

PARTITION FUNCTION APPROACH TO NON-GAUSSIAN LIKELIHOODS:
 INFORMATION THEORY AND STATE VARIABLES FOR BAYESIAN INFERENCE

REBECCA MARIA KUNTZ ^{1,◊}, HEINRICH VON CAMPE ², TOBIAS RÖSPEL ¹, MAXIMILIAN PHILIPP HERZOG ¹, AND BJÖRN MALTE SCHÄFER ^{1,2,‡}

¹ Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Astronomisches Rechen-Institut,
 Philosophenweg 12, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany and

² Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für wissenschaftliches Rechnen der Universität Heidelberg,
 Im Neuenheimer Feld 205, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany; Zuse School ELIZA

Version March 5, 2025

Abstract

The significance of statistical physics concepts such as entropy extends far beyond classical thermodynamics. We interpret the similarity between partitions in statistical mechanics and partitions in Bayesian inference as an articulation of a result by Jaynes (1957), who clarified that thermodynamics is in essence a theory of information. In this, every sampling process has a mechanical analogue. Consequently, the divide between ensembles of samplers in parameter space and sampling from a mechanical system in thermodynamic equilibrium would be artificial. Based on this realisation, we construct a continuous modelling of a Bayes update akin to a transition between thermodynamic ensembles. This leads to an information theoretic interpretation of Jazinsky’s equality, relating the expenditure of work to the influence of data via the likelihood. We propose one way to transfer the vocabulary and the formalism of thermodynamics (energy, work, heat) and statistical mechanics (partition functions) to statistical inference, starting from Bayes’ law. Different kinds of inference processes are discussed and relative entropies are shown to follow from suitably constructed partitions as an analytical formulation of sampling processes. Lastly, we propose an effective dimension as a measure of system complexity. A numerical example from cosmology is put forward to illustrate these results.

Keywords: inference in cosmology, Monte-Carlo Markov-chains, Bayesian evidence, supernova cosmology

1. INTRODUCTION

In problems of statistical inference, Bayes’ theorem combines the prior information $\pi(\theta)$ on the parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of a physical model with the likelihood $\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)$ as the distribution of the data points y for a given parameter choice θ to the posterior distribution $p(\theta|y)$

$$p(\theta|y) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)\pi(\theta)}{p(y)} \quad (1)$$

with the Bayesian evidence $p(y)$ given as the normalisation of $p(\theta|y)$

$$p(y) = \int d^n\theta \mathcal{L}(y|\theta)\pi(\theta). \quad (2)$$

At this instance, one must highlight the fact that use of the integration measure $\int d^n\theta$ is only justifiable for a flat, Euclidean parameter space with Cartesian coordinates. However, there is no need for us to make any such strong assumption about the geometry of parameter space. In order to consistently define an invariant volume form $d\mu(\theta)$, we turn to the field of information geometry.

In this work, we limit ourselves to likelihoods from the so-called exponential family, i.e. the set of probability distributions (Amari 2016)

$$\mathcal{P}_e = \{p_\theta(y) | p_\theta(y) = \exp(\theta_i y^i + k(y) - \psi(\theta))\}_{\theta \in \Theta}, \quad (3)$$

with $k(y)$ a function of the data y , $\psi(\theta)$ ensuring the normalization and Θ the parameter space (here \mathbb{R}^n).

Importantly, information geometry tells us that parametric families of probability distributions, such as the exponential family \mathcal{P}_e , constitute so-called statistical manifolds, whose metric tensor is precisely the Fisher information F , as defined by the likelihood (Amari 2016; Nielsen 2020, 2022),

$$F_{\mu\nu}(\theta) = \langle \partial_\mu \ln \mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \partial_\nu \ln \mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \rangle_{y \sim \mathcal{L}}. \quad (4)$$

Information geometry further establishes the so-called Jeffreys’ prior $\pi(\theta) \sim \sqrt{\det F}$, with F the Fisher information, which gives the unique invariant volume form,

$$d\mu(\theta) := d^n\theta \sqrt{\det F}, \quad (5)$$

of a Riemannian statistical manifold, whose metric is F (Jeffreys 1948; Amari 2016). Based on the appearance of the likelihood’s Fisher information F in $\pi(\theta) \sim \sqrt{\det F}$, we deem it appropriate to refer to $\sqrt{\det F}$ as Jeffreys’ covolume, rather than Jeffrey’s prior. The volume form in Equation 5 is invariant under coordinate changes, i.e. under reparameterisations of the statistical model. It correctly reflects the underlying geometry of the parameter space for the family \mathcal{P}_e (Jeffreys 1946).

The structure of Bayes’ theorem, with an integral in the denominator and the integrand in the numerator, suggests the definition of a partition function (or Bayes partition function) of statistical inference and information theory (Röver et al. 2022),

$$Z[T, J] = \int d\mu(\theta) [\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)\pi(\theta) \exp(J_\nu \theta^\nu)]^{1/T}. \quad (6)$$

Clearly, Equation 6 is an extension of the Bayes evidence,

◊ kuntz@stud.uni-heidelberg.de

‡ bjoern.malte.schaefer@uni-heidelberg.de

modified by the so-called ‘‘sources’’ $J \in \mathbb{R}^n$, as well as a control parameter T in analogy to temperature in statistical physics. This T is in line with the notion of temperature proposed in mathematical optimisation methods, such as simulated annealing (Kirkpatrick et al. 1983). For a likelihood $\mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \in \mathcal{P}_e$ together with a prior $\pi(\theta) \sim \exp(\varphi(\theta))$ one finds

$$Z[T, J] = \int d\mu(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{T}(\Phi(\theta) - J_\alpha \theta^\alpha)\right), \quad (7)$$

allowing to view $\Phi(\theta) := \chi^2(y|\theta)/2 + \varphi(\theta)$ as a potential over parameter space. Here, $\chi^2(y|\theta)$ includes the statistical model, the data, as well as the data covariance, whilst the function $\varphi(\theta)$ incorporates the prior belief (Röver et al. 2022). Indeed, Markov chain Monte Carlo methods, as introduced to cosmology by Lewis and Bridle (2002), first recognized the sampler distribution in parameter space as one microscopic realisation of a system subject to Φ .

In this picture, an information theoretical partition function as given in Equation 7 governs an ensemble of samplers in the same way that a statistical physics partition would a physical ensemble, completing the correspondence between statistical sampling in inference and their mechanical analogues. Indeed, the Bayes partition marginalises the microscopic realisations of the system, which are subject to randomness, to access its macroscopic features. Only those features at the macroscopic level, e.g. the moments of the posterior distribution, are relevant for inference.

We consider this great structural similarity to be an articulation of a result by Jaynes (1957), who clarifies that thermodynamics is in essence a theory of information: Inverting Jayne’s realisation suggests that statistical mechanics and thermodynamics can be used as tools in information-theoretical problems. Importantly, Equation 7 recovers the Bayesian evidence $p(y)$ for $T = 1$ and $J = 0$. Differentiation of the cumulant generating function ($+T \ln Z[T, J]$) with respect to J_α gives the cumulants of the posterior distribution $p(\theta|y)$, making them easily accessible at any order (Röver et al. 2022). Notably, the source terms J_α , which appear alongside an inverse temperature scaling, receive a mechanical intuition when a physics perspective is adopted by way of the potential $\Phi(\theta)$. In this, J_α appears as an additional control variable alongside T which naively introduces a shift to the potential $\Phi(\theta)$ in parameter space, thus causing a non-trivial alteration of the sampler configuration in parameter space. Accordingly, we refer to $\Phi_J(\theta) := \Phi(\theta) - J_\alpha \theta^\alpha$ as the shifted potential.

To begin with, Sect. 2 presents a continuous parametrization of a Bayes update, in order to continuously quantify the intermediate stages of a belief update. In this, a variant of the Jarzynski equality for transitions between equilibrium ensembles under expenditure of mechanical work is transferred to statistical inference. Subsequently, Sect. 3 furthers the transfer of concepts from thermodynamics to information theory by arranging the structure of Bayesian inference in parallel to that of thermodynamics. After this, Sect. 4 considers statistical inference processes against the backdrop of the first law of thermodynamics. Sect. 5 generalizes this approach to a setting where the sampler number N can vary. Besides, Sect. 6 seeks to generalise the link between relative entropies and partitions in information theory. Finally, Sect. 7 presents the concept of an effective

dimension as a temperature-dependent measure of system complexity. Sect. 8 illustrates the thermodynamic viewpoint using an inference problem from cosmology (placing joint constraints on the matter density Ω_m , and the dark energy equation of state parameter w_0). Sect. 9 summarizes our results.

