

Bayesian calculus and predictive characterizations of extended feature allocation models

Mario Beraha¹, Federico Camerlenghi¹, and Lorenzo Ghilotti¹

¹Department of Economics, Management, and Statistics, University of Milano–Bicocca, 20126 Milano, Italy

Abstract

We introduce and study a unified Bayesian framework for extended feature allocations which flexibly captures interactions – such as repulsion or attraction – among features and their associated weights. We provide a complete Bayesian analysis of the proposed model and specialize our general theory to noteworthy classes of priors. This includes a novel prior based on determinantal point processes, for which we show promising results in a spatial statistics application. Within the general class of extended feature allocations, we further characterize those priors that yield predictive probabilities of discovering new features depending either solely on the sample size or on both the sample size and the distinct number of observed features. These predictive characterizations, known as “sufficientness” postulates, have been extensively studied in the literature on species sampling models starting from the seminal contribution of the English philosopher W.E. Johnson for the Dirichlet distribution. Within the feature allocation setting, existing predictive characterizations are limited to very specific examples; in contrast, our results are general, providing practical guidance for prior selection. Additionally, our approach, based on Palm calculus, is analytical in nature and yields a novel characterization of the Poisson point process through its reduced Palm kernel.

Keywords: Indian buffet process, Bayesian nonparametrics, Sufficientness postulates, Exchangeable feature probability function, Point processes

1 INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction of the celebrated Indian buffet process (IBP) by [Ghahramani and Griffiths \(2005\)](#), feature allocation models ([Broderick et al., 2013](#)) have garnered significant attention across diverse fields. In feature models, each observation Z_i may be represented by a finite set of \mathbb{X} -valued variables that capture different “characteristics” or “features” recurring with positive probability across observations. The seminal paper by [Thibaux and Jordan \(2007\)](#), that linked the IBP to a Bayesian nonparametric model governed by a beta process prior, opened the door to several extensions of the IBP by changing either the prior distribution or the likelihood. For instance, [Teh and Gorur \(2009\)](#) and [Broderick et al. \(2013\)](#) considered a prior based on the three-parameter beta process resulting in flexible power-law distributions, while [Zhou et al. \(2012, 2016\)](#); [Heaukulani and Roy \(2016\)](#) proposed different likelihoods allowing for associating each feature with a nonnegative measurement. A comprehensive analysis of such generalizations of the IBP when the prior is a completely random measure (CRM) can be found in [Broderick et al. \(2018\)](#) and [James \(2017\)](#). The distributional properties of most available feature models are typically characterized through a combinatorial object called exchangeable feature probability function (EFPF), introduced by [Broderick et al. \(2013\)](#) as an extension of the classical exchangeable partition probability function ([Pitman, 1995](#)), which describes the probability distribution of a sample from a species sampling sequence. The class of feature models that admit an EFPF in product form ([Battiston et al., 2018](#)) constitutes a notable and tractable example. Applications of feature models span broad fields, such as image segmentation ([Titsias, 2007](#); [Griffiths and Ghahramani, 2011](#); [Hu et al., 2012](#); [Broderick et al., 2014](#)), text mining ([Thibaux and Jordan, 2007](#); [Teh and Gorur, 2009](#)), matrix factorization ([Zhou et al., 2012, 2016](#)), network analysis ([Miller et al., 2009](#); [Ayed and Caron, 2021](#)), ecology ([Stolf and Dunson, 2024](#)), and microbiome studies ([James et al., 2025](#)). See also [Griffiths and Ghahramani \(2011\)](#) for further discussions.

[Masoero et al. \(2022\)](#) recently proposed to employ feature allocation models to study the so-called *unseen feature problem*: given a sample of n observations displaying K_n unique features, how many new features will be observed in an additional sample of size m ? This problem is a natural generalization of the classical *unseen species problem*, in which, given a sample from a population of animals composed of different species with unknown proportions, one seeks to predict the number of previously unobserved species in future sampling. The unseen species problem has a long history and several applications; see, for example, [Good and Toulmin \(1956\)](#); [Orlitsky et al. \(2016\)](#) for frequentist contributions and [Lijoi et al. \(2007\)](#); [Favaro et al. \(2009,](#)

2012, 2016) for Bayesian contributions. Applications of the unseen feature problem have been explored in the context of genomic studies (Masoero et al., 2021, 2022; Camerlenghi et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2022), user activity prediction in online A/B testing (Beraha et al., 2024; Masoero et al., 2024), and ecology (Ghilotti et al., 2024). In these contexts, predictive distributions for unobserved samples play a crucial role. Under a feature allocation model, the predictive distribution assigns positive probability to both previously observed (“old”) and unobserved (“new”) features. However, when using CRM priors, James (2017) showed that the distribution of the new features depends solely on the sample size. This constitutes a severe limitation of CRM priors in addressing the unseen feature problem, as the predictive distribution, and consequently, any Bayesian estimator becomes independent of other sample statistics.

