

Iterative conditional replacement algorithm for conditionally specified models

Kun-Lin Kuo

Institute of Statistics, National University of Kaohsiung, Kaohsiung, Taiwan
and

Yuchung J. Wang*

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Rutgers University, Camden, NJ, USA

Abstract

The sample-based Gibbs sampler has been the dominant method for approximating joint distribution from a collection of compatible full-conditional distributions. However for conditionally specified model, mixtures of incompatible full and non-full conditional distributions are the realities; but, their updating orders are hard to identified. We propose a new algorithm, the Iterative Conditional Replacement (ICR), that produces distributional approximations toward the stationary distributions, dispensing Markov chain entirely. ICR always converges, and it produces mutually stationary distributions, which will be consistent among one another when the conditional distributions are compatible. Examples show ICR to be superior in quality, while being more parallelizable and requiring little effort in monitoring its convergence. Last, we propose an ensemble approach to decide the final model.

Keywords: Dependency network; I -projection; Method of alternating projection; Mutually stationary distributions; Unsupervised leaning.

*Corresponding author: yuwang@camden.rutgers.edu

1 Introduction

Using the two cultures of Breiman (2001), the assumption of a joint distribution is data modeling, whereas conditionally specified model (CSM)—specifying a joint distribution via conditional distributions—belongs to the camp of algorithmic modeling. A typical example is in multiple imputation: explicit full multivariate (Bayesian) models versus MICE (multiple imputation by chained equations, Raghunathan et al., 2001; van Buuren, 2007). However, Markov random field (Kaiser and Cressie, 2000), spatial modeling (Besag, 1974), and dependency networks (Heckerman et al., 2000) had been shown that the conditional approach offers certain advantages. CSM can be used to compose joint models from data collected over spatial ranges or temporal stages, because it would be unrealistic to simultaneously articulate a joint model for a large number of variables. A better is to locally model a small number of variables, then combine those submodels into a joint model, like embedding pieces of a jigsaw puzzle into a complete picture. Our algorithm will make the process of modeling locally and synthesizing globally easier. Formally, CSM determines a joint distribution for $\mathbb{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ after three stages of maneuvers:

Stage I. Conditional modeling: Built a predictive conditional model from data for every $x_i \equiv \{i\}$ using a subset of $\mathbb{X} \setminus \{x_i\} \equiv \{-i\}$ as the predictors via a regularized modeling or machine learning algorithm, such as regression, classification, or a neural network. Let the learning outcome be $\{f_{i|c_i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, where $c_i \subseteq \{-i\}$. Or more directly, a conditional model, $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, has already been formulated by domain experts using subject matter knowledge and algorithms of her choice, where a_i and b_i are non-intersecting subsets of \mathbb{X} . For spatial data, c_i (b_i) is commonly known as the “neighbors” of x_i (a_i); in general, c_i (b_i) is the covariates used to predict x_i (a_i).

Stage II. Synthesize (from local to global): Embed the conditional distributions, $\{f_{i|c_i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ or $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, into joint distributions of \mathbb{X} . Nodes of \mathbb{X} may be divided into groups. Within each group, the synthesis produces intermediate distribution. These intermediate distributions then propagate in phases to the entire \mathbb{X} , with the sequential orders of propagation playing a critical role.

Stage III. Optimize: Different sequences to propagate the intermediate distributions may result in different joint distributions. The entire collection of stationary joint distributions, produced in **Stage II**, make up an ensemble, and it is the ensemble that makes the final model of \mathbb{X} .

The final outcome of a CSM will depend on both the data and the algorithms used in the three stages. Here, we propose an algorithm to divide and to synthesize, and recommend another algorithm for the optimization attendant to **Stage III**. Absent the concerns of **Stages II** and **III**, much algorithmic creativity remains available in **Stage I**.

A conditional model of **Stage I** is said to be compatible if a joint distribution exists, from which every conditional or marginal distribution can be derived. In such a circumstance, the output of a synthesis should be unique. Moreover, a CSM is said to be sufficient if it has enough information to identify a joint distribution of \mathbb{X} . A conditional distribution involving all the variables in \mathbb{X} is called a full-conditional and is expressed as $f_{i|-i}$ or $f_{a_i|-a_i}$;

otherwise, it is a non-full conditional: $f_{a_i|b_i}$, $a_i \cup b_i \neq \mathbb{X}$. When the CSM is $\{f_{i|-i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ and the Gibbs sampler (GS) is used for synthesis, there can be up to $d!$ (systematic scan) stationary distributions, one for each permutation of $(1, \dots, d)$ (Chen and Ip, 2015).

Most CSM papers only consider full-conditional models that mimic the Bayesian computation (Smith and Roberts, 1993). However, proposing a full-conditional for every variable of \mathbb{X} is impractical; in stead, a mixture of full and non-full conditionals is a more realistic approach. Therefore, practical synthesis must be able to accommodate combinations of full and non-full conditionals. van Dyk and Park (2008) invented partially collapsed Gibbs sampler (PCGS): the GS based on combinations of *compatible* full and non-full conditionals. They discovered that PCGS must follow specific updating orders to draw correct samples. Another difference between Bayesian computation and CSM is that approximating the posterior distribution is not the main objective of GS, while joint distribution of \mathbb{X} is the only focus of CSM. Here, we invented the Iterative Conditional Replacement algorithm (ICR) which produces distributions, not samples. ICR will simultaneously compute several joints and/or marginal distributions *regardless* of compatibility and its convergence is guaranteed. When the CSM is compatible, ICR will approximate the unique stationary distribution; otherwise, the joint distributions would be many and different. More critically, we devise simple rules to identify all the permissible updating orders. The examples below show that ICR is computationally more robust and flexible than sample-based methods.

Traditionally, compatibility must be confirmed before GS or PCGS sampling can start; otherwise, the Markov chains can become null. In contrast, ICR cycles through a permissible updating order, and produces mutually stationary distributions. Moreover, there are compatible and sufficient CSM, such as $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}, f_3\}$, that PCGS cannot sample, because it cannot pass the dependence of (x_1, x_2) back to x_3 . We propose “divide-then-ICR” strategy: first, the CSM is divided into suitable groups such that permissible updating orders within each group can be found; second, apply ICR to each group and produce (intermediate) distributions for subsets of \mathbb{X} . Finally, use ICR again to combine intermediate distributions into joint distributions or marginal distributions. For example, $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}, f_3\}$ is first divided into $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}\}$ and $\{f_3\}$. From $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}\}$, ICR computes two stationary $\pi_{12|3}^{(1,2)}$ and $\pi_{12|3}^{(2,1)}$, where the superscripts indicate different updating orders. We multiply either distribution by f_3 and get the two mutually stationary joint distributions: $\pi_{123}^{(1,2)}$ and $\pi_{123}^{(2,1)}$. If these two joints are equal, the original CSM is deemed compatible. The **Stage III** optimization is to find a mixture, $\alpha\pi_{123}^{(1,2)} + (1 - \alpha)\pi_{123}^{(2,1)}$, that minimizes the deviance relative to the original CSM.

In the past, there have been many algebraic proposals to verify the compatibility among full conditionals, for example, Wang and Ip (2008) and Arnold et al. (2002). However, how to verify the compatibility between full and non-full conditionals is still very much an open problem. Here is a case that computations can answer algebraically difficult question; we prove that the CSM is compatible when the multiple stationary distributions computed by ICR are the same. In the examples below, benefits of ICR are highlighted by its capacity to handle (a) incompatible CSM; (b) reducible CSM whose support is partitioned; (c) the conditional density is sticky for GS to sample (slow mixing); and (d) the CSM that divide-then-ICR can synthesize, whereas PCGS cannot.

ICR is introduced in Section 2, first for full conditionals, then for combinations of full and non-full conditionals. ICR is cyclically doing I -projections among spaces defined

individually by each conditional distribution. Examples are in Section 3. Many times, ICR cannot be applied to a CSM directly; but partitioning a CSM into several smaller CSM enables ICR to be applied locally. Historical connections of ICR with other algorithms, such as GS, power method, and alternating projection are addressed in Section 4. Section 5 contains a brief conclusion.