Throughout the paper, we use the summation convention. For parameter tuples $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and data tuples $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as vectors with contravariant indices; Greek indices are reserved for quantities in parameter space (θ^α), while Latin indices denote objects in data space (y^i).

2. PARAMETRIC TRANSITION FROM PRIOR TO POSTERIOR

We begin by viewing a Bayes update in analogy to a continuous transition between two equilibrium ensembles in thermodynamics. To achieve this, a control parameter λ is introduced to the Bayes-partition (setting $J = 0$),

$$Z_\lambda[T] = \int d\mu(\theta) [\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)^\lambda \pi(\theta)]^{\frac{1}{T}}. \quad (8)$$

For conciseness of notation, we adopt the shorthand $\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)^\lambda \pi(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi$ in this section. Effectively, λ is an additional state variable which governs the influence of the data on the inference process.

At the same time, Equation 8 allows to quantify the rate of change in Shannon’s information entropy S with progressing inference ($\lambda : 0 \rightarrow 1$). Effectively, λ describes how the conversion from prior π to posterior belief occurs through the influence of the likelihood \mathcal{L} at fixed T, J . In thermodynamics, the information entropy S directly follows from the partition function Z via $S(T, (\dots)) = \partial_T (T \ln Z[T, (\dots)])$. Here, (\dots) indicates other control variables, which are not specified further at this point.

In the information theoretic case at hand, the information entropy S is derived from Z analogously, leading to

$$S_\lambda(T) = \ln Z_\lambda[T] - (T Z_\lambda[T])^{-1} \int d\mu(\theta) (\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi)^{1/T} \ln(\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi), \quad (9)$$

where the total entropy difference $\Delta S_{\pi \rightarrow \lambda}$ between prior and the ‘‘intermediate distribution’’ $\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi$ at stage $\lambda \neq 0$ of the inference progression can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{\pi \rightarrow \lambda}(T) &:= S_\pi(T) - S_\lambda(T) \\ &= \ln \int d\mu(\theta) (\pi^{1/T} / Z_\lambda[T]) + \\ &\quad + (T Z_\lambda[T])^{-1} \int d\mu(\theta) (\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi)^{1/T} \ln(\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi) \\ &\quad - (T \int d\mu(\theta) \pi^{1/T})^{-1} \int d\mu(\theta) \pi^{1/T} \ln \pi. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Intuitively, this way of introducing λ signifies a weighting of the inverse data covariance C . This is made plain for a λ -scaled exponential likelihood,

$$\mathcal{L}^\lambda \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(y^i - y_{\text{model}}^i) \lambda C_{ij} (y^j - y_{\text{model}}^j)\right). \quad (12)$$

In the most illustrative case of uncorrelated data, $C_{ij} = 0 \forall i \neq j$ and $C_{ii} = (\sigma_i \sigma_i)^{-1}$, λ acts as a weighting for the data variance. Here, the case of $\lambda = 0$ (i.e. only the prior is known) corresponds to

$$(\sigma_e^i \sigma_e^j)^{-1} := \lambda (\sigma^i \sigma^j)^{-1} = 0 \leftrightarrow \sigma_e^i \sigma_e^j = \infty \quad (13)$$

before measurement. Not having measured the data yet is equivalent to having infinite *effective* uncertainty $(\sigma_e^i \sigma_e^j)^{-1}$ in the data. Likewise, for $\lambda = 1$, the effective uncertainties coincide with the *actual* uncertainties of the data set, i.e., $\sigma_e^i \sigma_e^j = \sigma^i \sigma^j$. In conclusion, λ interpolates between constraining data with lower experimental errors ($\lambda = 1$) and uninformative data with effectively infinite experimental errors ($\lambda = 0$). Choosing a λ -scaled variant of Equation 7 at $J = 0$, i.e.

$$Z_\lambda[T] = \int d\mu(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{T}(\lambda\chi^2/2 + \varphi(\theta))\right) \quad (14)$$

with a prior $\pi(\theta) \sim \exp(-\varphi(\theta))$, one finds

$$dS\Big|_{T=1}^{\lambda=0} = \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial \lambda}\right) d\lambda = (-\lambda \text{Var}(\chi^2) - \text{Cov}(\chi^2, \varphi)) d\lambda, \quad (15)$$

with dS the rate of change of uncertainty while incorporating new information. This allows for two important observations: Firstly, the uncertainty strictly decreases as inference progresses, and secondly, the rate of information gain with inference depends on the variance of the likelihood's potential $\text{Var}(\chi^2)$ and the covariance between the likelihood and prior potentials $\text{Cov}(\chi^2, \varphi_0)$.

At this point, the relative entropy, (the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence) between prior and posterior is discussed as a function of λ . The KL-divergence between two probability distributions p, q over parameter space,

$$D_{KL}[p(\theta), q(\theta)] = \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta) \ln\left(\frac{p(\theta)}{q(\theta)}\right), \quad (16)$$

is an oriented measure of their relative information entropy (Nielsen 2022). One finds

$$D_{KL}[p(\theta, \lambda|y), \pi(\theta)] = p(y)^{-1} \int d\mu(\theta) \mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi \ln \mathcal{L}^\lambda - \ln p(y). \quad (17)$$

This is in accordance with expectations, since the limiting cases are

$$D_{KL}[p(\theta, \lambda|y), \pi(\theta)] \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow 0} 0 \quad (18)$$

i.e. the prior coincides with the intermediate distribution when no measurement has been taken yet. For $\lambda \rightarrow 1$, i.e. completion of a full update step, the KL-divergence between posterior and prior

$$D_{KL}[p(\theta, \lambda|y), \pi(\theta)] \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow 1} \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y) \ln\left(\frac{p(\theta|y)}{\pi(\theta)}\right) \quad (19)$$

is recovered. This is also referred to as the *surprise statistic* (Schosser et al. 2024a). Here, $(dD_{KL}/d\lambda)$ is the rate of information increase with progressing inference, which could be useful in experimental design.

2.1. Jarzynski equality

Following Jarzynski (1997), the average work W expended in a infinitely fast switching between two equilibrium states of a thermodynamic ensemble is given by

$$\langle e^{-W/T} \rangle_0 = e^{-\Delta G/T}, \quad (20)$$

with $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ the equilibrium average at $\lambda = 0$, and G the Gibbs free energy (see also Crooks 1998). Importantly, Equation 20 assumes that the transition occurs through a series

of equilibrium states. For $\lambda : 0 \rightarrow 1$, W corresponds to the average “work” required for a full inference step. The information theoretic analogue of the potential G is given by $G(T, \lambda) = -T \ln Z_\lambda[T, \lambda]$. For a detailed discussion of this identification, the reader is referred to Sect. 3. With this choice, we find

$$\Delta G(T, \lambda) = G(T, \lambda) - G(T, 0) \quad (21)$$

$$= -T \ln Z_\lambda[T] + T \ln Z_0[T] \quad (22)$$

$$= T \ln \frac{\int_K d\mu(\theta) \pi^{1/T}}{\int_K d\mu(\theta) (\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi)^{1/T}}, \quad (23)$$

with $J = 0$. For a parameter domain $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, Equation 20 leads to

$$\frac{\int_K d\mu(\theta) [\pi e^{-W}]^{1/T}}{\int_K d\mu(\theta) \pi^{1/T}} = \frac{\int_K d\mu(\theta) [\mathcal{L}^\lambda \pi]^{1/T}}{\int_K d\mu(\theta) \pi^{1/T}}, \quad (24)$$

which ultimately results in

$$e^{-W} = \mathcal{L}^\lambda \leftrightarrow W = -\lambda \ln \mathcal{L} = \lambda \frac{\chi^2}{2}, \quad (25)$$

since the equality of the integrals in Equation 24 holds for any domain of integration K . Equation 25 is highly intuitive and consistent with Dahlsten et al. (2011): The amount of “work” W expended in inference equals the effective potential energy contributed by the likelihood at the intermediate stage λ of the update. In that sense, the work performed to update a parameter space ensemble in light of new data depends on the data itself as well as the model choice via the likelihood.

