of trees, their ability to characterize local features, and results in reduced statistical efficiency. Traditional wisdom suggests that this compromise is inevitable to ensure coherent likelihood-based reasoning, as a data-dependent partition system that allows deeper expansion only in regions with more observations would induce double dipping of the data and thus lead to inconsistent inference. We propose a simple strategy to restore coherency while allowing the candidate partitions to be data-dependent, using Cox’s partial likelihood. This strategy parametrizes the tree-based sampling model according to the allocation of probability mass based on the observed data, and yet under appropriate specification, the resulting inference remains valid. Our partial likelihood approach is broadly applicable to existing likelihood-based methods and in particular to Bayesian inference on tree-based models. We give examples in density estimation in which the partial likelihood is endowed with existing priors on tree-based models and compare with the standard, full-likelihood approach. The results show substantial gains in estimation accuracy and computational efficiency from using the partial likelihood.

*Email: li.ma@duke.edu

†Email: benedetta.bruni@duke.edu

1 Introduction

Trees and recursive partitioning have been employed successfully in both supervised and unsupervised learning tasks. Bayesian modeling on trees typically involves specifying a prior on the space of recursive partitions. While the flexibility in the partition location is highly desirable for effectively characterizing the underlying structure of the distributions, incorporating flexible partition locations substantially expands the space of candidate trees, leading to challenges in effectively sampling over such spaces. This is a core challenge in efficient and scalable Bayesian tree-based inference, especially in multivariate and high-dimensional settings. Consequently, some well-known tree-based generative models in the Bayesian literature have focused on trees with constrained partition locations, most commonly requiring the splits in the recursive axis-aligned partitions to occur at predetermined, data-agnostic locations along one of the dimensions (e.g., the middle point). Some famous examples include the Pólya tree and tail-free processes in nonparametric generative modeling. While alleviating the computational complexity, such restricted partition schemes that are specified without regard to the actual data at hand can result in highly inefficient partitions that divide too deep in low-density regions with few observations, causing overfitting (or high variance) and unnecessary computation, while at the same time, do not partition the sample space deep enough in regions with high concentration of data, resulting in underfitting (or large bias) there.

Some previous works (Wong and Ma, 2010; Ma, 2017) attempt to address overfitting by incorporating regularization into the underlying stochastic model. For example, the optional Pólya tree adopts the ideas from Bayesian CART (Chipman et al., 1998) in incorporating randomized stopping, a form of hard thresholding, that can be inferred from the observations. Bayesian regularization or shrinkage is incorporated in the prior specification only *after* the sampling model (or the likelihood) has been specified, and therefore it can only address the danger of overfitting arising from an overparameterization in the likelihood in parts of the sample space where the predetermined partition tree is sufficiently deep, but is incapable of addressing the underparameterization from insufficiently deep trees that causes underfitting on parts of the sample space with high probability mass and rich distributional structure.

Such issues are not unique to Bayesian approaches to tree learning; therefore, non-Bayesian tree-based algorithms usually consider partitions that divide exactly on the observed data locations, which greatly reduces the complexity of the space of candidate partition trees. Moreover, by considering splits along marginal empirical quantiles (such as the median), they alleviate the local over- and underfitting issues by forcing the nodes at the same depth to contain roughly the same number of data points. See, for example, a recent algorithm introduced for density estimation (Walther and Zhao, 2023). These approaches generally deviate from likelihood-based inference and sacrifice many benefits that come with using the likelihood (Berger and Wolpert, 1988).

A natural question is then whether one could incorporate such data-dependent partition location into likelihood-based inference so that the likelihood function is parameterized in a way that makes downstream inference more efficient and robust. In the absence of oracular knowledge about the actual population marginal quantiles, a straightforward if not naïve

approach is to adopt marginal empirical quantiles as the split points in the partition tree. This, of course, runs the risk of “double dipping” the data. A simple remedy is through data-splitting—one can divide the training data into two parts, using one part to define partition locations and the other to estimate the underlying density based on the chosen partition grid. Such data splitting wastes a significant portion of the data and generally leads to a reduced effective sample size that will increase the risk of the resulting estimator.

We exploit a new “data splitting” strategy that operates on the basis of a dyadic recoding of real-valued observations into a sequences of 0’s and 1’s and then perform data splitting on such sequences. Consequently, the basic unit of empirical evidence is no longer a single observation x from the corresponding unknown distribution, but the individual 0s and 1s corresponding to the values of x . This allows a smaller—in fact, asymptotically negligible—fraction of the data to be used to pin down the partition locations. Intuitively, if x is only used to guide the choice of partition grids within a subset A of the sample space, then the event that the data point arises in A , that is, $x \in A$, should still be preserved when learning about the underlying density. The naïve data-splitting strategy would discard x in its entirety, but the dyadic recoding will preserve such information. We show that with this strategy it is then possible to incorporate data-dependent partition locations with asymptotically negligible information loss.

While the dependency on the same data in specifying the partition tree as those used to estimate the underlying distribution appears to be at odds with pure likelihood-based inference, we show that through the dyadic recoding such a strategy is in essence carrying out inference based on Cox’s partial likelihood (Cox, 1975). A practical consequence is that recipes for Bayesian inference under popular priors on tree-based density models under full likelihood can then proceed based on the partial likelihood with only minor modifications. We use the optional Pólya tree (OPT) prior (Wong and Ma, 2010) to demonstrate how such inference can proceed, and show empirically the improvement in estimation accuracy that arises from the more effective data-dependent parametrization of the underlying density.

2 Method

2.1 Likelihood decomposition along a dyadic partition tree

We start by presenting a dyadic recoding of data that leads to equivalent likelihood functions under i.i.d. sampling. Suppose that we observe training data $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that are i.i.d. samples from an unknown distribution F with density $f = dF/d\mu$. Without loss of generality, assume that Ω is a compact rectangle, e.g., $[0, 1]^d$. The full likelihood of this model is given by

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i).$$

Let \mathcal{T} be an *a priori* given dyadic partition tree over Ω that generates the Borel σ -algebra, F can be parameterized by the binomial splitting probability at each tree split $\theta(A) = F(A_l|A)$.

For all nodes with $n(A) > 1$, one could write this decomposition recursively as

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = m_{\text{fix}}(A) \cdot L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_l) L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_r) \quad (2.1)$$

where $A = A_l \cup A_r$ is the dyadic split of A according to \mathcal{T} and

$$m_{\text{fix}}(A) = \prod_{x \in A} \mathbb{P}(x \in A_l | A)^{\mathbf{1}(x \in A_l)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(x \in A_r | A)^{\mathbf{1}(x \in A_r)} = F(A_l | A)^{n(A_l)} F(A_r | A)^{n(A_r)}. \quad (2.2)$$

For $n(A) \geq 1$, further decomposition is unnecessary because for $n(A) = 0$, $L(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = 1$ and for $n(A) = 1$

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = f(x | A)$$

where x is the single observation in A . For continuous distributions, the probability that any data fall exactly on the boundary of any node in \mathcal{T} is nil, and hence for simplicity, we do not explicitly describe this possibility.

This full likelihood has been the basis for several Bayesian priors on f such as Pólya trees and its various generalizations that endow priors on $\theta(A) = F(A_l | A)$. Some recent developments further incorporate \mathcal{T} into the model by specifying a prior on the recursive partition tree \mathcal{T} . However, this fully Bayesian approach requires that the prior on \mathcal{T} ignores all information from the observed training data.

Now, let us consider a different decomposition of the full likelihood above along a dyadic tree that is *not* given *a priori* but rather with splitting points sitting right on top of an observed data point. We shall now use $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ to denote the tree, which emphasizes its dependence on the data set. Again, we provide an inductive description of the construction of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ along with a likelihood decomposition based on $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$. Let $A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ be a partition block or node that arises in our inductive procedure. We let $x_A \in A$ be an observed data point based on which we further divide A , and let $A = \{x_A\} \cup A_l \cup A_r$ where $A_l = \{x \in A : x < x_A\}$ and $A_r = \{x \in A : x > x_A\}$ are the two child nodes in $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$. Note that the definitions of A_l and A_r are different from before, but we shall use the same notation without causing additional confusion. Then we can write the full likelihood recursively as follows

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = m(A) \cdot L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_l) \cdot L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_r) \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$m(A) = f(x_A | A) \cdot F(A_l | A)^{n(A_l)} F(A_r | A)^{n(A_r)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Contrasting this new decomposition with what we had above, the observation x_A is now *singled out* on A and used to determine the partition of A and correspondingly eliminated from further recursive expression of $L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_l)$ and $L(f; \mathbf{x}, A_r)$. While this factorization holds for any observed value of x_A in A , in order to create partition trees that are evenly grown—that is, nodes in each level of the tree have almost the same number of observations, in the following, we shall consider choosing x_A to be the observed median in A . That is, in the following we let x_A be the $k(A)$ th order statistic on A with $k(A) = \lfloor (n(A) + 1)/2 \rfloor$.

Continuing this iteration, we can write the full likelihood in contributions from the tree nodes along a data-dependent tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$,

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} m(A).$$

More generally, if we let $\mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{x})$ be the subtree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ rooted at A , then

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{x})} m(A').$$

where $L(f; \mathbf{x}, A)$ the conditional likelihood on the subtree rooted at A , conditional on the event that A arises as a node in the data-dependent tree.