1.1 EXISTING RESULTS ON SUFFICIENTNESS POSTULATES

The unsuitability of CRM priors in the unseen feature problem highlights the need for selecting a prior distribution based on specific properties of the induced predictive law. More broadly, we note that assigning a system of predictive distributions, rather than relying on the traditional likelihood and prior, is a common theme in the Bayesian community and has garnered significant attention in recent years. Indeed, as recently argued in, e.g., Fortini and Petrone (2012) and Fong et al. (2023), reasoning about predictive distributions often proves more intuitive than direct prior specification. Consequently, a systematic characterization of the classes of prior distributions that induce predictive laws with specific characteristics serves a dual purpose: advancing the theoretical understanding of complex, often nonparametric, models and offering practitioners a principled approach for prior elicitation.

In the context of species sampling models (Pitman, 1996), such predictive characterizations are known as *sufficientness postulates*, a concept originating from the contribution of the English philosopher W.E. Johnson in the 1920s for the symmetric Dirichlet distribution. See Zabell (1982) for an historical account. Several predictive characterizations have been established within species sampling models. Notable contributions include the works of Regazzini (1978) and Lo (1991), who provided postulates for the Dirichlet process, Zabell (2005) for the Pitman-Yor process (Pitman and Yor, 1997) and Bacallado et al. (2017) for the more general class of Gibbs-type priors (De Blasi et al., 2015). Within the species setting, Gnedin and Pitman (2005) showed that Gibbs-type priors coincide with stable Poisson-Kingman models, widely studied by Pitman (2003); moreover, Lijoi et al. (2008) characterized the normalized generalized gamma process (James, 2002; Prünster, 2002; Pitman, 2003; Lijoi et al., 2007) as the only normalized

completely random measure (Regazzini et al., 2003) that is also a Gibbs-type prior. Additional characterizations exist for neutral-to-right priors (Muliere and Walker, 1999) and Markov chains (Zabell, 1995; Rolles, 2003; Bacallado et al., 2013).

In contrast, predictive characterizations for feature allocation models remain considerably less explored, and only limited contributions are available. Camerlenghi and Favaro (2021) and Camerlenghi et al. (2023) focused on feature models under a scaled process prior (James et al., 2015). These processes are random measures obtained as suitable transformations of CRMs. They introduce stronger dependence across the measure weights and, when used in the context of feature models, can produce predictive distributions that depend on the entire sampling information. As shown by Camerlenghi et al. (2023), only scaled processes derived from stable subordinators yield predictive distributions for new features that depend solely on the sample size and the number of distinct features in the sample. While these findings provide valuable insights into scaled processes, they offer limited guidance for the broader challenge of prior selection in feature allocation models. Indeed, as Ghilotti et al. (2024) demonstrated, predictions depending on both sample size and the number of distinct features extend beyond scaled processes to feature allocations exhibiting an EFPF in product form (Battiston et al., 2018). This highlights the need for a more comprehensive investigation of sufficientness postulates in the context of feature allocation models.

1.2 OUR CONTRIBUTIONS

This paper introduces a unified Bayesian framework for studying extended feature allocation models. Here, “extended” refers to models that incorporate feature interactions, such as repulsiveness or attractiveness, in contrast to traditional feature allocation approaches that assume independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) features. Moreover, the proposed class of models also allows for arbitrary dependencies across feature weights. Our extended framework offers several key advantages. First, it provides substantially greater modeling flexibility despite only marginally increasing the analytical complexity compared to available models. Second, incorporating repulsiveness in feature priors has important practical applications, mainly when features are latent rather than directly observed, such as in image segmentation and latent feature modeling. The growing literature on repulsive mixture models demonstrates that repulsive priors typically lead to more interpretable posterior inference (see, e.g., Petralia et al., 2012; Xie and Xu, 2019; Cremaschi et al., 2024; Beraha et al., 2023, and the references therein). Third, our

framework enables novel applications beyond traditional domains, as we demonstrate through applications in spatial statistics.

We derive explicit closed-form expressions for the marginal, posterior, and predictive distribution under extended feature allocation models, which hold without making assumptions on the prior distribution, therefore generalizing the treatment in [James \(2017\)](#); [Broderick et al. \(2018\)](#); [Ghilotti et al. \(2024\)](#). Based on the expression of the predictive distribution, we establish two sufficientness postulates for the extended feature models, which characterize priors that lead to predictions for the unseen features depending either only on the sample size or on both the sample size and the number of distinct features. In particular, we show that the former case characterizes the class of CRMs, while the latter pertains to a much broader class of random measures built from mixed Poisson and mixed binomial point processes. See [Section 2](#) for the definition of these processes. We specialize the general Bayesian analysis for some notable classes of priors, including Poisson, mixed Poisson, and mixed binomial processes. Our treatment and proofs heavily rely on point process theory and Palm calculus, providing new tools for studying feature allocation models. As a byproduct of our contribution, we also obtain a novel characterization of the Poisson process.