The illustrative role played by the analogue of mechanical work W in statistical inference (Equation 25) motivates Sect. 3, which aims to transfer thermodynamical concepts to information theory.

3. THERMODYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE ON BAYES PARTITIONS

The Guggenheim scheme (on the left side of Figure 1) is commonly used to organize (extensive and intensive) thermodynamic quantities, so as to visualise their relations, e.g. Maxwell's relations. At fixed particle number N , Figure 1 shows the extensive internal energy $U(S, V, N)$, which is a function of the thermodynamic entropy S , as well as the physical volume V , which are both extensive quantities. The respective opposing corners of the Guggenheim scheme give the conjugate intensive quantities of S and V , namely the temperature T and the pressure p , respectively. Those intensive state variables define the Gibbs free energy G (together with the extensive particle number N) via a Legendre transformation. Moreover, the Guggenheim scheme on the left side of Figure 1 includes the Helmholtz free energy $F(T, V, N)$ as well as the Gibbs enthalpy $H(S, p, N)$.

At this point, the structural counterparts of information theoretical quantities in thermodynamics must be identified. One way to do this is to locate the controlled parameters of sampler ensembles in a scheme akin to Figure 1. This is done using the concept of homogeneity in thermodynamics.

As of now, we limit ourselves to a Gaussian likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2T} F_{\mu\nu} \theta^\mu \theta^\nu\right), \quad (26)$$

governing a sampler ensemble in parameter space with a parabolic log-likelihood $\propto F_{\mu\nu} \theta^\mu \theta^\nu$. The Bayes partition

(see Equation 6) further entails source terms J_α , as well as a prior, which we chose to be uninformative, e.g. $\pi(\theta) \sim \text{const}$.

Note that the covolume $\sqrt{\det F}$ doubles as a diagnostic tool for the degeneracy of an inference problem as the following example demonstrates: Röver et al. (2022) derive the Fisher information of a linear model $y^i = A_\mu^i \theta^\mu$ (i.e. a Gaussian likelihood) as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = C_{ij} A_\mu^i A_\nu^j, \quad (27)$$

where C_{ij} is the covariance matrix of the N datapoints. Computation of its determinant is straightforward,

$$\det F = \varepsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} C_{i_1 j_1} A_{\mu_1}^{i_1} \dots C_{i_n j_n} A_{\mu_n}^{i_n}, \quad (28)$$

with $\varepsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$ the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol in n dimensions. For a non-vanishing determinant, the values of the j 's must be pairwise distinct

in some terms of the sum. In all others, there would be at least one pair of A_μ^j 's with equal j 's, which would yield zero when contracted with the antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol.

However, for an underconstrained model, i.e. if there are fewer data points than model parameters, $N < n$, the j 's cannot be chosen in a pairwise-distinct way in any of the sum's terms. Thus, $\det F$ must vanish for an underconstrained model. This result is intuitive since a vanishing covolume signifies that the N datapoints at hand are not sufficient to distinguish between different choices of the n parameters.

The partition function for a Gaussian likelihood governing a single sampler in parameter space can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Z[T, J] &= \int d\mu(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2T} F_{\mu\nu} \theta^\mu \theta^\nu + \frac{1}{T} J_\alpha \theta^\alpha\right) \\ &= \sqrt{(2\pi T)^n} \exp\left(+\frac{1}{2T} F^{\alpha\beta} J_\alpha J_\beta\right), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

using the analytic solution of a Gaussian integral. The construction of a conventional thermodynamic system requires its extensive variables to be related via a consistent fundamental relation. Importantly, the Gibbs-Duhem relation forbids any thermodynamic potential that only depends on intensive state variables, as information about quantities like total energy would otherwise be inaccessible. Intuitively, extensive variables scale with system size. However, for applications in pure statistics, concepts such as system size, extensivity and intensivity of state variables require a case-by-case definition. Therefore, after selecting extensive variables, we must check that their interplay is consistent.

In an inference setting, the quantities T and J_α function as external control variables. Their influence on the potential and the likelihood is depicted schematically in Figure 2. While T effectively scales the covariance and thus the width of the Gaussian, J_α induces a shift in the governing potential. We do not expect J_α to scale with what we choose to see as the system size (the extent of the sampler ensemble in parameter space). Thus, J_α is chosen to be a candidate for an intensive quantity. Naturally, the information theoretic variants of U, S, N are viewed as extensive variables. Importantly, first-order homogeneity of the fundamental relation necessitates another identification: $n = \dim \Theta$ (with Θ the parameter space) is selected as an extensive variable, changes of which will be ignored (set $dn = 0$ always) in all standard inference settings.

From a statistical point of view, changes in n would signify a different number of parameters and are thus related to the problem of model selection as discussed in Schosser et al. (2024b). For a thermodynamic viewpoint, n will turn out to mimic the notion of degrees of freedom (DOF) in physics. Furthermore, it will be shown that the information entropy, which is a measure of system complexity, scales with n , suggesting its extensive character. In fact, the link between n and system complexity will be the basis of the effective dimension presented in Sect. 7. Now, we must check first-order homogeneity of the fundamental relation in all extensive quantities.

With these choices in place, the potential $G(T, J_\alpha, n) := -T \ln Z[T, J_\alpha, n]$ (for one sampler) parallels the structure of the Gibbs free energy $G(T, p, N) = -T \ln Z[T, p, N]$,

$$G(T, p, N) = U - TS + pV (+\mu N), \quad (30)$$

$$dG(T, p, N) = -SdT + Vdp (+\mu dN). \quad (31)$$

Now, the conjugate quantities of all thermodynamic-like variables must be derived. The conjugate quantity of J follows as

$$\partial_{J_\alpha} (-T \ln Z[T, J, N = 1, n]) = -F^{\alpha\beta} J_\beta. \quad (32)$$

Accordingly, the conjugate quantity of n , namely $\eta := (T/2) \ln(2\pi T)$, is clearly intensive. Now, we make use of the following shorthand notation

$$J_\alpha \hat{=} J, \quad J_\alpha J_\beta \hat{=} JJ, \quad F_{\mu\nu} \hat{=} F, \quad F^{\mu\nu} \hat{=} F^{-1}, \quad (33)$$

for simplicity. The formulation of all results in index notation is straightforward. Setting $dn = 0$, $dN = 0$ (and $\mu = 0$) in the following, one ultimately finds

$$G(T, J, n) = U - TS - \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} JJ - n\eta \quad (34)$$

$$dG = -SdT - \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ). \quad (35)$$

By looking at (30), one can directly perform the intensity extensivity check: since the two thermodynamic potentials G and U are both extensive, the other terms must contain one intensive and one extensive variable each (as in the definition of the *thermodynamic* Gibbs free energy). This confirms that JJ can structurally assume the role of an intensive state variable. The converse argument shows that F^{-1} can indeed be extensive. On the basis of these findings, we make an adjustment to the selected variables. Given that the parameter covariance F^{-1} characterizes the extent of a region in Θ where samples lie (unlike a volume, this does not impose rigid boundaries), its extensivity seems to be favorable. Consequently, we discuss $F^{-1} d(JJ) (= 2F^{-1} J dJ)$ rather than $F^{-1} J dJ$. Now, it is structurally well-justified (omitting the n - and N -direction of the diagram) to build an information theoretic Guggenheim scheme for a Gaussian likelihood, as given in Figure 1.

3.1. Derived quantities from Bayes partitions

Within this framework, Equation 6 is employed to derive counterparts of thermodynamic quantities. In the following, the expectation value of a random variable X is understood to be

$$\langle X \rangle = Z[T, J_\alpha]^{-1} \int d\mu X \exp\left(-\frac{1}{T} (\Phi(\theta) - J_\alpha \theta^\alpha)\right). \quad (36)$$

$-S$	$U(S, V)$	V	$-S$	$U(S, F^{-1})$	F^{-1}
$H(S, p)$		$F(T, V)$	$H(S, JJ)$		$F(T, F^{-1})$
$-p$	$G(T, p)$	T	$\frac{1}{2}JJ$	$G(T, JJ)$	T

Figure 1. The Guggenheim scheme of standard thermodynamics (at fixed N), on the left, and one possibility to construct the analogous Guggenheim scheme of information theory for a Gaussian likelihood (at fixed n and N), on the right. Intensive variables in blue, extensive variables in red.