2.2 A partial likelihood approach to inference

The data-dependent nature of the above full likelihood decomposition hampers fully likelihood-based strategies such as Bayesian inference. At the same time, we recognize a striking similarity of the likelihood contribution on node A in a data-dependent tree, $m(A)$, compared to the corresponding likelihood contribution $m_{\text{fix}}(A)$ with a data-independent fixed tree. Both have a binomial likelihood component corresponding to those points that fall into A_l vs. A_r . The only difference being the extra component $f(x|A)$ in $m(A)$. While one could imagine inference that focuses on branching probabilities $F(A_l|A)$ and $F(A_r|A)$, for example, using priors such as beta or logit-normal, it is unclear how to infer the exact conditional density at the partition locations $f(x_A|A)$ at the exact value of x_A observed. However, we make two observations: (i) branching probabilities alone are sufficient to determine the probability distribution F almost everywhere on Ω ; (ii) the exact density at the exact partition boundaries cannot be reliably inferred anyway, even with a fixed partition tree, as those are usually the boundary of piecewise constant densities when tree-based methods are employed.

Consequently, we proceed by treating the exact conditional density of $f(\cdot|A)$ at the point x_A , i.e., $f(x_A|A)$, as “nuisance” parameters. Following the seminal work on the proportional hazards model (Cox, 1972), Cox (1975) formulated the notion of partial likelihood more generally by rewriting a data set \mathbf{x} as

$$\mathbf{x} = (w_1, \mathbf{x}_1, w_2, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, w_N, \mathbf{x}_N)$$

and assumed that the full likelihood can be written as

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^N f(w_j|d_j) \prod_{j=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}_j|c_j)$$

where $d_j = (w_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, w_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j-1})$ and $c_j = (w_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, w_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, w_j)$.

To see that under the data-dependent tree, we have a likelihood factorization exactly of this form, one can simply replace the index j in Cox’s notation with a coarse-to-fine

indexing of the nodes in a dyadic tree. There are various ways to define such an index. All we need is to ensure that it is consistent with a partial order of the nodes, so that a parent node always has a lower index j than its children. For example, we can simply let j be the order of a node A corresponding to the dyadic sequence of 0 and 1 corresponding to whether a descendant of A 's is the left or right child of a split. Now w_j corresponds to x_A , the value on which we divide the node A . In this case, $f(w_j|d_j)$ is exactly $f(x_A|A)^{n(\{x_A\})}$. On the other hand, each \mathbf{x}_j corresponds simply to the collection of indicators of whether each point in A falls into A_l or A_r , whose conditional likelihood given c_j depends only on the parameters of interest, here the branching probabilities $F(A_l|A)$ and $F(A_r|A)$. The first product generally involves some nuisance parameters, which in our context corresponds to the exact conditional density $f(x_A|A)$ at the partition locations that define the dyadic tree. Cox refers to the second product in the factorization, $\prod_{j=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}_j|c_j)$, as the ‘‘partial likelihood’’.

We can write the tree-based likelihood decomposition in Cox’s form by rearranging the terms. Specifically,

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \prod_j f(x_{A_j}|A_j) \cdot \prod_j m_P(A_j) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} f(x_A|A) \cdot \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} m_P(A)$$

where $m_P(A) = F(A_l|A)^{n(A_l)}F(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}$. The second piece in this product defines the partial likelihood exactly in Cox’s definition

$$L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} m_P(A),$$

which can be written recursively as

$$L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, A) = m_P(A) \cdot L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, A_l) \cdot L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, A_r) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{x})} m_P(A'). \quad (2.5)$$

We note that this partial likelihood has essentially the same form as the full likelihood under a fixed tree decomposition. This implies that inference strategies based on the full likelihood decomposition on a fixed tree can all be applied with little change to this partial likelihood by acting *as if* the data-dependent tree were actually fixed, though of course the validity of the resulting inference requires further justification, which we will provide later.

One question regards how much information is discarded by ignoring the ‘‘nuisance’’ portion of the likelihood, namely $\prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} f(x_A|A)$, and is similar in spirit to the naïve data splitting strategy described in the introduction. It is worth noting that the information discarded is much less than a conditional likelihood approach such as the one proposed in Lavine (1995), which conditions on the full set of observed partition points. To see this, note that the total likelihood contribution from the partition points to the full likelihood is

$$\prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} f(x_A),$$

where $f(x_A)$ is the density of f (not conditional on x_A is in A) evaluated at x_A . That is,

$$f(x_A) = f(x_A|A) \cdot F(A).$$

In other words, the partial likelihood retains the information about F from the event that the corresponding partition point on A is an observation *within* A , and only discards the information provided by its *relative value within* A . Another way to see this is that the partition point x_A contributes to the binomial likelihood on ancestral nodes of A in the partial likelihood because

$$F(A) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{A}(A)} F(A'_l|A')^{\mathbf{1}(x_A \in A'_l)} F(A'_r|A')^{\mathbf{1}(x_A \in A'_r)}$$

where $\mathcal{A}(A) = \{A' \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x}) : A \subsetneq A'\}$ is the ancestors of A in $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$. The binomial likelihood terms on all ancestors of A are indeed retained in the partial likelihood. For this reason, the partial likelihood approach is in essence carrying out data splitting using the 0 and 1 dyadic sequence corresponding dyadic sequence, and preserving the prefix of the sequence that indicates $x \in A$, and discarding the postfix that encodes the relative value of x in A . Later we will establish a theory that shows that the information discarded by the partial likelihood is asymptotically negligible when the partition points are chosen based on (non-degenerate) empirical quantiles.

It is worth noting that the partial likelihood approach, with a slight generalization, in fact provides a unifying framework that contains the full likelihood approach based on pre-determined partition grid locations as a special case and allows the approach to be applied to distributions that might not be continuous. To see this, in the likelihood decomposition in Eq. (2.3), we can now let

$$m(A) = f(x_A|A)^{n(\{x_A\})} \cdot F(A_l|A)^{n(A_l)} F(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}. \quad (2.6)$$

where $n(\{x_A\})$ is the number of observations exactly equal to x_A . Note that in previous situations, the fixed and observed partition locations correspond to the special case where $n(\{x_A\}) = 0$ and $n(\{x_A\}) = 1$, respectively. Under this unified framework, one can use partition locations that are “mixed and matched” involving locations that sit on one or more observations or a location without any observations. Inference can then proceed using the partial likelihood as defined in Eq. (2.5).

2.3 Likelihood decomposition on finite trees

The full likelihood decomposition can in principle proceed on a continuous sample space down to an infinite number of levels. Although assuming an infinitely deep tree partition can often be useful in theoretical analysis to maintain full nonparametricity of the model on f , this is hardly ever done in practice in tree-based models and algorithms, since in deep levels of the tree the data are typically too sparse to be informative about the local structure of the density. (To see this in the most extreme case, because data points are

usually measured and recorded in a rounded form, and so if the tree is sufficiently deep, there will be at most one unique data value in a node.) Expanding the partition tree too deep is usually computationally demanding without improving the quality of the inference, if not making the inference more prone to overfitting. Therefore, existing tree-based methods, either (full) likelihood-based or otherwise, usually impose a hard stopping rule for the tree splitting when the leaf node is either too small in Lebesgue measure or in sample size.

In Bayesian inference, the likelihood of f must be used together with regularization to ensure local smoothness and avoid overfitting. One such regularization frequently adopted in practice is that f is (with high probability) equal (or almost equal) to some baseline measure H , such as a uniform distribution, on regions that are small enough. This is often adopted either by enforcing a hard stopping rule based on the depth of the tree or by imposing a stronger shrinkage penalty toward h as the depth of the tree increases. Even the latter will eventually incorporate a hard stopping rule due to the constraint of the computational resources and the fact that real data usually are measured or recorded only up to a certain resolution.

The partial likelihood decomposition by design terminates after reaching empty leafs (i.e., those that include no data). For example, if we choose x_A to be the median of the observations in A , then the partition tree will generally terminate after $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ levels. In practical applications, especially when the sample size n is massive, the partition could be terminated before exhausting all observations as partition locations. A nice property of the partial likelihood tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ based on dividing at the empirical median is that all nodes at the same depth of the tree will have virtually the same number of samples, and hence one can just terminate the tree partition at a maximum depth. Therefore, it is practically more relevant to consider a partial likelihood based on a data-dependent partitioning only up to a maximum resolution $K \leq \log_2 n$.

To this end, let us first write the full likelihood as follows

$$L(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{I}_K(\mathbf{x})} m_P(A) \cdot \prod_{A \in \mathcal{I}_K(\mathbf{x})} f(x_A|A) \cdot \prod_{A \in \mathcal{L}_K(\mathbf{x})} L_F(f; \mathbf{x}, A)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_K(\mathbf{x})$ represents the interior nodes of a tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{L}_K(\mathbf{x})$ the leafs. Now we can define that depth- K partial likelihood to be

$$L_{P,K}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{I}_K(\mathbf{x})} m_P(A) \cdot \prod_{A \in \mathcal{L}_K(\mathbf{x})} L_F(f; \mathbf{x}, A).$$

This is the partial likelihood that discards $f(x_A|A)$ only in the first K levels of the partition tree. In practice, when the sample size is massive, one would still use $L_{P,K}$ for some $K < \log_2 n$ as the basis for inference.