2 The iterative conditional replacement algorithm

Hereafter, conditional and marginal distributions/densities will be abbreviated as conditional(s) and marginal(s). A joint density is denoted by p , q , π , f , or g without subscript, while their marginal and conditional densities have subscripts and are denoted as π_1 , p_{ij} , q_a , q_{-a} , $f_{i|-i}$, $g_{12|34}$, where $1 = \{x_1\}$, $ij = \{x_i, x_j\}$, $a = \{x_i : i \in a\}$, $-a = \{x_i : i \notin a\}$, $i|-i = \{x_i|x_j, j \neq i\}$, and $12|34 = \{x_1, x_2|x_3, x_4\}$. We also reserve $f_{a_i|b_i}$ and $g_{a_j|b_j}$ for the conditional distributions in a CSM, p and q as the distributions produced during ICR iterations, and $\pi^{(i_1, \dots, i_d)}$ for the stationary joint distribution updated in the order of (i_1, \dots, i_d) . Moreover, let $\mathcal{S}(f)$ and $\mathcal{S}(f_{i|-i})$ be the support of f and $f_{i|-i}$, respectively; $\mathcal{S}(q_a)$ be the support of q_a . We always assume $\mathcal{S}(f_{j|-j}) = \mathcal{S}(f_{i|-i})$ for all (i, j) . A d -dimensional joint density f is said to satisfy the total positivity condition if $\mathcal{S}(f) = \mathcal{S}(f_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}(f_d)$. We use Kullback-Leibler divergence, called K-L divergence hereafter, as the measure of deviance that drives ICR's search. The K-L divergence is defined as

$$I(p; q) = \sum_x p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}.$$

2.1 ICR for conditionally specified models of full conditionals

Let the CSM be $\{f_{j|-j} : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$, and (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) and (i_2, \dots, i_d, i_1) be two adjacent updating orders. Kuo and Wang (2019) prove the following properties for $\{\pi^{(i_1, \dots, i_d)}\}$:

- (H1) Stationary distributions $\pi^{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d)}$ and $\pi^{(i_2, \dots, i_d, i_1)}$, respectively, have $f_{i_d|-i_d}$ and $f_{i_1|-i_1}$ as their conditionals;
- (H2) $\pi_{-i_1}^{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d)} = \pi_{-i_1}^{(i_2, \dots, i_d, i_1)}$; and
- (H3) $\pi_{i_1}^{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d)} = \pi_{i_1}^{(i_2, \dots, i_d, i_1)}$.

Therefore, the goal of the algorithm is to formulate sequences of joint distributions that monotonically approximate the $\{\pi^{(i_1, \dots, i_d)}\}$ such that they collectively fulfill (H1)–(H3). Requirements (H2) and (H3) are necessary for balancing the degrees of freedom between the CSM and the collection of all the stationary distributions.

To illustrate, consider a simple CSM $\mathcal{A} = \{f_{1|2}, f_{2|1}\}$, and define $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{f_{1|2}\omega_2\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{f_{2|1}\nu_1\}$, where ω_2 and ν_1 are marginal densities of x_2 and x_1 , respectively. Let q be a joint density having the same support of $f_{1|2}$. The K-L divergence between q and a $\tau = f_{1|2}\tau_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ satisfies the Pythagoras equality:

$$I(q; \tau) = I(q; f_{1|2}q_2) + I(f_{1|2}q_2; \tau),$$

which is proved in Appendix A. By choosing $\tau_2 = q_2$, $I(f_{1|2}q_2; \tau) = 0$ and minimization of $I(q; \tau)$ is achieved. Thus, I -projection of $q = q_{1|2}q_2$ onto \mathcal{C}_1 , is $f_{1|2}q_2$, so it is named conditional replacement. By the same token, the I -projection of $q = q_{2|1}q_1$ onto \mathcal{C}_2 is $f_{2|1}q_1$. Let the iterations begin from a $q^{(0)}$. The following alternating I -projections between \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 produce two sequences of joints:

$$q^{(2k+1)} = f_{1|2}q_2^{(2k)} \in \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ and } q^{(2k+2)} = f_{2|1}q_1^{(2k+1)} \in \mathcal{C}_2, \text{ with } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Throughout, (H1) holds for both $\{q^{(2k+1)}\}$ and $\{q^{(2k+2)}\}$. The choices of $q_2^{(2k+1)} = q_2^{(2k)}$ and $q_1^{(2k+2)} = q_1^{(2k+1)}$ not only minimize the K-L divergence, but also satisfy (H2). Next, (H3) provides the metric to detect the convergence of ICR; I -projections will be stopped at t when $q_1^{(2t+1)} = q_1^{(2t)}$ and $q_2^{(2t+2)} = q_2^{(2t+1)}$. Numerically, stop ICR at t -th iteration when $M(t) = I(q_1^{(2t)}; q_1^{(2t+1)}) + I(q_2^{(2t+1)}; q_2^{(2t+2)}) < 10^{-10}$. Upon convergence, we designate $q^{(2t+1)}$ as $\pi^{(2,1)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $q^{(2t+2)}$ as $\pi^{(1,2)} \in \mathcal{C}_2$.

The following proposition follows from Theorem 10 to be proved later.

Proposition 1. *Both $I(\pi^{(2,1)}; q^{(2k+1)})$ and $I(\pi^{(1,2)}; q^{(2k+2)})$ decrease to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

Due to the total variation norm inequality, $\|P - Q\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} I(P; Q)}$, $\|q^{(2k)} - \pi^{(1,2)}\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|q^{(2k+1)} - \pi^{(2,1)}\| \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 2. $\pi^{(1,2)} = \pi^{(2,1)}$ if and only if $\{f_{1|2}, f_{2|1}\}$ are compatible.

Proof. $\pi^{(1,2)} = \pi^{(2,1)}$ implies $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 \neq \emptyset$, thus compatible. When $\{f_{1|2}, f_{2|1}\}$ are compatible if and only if they have the same odds ratios. Two distributions are the same if and only if they have the same odds ratios and the same marginal densities, which ICR is designed to achieve, i.e., (H2) and (H3). \square

Wang and Ip (2008) has an algebraic check of the compatibility between $f_{1|2345}$ and $f_{2|1345}$ without iteration. Alternatively, ICR begins with an arbitrary $q_{2|345}^{(0)}$ and computes $q_{12|345}^{(2k+1)} = f_{1|2345}q_{2|345}^{(2k)}$ and $q_{12|345}^{(2k+2)} = f_{2|1345}q_{1|345}^{(2k+1)}$, until they converge to $\pi_{12|345}^{(1,2)}$ and $\pi_{12|345}^{(2,1)}$, respectively. Regardless of the initial $q_{2|345}^{(0)}$, $\pi_{12|345}^{(1,2)} = \pi_{12|345}^{(2,1)}$ confirms compatibility.

For $d = 3$ and CSM: $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}, f_{3|12}\}$, define $\mathcal{C}_i = \{f_{i|-i}v_{-i}\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where v_{-i} is any marginal density of x_{-i} . There are two updating orders: clockwise: $\mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \dots$; and counter-clockwise: $\mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \dots$. The three stationary distributions of clockwise sequence are $\pi^{(1,2,3)} \in \mathcal{C}_3$, $\pi^{(2,3,1)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\pi^{(3,1,2)} \in \mathcal{C}_2$, and they are called circularly-related, and ICR approximates them with the following iterations:

$$q^{(3k+1)} = f_{1|23}q_{23}^{(3k)}, q^{(3k+2)} = f_{2|13}q_{13}^{(3k+1)} \text{ and } q^{(3k+3)} = f_{3|12}q_{12}^{(3k+2)}, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

The above marginalization-then-multiplications is designed to satisfy both (H1) and (H2). And ICR stops iterations when (H3): $q_1^{(3t)} = q_1^{(3t+1)}$, $q_2^{(3t+1)} = q_2^{(3t+2)}$ and $q_3^{(3t+2)} = q_3^{(3t+3)}$, are reached. Numerically, ICR stops when $M(t) = I(q_1^{(3t)}; q_1^{(3t+1)}) + I(q_2^{(3t+1)}; q_2^{(3t+2)}) + I(q_3^{(3t+2)}; q_3^{(3t+3)}) < 10^{-10}$. The following proposition follows from Theorem 10.

Proposition 3. *For the clockwise updating order, the three sequences of joint densities converge, respectively, to their stationary distributions. That is, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, $q^{(3k+1)} \rightarrow \pi^{(2,3,1)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $q^{(3k+2)} \rightarrow \pi^{(3,1,2)} \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and $q^{(3k+3)} \rightarrow \pi^{(1,2,3)} \in \mathcal{C}_3$ in K-L divergence.*

Proposition 4. CSM: $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}, f_{3|12}\}$ are compatible if and only if $\pi^{(1,2,3)} = \pi^{(2,3,1)} = \pi^{(3,1,2)}$.