Figure 2. Schematic changes of a univariate Gaussian (shaded region) and its corresponding potential (solid line), as given in equation (29), with different values of T and J . For simplicity, $F = 1$ is fixed.

In a Gibbs ensemble, the internal energy U , the enthalpy H and the entropy S of the parameter space configuration follow from the partition $Z[T, p] := Z[T, p, N = 1]$ as

$$H(S, p) = U + pV = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, p] \quad (37)$$

$$U(S, V) = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, p] - pV, \quad (38)$$

$$S(T, p) = \partial_T (T \ln Z[T, p]), \quad (39)$$

Analogously, for the previous identifications, we find (with $Z[T, J] := Z[T, J, n = \text{const}, N = 1]$),

$$H(S, J) = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, J] \quad (40)$$

$$U(S, F^{-1}) = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, J] + \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} JJ, \quad (41)$$

$$S(T, J) = \partial_T (T \ln Z[T, J]). \quad (42)$$

The result for the enthalpy H in Equation 40 coincides with the expectation value of the shifted potential $\langle \Phi_J \rangle = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, J, N]$, which follows directly using Equa-

tion 7. Employing Equation 29, we find

$$H = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, J] = \frac{nT}{2} - \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} JJ, \quad (43)$$

$$U = T^2 \partial_T \ln Z[T, J] + \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} JJ = \frac{nT}{2}, \quad (44)$$

$$S = \ln Z[T, J] + T \partial_T \ln Z = \frac{n}{2} (\ln 2\pi T + 1). \quad (45)$$

Clearly, the fact that $S \sim n \times h(T)$ (with h some function only dependent on the intensive T) confirms the extensivity of n in the information theoretical complex displayed in Figure 1. Interestingly, the result for U in Equation 44 is reminiscent of the internal energy $U = f k_B T / 2$ of a one-particle system in thermal equilibrium (with f the number of translational DOFs and k_B the Boltzmann constant). For $J \rightarrow 0 : H \rightarrow \langle \Phi \rangle = (nT/2) (= U)$.

The total differentials of S , H and U for Equation 29 turn out to be

$$dH = \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial S} \right)_{JJ} dS + \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial (JJ)} \right)_S d(JJ) \quad (46)$$

$$= \frac{n}{2} dT - \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ) \quad (47)$$

$$dU = \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial T} \right)_{F^{-1}} dT + \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial F^{-1}} \right)_T dF^{-1} = \frac{n}{2}. \quad (48)$$

$$dS = \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \right)_{JJ} dT + \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial (JJ)} \right)_T d(JJ) = \frac{n}{2T} dT. \quad (49)$$

Changes in H and S with respect to temperature changes scale with the variance of the (shifted) potential $\text{Var}(\Phi_J)_{\text{Gauss}} (= \text{Var}(\Phi)_{\text{Gauss}})$, which is defined by the parameter space dimension n (as well as T) in the Gaussian case, i.e.

$$\text{Var}(\Phi_J)_{\text{Gauss}} = \frac{nT^2}{2} (= \text{Var}(\Phi)_{\text{Gauss}}). \quad (50)$$

This is in line with expectations, as temperature changes modify the size of confidence regions in parameter space by altering the width of the governing potential. This concept is used to increase sampling efficiency in methods such as simulated annealing by accelerating the convergence of samplers into the parameter space potential's minima (Kirkpatrick et al. 1983). Moreover, the exclusive appearance of $\langle \theta \rangle$ in the derivatives with respect to J alludes to the ability of the "shift" in Φ_J to relocate the maximum of the posterior in parameter space.

Use of Equation 48 yields the caloric equation of state analogue,

$$dU = \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial T} \right)_{F^{\alpha\beta}, J} dT = \frac{n}{2} dT. \quad (51)$$

At this instance, the statistics equivalent of a thermodynamic heat capacity is inspected. In physics, the heat capacity at constant pressure or volume (C_p and C_v , respectively) measures the amount of thermal energy δQ necessary to foster a certain temperature change dT of the system. In thermodynamics, one defines

$$C_p := \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial T} \right)_p \quad \text{and} \quad C_v := \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial T} \right)_v. \quad (52)$$

For an ensemble of samplers subject to a likelihood as given

in Equation 26, the resulting heat capacity,

$$C_{JJ} = C_{F^{-1}} = \frac{n}{2}, \quad (53)$$

is once again reminiscent of the scaling of C_p with the number of internal DOFs f of a monoatomic gas. Most importantly, C_p and C_V are always extensive. Consequently, Equation 53 confirms the previous assumption of n being extensive in this structure.

Lastly, please note that the generalization of these results to a non-Gaussian setting is highly non-trivial. In particular, the identification of conjugate variables can only ever be possible when there is a close form expression for derivatives of Equation 6.

4. REVERSIBLE PROCESSES IN STATISTICAL INFERENCE

The thermodynamic perspective on statistical inference motivates the interpretation of Bayes-updates in analogy to thermodynamic processes. The first law of thermodynamics $dU = \delta W + \delta Q$ describes the change in a system's internal energy U as the sum of contributions from work/mechanical energy δW as well as heat transfer/thermal energy δQ . Of course, in an information theoretic picture, any physics analogy has limitations: We note that in the statistics setting at hand, the enthalpy-analogue H (see Equation 43) structurally assumes the role that is played by the internal energy U in a canonical thermodynamic ensemble. Based on this, this section discusses the splitting of dH in information theoretic variants of work δW and heat δQ , respectively. The anatomy presented in Figure 1 is employed, keeping in mind that the Bayes partition in Equation 29 is representative of a Gibbs-like ensemble governed by a quadratic potential. Once again, the alteration of the sampler configuration in light of new data is understood in parallel to a transition between two states of a thermodynamic system. These observations could potentially offer a novel view on different sampling modes in the context of Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. However, more extensive investigation is needed to make this connection plain.

“ADIABATIC” PROCESS

To begin with, it is instructive to discuss the analogue of a reversible adiabatic process. A process that is both reversible and adiabatic is called isentropic. In thermodynamics, a process is called *reversible* if it can be undone without lasting change to the environment. Crucially, reversibility does not imply adiabaticity and vice versa. For an isentropic process the change in H is constituted solely by the work expended in the transition, i.e.

$$dH = dW \quad \text{and} \quad \delta Q = TdS \stackrel{!}{=} 0. \quad (54)$$

Consider an isentropic process, brought about by a change $dF^{-1} \neq 0$ with $d(JJ) = 0$. Evidently, the true (likelihood) posterior is only recovered when we set $J = 0$ (before) after statistical inference. Accordingly, an isochoric transition at zero potential shift would enforce faithfulness to the true distributions at every step of the inference process (which is a stronger constraint than the usual $J_{\text{init.}} = 0 \wedge J_{\text{fin.}} = 0$). For an isentropic process, one finds

$$dT = -\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial T}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial F^{-1}}\right) dF^{-1}. \quad (55)$$

Combining Equation 54 and Equation 55 results in

$$dH = dW = \left(\left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial F^{-1}}\right) - \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial T}\right) \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial T}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial F^{-1}}\right) \right) dF^{-1}. \quad (56)$$

For Equation 43, this turns out to be

$$dH = dW = -\frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ) (= -F^{-1} J dJ), \quad (57)$$

whose structure is reminiscent of the thermodynamic *canonical* result $dU = dW = +pdV$. Notably, the sign difference is ultimately due to the different way in which J appears in the Bayes partition: $\exp(-J\theta)$ rather than $\exp(+pV)$ in thermodynamics.

“ISOTHERMAL” PROCESS

Secondly, a reversible isothermal process ($dT = 0$, $dF^{-1} \neq 0$, $d(JJ) \neq 0$) is discussed. Similarly, in thermodynamics, such a process articulates as a change in both p and V . From a Bayesian point of view, any inference process only results in the true posterior when $T = 1$ is restored or fixed throughout sampling. For a reversible process, the 2nd law of thermodynamics implies that $\delta Q = TdS$. For the reversible isothermal case one finds

$$dH \stackrel{\text{rev.}}{=} TdS + \delta W \quad (58)$$

$$\stackrel{(dT=0)}{=} T \left(\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial F^{-1}}\right)_T dF^{-1} + \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial J}\right)_T dJ \right) + \delta W, \quad (59)$$

which results in

$$dH = dW = -\left(\frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ) + \frac{1}{2} JJ dF^{-1} \right) \quad (60)$$

for a reversible isothermal process in an open system. This result resembles the internal energy change for an open canonical system $dU = pdV + Vdp$ in thermodynamics. Clearly, p and V can both change independently only if one allows for an open system.