2.4 Asymptotic equivalence to the full likelihood

Next we establish the equivalence of the partial likelihood to the full likelihood as the sample size grows to infinity. This equivalence simply implies that the data-adaptive tree partition

will discard a negligible amount of information contained in the data. One should not confuse this information-theoretic equivalence with the difference in practical ease and efficiency in inference under these two different parametrizations.

It is also important to note that the quality of the data-driven tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$, and correspondingly the resulting partial likelihood, depends critically on the rule by which one chooses the partition points. Though the partial likelihood can be computed with any arbitrary choice of partition points x_A , it may retain different amounts of information among F . For an (extreme) example, if we had chosen x_A to always be the smallest observation in A , then the resulting partial likelihood will not be useful for learning F . To see this, note that in this case the partial likelihood $m_P(A) = F(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}$, so all information is lost regarding $F(A_l|A)$. It is then natural to provide some general guidelines on how to choose the x_A to divide upon and understand the strategies for choosing x_A lead to efficient inference.

It turns out that a simple and effective strategy is to specify x_A to be an empirical quantile of the observations in A , for example, the median. More generally, let $k(A)$ be the rank of x_A among the observations in A . Then, as long as $q(A) = k(A)/n(A)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1 among all A , the partial likelihood will retain sufficient information to consistently estimate F as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The following theorem provides sufficient conditions under which inference based on the partial likelihood is asymptotically as efficient as that based on the full likelihood.

Theorem 1. *Suppose the data arise from a sampling distribution F_0 with density f_0 , such that $\int f_0 \log f_0 < 0$ and the following conditions hold:*

- (i) *The partition location x_A on each A is the $q(A)$ th empirical quantile of the observations in A , and $q(A)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1. That is, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $q(A) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$ for all A .*
- (ii) *The depth of the partition tree $K_n \leq c \log_2 n$ for some constant $c < 1$ and all large enough n .*

Let $\mathcal{C}_{a,b,D} = \{f : a < f/f_0 < b, 1/D < f < D\}$, the class of densities uniformly bounded by D whose density ratio with respect to f_0 is bounded by a and b . Then for any $a, b, D > 0$,

$$\frac{l_{P,K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)}{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} \rightarrow_P 1 \quad \text{in } F_0^{(n)} \text{ probability uniformly over } \mathcal{C}_{a,b,D}.$$

Remark I: The condition on F_0 that $\int f_0 \log f_0 < 0$ causes no loss of generality because it can always be made true by a scaling change-of-variable that expands the size of Ω and makes $\log f_0$ smaller by an arbitrary constant. Inference based on either the full likelihood or the partial likelihood is invariant with respect to a constant shift of the log-likelihood, and so it suffices to establish the results for F_0 that satisfies this condition.

Remark II: The theorem implies that the (depth- K_n) partial likelihood and the full likelihood of f are asymptotically equivalent as the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$ so long as the partition locations are chosen to be non-degenerate quantiles.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \frac{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)}{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} \right| &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left[\left| l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \right| \left| \frac{1}{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} \right| \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \right| \left| \frac{1}{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} \right| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})$ be the data-dependent tree in which we use the subscript K_n to emphasize that it has K_n levels. For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \right| \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log f(x_A | A) \right| \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} (\log f(x_A) - \log F(A)) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log f(x_A) \right| + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| - \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log F_0(A) \right| + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log F_0(A)/F(A) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Glivenko-Cantelli theorem that

$$- \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log F_0(A) \leq K_n^2 2^{K_n} \log(1/\epsilon) + o_P(1).$$

Call $R = \max\{|\log |a||, |\log |b||\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log F_0(A)/F(A) \right| &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} |\log F_0(A)/F(A)| \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} R = K_n^2 2^{K_n} R. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $1/D < f < D$,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log f(x_A) \right| \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_{K_n}(\mathbf{x})} \log D = K_n^2 2^{K_n} \log D.$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \right| \leq K_n 2^{K_n} \log R + K_n^2 2^{K_n} \log(1/\epsilon) + o_P(1),$$

where, since $K_n \leq c \log_2 n$, we have $K_n \cdot 2^K = o(n)$ and $K_n^2 \cdot 2^{K_n} = o(n)$.

Now note that by the law of large numbers

$$\frac{1}{n}l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f(x_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f$$

and this convergence is uniform since $a < f/f_0 < b$. Moreover $\mathbb{E}_{f_0} f = \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f/f_0 + \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f_0 < 0$ by Jensen's inequality and the condition that $\mathbb{E}_{f_0} f_0 < 0$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}_{a,b}} \left| \frac{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) - l_{P, K_n}(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)}{l(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} \right| \leq \frac{K_n 2^{K_n} \log M + K_n^2 2^{K_n} \log(1/\epsilon) + o_P(1)}{n(\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f + o_P(1))} \rightarrow_P 0.$$

This establishes the theorem. □

The theorem does not specify the actual model on f , and it is important not to confuse the equivalence of the likelihood to equivalence in the resulting inference. Carrying out inference requires specifying the model on f , which typically involves expressing f using a more explicit parametrization. It is important to remember that even when the likelihood functions under different parametrizations are equivalent, different parametrizations can often lead to more or less efficient statistical analyses and computation (Hoff, 2009, Sec. 10). Here, the same lesson applies. In specifying a prior on f , those that utilize the data-dependent partition under the partial likelihood can achieve a comparable inference to that of an oracle who specifies a partition tree based on the population quantiles of f . In contrast, priors and the ensuing inference based on a fixed partition grid given *a priori* will generally lead to less efficient inference even when the full likelihood is employed. This difference in the resulting inference will be demonstrated in our numerical experiments given in [Section 4](#).

2.5 Partial likelihood for multivariate tree-based density models

The discussion so far has concerned a univariate sample space on which recursive partitions are defined. Many problems in which tree-based methods are useful involve multivariate sample spaces in which there are multiple axis-aligned partition directions that can be chosen to grow the dyadic partition tree. The partition tree can then be used to specify models on f and the likelihood can serve as the basis for inferring what the underlying partition tree should be to generate models on f that fit the data well.

One principled strategy to incorporating inference on the tree topologies is to treat the splitting variables, denoted by \mathbf{J} , which determine the tree topology $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{J})$ as latent variables. In this way the full likelihood is expressed as a likelihood of f and \mathbf{J} jointly. In particular, we utilize the following decomposition

$$L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A) = m_{\text{fix}, J(A)}(A) \cdot L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{J(A), l}) \cdot L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{J(A), r})$$

where for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $A_{j, l}$ and $A_{j, r}$ denote the two children node if A is divided in the j th direction at a pre-determined fixed location and

$$m_{\text{fix}, j}(A) = F(A_{j, l}|A)^{n(A_{j, l})} F(A_{j, r}|A)^{n(A_{j, r})}.$$

Treating the splitting variables as latent auxiliary parameters, one can then use this decomposition to infer jointly the density f and the latent variables \mathbf{J} as described in [Wong and Ma \(2010\)](#).

One can naturally apply the same strategy to the unified partial likelihood framework regardless of whether or not partition locations sit on observed values, which contains the above strategy as a special case. The only complication is that now the tree topology depends on both \mathbf{J} and the observed data \mathbf{x} . As such we denote the tree now by $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{x})$. The full likelihood for (f, \mathbf{J}) can then be decomposed as follows. For each $A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{x})$,

$$L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A) = m_{J(A)}(A) \cdot L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{J(A),l}) \cdot L(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{J(A),r}) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{x})} m_{J(A')}(A') \quad (2.7)$$

where for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $A_{j,l} = \{\mathbf{x} \in A : x_j < x_{A,j}\}$, $A_{j,r} = \{\mathbf{x} \in A : x_j > x_{A,j}\}$ and

$$m_j(A) = f(x_{A,j}|A)F(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}F(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})}.$$

It is important that the partition location along each dimension j is through the same observation x_A to ensure validity of the partial likelihood. This is because otherwise the nuisance parameter $f(x_A|A)$ would be different for different j , resulting in a different piece of the likelihood to be discarded for different ways of partition. Such discrepancy could accumulate over multiple levels of partitions, rendering the partial likelihood corresponding to different partition sequences incomparable, and therefore making them unfit as the bases for learning the unknown partition tree.

As such, in the multivariate case, one would need an effective way to choose the partition point x_A . The ideal x_A should be close to the marginal median along each dimension of A . Searching for such x_A 's might be computationally challenging depending on the nature of the underlying distribution F . An alternative strategy is to simply pick an observation x_A^j to divide on specifically for each dimension j , and then take out all of these potential division points $\mathbf{x}_A = \{x_A^j : j = 1, 2, \dots, d\}$. The nuisance part of the likelihood under each partition direction j then becomes equal and for each dimension j ,

$$m_j(A) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^d f(x_A^j|A) \right) \cdot F(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}F(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})}$$

but now $A_{j,l} = \{\mathbf{x} \in A : x_j < x_{A,j}^j\}$, $A_{j,r} = \{\mathbf{x} \in A : x_j > x_{A,j}^j\}$ and $n(A_{j,l})$ and $n(A_{j,r})$ are the number of observations in $A_{j,l}$ *excluding* all those in \mathbf{x}_A . Compared to dividing on the same x_A on all directions, this alternative strategy discards d times as much information from the data, but avoids the difficulty in choosing the single x_A as now one can again simply divide marginally on, for example, the median. This trade-off is often favorable when d is relatively small compared to n .