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, d\}$ represent (x_1, \dots, x_d) . Consider the conditional model: $\mathcal{A} = \{f_{a_i|-a_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, with $\bigcup_{i=1}^L a_i = \mathcal{D}$. Again define $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} = \{f_{a_i|-a_i} v_{-a_i}\}$, where v_{-a_i} is any x_{-a_i} -marginal density. For a fixed updating order: $\mathcal{C}_{a_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_L}$, the L circularly-related stationary distributions are

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\pi^{(a_2, \dots, a_L, a_1)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_1}, \pi^{(a_3, \dots, a_L, a_1, a_2)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_2}, \dots, \pi^{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_L)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_L}\}.$$

We start with $q^{(0)} = f_{a_L|-a_L} w_{-a_L} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_L}$. One cycle of ICR consists of L I -projections. For $1 \leq i \leq L$, the conditional replacements for (H1) and (H2) are:

$$q^{(Lk+i)} = f_{a_i|-a_i} q_{-a_i}^{(Lk+i-1)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_i}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

The iterations stop at t when $q_{a_i}^{(Lt+i)} = q_{a_i}^{(Lt+i-1)}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq L$, that is, (H3). Numerically, $\sum_{i=1}^L I(q_{a_i}^{(Lt+i)}; q_{a_i}^{(Lt+i-1)}) < 10^{-10}$ is used to stop the iterations.

Proposition 5. If the L stationary distributions of \mathcal{P} are the same, then the conditionals of \mathcal{A} are compatible.

Proof. Because $\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_i}$, the equalities of L stationary distributions of \mathcal{P} imply $\bigcap_{i=1}^L \mathcal{C}_{a_i} \neq \emptyset$, hence compatible. \square

2.2 ICR for unsaturated conditionally specified models (combinations of full and non-full conditionals)

We shall name a CSM of exclusively full conditionals (Section 2.1), as a *saturated* CSM, otherwise, the CSM is unsaturated. To model data, unsaturated CSM is more realistic. But it is rarely discussed in the literature because the GS has a hard time sampling unsaturated CSM. A major difficulty for GS is finding the rules that identify the correct sequential orders to sample the non-full conditionals. PCGS (van Dyk and Park, 2008) is proposed to circumvent such issues, and our algorithms will provide its theoretical justifications. The following rules are quite intuitive from the perspective of conditional replacement. Let an unsaturated CSM be represented by $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$ and $\Delta = (\bigcup_{i=1}^L b_i) \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^L a_i)$. Also, define $\mathcal{C}_{a_k} = \{f_{a_k|b_k} v_{b_k} = q_{a_k \cup b_k}\}$, where v_{b_k} is a marginal distribution of b_k .

Algorithm 1. Conditional replacement (I -projection) of any $q_{a_i \cup b_i} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_i}$ onto \mathcal{C}_{a_j} is permissible, written as $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_j}$, when the following two rules hold:

Rule A. $b_j \subseteq a_i \cup b_i$.

Rule B. $a_i \cap b_j \neq \emptyset$.

When $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_j}$, we define the ICR mapping $\mathbb{P} : \mathcal{C}_{a_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_j}$ as $\mathbb{P}(q_{a_i \cup b_i}) = f_{a_j|b_j} q_{b_j}$, where q_{b_j} is the x_{b_j} -marginal density of $q_{a_i \cup b_i}$. Marginalization of $q_{a_i \cup b_i}$ into q_{b_j} can only be done when Rule A holds. Next, we consider applying \mathbb{P} in cycle.

Definition 6. Let $(1^*, \dots, L^*)$, be a permutation of $(1, \dots, L)$ with $(L+1)^* \equiv 1^*$. If every \mathbb{P} mapping from $\mathcal{C}_{a_{i^*}}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{a_{(i+1)^*}}$ is permissible, then $(a_{1^*}, \dots, a_{L^*})$ is said to be a permissible updating cycle for $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, and is denoted as $\langle\langle a_{1^*}, \dots, a_{L^*} \rangle\rangle$.

Algorithm 2 (unconditioned ICR). Let the conditional model be $\mathcal{A} = \{f_{a_i|b_i} : b_i \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, $\Delta = \emptyset$, and $\bigcup_{i=1}^L a_i = \Lambda$. When $\langle\langle a_{1^*}, \dots, a_{L^*} \rangle\rangle$, ICR will synthesize joint and marginal distributions of Λ . In addition, the I -projections begin with a marginal distribution, $q_{b_{1^*}}^{(0)}$, use $q^{(1)} = f_{a_{1^*}|b_{1^*}} q_{b_{1^*}}^{(0)}$ to initiate the iterations, and $\mathbb{P}^k(q^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{C}_{a_{r^*}}$ where $r = k \pmod{L} + 1$.

For example, CSM: $\{f_{12|3}, f_{4|123}, f_{3|124}, f_{5|1234}\}$ permits $\mathcal{C}_{12} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_5$, but not $\mathcal{C}_5 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{12}$ due to violation of Rule B; hence, Algorithm 2 cannot be applied. Had we changed $f_{12|3}$ to $f_{12|35}$, then $\langle\langle 12, 4, 3, 5 \rangle\rangle$, and Algorithm 2 will synthesize one joint, π^* , plus two marginals: $\{\pi_{1235}, \pi_{1234}\}$. When $\pi_{1235}^* = \pi_{1235}$ and $\pi_{1234}^* = \pi_{1234}$, the CSM is compatible. In the following, we consider unsaturated CSM that specifies conditional distributions, not joints. When $\Delta \neq \emptyset$, it can be shown that $\Delta \subset b_i$ for every i .

Lemma 7. Suppose that CSM $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : b_i \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq i \leq L\}$ has a permissible updating cycle. If $\Delta \neq \emptyset$, then $\Delta \subset b_i$ for every i .

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $\langle\langle a_1, \dots, a_L \rangle\rangle$ be a permissible updating cycle. When $u \in \Delta = (\bigcup_{i=1}^L b_i) \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^L a_i)$, $u \in b_j$ for some j , but $u \notin a_i$ for all i . Because of Rule A, we have $u \in b_j \subseteq a_{j-1} \cup b_{j-1}$. Hence, u must also belongs to b_{j-1} . By induction, u belongs to every b_i , which implies that $\Delta \subset b_i$ for every i . \square

Algorithm 3 (conditioned ICR). Let $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : b_i \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq i \leq L\}$ be a conditional model having a permissible updating cycle. When $\Delta \neq \emptyset$, ICR will synthesize densities that are conditioned on Δ .

Let $\langle\langle a_1, \dots, a_L \rangle\rangle$ be a permissible updating cycle. The initial density is $q_{(a_1 \cup b_1) \setminus \Delta | \Delta}^{(1)} = f_{a_1|b_1} q_{(b_1 \setminus \Delta) | \Delta}^{(0)}$, where $q_{(b_1 \setminus \Delta) | \Delta}^{(0)}$ is any conditional density of $(b_1 \setminus \Delta)$ given Δ . Every subsequent distribution produced by ICR is also conditioned on Δ . A simple example is $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}\}$. Another example is $\{f_{12|345}, f_{3|245}\}$ which permits \mathbb{P} mapping from \mathcal{C}_3 onto \mathcal{C}_{12} conditioned on $\Delta = \{x_4, x_5\}$, and \mathbb{P} mapping from \mathcal{C}_{12} back onto \mathcal{C}_3 conditioned on Δ . Using Algorithm 3, ICR synthesizes $\pi_{123|45}^{(3,12)}$ and $\pi_{23|45}^{(12,3)}$ from $\{f_{12|345}, f_{3|245}\}$. In the following, we concentrate on Algorithm 2, because most discussions apply to Algorithm 3 with additional conditioning on Δ .

Definition 8. For CSM: $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : b_i \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, let $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} = \{f_{a_i|b_i} v_{b_i}\}$, and $\langle\langle a_1, \dots, a_L \rangle\rangle$ be a permissible updating cycle. A collection of densities, $\{\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)} \in \mathcal{C}_{a_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, are said to be mutually stationary when $\mathbb{P}(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}) = \pi^{(a_{i+2}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_{i+1})}$ for every i , with $(L+1) \equiv 1$.

Mutually stationary distributions have the following properties:

- (a) Each set of $\{\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}\}$ is associated with a specific permissible updating cycles.
- (b) Every $\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$ is stationary with respect to \mathbb{P}^L , i.e., $\mathbb{P}^L(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}) = \pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$.