“ISOBARIC” PROCESS

Consider a process occurring under $d(JJ) = 0$. Then

$$dH \stackrel{(dF^{-1}=0)}{=} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial T}\right)_{JJ, F^{-1}} dT + \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial JJ}\right)_{T, F^{-1}} d(JJ) \quad (61)$$

$$= \delta Q + \delta W. \quad (62)$$

This leads to

$$\delta Q = \frac{n}{2} dT = C_{JJ} dT \quad \text{and} \quad (63)$$

$$\delta W = dH - \frac{n}{2} dT = 0. \quad (64)$$

In a thermodynamic Gibbs ensemble, the pressure p structurally takes the role that the volume V has in a canonical ensemble. Thus, the structure of an "isobaric" process in this information theoretic Gibbs-like ensemble is comparable to the structure of the thermodynamic *isochoric* process in a canonical ensemble. Such an isochoric process performed on an ideal gas (a canonical ensemble) is characterized by a change $dU = dQ = C_V dT$ and $dW = 0$, which evidently parallels Equation 63 and Equation 64.

“ISOCHORIC” PROCESS

At this point, the analysis turns to a reversible isochoric process ($dF^{-1} = 0$), where the change in the system’s state is brought about by $dT \neq 0$. In this case,

$$dH \stackrel{(dF^{-1}=0)}{=} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial T} \right)_{JJ, F^{-1}} dT + \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial JJ} \right)_{T, F^{-1}} d(JJ) \quad (65)$$

$$= \delta Q + \delta W. \quad (66)$$

Again using reversibility ($TdS = \delta Q$), this results in

$$\delta Q = \frac{n}{2} dT = C_{JJ} dT (= C_{F^{-1}} dT), \quad (67)$$

$$\delta W = dH - \frac{n}{2} dT = -\frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ). \quad (68)$$

Using the same chain of reasoning as for the previous process, this result is compared to the structure of an isobaric process in a thermodynamic canonical ensemble. In physics, such a process occurs under $\delta Q = C_p dT$ and $\delta W = p dV$, which matches the shape of the information theoretic $\delta Q = C_{F^{-1}} dT$, $\delta W = -\frac{1}{2} F^{-1} d(JJ)$.

Recall that according to Jaynes (1957), the laws of thermodynamics are actually the laws of information itself and thus have validity outside of any physics application. This Section showed that it is possible to construct “information theoretic processes” in parallel to thermodynamic processes. Hence, this result is interpreted as a confirmation of (Jaynes 1957).

5. GRAND GIBBS ENSEMBLE

The transfer of the above concepts to a grand ensemble governed by Equation 69, i.e. for $dN \neq 0$, is straightforward: The joint partition function of N non-interacting samplers in an n -dimensional parameter space is given by $Z[T, J, N] = Z[T, J, N = 1]^N$. Instead of controlling the number of samplers N , it is possible to introduce a chemical potential μ , enabling the definition of the partition $\Xi[T, J, \mu]$,

$$\Xi[T, J, \mu] = \sum_N \frac{1}{N!} Z[T, J, N = 1]^N \exp\left(\frac{\mu N}{T}\right) \quad (69)$$

$$= \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{\mu}{T}\right) Z[T, J, N = 1]\right), \quad (70)$$

with a Gibbs-factor $1/N!$. Effectively, the total number of samplers N is replaced by μ by way of a Laplace-transform. Importantly, Herzog et al. (2023) thoroughly discuss the use of such an ensemble in MCMC sampling. The associated potential is defined as $\Omega(T, J, \mu) = -T \ln \Xi[T, J, \mu]$. Importantly, Herzog et al. (2023) note that

$$\langle N \rangle = \exp\left(\frac{\mu}{T}\right) Z[T, J, N = 1]. \quad (71)$$

In accordance with Equation 40 and Equation 39, respectively, the enthalpy and entropy for the grand ensemble follow as

$$H_G[T, J, \mu] := T^2 \partial_T \ln \Xi = \langle N \rangle (H - \mu), \quad (72)$$

$$U_G[T, J, \mu] := T^2 \partial_T \ln \Xi + \mu N = \langle N \rangle H, \quad (73)$$

$$S_G[T, J, \mu] := \partial_T (T \ln \Xi) = \frac{\langle N \rangle}{T} (T + H - \mu). \quad (74)$$

with $H := H(N = 1)$ the one-sampler case. Using Equation 74, we can write

$$\Omega(T, J, \mu) = H_G[T, J, \mu] - T S_G[T, J, \mu] \quad (75)$$

$$= U_G - T S_G - \mu \langle N \rangle, \quad (76)$$

which fulfills the homogeneity constraints for an extensive sampler number $\langle N \rangle$ and an intensive chemical potential analogue μ . In the Gaussian case (see Equation 29), the enthalpy and entropy explicitly read

$$H_G[T, J, \mu] := \langle N \rangle \left(\frac{nT}{2} - \frac{1}{2} F^{-1} JJ - \mu \right), \quad (77)$$

$$S_G[T, J, \mu] := \langle N \rangle \left(1 + \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2T} F^{-1} JJ - \frac{\mu}{T} \right). \quad (78)$$

In conclusion, the transfer of thermodynamic ideas to information theory naturally generalizes to a configuration with variable sampler number $dN \neq 0$.

6. RELATIVE ENTROPIES FROM BAYES PARTITIONS

This section relates Bayes partitions to different concepts of relative entropy. In this, a temperature dependence of the likelihood and the prior is chosen¹

$$Z[T, (\dots)] = \int d\mu(\theta) \mathcal{L}(y|\theta)^{\frac{1}{T}} \pi(\theta)^{\frac{T+1/T}{2}}. \quad (79)$$

At $T = 1$, this expression recovers the Bayes evidence, as given in Equation 2. The information entropy $S(T) = \partial_T (T \ln Z[T, (\dots)])$ follows as

$$S(T) = \ln Z[T, (\dots)] + T \partial_T \ln Z[T, (\dots)] \quad (80)$$

$$= \ln Z + \frac{1}{Z} \int d\mu(\theta) \mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{T}} \pi^{\frac{T+1/T}{2}} \left(\left(T - \frac{1}{T} \right) \frac{\ln \pi}{2} - \frac{\ln \mathcal{L}}{T} \right). \quad (81)$$

At this point, we set $T = 1$ and employ Bayes’ theorem, which leads to

$$S(T = 1) = \ln p(y) - \int d\mu(\theta) \frac{\mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \pi(\theta)}{p(y)} \ln \mathcal{L}(y|\theta) \quad (82)$$

$$= \ln p(y) - \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y) \left(\ln p(y) + \ln \frac{p(\theta|y)}{\pi(\theta)} \right) \quad (83)$$

$$= - \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y) \ln \frac{p(\theta|y)}{\pi(\theta)} = -D_{KL}[p(\theta|y), \pi(\theta)]. \quad (84)$$

Thus, at $T = 1$, the entropy in Equation 80 coincides with the surprise statistic mentioned above. It quantifies the amount of information obtained in an inference process, i.e. the inherent surprise of the outcome in contrast to the a priori knowledge.