Under either strategy, similar to before, we can then define the partial likelihood as

$$L_P(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{x})} m_{P, J(A')}(A') \quad (2.8)$$

where for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$

$$m_{P,j}(A) = F(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})} F(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})}.$$

The partial likelihood can then be used to infer jointly (f, \mathbf{J}) as with the full likelihood. We will demonstrate later through numerical experiments in Section 4.2.

3 Bayesian modeling based on the partial likelihood

Given the striking similarity between $m_P(A)$ and $m_{\text{fix}}(A)$, it is not surprising then that existing tree-based Bayesian models for F and f , which are constructed through specifying priors on the splitting probabilities $\theta(A) = F(A_l|A)$, can apply readily to the case with data-dependent tree splits with the partial likelihood. We shall consider a few of these examples. Before presenting these examples, quickly review a technique that expresses the likelihood of f with respect to a baseline density h , which is not necessary but can substantially simplify our notation and derivation for the posterior distribution in the examples.

3.1 Expressing the partial likelihood in terms of likelihood ratios

One technique introduced in Ma (2017) that simplifies the expression of the likelihood under a fixed tree partition and leads to more numerical robustness is to express the full likelihood decomposition with respect to that under a base measure. This technique can be readily applied to the current partial likelihood. Specifically, let H be a fixed baseline measure on Ω , and let $h = dH/d\mu$ be its density. Then the partial likelihood under this baseline density $L_P(h; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)$. We can then write the partial likelihood ratio between any model f and h

$$\frac{L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)}{L_P(h; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})} r_P(A).$$

where

$$r_P(A) = \frac{F(A_l|A)^{n(A_l)} F(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}}{H(A_l|A)^{n(A_l)} H(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}}.$$

That is, the overall (partial) likelihood ratio between F and H can be factorized over the tree nodes where $r_P(A)$ is the (partial) likelihood ratio with respect to the corresponding binomial likelihood. Accordingly, we can express this factorization in each subtree $\mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$\frac{L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, A)}{L_P(h; \mathbf{x}, A)} = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A(\mathbf{x})} r_P(A').$$

The benefits of expressing the (partial) likelihood ratio with respect to that of a base model stem mainly from the fact that likelihood ratios are invariant with respect to the change of variable from the original observation \mathbf{x} to some transformed observations \mathbf{x}' . Accordingly, the likelihood ratio, full or partial, is then scale-free with respect to any change of scales on the measurement of \mathbf{x} . This scale-invariant property will become especially handy in simplifying the computation of inference algorithms and avoiding numerical problems.

3.2 Example 1: Pólya trees

The first example we consider is the Pólya tree (PT) model. PT is the simplest model on F based on prior specifications on $F(A_l|A)$. It assumes simple independent beta priors on $F(A_l|A)$, which renders simple conjugate posterior inference. Now we can again adopt this prior, but now carry out (partial) Bayesian inference through a conjugate posterior update with the partial likelihood. An important simplification of the current framework is that the data-adaptive tree will *always* be finite for any finite sample as eventually all data points will be partitioned upon. For this reason, we only need to consider the so-called finite PT, which are PT priors defined on trees of a finite number of levels, and the model will *always* generate a density function.

Specifically, PT models the branching probabilities independently on all interior nodes in the partition tree using beta priors

$$F(A_l|A) \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha_l(A), \alpha_r(A)).$$

On a leaf node A , simply set $F(\cdot|A) = u_A(\cdot)$ to some base distribution u_A supported on A .

A popular way to specify the beta priors is by using a concentration (or shrinkage) parameter along with a mean base measure. Specifically, we can let H be a probability measure on Ω . Then if we let

$$\alpha_l(A) = c(A)H(A_l|A) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_r(A) = c(A)H(A_r|A)$$

where $c(A)$ is possibly the node-specific concentration parameter on A . If in addition, we let the base distribution on a leaf node A be $u_A(\cdot) = H(\cdot|A)$, then the resulting PT prior will have its prior mean equal to H .

Bayesian inference (using the partial likelihood) can proceed now due to beta-binomial conjugacy, and the posterior model is simply a PT given the same data-adaptive tree with

$$F(A_l|A) | \mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha_l(A) + n(A_l), \alpha_r(A) + n(A_r)).$$

One could also compute the overall marginal likelihood after integrating out the PT prior. Specifically, due to the factorization of the partial likelihood over the tree nodes and the prior independence of $F(A_l|A)$ for all A s, the “partial” marginal likelihood is given by

$$\Phi(\Omega) = \int L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \pi(dF) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}} M_P(A)$$

where

$$M_P(A) := \int m_P(A) \pi(dF(A_l|A)) = \frac{B(\alpha_l(A) + k(A) - 1, \alpha_r(A) + n(A) - k(A))}{B(\alpha_l(A), \alpha_r(A))}$$

with $B(a, b)$ being the beta function. That is, $B(a, b) = (\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b))/\Gamma(a + b)$ for $a, b > 0$.

The posterior predictive density—that is, the posterior mean of f —is also available exactly. To evaluate the posterior predictive density at a point $\mathbf{x}' \in \Omega$, we simply need to trace

the sequence of nodes in \mathcal{T} given by the training data, $\mathbf{x}' \in A_k \subset A_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset A_0 = \Omega$ where A_k is a leaf, that is, $n(A_k) \leq 1$. Then the posterior mean density at \mathbf{x}' is

$$\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}')|\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}(F(A_k)|\mathbf{x}) \cdot h(\mathbf{x}'|A_k) = \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot h(\mathbf{x}'|A_k)$$

where $\mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x})$ is the corresponding posterior mean of $F(A_{i+1}|A_i)$. That is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{M_P(A_i)} \int F(A_{i+1}|A_i) m_P(A_i) \pi(dF(A_{i+1}|A_i)) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha_l(A_i) + n(A_{i+1})}{\alpha_l(A_i) + \alpha_r(A_i) + n(A_i) - 1} & \text{if } A_{i+1} \text{ is the left child of } A_i \\ \frac{\alpha_r(A_i) + n(A_{i+1})}{\alpha_l(A_i) + \alpha_r(A_i) + n(A_i) - 1} & \text{if } A_{i+1} \text{ is the right child of } A_i. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The predictive density above can also be easily expressed in a scale-free manner relative to the base measure

$$\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}')|\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x}') \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A_k)|\mathbf{x})}{H(A_k)} = h(\mathbf{x}') \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x})}{H(A_{i+1}|A_i)}.$$

The posterior predictive density ratio w.r.t. the base density can also be computed recursively. For each A_i $i = 0, \dots, k-1$

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A_i)|\mathbf{x})}{h(\mathbf{x}'|A_i)} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x})}{H(A_{i+1}|A_i)} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A_{i+1})|\mathbf{x})}{h(\mathbf{x}'|A_{i+1})}$$

and it is equal to 1 for $i = k$. To emphasize the recursive nature, let $\xi(A) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A)|\mathbf{x})}{h(\mathbf{x}'|A)}$ and let $\varphi(A) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A|A_p)|\mathbf{x})}{H(A|A_p)}$. Then $\xi(A_k) = \varphi(A_k) = 1$ and for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

$$\xi(A_i) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x})}{H(A_{i+1}|A_i)} \cdot \xi(A_{i+1}) = \varphi(A_{i+1}) \xi(A_{i+1}),$$

which is a bottom-up recursion on the sequence A_k, A_{k-1}, \dots, A_0 . While this recursive expression is not necessary for the PT model *per se*, as we will describe in the following section, when latent Markov state variables are incorporated into PT, such a recursive expression for the posterior predictive density ratio will become important.

In problems involving model choice and hypothesis testing (Berger and Guglielmi, 2001; Ma and Wong, 2011; Holmes et al., 2015; Soriano and Ma, 2017) it is often helpful to compute the likelihood ratio, that is, the Bayes factor between the PT model and the corresponding partial likelihood under the base density h , denoted by $\phi(\Omega)$, which is

$$\phi(\Omega) = \frac{\int L_P(f; \mathbf{x}, \Omega) \pi(dF)}{L_P(h; \mathbf{x}, \Omega)} = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}} \int r_P(A) \pi(dF(A_l|A)) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{T}} \eta_P(A),$$

where $\eta_{\mathbb{P}}(A) := \int r_{\mathbb{P}}(A)\pi(dF(A_l|A)) = \frac{M_{\mathbb{P}}(A)}{H(A_l|A)^{k(A)-1}H(A_r|A)^{n(A)-k(A)}}$, which is the “evidence” for F marginalized over the prior with respect to the base measure H . We could also define the corresponding Bayes factor on the subtree \mathcal{T}_A rooted at A , denoted by $\phi(A)$ to gauge the model against the base measure

$$\phi(A) = \prod_{A' \in \mathcal{T}_A} \eta_{\mathbb{P}}(A') = \begin{cases} \eta_{\mathbb{P}}(A)\phi(A_l)\phi(A_r) & \text{if } n(A) > 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One benefit of the current approach is that we now know *a priori* the number of samples that fall into each tree node A at the l th level of \mathcal{T} before even observing the data, once the total sample size is known. The sample size $n(A) \approx n \cdot 2^{-(l(A)-1)}$. One can use this *prior knowledge* to specify the concentration parameter $c(A)$ depending on $l(A)$.