- (c) For saturated CSM, $\{\pi^{(1,2)}, \pi^{(2,1)}\}$, $\{\pi^{(1,2,3)}, \pi^{(2,3,1)}, \pi^{(3,1,2)}\}$ and $\{\pi^{(a_2, \dots, a_L, a_1)}, \pi^{(a_3, \dots, a_L, a_1, a_2)}, \dots, \pi^{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_L)}\}$ are mutually stationary.
- (d) Neighboring marginal densities satisfy $\pi_{b_{i+1}}^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)} = \pi_{b_{i+1}}^{(a_{i+2}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_{i+1})}$, i.e., condition (H2) for every i .
- (e) For a compatible CSM having π^* as its joint, $\{\pi_{a_i \cup b_i}^* : i \leq i \leq L\}$ satisfy $\mathbb{P}(\pi_{a_i \cup b_i}^*) = \pi_{a_{i+1} \cup b_{i+1}}^*$, hence are mutually stationary.
- (f) If one $\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$ is known, the other $L - 1$ stationary densities can be computed via mapping \mathbb{P} cyclically. For example, when $\pi^{(1,2)}$ is known, $\pi^{(2,1)} = \mathbb{P}(\pi^{(1,2)})$.
- (g) Only for a saturated CSM, $\{\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}\}$ are all joint densities.
- (h) The assertion of the existence of $\{\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}\}$ is always true for totally positive CSM. Otherwise, the existence depends on whether $\pi_{b_{i+1}}^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$ is a bona fide marginal distribution of b_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq L$.

Therefore, we first determine a permissible updating cycle, say $\langle\langle a_1, \dots, a_L \rangle\rangle$, then ICR will compute $\{\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}\}$. In the following proofs, the CSM is $\{f_{a_i|b_i} : 1 \leq i \leq L\}$, $c_i = a_i \cup b_i$, symbol x_{c_i} denote values of $(x_j : j \in c_i)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} = \{h_{c_i} : h_{a_i|b_i} = f_{a_i|b_i}\}$.

Lemma 9. *Assume $\mathcal{C}_{a_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{a_j}$ is permissible. For any two densities h and g in \mathcal{C}_{a_i} , mapping both by \mathbb{P} onto \mathcal{C}_{a_j} decreases their K-L divergence. That is, $I(h; g) > I(\mathbb{P}(h); \mathbb{P}(g))$.*

Proof. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(h; g) &= \sum_{x_{c_i}} h(x_{c_i}) \log \frac{h(x_{c_i})}{g(x_{c_i})} \\
&= \sum_{x_{b_j}} h_{b_j}(x_{b_j}) \sum_{x_{c_i \setminus b_j}} h_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j}) \left(\log \frac{h_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j})}{g_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j})} + \log \frac{h_{b_j}(x_{b_j})}{g_{b_j}(x_{b_j})} \right) \\
&= \left[\sum_{x_{b_j}} h_{b_j}(x_{b_j}) I(h_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j}); g_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j})) \right] + I(h_{b_j}; g_{b_j}).
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $I(\mathbb{P}(h); \mathbb{P}(g)) = I(h_{b_j}; g_{b_j})$, because $\mathbb{P}(h)$ and $\mathbb{P}(g)$ have the same conditional density $f_{a_j|b_j}$. Hence,

$$I(h; g) - I(\mathbb{P}(h); \mathbb{P}(g)) = \sum_{x_{b_j}} h_{b_j}(x_{b_j}) I(h_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j}); g_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}(x_{c_i \setminus b_j} | x_{b_j})),$$

which is strictly positive, unless $h_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j} = g_{c_i \setminus b_j | b_j}$ for every $x_{b_j} \in b_j$. \square

The following theorem proves that the L sequences of densities produced by ICR converge respectively to mutually stationary densities.

Theorem 10. *For a permissible updating cycle, say $\langle\langle a_1, \dots, a_L \rangle\rangle$, assume the corresponding L mutually stationary densities $\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$, $1 \leq i \leq L$ with $(L + 1) \equiv 1$, exist. For every $1 \leq i \leq L$, the sequence of densities produced by Algorithm 2, $\{q^{(kL+i)}\}$, converge monotonically to $\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$ in K-L divergence, as k tends to ∞ .*

Proof. Due to Lemma 9, we have, for $1 \leq i \leq L$,

$$\begin{aligned} I\left(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}; q^{(kL+i)}\right) &> I\left(\mathbb{P}(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}); \mathbb{P}(q^{(kL+i)})\right) \\ &= I\left(\pi^{(a_{i+2}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_{i+1})}; q^{(kL+i+1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

After applying \mathbb{P} L times, ICR is back to \mathcal{C}_{a_i} with $\mathbb{P}^L(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}) = \pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}$, and $\mathbb{P}^L(q^{(kL+i)}) = q^{((k+1)L+i)}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I\left(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}; q^{(kL+i)}\right) &> I\left(\mathbb{P}^L(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}); \mathbb{P}^L(q^{(kL+i)})\right) \\ &= I\left(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}; q^{((k+1)L+i)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $I(\pi^{(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_L, a_1, \dots, a_i)}; q^{(kL+i)})$ decreases strictly to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Because the decrease is monotonic, Algorithm 2 may be stopped at $(k+1)$ th cycle when $I(q^{(kL+i)}; \mathbb{P}^L(q^{(kL+i)})) < 10^{-10}$ for any i . The following corollary provides theoretical justifications for PCGS.

Corollary 11. *Let π be a joint distribution of \mathbb{X} and the CSM be $\{\pi_{i|c_i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$. Let $(1^*, \dots, d^*)$ be a permutation of $(1, \dots, d)$. When (a) $i^* \in c_{(i+1)^*}$ and (b) $c_{(i+1)^*} \setminus \{i^*\} \subseteq c_{i^*}$ for every i^* with $(d+1)^* \equiv 1^*$, Algorithm 2 will synthesis $\{\pi_{i \cup c_i}\}$ from $\{\pi_{i|c_i}\}$. Moreover, PCGS updating in the order of $x_{1^*} \rightarrow x_{2^*} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_{d^*} \rightarrow x_{1^*} \rightarrow \dots$ preserves stationarity.*

Another feature of Algorithm 2 is that it can be applied to subgroups of conditionals after suitably partitioning the CSM; the rule is that a permissible updating cycle is identified within each subgroup. Depending on the CSM, ICR might be able to synthesize the outcomes of the subgroups—the many local models—into global joint distributions of \mathbb{X} . We shall name such an approach “divide-then-ICR”. If we depict a CSM as a directed graph, GS requires a feedback loop that connects every variable of \mathbb{X} . Therefore, the option of partitioning a CSM into subgroups is not available to GS or PCGS.

3 Examples

Example 1 (A simple case for divide-then-ICR). Consider the compatible unsaturated CSM, $\{f_3, f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}\}$, with $f_3(0) = f_3(1) = 1/2$. Kuo and Wang (2018) showed that none of the six permutations of $(1, 2, 3)$ can lead PCGS to generate samples from the correct joint, because there is no permissible updating cycle; though, the model is sufficient. The joint π and its two conditional densities $f_{1|23}$ and $f_{2|13}$ are given as follows; moreover, we add an incompatible $g_{2|13}$ to pair with $f_{1|23}$ for showcasing our compatibility check:

x_1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
x_2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
x_3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
π_{123}	1/20	3/20	4/20	2/20	3/20	3/20	3/20	1/20
$f_{1 23}$	1/4	3/4	2/3	1/3	1/2	1/2	3/4	1/4
$f_{2 13}$	1/5	3/5	4/5	2/5	1/2	3/4	1/2	1/4
$g_{2 13}$	3/5	1/7	2/5	6/7	4/5	3/4	1/5	1/4

The CSM is first partitioned into $\{f_{1|23}, f_{2|13}\}$ and $\{f_3\}$. Then $\langle\langle 1, 2 \rangle\rangle$, and Algorithm 3 is applied with $\Delta = \{3\}$. The initial distribution can be any $q_{2|3}^{(0)}$. The stationary distributions, $\pi_{12|3}^{(2,1)}$ and $\pi_{12|3}^{(1,2)}$, are computed via the following alternating \mathbb{P} mappings:

$$\mathbb{P}(q^{(2k)}) = q_{12|3}^{(2k+1)} \equiv f_{1|23} q_{2|3}^{(2k)} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(q^{(2k+1)}) = q_{12|3}^{(2k+2)} \equiv f_{2|13} q_{1|3}^{(2k+1)}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

When $q_{1|3}^{(2t+1)} = q_{1|3}^{(2t)}$ and $q_{2|3}^{(2t+2)} = q_{2|3}^{(2t+1)}$, the iterations reaches stationarity. Numerically, convergence had occurred after seven cycles because $M(t) = I(q_{1|3}^{(2t)}; q_{1|3}^{(2t+1)}) + I(q_{2|3}^{(2t+1)}; q_{2|3}^{(2t+2)})$ drops from $M(0) = 6.7 \times 10^{-2}$ to $M(6) = 4.7 \times 10^{-11}$. Hence, we have $q_{12|3}^{(13)} = \pi_{12|3}^{(2,1)}$ and $q_{12|3}^{(14)} = \pi_{12|3}^{(1,2)}$. To check compatibility, we use $\Pi(t) = I(q_{12|3}^{(2t)}; q_{12|3}^{(2t+1)}) + I(q_{12|3}^{(2t+1)}; q_{12|3}^{(2t+2)})$; it drops from $\Pi(0) = 2.0 \times 10^{-2}$ to $\Pi(6) = 5.6 \times 10^{-11}$, which implies $\pi_{12|3}^{(2,1)} = \pi_{12|3}^{(1,2)}$ and compatibility. Furthermore, $\pi_{12|3}^{(2,1)} f_3$ reproduces π_{123} .