Aside from the Shannon entropy, consider the class of Rényi entropies (Rényi 1960; Harremoës 2006),

$$S_\alpha := -\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y)^\alpha, \quad (85)$$

¹ The precise choice of variables does not influence the arguments in this Section. Therefore, the brackets (\dots) are again used to indicate any other control variables which must not be specified in order to reach the result of Section 6.

which are akin to the structure of a thermodynamic potential such as $G(T, (\dots)) := -T \ln \int d\mu(\theta) (p(\theta|y)p(y))^{1/T}$. Here, $0 < \alpha < \infty$ is a parameter ($\alpha \neq 1$). Using Bayes' theorem as well as an exponential likelihood and prior $\mathcal{L}\pi \sim \exp(-\Phi_J(\theta))$ (see Equation 7), one can write

$$p(\theta|y)_{T_0} = Z[T_0, (\dots)]^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{T_0} \Phi_J(\theta)\right), \quad (86)$$

for a variable temperature T_0 . The true posterior is recovered for $T_0 = 1$. It is a well-known fact that the Rényi entropy recovers the Shannon entropy for $\alpha = 1$. We wish to reproduce this result from the viewpoint of Bayes partitions: Substituting Equation 86 into the definition of the Rényi entropy yields

$$S_\alpha(T_0) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \int d\mu(\theta) Z[T_0, (\dots)]^{-\alpha} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{T_0} \Phi_J(\theta)\right). \quad (87)$$

Baez (2022) realized that the scaling with α and T_0 suggests the definition of a new temperature as $T := (T_0/\alpha)$. With this definition, Equation 87 leads to

$$S_\alpha(T_0) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left(\ln \int d\mu(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{T_0} \Phi(\theta)\right) - \alpha \ln Z[T_0] \right) \quad (88)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (\ln Z[T_0/\alpha] - \alpha \ln Z[T_0]) \quad (89)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-T_0/T} (\ln Z[T] - (T_0/T) \ln Z[T_0]) \quad (90)$$

$$= \frac{G(T) - G(T_0)}{T - T_0}. \quad (91)$$

Crucially, there exists the so-called “ q -derivative” defined as

$$\left(\frac{dg}{dx}\right)_q := \frac{g(qx) - g(x)}{qx - x}, \text{ for } q \neq 1 \text{ and } x \neq 0. \quad (92)$$

Applying this to the above result yields

$$S_\alpha(T_0 = 1) = \frac{G(T_0/\alpha) - G(T_0)}{1/\alpha - 1} = \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial T}\right)_{1/\alpha} \Big|_{T_0=1}. \quad (93)$$

Use of l'Hôpital's rule shows that in the limit of $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, the q -derivative becomes $(\partial_x g)_{q=1} = (\partial_x g)$. In this limit, Equation 93 coincides with Shannon's information entropy S .

In summary, use of the q -derivative allows to write the more general Rényi entropy as a partial derivative of the Bayes partition's generating function $G = -\ln Z[T, (\dots)]$. Furthermore, this result recovers Shannon's entropy in the limit of $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, as expected (see also van Erven and Harremoës (2014); Baez and Fritz (2014)).

7. EFFECTIVE DIMENSIONALITY AND MODEL COMPLEXITY

Röver et al. (2022) showed that for an n -dimensional Gaussian distribution, the number of parameters $n = \dim \Theta$ follows from

$$\left|\partial_\beta \ln Z_G\right|_{\beta=1} = \left|\partial_\beta^2 \ln Z_G\right|_{\beta=1} = \frac{n}{2}, \quad (94)$$

where we use the inverse temperature $\beta := 1/T$ for notational simplicity. In light of the internal energy $U = (nT/2)$ given in Equation 44, this result appears quite intuitive. A

system governed by the entropy-maximising distribution² assumes its minimum energy U , which is

$$U_{\min} \Big|_{S \text{ max.} \leftrightarrow p=\text{Gauss}} (\beta = 1, J = 0) = \frac{n}{2}, \quad (95)$$

at $T = 1 = \beta$. In this case, U is solely defined by the number of parameters n . This result seems to parallel an exemplary thermodynamic system such as an ideal gas, whose internal energy scales with the number of DOFs of the gas, recovering equipartition. Crucially, for a non-Gaussian distribution, the first and second derivatives in Equation 94 no longer coincide.

This discrepancy is in accordance with an information geometric observation: a Gaussian family's statistical manifold has trivial, flat geometry³. Due to its flatness, this manifold (and thus the structure of its statistical model) can be communicated fully by one scalar n . The introduction of non-Gaussianities prompts the appearance of non-trivial geometric invariants, such as scalar curvature (Giesel et al. 2021). Therefore, the above discrepancy suggests that the scalar produced in Equation 94 is a diagnostic tool which entails more information about the statistical model (manifold) than just its dimension n .

These observations motivate the definition of an effective dimension n_{eff} as a measure of deviations from the (most random, thus entropy maximising) distribution. To do this, consider $\beta \neq 1$ and once again $Z_G[\beta, J] = \sqrt{(2\pi/\beta)^n} \exp\left(+\frac{\beta}{2} F^{-1} J J\right)$. Equation 53 gives the heat capacity analogue for a Gaussian distribution as

$$C_{\text{Gaussian}} := \beta^2 \partial_\beta^2 \ln Z_G \Big|_{J=0} = \frac{n}{2}. \quad (96)$$

Schosser et al. (2024b) show that the specific heat C is strictly positive for Bayes partitions, which is a consequence of an inequality for logarithmic averages. This is a desirable feature for n_{eff} , as it is intended to mimic a dimension. Given this result, it seems appropriate to define

$$n_{\text{eff}} := 2 C_{\text{non-Gaussian}} > 0, \quad (97)$$

which is strictly positive and possibly temperature-dependent. It is expected that $n_{\text{eff}} \leq n$, since the complexity of a sampler configuration is reduced as the appearance of higher-order cumulants marks the onset of a non-Gaussian posterior.

To inspect this, n_{eff} is derived for a weakly non-Gaussian partition function with

$$-\beta \frac{\chi^2}{2} = -\frac{\beta}{2} F_{\alpha\beta} \theta^\alpha \theta^\beta - \beta \sum_{k=3}^N \frac{1}{k!} C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} \theta^{\mu_1} \dots \theta^{\mu_k}. \quad (98)$$

Following the treatment in Röver et al. (2022), we use

$$Z = \int d\mu(\theta) \exp\left(-\beta \frac{\chi^2}{2} + \beta J_\alpha \theta^\alpha\right) \cong Z_G Z_{NG}, \quad (99)$$

² A Gaussian for the distributions over \mathbb{R} at fixed variance. We employ the Gaussian given in Equation 26.

³ In the standard KL-divergence-induced Riemannian geometry with the metric connection (the Levi-Civita connection) (Amari 2016; Giesel et al. 2021).

With Z_G given by Equation 29 and

$$Z_{NG} = \left[1 - \beta \sum_{k=3} \frac{1}{k!} C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{2} F^{\alpha\beta} J_\alpha J_\beta\right) \times \frac{\partial^k}{\partial J_{\mu_1} \dots \partial J_{\mu_k}} \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{2} F^{\alpha\beta} J_\alpha J_\beta\right) \right]. \quad (100)$$

Equation 97 and Equation 99 lead to

$$n_{\text{eff}} = 2\beta^2 \partial_\beta^2 \ln Z_G|_{J=0} + 2\beta^2 \partial_\beta^2 \ln Z_{NG}|_{J=0}, \quad (101)$$

which allows to write down the discrepancy $\Delta n := n - n_{\text{eff}}$, i.e.

$$\Delta n = 2\beta^2 \sum_{\substack{k=4 \\ k \text{ even}}} C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} \frac{1}{k!} \left(2\partial_\beta + \beta \partial_\beta^2 \right) \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \beta^{k/2} \prod_{\substack{s \in \pi \\ |s|=2}} \prod_{i, j \in s} F^{\mu_i \mu_j} \quad (102)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{k=4 \\ k \text{ even}}} C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} \frac{(k+2)}{2(k-1)!} \beta^{k/2+1} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \prod_{\substack{s \in \pi \\ |s|=2}} \prod_{i, j \in s} F^{\mu_i \mu_j}. \quad (103)$$

Notably, Δn is positive for $C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} > 0$ denoting higher-order, non-Gaussian cumulants. For $\Delta C := C_{\text{Gauss}} - C_{\text{non-Gauss}}$, we find

$$\Delta C = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{k=4 \\ k \text{ even}}} C_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k} \frac{(k+2)}{(k-1)!} \beta^{k/2+1} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \prod_{\substack{s \in \pi \\ |s|=2}} \prod_{i, j \in s} F^{\mu_i \mu_j}. \quad (104)$$

In this way, a difference ΔC in the analogue of the thermodynamic heat capacity can be linked to the appearance of non-Gaussian features of the posterior. From a technical viewpoint, note that only non-Gaussianities of even order contribute to n_{eff} in Equation 103, as indicated in the summation. This is a relic of the approximation used to solve the integral Z_{NG} before imposing $J = 0$ in n_{eff} . Physically, one could argue that in a purely parabolic potential described by the Fisher-matrix $F_{\mu\nu}$, every degree of freedom would carry equal amounts of thermal energy, as required by equipartition, irrespective of affine transformations that would reshape the potential $F_{\mu\nu} \theta^\mu \theta^\nu$. As such, the dimension n carries information about the number of degrees of freedom, which effectively reduces to n_{eff} smaller than n in the non-Gaussian case.