It has been a popular strategy to specify $c(A)$ in terms of $l(A)$ in traditional PT modeling when the partition tree is not data-adaptive, as was recommended in [Lavine \(1992\)](#). But [Ma \(2017\)](#) argued that for such models with predetermined fixed partition locations, one should generally *not* specify the concentration parameter based *solely* on the level of the tree, as it will not adapt to the proper level of smoothness in the underlying function. These papers introduced adaptive shrinkage prior in terms of putting priors on $c(A)$ in the form of a Markov process along the partition tree to resolve this issue.

However, with the location of the data-adaptive partition achieved with the partial likelihood, the simple strategy of specifying the concentration parameter $c(A)$ as a function of $l(A)$ appears less problematic. For example, when we always partition on the empirical median in each A , the number of samples that fall into every tree node A in the l th level of \mathcal{T} is always roughly $n \cdot 2^{-l}$. Now that the nodes in the same level of the tree contain roughly the same number of observations, the model complexity within each level of the tree is *automatically* re-scaled corresponding to the local concentration of mass in F .

The predetermined sample size in the tree nodes brings an additional computational benefit. Because $n(A)$ is (roughly) always $n \cdot 2^{-l(A)}$, the beta posteriors within each tree level are essentially different only due to the prior beta pseudo-counts. If we adopt the same beta pseudo-counts in each level of the tree, then there are only a small collection of beta functions that need to be evaluated. If instead one adopts pseudo-counts based on a base measure such as $\alpha_l(A) = cH(A_l|A)$ and $\alpha_r(A) = cH(A_r|A)$, then the beta functions also depend on the relative sizes of A_l and A_r with respect to the base measure H , that is, $(H(A_l|A), H(A_r|A))$. Even in these cases, one may precompute them using a grid of values for these relative sizes, such as $(0.01, 0.99), (0.02, 0.98), \dots, (0.99, 1)$. In applications such as hypothesis testing where the marginal likelihood is needed, the main computation involves evaluating the corresponding beta functions for the posterior and prior beta distributions for each A . Such an approximation can substantially speed up computation. This speed-up can be especially helpful in multivariate settings.

There is an interesting connection between this partial likelihood-based PT to a non-parametric process called quantile pyramids (QP) introduced by [Hjort and Walker \(2009\)](#). QP is a prior distribution on the unobserved quantiles of F . It is designed to address issues caused by prefixed partition locations as well. It is computationally demanding to carry

out inference with QP, as it breaks down the beta-binomial conjugacy in PT. Our partial likelihood approach provides an alternative that maintains the conceptual advantage of partitioning along quantiles (though now the empirical ones) while preserving the computational tractability of the PT.

There exists an asymptotic relationship between our partial likelihood-based PT model and the QP. To see this, suppose now $n \rightarrow \infty$ and we choose $k(A)$ to be a fixed empirical q th quantile ($q \in (0, 1)$) such as the median (i.e., $q = 0.5$) in A , then $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ will converge with probability 1 to the dyadic tree defined by the dyadic quantiles of Ω . Moreover, for each $A \in \mathcal{T}$, $n(A) \rightarrow \infty$ and $k(A)/n(A) \rightarrow q$. Thus, asymptotically, the partition tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ will converge to the population quantile pyramid tree.

Interestingly, [Hjort and Walker \(2009\)](#) proposed to address the computational intractability of the QP by adopting a multinomial approximate likelihood introduced in [Lavine \(1995\)](#), which replaces the full likelihood under f with a finite discrete approximation based on the quantile grid of F up to a certain resolution. This approach leads to a posterior computational algorithm similar to the conjugate computation we achieve with the partial likelihood. However, it is acknowledged in [Lavine \(1995\)](#) that such an approximation generally introduces bias and leads to overly conservative inference. Our partial likelihood approach avoids this issue and preserves the consistency of the inference.

3.3 Example 2: Models that incorporate Markov latent states

The collection of beta concentration parameters $\{c(A) : A \in \mathcal{T}\}$ plays a critical role in regularizing the smoothness of f relative to the base density h . Previous works ([Wong and Ma, 2010](#); [Ma, 2017](#); [Christensen and Ma, 2019](#)) have shown that inference can be substantially enhanced under PT by incorporating these concentration parameters into the modeling and learning them based on the data. They introduce a technique that allows adaptive inference on these concentration parameters to characterize potentially spatially heterogeneous features of F while maintaining computational tractability using latent variables with a first-order Markov model. We show how these models can also be applied with partial likelihood.

Specifically, given a partition tree \mathcal{T} , we consider PT models specified conditional on a latent state variable $S(A)$ associated with the node A . In other words, the branching probabilities are modeled as a mixture of betas with $S(A)$ representing the corresponding mixture component to which $F(A_l|A)$ belongs. That is

$$F(A_l|A) | S(A) = s \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha_{s,l}(A), \alpha_{s,r}(A)). \quad (3.1)$$

and jointly modeled the states using a root-to-leaf Markov process with a (prior) transition matrix $\rho_{s,s'}(A)$ on each node A to move into s' given $S(A_p) = s$. Two special cases are when $\rho_{s,s}(A) = 1$ for all A and s , corresponding to all states being identical, and when $\rho_{s,s'}(A) = \rho_{s'}(A)$ for all A , s and s' , corresponding to all states being independent across A 's.

One can compute the posterior transition matrix of the Markov tree model exactly based on a one-pass message passing (essentially a forward-backward algorithm for discrete Markov process). More specifically, a key component of the message passing algorithm is the marginal

likelihood of the submodel in A given the parent state, that is, $S(A_p) = s$. To emphasize the recursive nature of this algorithm, we define this marginal likelihood on A as $\Phi_s(A)$, which is given by the following recursive formula

$$\Phi_s(A) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_{s,s'}(A) M_{s'}(A) \Phi_{s'}(A_l) \Phi_{s'}(A_r)$$

where $M_s(A) := \int m(A) \cdot \pi_s(dF(A_l|A))$ for all states s in which for simplicity we let $\pi_s(dF(A_l|A)) := \pi(dF(A_l|A)|S(A) = s)$.

Based on a bottom-up recursion from the leaf to the root, one can compute these mappings for all $A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x})$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Note that the above expression applies to any prior specification on $F(A_l|A)$. When beta priors are adopted under the PT, the integral boils down to the reciprocal of a beta function with a closed form.

We can normalize the mapping $\phi_s(A)$ with respect to the likelihood of a base measure H . Specifically, let h be the corresponding density of the base measure on Ω around which the PT is centered. We can define a marginal likelihood ratio mapping

$$\phi_s(A) = \Phi_s(A) / \prod_{x \in A} h(x|A).$$

The likelihood ratio mapping can again be expressed recursively. For any A with $n(A) > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_s(A) &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_{s,s'}(A) \left(\int r(A) \cdot \pi_{s'}(dF(A_l|A)) \right) \phi_{s'}(A_l) \phi_{s'}(A_r) \\ &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_{s,s'}(A) \eta_{s'}(A) \phi_{s'}(A_l) \phi_{s'}(A_r). \end{aligned}$$

where $r(A) = \frac{m(A)}{H(A_l|A)^{n(A_l)} H(A_r|A)^{n(A_r)}}$ and $\eta_s(A) = \int r(A) \cdot \pi_s(dF(A_l|A))$. If $n(A) \leq 1$, then $r(A) = 1$ by definition.

The recursion then terminates when $n(A) \leq 1$ with $\phi_s(A) = 1$ in this case. Once the message passing has been completed either in terms of $\Phi_s(A)$ or $\phi_s(A)$, one can easily compute the corresponding posterior. Specifically, the posterior transition probability is then

$$\rho_{s,s'|x}(A) := P(S(A) = s' | S(A_p) = s, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\phi_s(A)} \cdot \rho_{s,s'}(A) \eta_{s'}(A) \phi_{s'}(A_l) \phi_{s'}(A_r).$$

The conditional posterior for $F(A_l|A)$ given the latent state $S(A) = s$ is again simply given by the conjugate update

$$F(A_l|A) | S(A) = s, \mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha_{s,l}(A) + n(A_l), \alpha_{s,r}(A) + n(A_r)).$$

Under the partial likelihood framework and the data-dependent partition tree \mathcal{T} , the message passing algorithm in terms of either $\Phi_s(A)$ and $\phi_s(A)$ still applies, with the only difference being replacing the full likelihood on node A , $m(A)$, with the partial likelihood

$m_P(A)$, and the likelihood ratio $r(A)$ with $r_P(A)$. The same posterior can be derived exactly in the same way with the same substitution.