Now, consider the incompatible case: $\{f_{1|23}, g_{2|13}\}$. Because $M(0) = 2.7 \times 10^{-1}$ drops to $M(7) = 2.1 \times 10^{-11}$, Algorithm 3 converges after eight cycles. But $0.92 < \Pi(t) < 0.95$, $0 \leq t \leq 10$ never decreases, hence the two stationary densities are different, which implies that $f_{1|23}$ and $g_{2|13}$ are not compatible.

Let x_i have m_i categories for $i = 1, 2, 3$. In order to match the joint and the x_3 marginal distributions, the number of unknowns is $m_1 m_3 + m_2 m_3 - 2$, but the number of equations is $m_1 m_2 m_3 + 2 m_3 - 3$. In terms of computational effort, Algorithm 3 is much simpler than solving over-specified linear equations. \square

Example 2 (Permissible updating cycles of an unsaturated CSM). Consider a hypothetical example that an Asian nation applies to become a permanent member of the Security Council of United Nations (UN). America's vote is conditioned on Great Britain and France, but not on Russia and China. So its conditional distribution is a non-full conditional. Assume that France's vote would be conditioned on the other four nations, so its conditional distribution is a full conditional. Only the joint distribution can express the probability that this nation will not receive a veto. In **Stage I**, each conditional distribution can be estimated from this nation's voting history in UN and geopolitics; in **Stage II** joints will be synthesized from this unsaturated CSM. Here, we consider a hypothetical model whose $f_{i|a_i}$ are derived from a randomly generated $\pi(x_1, \dots, x_5)$, hence, compatible:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{f_{1|2345}, f_{2|1345}, f_{3|145}, f_{4|15}, f_{5|1234}\}.$$

There are only two out of $5! = 120$ updating cycles that are permissible: $\langle\langle 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle 5, 1, 4, 3, 2 \rangle\rangle$. Therefore, partition of CSM is not needed. For $\langle\langle 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 \rangle\rangle$, one cycle of Algorithm 2 is as follows:

$$q^{(5t+1)} = f_{5|1234} q_{1234}^{(5t)}, \quad q_{145}^{(5t+2)} = f_{4|15} q_{15}^{(5t+1)}, \quad q_{1345}^{(5t+3)} = f_{3|145} q_{145}^{(5t+2)},$$

$$q^{(5t+4)} = f_{2|1345} q_{1345}^{(5t+3)}, \quad q^{(5t+5)} = f_{1|2345} q_{2345}^{(5t+4)}.$$

Every I -projection does two operations: marginalization then multiplication. For some non-full conditionals, marginalization may not be required. Among the above five steps, $q_{145}^{(5t+2)}$ and $q_{1345}^{(5t+3)}$ are, respectively, multiplied directly into $f_{3|145}$ and $f_{2|1345}$ to form $q_{1345}^{(5t+3)}$

and $q^{(5t+4)}$. When no marginalization is performed, the $q^{(k)}$ will not conflict with the conditional models. Stop ICR when $q_5^{(5t+1)} = q_5^{(5t)}$, $q_{234}^{(5t+1)} = q_{234}^{(5t+4)}$, and $q_1^{(5t+4)} = q_1^{(5t+5)}$. Numerically, ICR iterations will be stopped at t when

$$M(t) = I(q_5^{(5t)}; q_5^{(5t+1)}) + I(q_{234}^{(5t+1)}; q_{234}^{(5t+4)}) + I(q_1^{(5t+4)}; q_1^{(5t+5)}) < 10^{-10}.$$

When compatibility is in question, you compute the following $\Pi(t)$:

$$\Pi(t) = I(q^{(5t)}; q^{(5t+1)}) + I(q^{(5t+1)}; q^{(5t+4)}) + I(q^{(5t+4)}; q^{(5t+5)}).$$

If it drops to 0, the CSM is compatible, otherwise, not. The stopping criterion for the other permissible cycle: $\langle\langle 5, 1, 4, 3, 2 \rangle\rangle$ is

$$M(t) = I(q_5^{(5t)}; q_5^{(5t+1)}) + I(q_1^{(5t+1)}; q_1^{(5t+2)}) + I(q_{234}^{(5t+2)}; q_{234}^{(5t+5)}).$$

For both updating cycles, the randomly generated joint distribution is recovered. \square

Example 3. Arnold et al. (1996, Section 4) considered the unsaturated CSM: $\{f_{1|2345}, f_{2|345}, f_{3|145}, f_{4|25}, f_{5|13}\}$; they used a procedure that is equivalent to recursive factorization to derive the joint density. We illustrate divide-then-ICR here. First, divide the CSM into $\{f_{1|2345}, f_{2|345}, f_{3|145}\}$, $\{f_{4|25}\}$, and $\{f_{5|13}\}$ because $\langle\langle 3, 2, 1 \rangle\rangle$; $\langle\langle 123, 4 \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle 1234, 5 \rangle\rangle$ hold.

1. Phase 1: Algorithm 3 produces $\pi_{123|45}^{(3,2,1)}, \pi_{13|45}^{(2,1,3)}, \pi_{23|45}^{(1,3,2)}$ condition on $\{4, 5\}$. To build a joint, only $\pi_{123|45}^{(3,2,1)}$ needs to be used in the next phase.
2. Phase 2: Algorithm 3 uses $\{\pi_{123|45}^{(3,2,1)}, f_{4|25}\}$ to build $\pi_{1234|5}^{(4,123)}$ and $\pi_{24|5}^{(123,4)}$ conditioned on $\{5\}$.
3. Phase 3: Algorithm 2 uses $\{\pi_{1234|5}^{(4,123)}, f_{5|13}\}$ to build a joint $\pi_{12345}^{(5,1234)}$ and a marginal $\pi_{135}^{(1234,5)}$.

When the CSM is compatible, $\pi_{12345}^{(5,1234)}$ is the joint producing the CSM. The synthesis is written as $\langle\langle \langle\langle \langle\langle 1, 2, 3 \rangle\rangle, 4 \rangle\rangle, 5 \rangle\rangle$. \square

Example 4 (Embedding a CSM like a jigsaw puzzle). Let the CSM be $\{f_{2|1}, f_{3|2}, f_{1|3}, f_{4|123}, f_{5|1246}, f_{6|1245}, f_{3^*|12456}, f_{6^*|12345}\}$, where 3^* and 6^* indicate the variables appear twice in the model. We divide CSM into 4 subgroups: $\{f_{2|1}, f_{3|2}, f_{1|3}\}$, $\{f_{4|123}\}$, $\{f_{5|1246}, f_{6|1245}\}$, $\{f_{3^*|12456}, f_{6^*|12345}\}$, and use Algorithm 2 or 3 to consolidate the conditionals in each group into: marginals: $\{\pi_{12}, \pi_{23}, \pi_{13}\}$, and conditionals: $f_{56|124}, f_{36|1245}$, respectively.

In order to incorporate $f_{4|123}$, we need the marginal π_{123} which is missing from the CSM, so the CSM is not sufficient. Recall the three-way log-linear model:

$$\log \pi_{ijk} = \mu + \mu_i^1 + \mu_j^2 + \mu_k^3 + \mu_{ij}^{12} + \mu_{jk}^{23} + \mu_{ik}^{13} + \mu_{ijk}^{123}.$$

In order to obtain π_{123} , an assumption about the three-way iterations is required. Either $\mu_{ijk}^{123} = 0$ or $\mu_{ijk}^{123} = \text{constant}$ is most common; other possibilities may need some subject-matter knowledge. Once μ^{123} are settled, use iterative proportional fitting algorithm (IPF) along with $\{\pi_{12}, \pi_{23}, \pi_{13}\}$ to obtain π_{123} . Combining π_{123} and $f_{4|123}$ gives π_{1234} , which will be marginalized into π_{124} to be combined with $f_{56|124}$ to form π_{12456} . This distribution can be reduced to π_{1245} to be matched with $f_{36|1245}$ to form a joint distribution π_{123456} . \square




Figure 1: Comparisons of the speeds of convergence among ICR ($I(q^{(2t)}; \pi) + I(\pi; q^{(2t)})$), the power method ($I(p^{(t)}; \pi) + I(\pi; p^{(t)})$), and GS ($I(g^{(t)}; \pi) + I(\pi; g^{(t)})$).