Lastly, it is worthwhile to examine the temperature scaling of the absolute difference $|\Delta n|$: for a non-Gaussianity of k -th order, one finds

$$|\Delta n| = |n - n_{\text{eff}}| \sim T^{-k/2-1} \quad (k > 3). \quad (105)$$

This is illustrated in Figure 3, where the magnitude of $|n - n_{\text{eff}}|$ decreases with increasing temperature T . This scaling behaviour may be due to the fact that for very high T , the samplers are extremely mobile and swirl around in parameter space with little sensitivity to the underlying potential. Being entropy-maximising by nature, this freedom will allow the system to gradually approach the most uninformative distribution possible, i.e. a Gaussian, effectively wiping out the difference between n_{eff} and n . Conversely, cooling or annealing to low T forces the samplers to assemble close to minima of the potential, such that their distribution is indicative of the potential landscape. As a consequence, the




Figure 3. Decrease of $|n - n_{\text{eff}}|$ with temperature T and even order of non-Gaussianity k . Here, the scaling is $T^{-k/2-1} \frac{(k+2)}{(k-1)!}$.

differences between Gaussian and non-Gaussian landscapes become very pronounced at low T .

Additionally, Figure 3 shows that the higher the order of the non-Gaussianity, the more quickly the difference between n and n_{eff} vanishes. Accordingly, turning up T increases the gaps between different orders of non-Gaussianities. Thus, “heating” allows to effectively limit the problem to the dominant, lowest-order non-Gaussianities, whilst “cooling” evens out the weighting of the different orders, permitting higher-orders to also contribute significantly.

8. COSMOLOGY APPLICATION

Finally, the partition function defined in Equation 6 and its derived formalism are applied to the distance-redshift relation of supernovae of type Ia from data compiled by Riess et al. (1998); Goobar and Leibundgut (2011). This data is used to constrain the matter density Ω_m and equation of state parameter w_0 of dark energy, and its likelihood allows to derive partition functions and information entropies (see Equation 42).

The distance modulus μ is defined as the difference between the apparent magnitude m and the absolute magnitude M at a certain scale factor a ,

$$\mu = m - M = 5 \log_{10}(d_L(a)) + 10, \quad (106)$$

with $d_L(a)$ the luminosity distance defined as

$$d_L(a) = \frac{c}{a} \int_a^1 da' \frac{1}{a'^2 H(a')}. \quad (107)$$

This distance measure depends on the scale factor a as well as the Hubble function $H(a)$, which is given by

$$H(a) := H_0^{-2} (\Omega_m a^{-3} + (1 - \Omega_m) a^{-3(1+w_0)}). \quad (108)$$

In this application, the Hubble constant is fixed to $H_0 = 70$ km/s/Mpc and a spatially flat spacetime is assumed. With these choices, the integral in Equation 107 has a closed-form solution involving the hypergeometric functions (see Arutjunjan et al. 2022; Röver et al. 2022). We use the




Figure 4. The Supernova posterior distribution of the matter density Ω_m and dark energy equation of state parameter w_0 . The 2σ -contour of the Gaussian approximation deviates from the true sampled posterior (blue).

Union2.1 data set (Suzuki et al. 2012; Kowalski et al. 2008; Amanullah et al. 2010) which includes SNIa distance moduli measurements at 580 redshifts. The likelihood is defined assuming Gaussian errors σ_i and independent measurements for simplicity,

$$\mathcal{L}(y | \Omega_m, w_0) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \left(\frac{\mu_i - \mu(a_i | \Omega_m, w_0)}{\sigma_i}\right)^2\right). \quad (109)$$

A uniform prior is chosen. In a next step, posterior samples are obtained using the emcee package (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). The resulting non-Gaussian posterior as well as a Gaussian approximation are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 5 shows the partition as a function of temperature. For $T = 1$, the Bayesian evidence can be recovered from the partition function. Using Bayes' theorem, one can write the partition function as

$$Z[T] = p(y)^{1/T} \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y)^{1/T}. \quad (110)$$

The evidence is derived numerically using the PyMultiNest package (Buchner et al. 2014; Feroz et al. 2009) which takes the likelihood $\mathcal{L}(y|\theta)$ and prior $\pi(\theta)$ as inputs. Since the Gaussian approximation shown in Figure 4 is really an approximation of the posterior samples, its likelihood is not easily accessible. Therefore, the evidence for the Gaussian approximation could not be calculated analytically by means of a density estimate of the posterior probability.

Importantly, Figure 5 shows that the partition function diverges rapidly for small temperature values which stems from the exponent $1/T$ of the evidence $p(y)$ in Equation 110. For high temperatures, conversely, this dependence results in the convergence of $Z[T]$ to a value near zero. In this limit, the evidence becomes approximately one, whilst the integral of the posterior scaled by the inverse temperature tends to the volume of the parameter space. Starting with




Figure 5. The generating function/ potential $\ln Z[T]$ of the Supernova posterior is given as a function of temperature. The value for $T = 1$ is marked by a vertical line, indicating the value of $\ln Z[T]$ with the Bayesian evidence $Z[T = 1]$.




Figure 6. The thermodynamic information entropy $S[T]$ as a function of temperature T is always higher for the Gaussian approximation (orange) than for its non-Gaussian counterpart (blue) - in accordance with the Gaussian distribution being entropy maximising for fixed variance. $T = 1$ marks the statistical case of information entropy.

Equation 110, we use the derived Gibbs free energy

$$G[T] = -T \ln Z[T] = -p(y) - T \ln \int d\mu(\theta) p(\theta|y)^{1/T}. \quad (111)$$

As described in Equation 42, the temperature derivative of $G(T)$ gives the information entropy S . Evaluating the derivative of the Bayes partition function using finite differencing yields the entropy as a function of T , as shown in Figure 6. In Figure 6, the entropy of the Gaussian approximation exceeds that of the posterior samples for all T , which illustrates the fact that the normal distribution maximises entropy at fixed variance. The entropy increases with higher T , which is to be expected, as the temperature effectively scales the covariance matrix. Here, higher T correspond to larger effective experimental uncertainties. This argument works in parallel to the λ -scaling in Equation 13. The difference between the Gaussian approximation and the exact samples decreases for high T , meaning that the non-Gaussianities' effect reduces in this limit. Crucially, this re-

	posterior samples	approximation (der.)	approximation (ana.)
S	-3.350 ± 0.004	-3.035 ± 0.008	-3.053 ± 0.008

Table 1

Information entropy $S[T = 1]$ for posterior samples and Gaussian approximation as temperature derivative of the Gibbs free energy in Equation 111. An analytical value for the Gaussian approximation is provided and falls within the two sigma interval of the value obtained by differentiation.

sult supports the central conclusion of Sect. 7, which found the difference between n and n_{eff} to increase, as the system undergoes “heating”. For $T = 1$, the statistical information entropy can be recovered and its value is shown in Table 1. As the covariance matrix for the Gaussian approximation is known, its entropy is calculated analytically and used as a validation of the entropy values obtained by temperature differentiation. The two entropies of the approximation do not only agree within 2σ , but the results is also in accordance with that a different numerical method based on normalising flows (Röspel et al. 2024, in preparation).

9. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Subject of this paper was the relation between information theory applied to Bayesian inference problems on one side and the thermodynamics of sampling processes on the other. Central to this analogy is the realisation that every sampling process has an analogue in statistical mechanics. Consequently, control variables of the sampling process can be understood in parallel to thermodynamical state variables. Jeffreys covolume, which was also presented as a diagnostic marker for an inference problem’s degeneracy, is used in all parameter space integrals to ensure the invariance of the volume element under reparameterizations (Amari 2016).