There is a corresponding recursion for computing the posterior predictive density. As before, for any new point $\mathbf{x}' \in \Omega$, let $\mathbf{x}' \in A_k \subset A_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset A_0 = \Omega$ be the branch in the tree \mathcal{T} which depends on the training data in which \mathbf{x}' belongs. Let us now define a mapping

$$\xi_s(A) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A)|\mathbf{x}, S(A_p) = s)}{h(\mathbf{x}'|A)}.$$

That is, $\xi_s(A)$ gives the posterior predictive density ratio conditional on A given that $S(A_p) = s$. Then $\xi_s(A_k) = 1$ for all s , and for $i < k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_s(A_i) &= \mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A_i)|\mathbf{x}, S(A_{i-1}) = s)/h(\mathbf{x}'|A_i) \\ &= \sum_{s'} \mathbb{P}(S(A_i) = s' | S(A_{i-1}) = s, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}'|A_i)|\mathbf{x}, S(A_i) = s')/h(\mathbf{x}'|A_i) \\ &= \sum_{s'} \mathbb{P}(S(A_i) = s' | S(A_{i-1}) = s, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A_{i+1}|A_i)|\mathbf{x}, S(A) = s')}{H(A_{i+1}|A_i)} \cdot \xi_{s'}(A_{i+1}) \\ &= \sum_{s'} \rho_{s,s'|\mathbf{x}}(A) \cdot \varphi_{s'}(A_{i+1}) \cdot \xi_{s'}(A_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

where for all s and all $A \in \mathcal{T}$, $\varphi_s(A) := \frac{\mathbb{E}(F(A|A_p)|\mathbf{x}, S(A_p)=s)}{H(A|A_p)}$. Thus we have for $i < k$,

$$\varphi_s(A_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha_{s,l}(A_i) + n(A_{i+1})}{\alpha_{s,l}(A_i) + \alpha_{s,r}(A_i) + n(A_i) - 1} & \text{if } A_{i+1} \text{ is the left child of } A_i \\ \frac{\alpha_{s,r}(A_i) + n(A_{i+1})}{\alpha_{s,l}(A_i) + \alpha_{s,r}(A_i) + n(A_i) - 1} & \text{if } A_{i+1} \text{ is the right child of } A_i. \end{cases}$$

This provides a recursive recipe for computing the posterior predictive density ratio. Then the posterior predictive density is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{x}')|\mathbf{x}) = \xi_0(A_0)h(\mathbf{x}') = \xi_0(\Omega)h(\mathbf{x}').$$

Note that because $A_0 = \Omega$ has no parent, conditioning on the event that $S(A_p) = s$ for $A = \Omega$ is equivalent to not conditioning on anything.

While in computing the posterior one can proceed equivalently through either the marginal likelihood mapping $\Phi_s(A)$ or the likelihood-ratio mapping $\phi_s(A)$, for some models that incorporate a so-called stopping state under which $F(\cdot|A) = H(\cdot|A)$ w.p.1, one must remember that the partial likelihood under the stopping state should be the partial likelihood under H , that is, excluding all of the partition locations within A . This is ensured automatically in the likelihood-ratio formulation.

Similarly as before, one can precompute the beta functions involved in $\eta_s(A) = \int r_P(A) \cdot \pi_s(dF(A_l|F))$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ on a predefined grid of $(H(A_l|A), H(A_r|A))$ values as discussed before to speed up the computation. We provide numerical examples for density estimation using these models in Section 4.1.

3.4 Example 3: Models for multivariate distributions

Next we demonstrate how to incorporate adaptive partitioning in multivariate spaces using the partial likelihood following the OPT prior, which essentially imposes a Bayesian CART prior on the tree splitting. Specifically, for each potential tree node A , we adopt a multinomial prior on $J(A)$ over the available dimensions to divide. That is, $J(A) \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ is a multinomial Bernoulli variable with probability $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(A) = (\lambda_1(A), \lambda_2(A), \dots, \lambda_d(A))$ where $0 \leq \lambda_j(A) \leq 1$ for all j and $\sum_j \lambda_j(A) = 1$. Given that $J(A) = j$, then we divide A in the j th dimension into the two children $A_{j,l}$ and $A_{j,r}$ and the splitting variable $J(A_{j,l})$ and $J(A_{j,r})$ are further generated in the same way. The partial likelihood of (f, \mathbf{J}) then follows the expression in Eq. (2.8).

We can again express the partial likelihood in a scale-free fashion in terms of the likelihood-ratio with respect to a base measure H . Let

$$r_j(A) = \frac{m_{\mathbf{P},j}(A)}{H(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}H(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})}}.$$

Then for $J(A) = j$,

$$\frac{L_{\mathbf{P}}(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A)}{L_{\mathbf{P}}(h, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A)} = r_j(A) \frac{L_{\mathbf{P}}(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,l})}{L_{\mathbf{P}}(h, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,l})} \frac{L_{\mathbf{P}}(f, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,r})}{L_{\mathbf{P}}(h, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,r})}.$$

where for each j

$$L_{\mathbf{P}}(h; \mathbf{x}, A) = H(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}H(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})} \cdot L_{\mathbf{P}}(h; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,l}) \cdot L_{\mathbf{P}}(h; \mathbf{x}, A_{j,r}).$$

Moreover, one can compute the exact posterior distribution of \mathbf{J} by integrating out the conditional prior on f , such as the PT, as follows. Let $\Phi(A) = \int L_{\mathbf{P}}(f; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{J}, A) \pi(df, d\mathbf{J})$. Then $\Phi(A)$ can be computed recursively

$$\Phi(A) = \int \int L_{\mathbf{P}}(f; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{J}, A) \pi(df | \mathbf{J}) \pi(d\mathbf{J}) = \sum_j \lambda_j(A) M_j(A) \Phi(A_{j,l}) \Phi(A_{j,r})$$

where $M_j(A) = \int m_j(A) \pi(dF(A_{j,l}|A))$. Again, the integral term in the middle is simply a beta function when beta priors are adopted on $F(A_{j,l}|A)$. Correspondingly, the posterior probability for $J(A) = j$ given the training data \mathbf{x} is

$$\mathbb{P}(J(A) = j | \mathbf{x}) = \lambda_j(A) M_j(A) \cdot \Phi(A_{j,l}) \Phi(A_{j,r}) / \Phi(A).$$

The conditional posterior for f given \mathbf{J} is exactly the same as in the case with a predetermined partition tree. One can similarly write the above recursion in a normalized fashion in terms of the likelihood ratio with respect to the base density $\phi(A) = \Phi(A) / \prod_{x \in A} h(x|A)$. In which case

$$\phi(A) = \sum_j \lambda_j(A) \eta_j(A) \phi(A_{j,l}) \phi(A_{j,r})$$

where $\eta_j(A) = \int r_j(A)\pi(df, d\mathbf{J}) = M_j(A)/H(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}H(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})}$. Accordingly,

$$P(J(A) = j|\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_j(A)\eta_j(A) \cdot \phi(A_{j,l})\Phi(A_{j,r})/\phi(A).$$

Furthermore, one can specify the conditional model on f given the tree using latent state variables. When the underlying latent states are modeled using a Markov process, for example, one can still follow the recipe described previously and arrive at the following expression for the marginal likelihood on A , after integrating out both the state variables as well as the splitting variables

$$\Phi_s(A) = \sum_j \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \lambda_j(A)\rho_{s,s'}(A)M_{j,s'}(A)\Phi_{s'}(A_{j,l})\Phi_{s'}(A_{j,r}). \quad (3.2)$$

where for all s , $M_{j,s}(A) = \int m_{P,j}(A) \cdot \pi_s(dF(A_l|A))$. Intuitively, $\Phi_s(A)$ is the marginal likelihood for A given that $S(A_p) = s$.

Even though we had specified the priors for \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{J} independently, *a posteriori* they are dependent. So we must describe the joint posterior of (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{S}) , which is jointly a Markov process. Specifically, the posterior transition probability for $(J(A), S(A))$ is

$$P(J(A) = j', S(A) = s' | J(A_p) = j, S(A_p) = s, \mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{j'}(A)\rho_{s,s'}(A)M_{j',s'}(A_{j',l})\Phi_{s'}(A_{j',r})/\Phi_s(A).$$

Note that the dependence on $J(A_p) = j$ is implicit as it determines the node A . Given the values of (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{S}) , the conditional posterior of F boils down to the standard univariate PT.

All of the above expressions can be written in terms of the likelihood ratio with respect to the base density by replacing $\Phi_s(A)$ with $\phi_s(A) = \Phi_s(A)/\prod_{x \in A} h(x|A)$ and $M_{j,s}(A)$ with $\eta_{j,s}(A) = M_{j,s}(A)/(H(A_{j,l}|A)^{n(A_{j,l})}H(A_{j,r}|A)^{n(A_{j,r})})$. That is

$$\phi_s(A) = \sum_j \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \lambda_j(A)\rho_{s,s'}(A)\eta_{j,s'}(A)\phi_{s'}(A_{j,l})\phi_{s'}(A_{j,r}) \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$P(J(A) = j', S(A) = s' | J(A_p) = j, S(A_p) = s, \mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{j'}(A)\rho_{s,s'}(A)\eta_{j',s'}(A)\phi_{s'}(A_{j',l})\phi_{s'}(A_{j',r})/\phi_s(A). \quad (3.4)$$

This gives a complete characterization of the marginal posterior of (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{S}) . Given (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{S}) , the conditional posterior of F is simply that of the corresponding PT model. We provide numerical examples for inference on multivariate sample spaces in Section 4.2.