Example 5 (A sticky conditional model for GS). Consider the following compatible conditionals:

x_1	0	1	0	1	0	1
x_2	0	0	1	1	2	2
$f_{1 2}$	100000/100001	1/100001	100000/100001	1/100001	7/8	1/8
$f_{2 1}$	200000/700007	2/8	500000/700007	5/8	7/700007	1/8

, which are derived from the following joint density:

$$\pi = \left(\frac{200000}{700015}, \frac{2}{700015}, \frac{500000}{700015}, \frac{5}{700015}, \frac{7}{700015}, \frac{1}{700015} \right).$$

It would be difficult for GS to explore the support because the concentration of probabilities at $(0,0)$ and $(0,1)$. Here we show that ICR will not be hindered by the sticky cells.

For ICR, $M(4) = 3.8 \times 10^{-11}$ indicates convergence after five rounds of ICR. The mutual K-L divergence between $\pi^{(1,2)}$ and $\pi^{(2,1)}$ is $\Pi(4) = 3.9 \times 10^{-11}$, thus confirms that the model is compatible, and π is reproduced. Next, GS is used to produce 5 batches of size 1,000,000 samples from $\{f_{1|2}, f_{2|1}\}$; the burn-in is set at 100,000. Let $g^{(s)}$, $s = 1, \dots, 5$, be the empirical pdf with $g^{(1)}$ based on the first 1,000,000 samples, and the other $g^{(i)}$ s based on 4 increments of 1,000,000 additional samples. The accuracy of GS are measured by discrepancies, $I(g^{(s)}; \pi) + I(\pi; g^{(s)})$, $s = 1, \dots, 5$. Last, let T_1 and T_2 be the transition matrices based on $f_{1|2}$ and $f_{2|1}$, respectively. The power method uses the averages of the six rows of $(T_1 T_2)^n$ as the approximations to π . Let $p^{(t)}$ be the distribution by power-method approximations, which stops at $t = 5$ with $I(p^{(5)}; \pi) + I(\pi; p^{(5)}) < 10^{-10}$, where π is the target joint distribution.

In Figure 1, ICR converges a bit faster than the power method, while the additional 4 million GS samples shows little improvement. In terms of efficiency, CPU times (second) of ICR, power method, and GS are 0.006, 0.019 and 114, respectively. The CPU time consumed by GS makes it impractical to deal with problems having sticky issue (Williams, 2001, p. 354), also see Kuo and Wang (2018, Example 5) for a sticky Gaussian model. Sticky issue slows down sample-based exploitation of the support, but it does not affect distribution-based ICR or power method. \square

Example 6 (Conditional models with disjoint support). Consider a compatible model $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{f_{1|234}, f_{2|134}, f_{3|124}, f_{4|123}\}$ and an incompatible model $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{f_{1|234}, f_{2|134}, f_{3|124}, g_{4|123}\}$, whose conditional densities are detailed as follows:

x_1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
x_2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
x_3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
x_4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
$f_{1 234}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$f_{2 134}$	1/8	7/8	2/5	3/5	5/12	7/12	1/5	4/5
$f_{3 124}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$f_{4 123}$	1/6	1/2	2/3	3/7	5/6	1/2	1/3	4/7
$g_{4 123}$	1/6	3/10	2/3	3/7	5/6	7/10	1/3	4/7

Their support S is the union of two disjoint regions $S_1 = \{(0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0, 1)\}$ and $S_2 = \{(1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1)\}$. We will use three different marginal distributions: u , v and w to show how they affect the stationary distributions:

x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4	u	v	w
0	0	0	0	1/8	1/20	1/15
0	1	0	0	1/8	3/20	2/15
0	0	0	1	1/8	2/20	3/15
0	1	0	1	1/8	4/20	4/15
total of S_1				1/2	1/2	2/3
1	0	1	0	1/8	1/10	1/15
1	1	1	0	1/8	1/10	1/15
1	0	1	1	1/8	1/10	1/15
1	1	1	1	1/8	2/10	2/15
total of S_2				1/2	1/2	1/3

Notice that u is the uniform distribution, and $\sum_{x \in S_i} v(x) = \sum_{x \in S_i} u(x) \neq \sum_{x \in S_i} w(x)$. Let $p^{(0)} = f_{4|123}u_{123}$, $q^{(0)} = f_{4|123}v_{123}$ and $r^{(0)} = f_{4|123}w_{123}$ be the initial distributions of ICR, which uses $\langle\langle 1, 2, 3, 4 \rangle\rangle$ as the updating cycle. The three sequences of joints are, respectively,

$$p^{(4k+i)} = f_{i|i} p_{-i}^{(4k+i-1)}, \quad q^{(4k+i)} = f_{i|i} q_{-i}^{(4k+i-1)}, \quad r^{(4k+i)} = f_{i|i} r_{-i}^{(4k+i-1)},$$

where $i = 1, \dots, 4$. The convergence of $p^{(k)}$ is determined by

$$M_p(k) = I(p_1^{(4k)}; p_1^{(4k+1)}) + I(p_2^{(4k+1)}; p_2^{(4k+2)}) + I(p_3^{(4k+2)}; p_3^{(4k+3)}) + I(p_4^{(4k+3)}; p_4^{(4k+4)}).$$

We stop ICR at time t_p when $M_p(t_p) < 10^{-10}$. The $M_q(k)$ and $M_r(k)$ are similarly defined, so are the stopping times t_q and t_r . Figure 2 plots $M_p(t)$, $M_q(t)$ and $M_r(t)$ vs. t , and they all indicate fast convergence with $t_p = 5$, $t_q = 4$ and $t_r = 4$, respectively. After convergence, we obtain three batches of stationary joint distributions: $\{p^{(4t_p+i)}\}$, $\{q^{(4t_q+i)}\}$, $\{r^{(4t_r+i)}\}$, where $i = 1, \dots, 4$ are associated with \mathcal{C}_i .




Figure 2: The upper panel is for the compatible \mathcal{A}_1 , where the left plot is $M_x(t)$ for detecting the convergence of ICR, and the right plot is $\Pi_x(t)$ indicating compatibility of \mathcal{A}_1 , where $x = p, q, r$; the lower panel is for incompatible \mathcal{A}_2 , where the convergence indicators, $M_x(t)$, (lower left) decrease to 0, but every $\Pi_x(t)$ indicates multiple stationary distributions (lower right) from \mathcal{A}_2 , hence incompatible.

Compatibility is equivalent to within-group consistency, whose discrepancy is measured by

$$\Pi_p(t) = I(p^{(4t)}; p^{(4t+1)}) + I(p^{(4t+1)}; p^{(4t+2)}) + I(p^{(4t+2)}; p^{(4t+3)}) + I(p^{(4t+3)}; p^{(4t+4)}).$$

The resulting $\Pi_p(5) = 3.6 \times 10^{-12}$, $\Pi_q(4) = 9.4 \times 10^{-11}$ and $\Pi_r(4) = 1.3 \times 10^{-10}$ indicate that \mathcal{A}_1 is a compatible CSM, no matter which initial distribution is used.

Uniqueness of stationary distributions is based on within- \mathcal{C}_4 consistency; we need only to compare among $p^{(4t_p+4)}$, $q^{(4t_q+4)}$ and $r^{(4t_r+4)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} I(p^{(4t_p+4)}; q^{(4t_q+4)}) + I(q^{(4t_q+4)}; p^{(4t_p+4)}) &= 1.2 \times 10^{-12}, \\ I(p^{(4t_p+4)}; r^{(4t_r+4)}) + I(r^{(4t_r+4)}; p^{(4t_p+4)}) &= 0.1155, \\ I(q^{(4t_q+4)}; r^{(4t_r+4)}) + I(r^{(4t_r+4)}; q^{(4t_q+4)}) &= 0.1155. \end{aligned}$$

The above informs us that $p^{(4t_p+4)} = q^{(4t_q+4)}$, $p^{(4t_p+4)} \neq r^{(4t_r+4)}$, and $q^{(4t_q+4)} \neq r^{(4t_r+4)}$. Therefore, stationary distributions indeed depend of the initial distributions, which is expected for reducible Markov chain.