- (i) A parametric modelling effectively scales measurement uncertainties, granting access to the intermediate stages of a Bayes update. Changes in information entropy dS in light of new data are negative. The rate of change of the inherent “surprisal” in an outcome with a progressing Bayes update ($dD_{KL}/d\lambda$) is a well-defined quantity.
- (ii) Transfer of the Jarzynski equality to information theory yields the “work” expended in a Bayes update as a function of the log-likelihood, i.e. $W = -\lambda \ln \mathcal{L}$, at the current state λ of the update step.
- (iii) The transfer of statistical mechanics vocabulary to statistical inference can occur through Bayes partitions. An information theoretic analogue of the Guggenheim scheme for a Gaussian likelihood and uninformative prior suggests the inverse Fisher information $F^{\mu\nu}$ as an extensive measure of “system size”. The structure of the internal energy U and heat capacity analogue C match the respective results for a monoatomic ideal gas in statistical physics. Interestingly, the number of parameter space dimensions n assumes the position held by the number of internal DOFs in thermodynamics.
- (iv) An inspection of Bayes updates as thermodynamic processes shows that changes in “work” δW and “heat” δQ can be formulated meaningfully for a sampler ensemble in parameter space. The close resemblance to physics processes is interpreted as a high-level demonstration of the fundamental result by Jaynes (1957).

- (v) A specific temperature dependence of the Bayes partition (Equation 79) leads to the *surprise statistics*, i.e. the relative entropy between prior and posterior. Bayes partitions successfully recover Shannon’s information entropy from Rényi entropies by way of q -derivatives.
- (vi) An effective dimension n_{eff} (or equivalently an effective heat capacity C_{eff}) serves as an indicator of deviations from Gaussianity. Crucially, $n_{\text{eff}} (\leq n)$ is a measure of system complexity, which reduces as higher-order correlations appear. The effective dimension is maximized for the entropy-maximizing distribution, a Gaussian, in which case $n_{\text{eff}} = n$ and $C = (n/2)$. In the event of heating (increase in T), the difference $\Delta n = |n_{\text{eff}} - n|$ gradually vanishes, suggesting that overly mobile samplers lack sensitivity to detect differences in the underlying potential landscapes. Conversely, Δn increases with cooling, as the potentials imprint on the sampler distribution in much more stringency. The higher the order of non-Gaussianity, the more quickly its influence on the sampler ensemble drops off with T .
- (vii) The formalism is illustrated on the inference of the matter density parameter Ω_m and the dark energy equation of state parameter w_0 using a data set of SNIa distance moduli. The Gaussian approximation of the posterior deviates from the exact posterior (sampled using emcee), as anticipated. At $T = 1$, the Bayes partition coincides with the evidence that was determined using PyMultiNest. In the limit of high T , the Bayes partition approaches a constant value. Finite differencing with respect to T allows to access the information entropy S of the Gaussian, as well as of the exact posterior. The results agree with the entropy-maximization provided by a Gaussian distribution. Crucially, ΔS between the Gaussian and non-Gaussian distribution decreases with heating. Crucially, this finding separately confirms the result of Sect. 7, which found Δn to decrease with increasing T .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding information — This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2181/1 - 390900948 (the Heidelberg STRUCTURES Excellence Cluster). RMK acknowledges funding of the Stiftung der Deutschen Wirtschaft (Foundation of German Business) with funds from the Begabtenförderung of the BMBF (Federal Ministry of Education and Research’s scholarship programme for gifted students). HvC is supported by the Konrad Zuse School of Excellence in Learning and Intelligent Systems (ELIZA) through the DAAD programme Konrad Zuse Schools of Excellence in Artificial Intelligence, sponsored by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. We acknowledge the usage of the AI-clusters *Tom* and *Jerry* funded by the Field of Focus 2 of Heidelberg University.

Data availability — No new data resulted from this study.

REFERENCES

- E. T. Jaynes, Physical Review **106**, 620 (1957), ISSN 0031-899X, URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.106.620>.
S.-i. Amari, *Information Geometry and Its Applications*, vol. 194 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences* (Springer Japan, 2016), ISBN 978-4-431-55977-1 978-4-431-55978-8, URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-4-431-55978-8>.

- F. Nielsen, Entropy **22** (2020), ISSN 1099-4300, URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/22/10/1100>.
- F. Nielsen, Notices of the American Mathematical Society (2022), URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:245271344>.
- H. Jeffreys, *Theory of Probability* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, 1948), second edition ed.
- H. Jeffreys, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences **186**, 453 (1946), URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:19490929>.
- L. Röver, L. C. Bartels, and B. M. Schäfer, MNRAS **523**, 2027 (2022).
- S. Kirkpatrick, C. Gelatt, and M. Vecchi, Science (New York, N.Y.) **220**, 671 (1983).
- A. Lewis and S. Bridle, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 103511 (2002), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.66.103511>.
- B. Schosser, P. R. Mello, M. Quartin, and B. M. Schaefer, *Bayesian distances for quantifying tensions in cosmological inference and the surprise statistic* (2024a), 2402.19100, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19100>.
- C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2690 (1997), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.2690>.
- G. E. Crooks, Journal of Statistical Physics **90**, 1481 (1998), URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7014602>.
- O. C. O. Dahlsten, R. Renner, E. Rieper, and V. Vedral, New Journal of Physics **13**, 053015 (2011), ISSN 1367-2630, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/13/5/053015>.
- B. Schosser, T. Röspel, and B. M. Schaefer, *Markov walk exploration of model spaces: Bayesian selection of dark energy models with supernovae* (2024b), 2407.06259, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.06259>.
- M. P. Herzog, H. von Campe, R. M. Kuntz, L. Röver, and B. M. Schäfer, OJA **7** (2023), 2311.16218.
- A. Rényi, Proceedings of the fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematics, Statistics and Probability pp. 547–561 (1960), 1102.2098, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1102.2098>.
- P. Harremoës, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **365**, 57 (2006), ISSN 0378-4371, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2006.01.012>.
- J. C. Baez, Entropy **24**, 706 (2022), ISSN 1099-4300, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/e24050706>.
- T. van Erven and P. Harremoës, Transactions on Information Theory **60**, 3797 (2014), ISSN 0018-9448, 1557-9654, 1206.2459, URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.2459>.
- J. C. Baez and T. Fritz, arXiv e-prints 1402.3067 (2014), 1402.3067, URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.3067>.
- E. Giesel, R. Reischke, B. M. Schäfer, and D. Chia, JCAP **2021**, 005 (2021), ISSN 1475-7516, 2005.01057 [astro-ph, physics:gr-qc], URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.01057>.
- A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, et al., AJ **116**, 1009 (1998).
- A. Goobar and B. Leibundgut, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science **61**, 251 (2011), ISSN 0163-8998, 1545-4134, 1102.1431, URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.1431>.
- R. Arutjunjan, B. M. Schaefer, and C. Kreutz, *Constructing exact confidence regions on parameter manifolds of non-linear models* (2022), 2211.03421, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.03421>.
- N. Suzuki, D. Rubin, C. Lidman, G. Aldering, R. Amanullah, K. Barbary, L. Barrientos, J. Botyanski, M. Brodwin, N. Connolly, et al., The Astrophysical Journal **746**, 85 (2012).
- M. Kowalski, D. Rubin, G. Aldering, R. Agostinho, A. Amadon, R. Amanullah, C. Balland, K. Barbary, G. Blanc, P. J. Challis, et al., The Astrophysical Journal **686**, 749 (2008).
- R. Amanullah, C. Lidman, D. Rubin, G. Aldering, P. Astier, K. Barbary, M. Burns, A. Conley, K. Dawson, S. Deustua, et al., The Astrophysical Journal **716**, 712 (2010).
- D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, PASP **125**, 306 (2013), 1202.3665.
- J. Buchner, A. Georgakakis, K. Nandra, L. Hsu, C. Rangel, M. Brightman, A. Merloni, M. Salvato, J. Donley, and D. Kocevski, A&A **564**, A125 (2014), 1402.0004.
- F. Feroz, M. Hobson, and M. Bridges, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **398**, 1601 (2009).
- T. Röspel, A. Schlosser, and B. M. Schäfer (2024), in preparation.

This paper was built using the Open Journal of Astrophysics L^AT_EX template. The OJA is a journal which provides fast and easy peer review for new papers in the astro-ph section of the arXiv, making the reviewing process simpler for authors and referees alike. Learn more at <http://astro.theoj.org>.