4 Numerical experiments

Next we compare Bayesian inference using partial vs full likelihood under the OPT prior. In particular, we assess the performance in density estimation when using the posterior mean—which is also called the posterior predictive density—of OPT as the estimator under three

losses L_1 , L_2 and L_∞ . We report the results on L_2 loss in the main paper and present those for L_1 and L_∞ , which are qualitatively similar, in the supplement. L_2 strikes a balance between L_1 which is a global metric that focuses on large-scale features of the density and L_∞ which is a local metric that focuses on local structures. OPT is the simplest model that enjoys all of the features discussed in [Section 3](#). Specifically, it is a PT-type model enhanced with a latent state variable $S(A)$ and is endowed with a Bayesian CART prior on the tree structure in multivariate sample spaces. The latent state $S(A)$ takes values 0 and 1 and is modeled as $\text{Bernoulli}(\rho_{0,1}(A))$. The $S(A) = 1$ state describes a “stopping” state in which the prior within A is degenerately concentrated on the base measure $H(\cdot|A)$, i.e., $F(\cdot|A) = H(\cdot|A)$. This can be achieved by setting $\rho_{1,0}(A) = 0$ for all A , that is, making $S(A) = 1$ an absorbing state in the Markov model and letting $c_1(A) \uparrow \infty$ while keeping $\alpha_{1,l}(A)/(\alpha_{1,l}(A) + \alpha_{2,r}(A)) = H(A_l|A)$.

4.1 Univariate examples

We start by considering univariate density estimation problems over the $[0, 1]$ interval. To make a fair comparison between the partial- and full-likelihood trees, the posterior predictive of the OPT is computed under both the full and partial likelihoods with the same tree depth and hyperparameters. For simplicity and following the suggestion in [Wong and Ma \(2010\)](#), we set the prior stopping probability equal to $\rho_{0,1}(A) \equiv 0.5$ for all A , concentration parameters $c_0(A) = 2$ in the non-stopping case and $c_1(A) = e^{20}$, as a numerical approximation to ∞ . In the full likelihood tree, the left and right children of an interval are obtained by splitting over the midpoint of each interval. In the partial likelihood tree, the left and right children are obtained by splitting over the sample median of the observations in the interval (i.e., the interval observation of order $k = \lceil n \cdot p \rceil$, where n is the number of points in the interval and $p = 0.5$). Moreover, as discussed in [Section 2.2](#), the data points coinciding with splitting locations are removed from the sample once splitting occurs (in the partial tree). The posterior mean is computed exactly for univariate examples with the recursive algorithm for latent-state models in [Section 3.3](#).

We consider three cases of density estimation on the $[0, 1]$ interval. For each scenario, [Figure 1](#) reports the partial and full model performance in terms of the average $\log L_2$ risk (and standard error) across 200 Monte Carlo runs, for sample sizes varying in the range $[500, 5000, 50000]$ and maximum tree depth ranging from 1 to at most 15. In a single Monte Carlo experiment, we compute the posterior predictive density of OPT for the full and partial trees, according to the recursive algorithm described above, and the L_2 distance between the posterior density estimate and the true density. Similar results for the L_1 and L_∞ risks are reported in the Supplementary Materials.

At first glance, the partial- and full-likelihood trees show similar trends in the $\log L_2$ risk, across all three density scenarios and sample sizes: the risk steeply decreases along the first few tree depths, to then stabilize in the medium to high range of resolutions. This is consistent with our intuition—the dominating component in the risk at low resolutions is the bias or inflexibility of the model, but as the model grows richer, eventually the bias is no longer important and the adaptive protects the variance (or overfitting) from dominating.




Figure 1: Boxplots for L_2 loss on univariate density estimation with OPT.

Moreover, the performance of both trees improves for larger sample sizes. However, we can notice different patterns when examining the three sampling densities in detail.

In the Beta(6, 4) case, the full tree shows lower risk than the partial tree in the low to medium range of depths across all sample sizes. This suggests that for such a smooth and rather symmetric sampling density, the data-adaptive partitioning of the partial tree does not offer a major advantage over the usual model, since the even splitting employed in the full tree is more or less the “right” partition to adopt.

Such is not the case when the underlying density is less even over the sample space. For example, in the Beta(500, 20) case, the model performance of the partial tree is clearly superior to that of the full tree, especially in the low-to-medium range of tree depths. The L_2 risk of the partial tree decreases much more rapidly and tends to plateau earlier than in the full tree, consistent with our intuition that an adaptively designed sampling model more effectively reduces bias. Eventually, of course, for deep enough trees, the full tree catches up, but it requires a much deeper tree and hence incurs additional computational costs.

Next we consider a mixture density with heterogeneous smoothness over the sample space:

$$0.1 * \text{Uniform}(0, 1) + 0.2 * \text{Beta}(2, 5) + 0.2 * \text{Beta}(1200, 800) \\ + 0.3 * N_{[0.1, 0.9]}(0.5, 0.1^2) + 0.2 * N_{[0.3, 0.87]}(0.7, 0.05^2)$$

where $N_{[a,b]}$ represents a normal distribution truncated into the interval $[a, b]$. This mixture of high- and low-resolution structures is an example of a more realistic sampling density, compared to the extreme scenarios discussed above. Again in this case, the partial tree shows better performance than the full tree, level-by-level, for the first few resolution levels, as the bias is reduced at a much faster rate than a data-agnostic tree.

4.2 Bivariate examples

We present results for a set of bivariate density estimation problems on the unit rectangle $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. In these examples, the dyadic partitioning process can split a set on either dimension, randomly selected with a prior probability of 0.5. Once the dimension is selected, the full and partial likelihood trees differ in splitting locations. For the full likelihood tree, a set is partitioned on its marginal midpoint in the chosen dimension. For the partial likelihood tree, a set is partitioned over the marginal sample median of the set points in the chosen dimension (the partition location is the data point having dimension coordinate of order $k = \lceil n \cdot p \rceil$, where n is the number of points in the set and $p = 0.5$). In the experiments below, when partitioning a set, we condition on both the sample median in the x coordinate and the sample median in the y coordinate, regardless of the actual splitting dimension enforced for that set.

In these bivariate OPT examples, we compute the posterior mean through Monte Carlo samples of the trees. This method is straightforward to implement in a setting where randomizing the splitting dimension for a set requires accounting for all possible children generated by that set. For each MC run, we first compute the message passing recursion terms as in Section 3.3 for all possible sets generated through all possible trees, to compute posterior stopping probabilities and splitting probabilities along each dimension. Next, we sample a tree using a top-down algorithm: for an available set, we sample a latent state (determining stopping and non-stopping) with the posterior stopping probability and next we sample a splitting dimension using the posterior splitting probability conditional on the sampled state and compute its children. Given such a tree, we evaluate the posterior mean on the tree in a way similar to the univariate case in Section 3.3. We repeat this procedure for 1000 MC runs and average the tree-conditional posterior predictive to estimate the unconditional posterior mean. We use this approach to estimate the posterior mean (i.e., the posterior predictive density) under both the partial-likelihood and full-likelihood specifications. Again, the performance of the methods is evaluated by comparing this density estimate with the true sampling density in terms of L_1, L_2, L_∞ metrics.

The same OPT prior is assumed under both partitioning schemes, with prior stopping probability $\rho_{0,1} = 0.5$, concentration parameters $c_0(m) = m^2$ (where m is the tree depth) in the non-stopping case and $c_1 = e^{20}$ in the stopping case.

We consider six density estimation scenarios in the unit rectangle, represented in the ‘‘Sampling Density’’ column in Figure 2. In the same figure, we report the log L_2 risk across 200 Monte Carlo experiments, for sample sizes in the range $[500, 5000, 50000]$, for maximum tree depth ranging between 1 and 11, depending on the sample size. In each experiment, we estimate the posterior mean under the partial- and full-likelihood models using the procedure described above. We found the L_2 risk to be the most effective for comparing the two tree specifications, but we report analogous results for the L_1 and L_∞ risks in the Supplementary Materials.

We display results for four different generalized beta densities constructed as follows. Let $G_0 \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$, $G_1 \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ and $G_2 \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ be three independent gamma random variables, with $\alpha_i, \beta_i > 0$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. The joint density of $X = G_1 / (G_1 +$

G_0) and $Y = G_2/(G_2 + G_0)$, with $x, y \in (0, 1)$ has the form

$$f(x, y) = \frac{1}{B(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \frac{\lambda_1^{\alpha_1} x^{\alpha_1-1} (1-x)^{-(\alpha_1+1)} \lambda_2^{\alpha_2} y^{\alpha_2-1} (1-y)^{-(\alpha_2+1)}}{[1 + \lambda_1 x/(1-x) + \lambda_2 y/(1-y)]^{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}}$$

and $\lambda_i = \beta_i/\beta_0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $B(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \prod_{i=0,1,2} \Gamma(\alpha_i) / \Gamma(\sum \alpha_i)$.

The Generalized Beta scenarios are designed to have density spikes of varying ‘‘spikiness.’’

Generalized Beta I: with parameters $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (50, 1, 100, 1, 150, 1)$;

Generalized Beta II: with parameters $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (12, 1, 25, 1, 35, 1)$;

Generalized Beta III: with parameters $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (3, 1, 6, 1, 9, 1)$;

Generalized Beta IV: with parameters $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (5, 10, 3, 10, 3, 10)$.

In addition to these unimodal examples, we again consider two multimodal scenarios constructed as mixtures of high-resolution and low-resolution components. Mixture I is designed for the spike to overlap with the smoother components, while Mixture II is designed so that the spike and the smoother components occupy different regions of the space.