Next, ICR with initial distributions u , v and w is applied for \mathcal{A}_2 . The $M_p(t)$, $M_q(t)$ and $M_r(t)$ are plotted against t in lower panel of Figure 3. The left plot indicates fast convergence also for incompatible CSM, with $M_p(4) = 1.0 \times 10^{-12}$, $M_q(4) = 2.2 \times 10^{-13}$, and $M_r(3) = 7.2 \times 10^{-11}$. To check compatibility, we calculate Π_x . Because $\Pi_p(4) = 0.0107$, $\Pi_q(4) = 0.0107$ and $\Pi_r(3) = 0.0143$, \mathcal{A}_2 is deemed incompatible. To see the effect of initial

distributions, we compute the following K-L divergences:

$$\begin{aligned} I(p^{(20)}; q^{(20)}) + I(q^{(20)}; p^{(20)}) &= 1.57 \times 10^{-15}, \\ I(p^{(20)}; r^{(16)}) + I(r^{(16)}; p^{(20)}) &= 0.1155, \\ I(q^{(20)}; r^{(16)}) + I(r^{(16)}; q^{(20)}) &= 0.1155. \end{aligned}$$

We see that the difference between u and v does not change their stationary distributions. In summary, this example shows that

- (a) Convergence of ICR is not affected by the compatibility of the model;
- (b) Compatibility is not affected by the choice of the initial distribution, i.e., our compatibility check is independent of the choice of the initial distribution; and
- (c) It is the probability assigned to each disjoint support, $\Pr(S_i)$, not the detailed distribution over S_i , that determines the stationary distribution.

When the support is partitioned, $\Pr(S_i)$ must be carefully guided by subject-matter knowledge; the $\Pr(S_i)$ may also be adjusted iteratively until the joint distribution is more consistent with data. This flexibility of using initial distribution to fine tune the stationary distribution is not available to irreducible CSM. \square

4 Discussions

4.1 Differences between ICR and GS

Consider the saturated CSM $\{f_{i|-i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$; let T_i be the transition matrix of $f_{i|-i}$, and q be a vector representing a joint pdf. It can be shown that

$$qT_i = f_{i|-i}q_{-i} \equiv \mathbb{P}(q).$$

That is, q transitioned by T_i , I -projection of q onto \mathcal{C}_i , and replacing the $(x_i|x_i)$ -conditional of q by $f_{i|-i}$ are the same thing. But the commonality ends here. We choose conditional replacement because it is the easiest to modify for non-full conditionals. Also, Rule A of Algorithm 1 is intuitively necessary because it is the only circumstance under which conditional replacement can be executed. GS is justified by Markov chain which cannot be applied to incompatible or unsaturated CSM. A popular remedy is to expand every non-full conditionals into a full conditional. But such a practice may blind GS to use an impermissible updating cycle, and cause GS to sample from the distribution that is not the target. We show that identification of the permissible updating cycles is critical for the execution of ICR, while GS does not need to pay attention to it, because Rule A and Rule B are automatically satisfied for full conditionals.

4.2 Use Gibbs ensemble to find the optimal joint distribution

Graphically, a conditional model is depicted by a *cyclic* directed graph with feedback loop. Heckerman et al. (2000) call such a graphical model a dependency network, and their objective is to synthesize *one* joint distribution from a saturated CSM derived empirically,

and without regard to compatibility. They used GS based on incompatible full conditionals to synthesize, and coined the term pseudo-Gibbs sampler (PGS). They claimed that different updating cycles of PGS will converge to nearly identical stationary distributions when the data are large; but, statisticians have refuted such a claim. For example, Gelman and Raghunathan (2001, p. 268) stated “the simulations (imputations) never converge to a single distribution, rather the distribution depends upon the order of the updating and when the updating stopped.” Casella (1996, p. 257) also stated “Gibbs samplers based on a set of densities that are not compatible result in Markov chains that are *null*, that is, they are either null recurrent or transient.” In fact, Besag (2001, p. 267) stated that PGS’s “theoretical properties are largely unknown and no doubt considerable caution must be exercised.” Heckerman et al. (2000) called the stationary distributions of PGS, pseudo-Gibbs distributions (PGD).

According to Breiman (2001), incompatible CSM faces the multiplicity problem: there are many different models that have about the same merit. He suggests that “aggregating over a large set of competing models can reduce the nonuniqueness, while improving accuracy.” In addition, the resulting model “is also more stable.” (Breiman, 2001, p. 206) Chen et al. (2013) named the collection of $d!$ PGDs of a saturated CSM as the Gibbs ensemble, and proposed to use a weighed sum of PGDs as the final model. Building the ensemble requires running $d!$ long chains of Gibbs sampling, which makes the computational burden heavy, if not impossible for large d . For instance, Chen and Ip (2015) used two chains of 1,000,000 GS samples each to approximate $\pi^{(1,2)}$ and $\pi^{(2,1)}$, even though $\{f_{1|2}, f_{2|1}\}$ are two 2×2 conditionals. From d full conditionals, ICR produces d PGDs in one batch, hence, reduces the computational burden by one order. Chen et al. (2013) considered only ensemble for saturated CSM, because PGS cannot sample unsaturated CSM. As we have shown, the size of the Gibbs ensemble of an unsaturated CSM is considerably less than $d!$, because only permissible updating cycles need to be entertained. This understanding makes the computations for unsaturated CSM less prohibitive. In Example 2, $\{f_{1|2345}, f_{2|1345}, f_{3|145}, f_{4|15}, f_{5|1234}\}$ have only six stationary distributions in two batches, not 120. Gibbs ensemble optimizes by computing a weighted mixture of these six distributions. The deviance of the mixture relative to the CSM is smaller than every individual PGD. Different deviance measures, such as K-L divergence, Pearson chi-square X^2 , and Freeman-Turkey F^2 have been considered; therefore, the optimal joint will be deviance-dependent.

4.3 Comparisons between the power method and ICR

Back to $\{f_{i|-i} : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, let T_i be the transition matrix of $f_{i|-i}$, and $\mathcal{T} = T_1 \cdots T_d$. The power method uses the row average of \mathcal{T}^k as the stationary distribution for \mathcal{T} . But in practice, the power method often encounters a sparse \mathcal{T} of enormous size when d is large; thus it is not practical. ICR computes at least as fast as the power method, and it has the following computational advantages:

- (a) One cycle of ICR computes d stationary densities, while the power method requires d sequences. For $d = 3$, ICR produces mutually stationary joints: $\pi^{(1,2,3)}, \pi^{(2,3,1)}$, and $\pi^{(3,1,2)}$, whereas the power method needs to evaluate 3 separate sequences: $(T_1 T_2 T_3)^k$, $(T_2 T_3 T_1)^k$ and $(T_3 T_1 T_2)^k$ until convergence.

- (b) The size of 2-dimensional \mathcal{T} increases exponentially with d , while ICR works with d -dimensional arrays.
- (c) The power method cannot be applied to unsaturated conditional models because the transition matrices of full and of non-full conditionals have different sizes.
- (d) When \mathcal{T} is a reducible matrix, power method often fails.

4.4 Method of alternating projections (MAP)

Traditionally, GS considers $\mathcal{T} = T_1 \cdots T_d$ as one entity; hence, the effect of individual T_i becomes latent. However, entertaining T_i separately can gain operational advantage, see, for example, Burkholder and Chow (1961) and Burkholder (1962), who used the method of alternating projection (MAP) of von Neumann (1950) to find “minimal sufficient subfields”. Also, it should not be a surprise that our conditional replacement mapping \mathbb{P} onto \mathcal{C}_i is Burkholder’s conditional expectation given \mathcal{C}_i . More recently, Diaconis et al. (2010) show that the GS is a MAP, when every T_i is considered separately. When the saturated CSM is compatible, the proof in Diaconis et al. (2010) guarantees the convergence of ICR in norm, but not in K-L divergence. However, CSM often encounter incompatible models having non-full conditionals. Algorithm 2 is a MAP, but it is different from ordinary MAP in the following aspects:

- (a) MAP is commonly used to approximate one fixed point in $\cap_i \mathcal{C}_i$, see Diaconis et al. (2010). Here, we show that MAP can also be used to pursue multiple fixed points, one in each \mathcal{C}_i .
- (b) MAP usually projects onto closed subsets of the same space, say $\mathcal{H} = \{\text{all the joint distributions over } \mathcal{S}(f_{i|-i})\}$. For a saturated CSM, every \mathcal{C}_i is a subset of \mathcal{H} . But the \mathcal{C}_i defined by a non-full conditional is not a subset of \mathcal{H} , but of a different space. Examples here show that MAP can be applied to closed subsets of different spaces, as long as the projections respect the hierarchy between spaces, i.e., Rule A.

Because of (a) and (b) above, a new concept of stationarity is needed; mutual stationarity is better defined collectively, not individually. Figure 3 illustrates such pursuits of \mathbb{P} with $d = 3$. Distributions $q^{(3k+i)}$ within each \mathcal{C}_i converge monotonically to stationary distribution $\pi^{(j,k,i)}$, and $\mathbb{P}(\pi^{(j,k,i)}) = \pi^{(k,i,j)}$. Minimum context and little background knowledge are required to understand the replacement of conditional distribution, and the simple proof of Theorem 10. Our goal is to make ICR, as an algorithm, easily understood and appreciated by statisticians and data scientists, who have little familiarity with Markov chain theory or Hilbert space. Another popular MAP algorithm is IPF, which hardly refer to Hilbert space, orthogonal projection or conditional expectation; instead, it is described as replacing marginal densities iteratively, see Darroch and Ratcliff (1972) and Wang (1993).

Finally, much of MAP has been dealing with continuous functions over convex domains. The algorithm, “divide-then-ICR,” and the proof of Theorem 10 can be easily carried over to continuous distributions provided the integrals are finite. Marginalization of a continuous density is the computational obstacle of ICR. Cramer (1998) studied alternating I -projection of a regular Gaussian distribution onto the intersection of spaces characterized by Gaussian conditionals (a \mathcal{C}_i defined by a full conditional) and Gaussian marginal




Figure 3: This figure illustrates alternating projections for $d = 3$ with \rightarrow representing \mathbb{P} . Three sequences of joint distributions $q^{(3k+i)}$ within $\mathcal{C}_i = \{q : q_{i|i} = f_{i|i}\}$ converge monotonically to their respective stationary distributions, $\pi^{(j,k,i)}$. ICR is doing $(T_1 T_2 T_3)^k T_1 \equiv \mathbb{P}^{(3k+1)}$, $(T_1 T_2 T_3)^k T_1 T_2 \equiv \mathbb{P}^{(3k+2)}$ and $(T_1 T_2 T_3)^{k+1} \equiv \mathbb{P}^{(3k+3)}$ in one cycle, where T_i is the transition matrix of $f_{i|i}$. After convergence, the three $\pi^{i,j,k}$ become mutually stationary.

distribution (another \mathcal{C}_j defined by a non-full conditional). For Gaussian distributions, marginalization is straightforward. Part of his algorithm (Cramer, 1998, Eq. 2.3) is similar to ICR. His model placed restrictions on the conditionals that guarantee compatibility ($\mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_j \neq \emptyset$), hence, has unique stationarity; he did not consider incompatible cases or discrete densities.

5 Conclusion

When the number of variables is large and the data size is relatively small, subjective or objective variable selection is necessary, hence, unsaturated conditional models are inevitable. However, in the past, only saturated conditional models had been considered—Besag (1974), Diaconis et al. (2010), Kaiser and Cressie (2000), Heckerman et al. (2000), Wang and Ip (2008), Chen et al. (2013) and Kuo and Wang (2019)—due to lack of computational tools. On the other front, Arnold et al. (2002, 2004) used linear equations/algebra to check compatibility; their methods quickly reach the curse of dimension. ICR is invented to fit unsaturated conditional models, and to check their compatibility using computing, rather than algebra. ICR provides the channel to apply computing power to solve issues of conditional modeling. It seems to us that ICR is the right choice for CSM because it is multiplying by the transition matrix (see Section 4.1), doing I -projection (see Section 2.1), and performing conditional expectation (see Section 4.4), at the same time.

ICR, along with “divide-then-ICR” and parallelization, can efficiently compute all of the mutually stationary distributions, which are called the Gibbs ensemble. We are in agreement with Breiman (2001) and Chen et al. (2013) that a fair-minded mixture of the Gibbs ensemble is a sensible approach in **Stage III** to resolve the multiplicity problem. Any practical algorithm must be easy to scale and requires little expertise to tune. ICR and

the ensemble optimization meet both criteria.

Appendix

A The proof of Pythagoras equality

Because $\tau \in \mathcal{C}_1$, it can be written as $\tau = f_{1|2}\tau_2$, and the K-L divergence between q and τ is

$$\begin{aligned} I(q; \tau) &= \sum_{i,j} q(i, j) \log \frac{q(i, j)}{f_{1|2}(i|j)\tau_2(j)} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} q(i, j) \log \frac{q(i, j)}{f_{1|2}(i|j)q_2(j)} + \sum_{i,j} q(i, j) \log \frac{f_{1|2}(i|j)q_2(j)}{f_{1|2}(i|j)\tau_2(j)} \\ &= I(q; f_{1|2}q_2) + I(q_2; \tau_2) = I(q; f_{1|2}q_2) + I(f_{1|2}q_2; \tau), \end{aligned}$$

because of

$$\begin{aligned} I(q_2; \tau_2) &= \sum_i f_{1|2}(i|j) \sum_j q_2(j) \log \frac{q_2(j)}{\tau_2(j)} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} f_{1|2}(i|j)q_2(j) \log \frac{q_2(j)}{\tau_2(j)} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} f_{1|2}(i|j)q_2(j) \log \frac{f_{1|2}(i|j)q_2(j)}{f_{1|2}(i|j)\tau_2(j)} = I(f_{1|2}q_2; \tau). \end{aligned}$$

References

- Arnold B. C., Castillo E., & Sarabia, J. M. (1996). Specification of distributions by combinations of marginal and conditional distributions. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 26, 153–157.
- Arnold B. C., Castillo E., & Sarabia, J. M. (2002). Exact and near compatibility of discrete conditional distributions. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 40, 231–252.
- Arnold B. C., Castillo E., & Sarabia, J. M. (2004). Compatibility of partial or complete conditional probability specifications. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 123, 133–159.
- Besag J. (1974). Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 36, 192–236.
- Besag J. (2001). Comment on “Conditionally specified distributions: an introduction. *Statistical Science*, 16, 265–267.
- Breiman L. (2001). Statistical modeling: the two cultures. *Statistical Science*, 16, 199–215.

- Burkholder D. L., & Chow Y. S. (1961). Iterates of conditional expectation operators. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 12, 490–495.
- Burkholder D. L. (1962). Successive conditional expectations of an integrable function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33, 887–893.
- Casella G. (1996). Statistical inference and Monte Carlo algorithms. *Test*, 5, 249–344.
- Chen S.-H., Ip E. H., & Wang, Y. J. (2013). Gibbs ensembles for incompatible dependency networks. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 5, 478–485.
- Chen S.-H., & Ip, E. H. (2015). Behaviour of the Gibbs sampler when conditional distributions are potentially incompatible. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 85, 3266–3275.
- Cramer E. (1998). Conditional iterative proportional fitting for Gaussian distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 65, 261–276.
- Darroch J. N., & Ratcliff, D. (1972). Generalized iterative scaling for log-linear models. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 43, 1470–1480.
- Diaconis P., Khare K., & Saloff-Coste, L. (2010). Stochastic alternating projections. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 54, 963–979.
- Gelman A., & Raghunathan T. E. (2001). Comment on “Conditionally specified distributions: an introduction”. *Statistical Science*, 16, 268–269.
- Heckerman D., Chickering D. M., Meek C., Rounthwaite R., & Kadie C. (2000). Dependency networks for inference, collaborative filtering, and data visualization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 1, 49–75.
- Kaiser M. S., & Cressie N. (2000). The construction of multivariate distributions from Markov random field. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 73, 199–220.
- Kuo, K.-L., & Wang, Y. J. (2018). Simulating conditionally specified models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 167, 171–180.
- Kuo K.-L., & Wang, Y. J. (2019). Pseudo-Gibbs sampler for discrete conditional distributions. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 71, 93–105.
- Raghunathan T. E., Lepkowski J. M., van Hoewyk J., & Solenberger, P. (2001). A multivariate technique for multiply imputing missing values using a sequence of regression models. *Survey Methodology*, 27, 85–95.
- Smith A. F. M., & Roberts G. O. (1993). Bayesian computation via the Gibbs sampler and related Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 55, 3–23.
- van Buuren S. (2007). Multiple imputation of discrete and continuous data by fully conditional specification. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 16, 219–242.

- van Dyk D. A., & Park T. (2008). Partially collapsed Gibbs samplers: theory and methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103, 790–796.
- von Neumann J. (1950). *Functional Operators*, Vol. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wang Y. J. (1993). Construction of continuous bivariate density functions. *Statistica Sinica*, 3, 173-187.
- Wang Y. J., & Ip E. H. (2008). Conditionally specified continuous distributions. *Biometrika*, 95, 735–746.
- Williams D. (2001). *Weighing the Odds*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.