Mixture I:

$$0.4 * N_{[0,1] \times [0,1]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.2 \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 \end{bmatrix} \right) + 0.4 * N_{[0,1] \times [0,1]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.4 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.02 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.02 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ + GBeta(200, 1, 150, 1, 150, 1),$$

where $N_{[0,1] \times [0,1]}$ indicates a Normal distribution truncated over the unit interval and $GBeta$ a Generalized Beta distribution.

Mixture II:

$$0.4 * N_{[0,1] \times [0,1]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.2 \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 \end{bmatrix} \right) + 0.4 * N_{[0,1] \times [0,1]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.4 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.02 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.02 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ + GBeta(100, 1, 250, 1, 250, 1).$$

The simulation results for generalized beta densities confirm the findings in the univariate examples. For both tree models, the risk tends to decrease at higher depths and larger sample sizes, especially for L_1 and L_2 risks. Generally, the partial model is preferable to the full model in the presence of higher density spikes. This trend is confirmed for the most extreme case, ‘‘Generalized Beta I’’, where the partial model outperforms the full model for all sample sizes with deep enough trees. The more gentle spikes of ‘‘Generalized Beta II’’ and ‘‘III’’ still illustrate a relative advantage of the partial model maintained for intermediate to high resolution levels, and especially for L_2, L_∞ , metrics that better capture local discrepancies. However, the full tree catches up with the partial tree with smoother sampling densities, as illustrated by the results for ‘‘Generalized Beta IV’’. The performance of the partial model under the different Generalized Betas suggests that the full likelihood tree is still valid in the presence of smooth and symmetric sampling densities. However, the partial likelihood tree

is much preferable when the true density is locally concentrated and highly skewed, when data-adaptive splitting actually generates a different tree geometry compared to midpoint-based splitting. Moreover, the partial tree still outperforms the full tree in both mixture examples, despite the presence of smooth low-resolution structures.

An important observation is that the full tree now never catches up with the partial tree up to the maximum depth of 10, at which point the risk of the partial tree had already plateaued for all of the scenarios. The fact that this occurs even in just a two-dimensional sample space is striking. The gain of data-adaptive design of the sampling model becomes ever more substantial as the dimensionality grows as the computational cost one must pay to allow a data-agnostic partition system becomes prohibitive.

In [Figure 3](#), we plot the posterior mean density under the full and partial tree for each of the scenarios considered above at sample size 5000, which clearly shows that the large bias, or underfitting under the full tree, as reflected in the severe pixelation in the estimated density, is the cause of its poor performance, and the partial likelihood-based estimate is much more effective in capturing the heterogeneous smoothness of the underlying density.

5 Discussion

While we motivated the randomized partitioning we considered to achieve adaptively dividing a dimension, one can further consider selection variables that determine not only the partition dimension, but also the partition location. This partition location can then be on each of the observed values of the training data along a dimension. The notation becomes more complicated because then the k th order statistic is no longer a simple function of A but also a function of (j, l) , where j is the dimension to divide and l is the location to divide. In that case, we can now condition on the $k_{j,l}(A)$ th order statistic. An important implication of this is that the partial likelihood approach can be applied to allow possible partition on each of the observed values along each dimension in each node A , giving a probabilistic version of the non-Bayesian CART partition strategy. Exact recursive calculation of the corresponding posterior will be computationally intractable for multivariate problems with even just a few hundred data points. Simplification could be made to consider just a subset of observed values as candidate partition locations.

[Lu et al. \(2013\)](#) showed that one could effectively sample from the posterior tree model when there is a large number of predetermined partition locations in each dimension of a multivariate sample space using a sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) strategy. [Awaya and Ma \(2024a\)](#) further showed that this SMC still works even when latent states are incorporated. Future work will examine how the SMC sampling strategy works in the partial likelihood framework. This will allow us to restrict the partition locations on one or multiple of the actual *observed* data values in each direction, thereby substantially reducing the number of particles needed and improving computational efficiency. This will be particularly useful in building shallow trees that can serve as a base learner in more flexible ensemble models such as an additive tree ensemble ([Awaya and Ma, 2024b](#)). We will examine the impact on computational scalability and statistical performance in the future.




Figure 2: $\log L_2$ simulation results for bivariate Optional Polya Trees.




Figure 3: The posterior predictive density of a bivariate OPT, at tree depth 9 for sample size 5000 under six simulation scenarios. Left: True density; Middle: PPD with partial likelihood; Right: PPD with full likelihood. Each row corresponds to a simulation scenario.

Acknowledgments

This research is partly supported by NSF grants DMS-1749789 and DMS-2152999, as well as NIGMS grant R01-GM135440.

References

- Awaya, N. and L. Ma (2024a). Hidden markov pólya trees for high-dimensional distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 119(545), 189–201.
- Awaya, N. and L. Ma (2024b). Unsupervised tree boosting for learning probability distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25(198), 1–52.
- Berger, J. and R. Wolpert (1988). *The Likelihood Principle*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics. Lecture notes : monographs series. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Berger, J. O. and A. Guglielmi (2001). Bayesian and conditional frequentist testing of a parametric model versus nonparametric alternatives. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96(453), 174–184.
- Chipman, H. A., E. I. George, and R. E. McCulloch (1998). Bayesian cart model search. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 93(443), 935–948.
- Christensen, J. and L. Ma (2019, 11). A bayesian hierarchical model for related densities by using pólya trees. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 82(1), 127–153.
- Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 34(2), 187–202.
- Cox, D. R. (1975). Partial likelihood. *Biometrika* 62(2), 269–276.
- Hjort, N. L. and S. G. Walker (2009). Quantile pyramids for bayesian nonparametrics. *The Annals of Statistics* 37(1), 105–131.
- Hoff, P. D. (2009). *A First Course in Bayesian Statistical Methods* (1st ed.). Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer.
- Holmes, C. C., F. Caron, J. E. Griffin, and D. A. Stephens (2015). Two-sample bayesian nonparametric hypothesis testing. *Bayesian Analysis* 10(2), 297–320.
- Lavine, M. (1992). Some aspects of polya tree distributions for statistical modelling. *The Annals of Statistics* 20(3), 1222–1235.
- Lavine, M. (1995). On an approximate likelihood for quantiles. *Biometrika* 82(1), 220–222.

- Lu, L., H. Jiang, and W. H. Wong (2013). Multivariate density estimation by bayesian sequential partitioning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108(504), 1402–1410.
- Ma, L. (2017). Adaptive Shrinkage in Pólya Tree Type Models. *Bayesian Analysis* 12(3), 779 – 805.
- Ma, L. and W. H. Wong (2011). Coupling optional pólya trees and the two sample problem. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(496), 1553–1565.
- Soriano, J. and L. Ma (2017). Probabilistic multi-resolution scanning for two-sample differences. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 79(2), 547–572.
- Walther, G. and Q. Zhao (2023). Beta-trees: Multivariate histograms with confidence statements.
- Wong, W. H. and L. Ma (2010). Optional Pólya tree and Bayesian inference. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(3), 1433 – 1459.

Supplementary Materials

Additional details and results of the numerical experiments

We report additional numerical results for the univariate and multivariate simulations previously discussed.

Univariate OPT. **Figure 4** reports the log L_1, L_∞ risks obtained under the same experiments discussed in Section 4.1. Both metrics generally suggest the same patterns already observed in the L_2 risk: a steep decrease in the first few tree depths and then plateau around some value, with the partial tree having better performance than the full tree in the low to medium depth for the $Beta(500, 20)$ and *Mixture* cases. However, these patterns are not as regular as in L_2 , especially when considering a sample size of 500 and the L_∞ metric, which, having a more local nature, is more sensitive to lower sample sizes than the other two metrics.

Bivariate OPT. **Figure 5** reports the log L_1, L_∞ risks obtained under the scenarios described in Section 4.2. Again, they suggest similar patterns to those already discussed based on the L_2 risk, with the partial likelihood tree being the preferable model in the presence of high-density spikes. However, the discrepancy between the two tree specifications is less neat according to these two metrics. For example, the L_1 distance for the *Mixture* examples displays better performance of the partial model only for tree depths in the medium-high range. The L_1 partial model gains are less evident for the Generalized Beta II than in the L_2 case, and the Generalized Beta III shows comparable (if not better) performance of the full tree. On the other hand, L_∞ shows major advantages of the partial model in the presence of high spikes and for higher sample sizes (5000 – 50000). However, it displays a rather “jumpy” behavior, probably due to the extremely local nature of such a metric.

Finally, **Figure 3** displays some examples of posterior mean under the full and partial models for a sample size of 5000 and tree depth of 9. The comparison between partial and full tree posterior mean at 5000 sample size really shows the difference between the data-adaptive partition and the classic midpoint splitting. The partial likelihood tree is already much more representative of the true density than the full tree. In particular, and unsurprisingly, we can see how the median-partition does a much better job at capturing density spikes, compared to the midpoint partition, as visible in examples such as the Generalized Beta I, or the mixture cases.










Figure 4: Simulation results for $\log L_1, L_\infty$ risks in Univariate examples.






Figure 5: Simulation results for $\log L_1, L_\infty$ risks in the bivariate examples.