Finally, we discuss the practical application of our framework in spatial statistics. We demonstrate that an extended feature model based on a determinantal point process ([Hough et al., 2006](#); [Lavancier et al., 2015](#)) can be used to estimate the size of a forest from partial observations of tree locations, as well as to locate the unseen trees.

1.3 OUTLINE OF THE PAPER

The paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we define the framework of extended feature models and review key concepts from point process theory necessary to our treatment. In [Section 3](#), we develop a general Bayesian theory for extended feature allocation models, without any assumption on the prior distribution. In [Section 4](#), we provide the two sufficientness postulates, and we discuss strategies to enrich the models' predictive distributions. [Section 5](#) applies the general results from [Section 3](#) to specific classes of priors, with emphasis on a determinantal point process-based model. [Section 6](#) demonstrates the key advantage of this latter model in both simulated and real-world spatial statistics scenarios. The paper ends with a discussion. Proofs, additional results, and further details on the illustrations are collected in the supplementary material.

2 POINT PROCESS FORMULATION OF EXTENDED FEATURE ALLOCATION MODELS

2.1 BACKGROUND ON POINT PROCESSES

Point processes play a central role in the general definition of extended feature allocation models. Thus, here we remind the main notions of point process theory needed in the following sections, among which Palm calculus. A rigorous treatment can be found in [Daley and Vere-Jones \(2008\)](#) or [Baccelli et al. \(2020\)](#). See also [Kallenberg \(1984\)](#) for some further intuition.

First, let us recall the formal definition of a point process. Indicate by \mathbb{X} a Polish space equipped with the corresponding Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{X} . We say that a measure ν on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ is *locally finite* if $\nu(B) < \infty$ for any relative compact set $B \in \mathcal{X}$. Denote by $(\mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{X}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}})$ the space of locally finite counting measures on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$, equipped with the corresponding Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}}$. A point process Φ on the space \mathbb{X} is a measurable map from an underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ taking values in $(\mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{X}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}})$ so that $\Phi(B)$ is a nonnegative integer almost surely (a.s.), for any relatively compact Borel set B . Let $\mathbf{P}_{\Phi} := \mathbb{P} \circ \Phi^{-1}$ denote the probability distribution of Φ , which is uniquely characterized by the Laplace functional $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}(f) := \mathbb{E}[\exp\{-\int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\Phi(dx)\}]$, for any measurable function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.

Any point process Φ can be represented as $\Phi = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{X_j}$, where $(X_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is a sequence of random variables taking values in \mathbb{X} , and δ_{X_j} denotes the Dirac delta mass at X_j . In the sequel, we will deal with *simple* point processes, for which the atoms of Φ are a.s. distinct, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(X_i = X_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$. The mean measure M_{Φ} associated with a point process Φ is defined as $M_{\Phi}(B) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(B)]$ for any Borel set $B \in \mathcal{X}$. The *k-th order factorial* moment measure $M_{\Phi^{(k)}}$ of Φ is the mean measure of the *k-th factorial power* of Φ , i.e., of the point process $\Phi^{(k)}$ defined as:

$$\Phi^{(k)} := \sum_{\substack{\neq \\ (j_1, \dots, j_k)}} \delta_{(X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_k})},$$

where the symbol \neq over the summation means that the sum is extended over all pairwise distinct indexes. Therefore, $M_{\Phi^{(k)}}(B) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi^{(k)}(B)]$, where B is a Borel set in \mathbb{X}^k .

We now introduce two of the most relevant classes of point processes in the paper.

Example 1 (Poisson and mixed Poisson processes). Let ν be a locally finite measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$. We say that Φ is a Poisson process on \mathbb{X} with intensity measure ν if, for any $B \in \mathcal{X}$, $\Phi(B)$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $\nu(B)$, and for every collection of disjoint Borel sets

B_1, \dots, B_k the random variables $\Phi(B_1), \dots, \Phi(B_k)$ are independent, for any $k \geq 1$. In the sequel, we will write $\Phi \sim \text{PP}(\nu)$. In this example, the mean measure M_Φ equals ν and the k -th factorial moment measure satisfies $M_\Phi^{(k)} = \nu^k$.

Second, to define a mixed Poisson process, let γ be a positive finite random variable with law f_γ on \mathbb{R}_+ , we say that Φ is a mixed Poisson process directed by f_γ if $\Phi | \gamma \sim \text{PP}(\gamma\nu)$ and $\gamma \sim f_\gamma$. We will write $\Phi \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$. It is easy to see that the k -th factorial moment measure satisfies $M_\Phi^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[\gamma^k] \nu^k$.

Example 2 (Binomial and mixed binomial processes). Let ν be a probability measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$, and consider a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $(X_j)_{j \geq 1}$ with common distribution ν . Then, for any integer $m \geq 1$, the point process $\Phi_m := \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_{X_j}$ is termed a binomial point process, denoted as $\Phi_m \sim \text{BP}_m(\nu)$.

Let M be a random variable taking values in the set of nonnegative integers with probability mass function q_M (possibly degenerate), independent of $(X_j)_{j \geq 1}$. We say that the point process $\Phi = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{X_j}$ is a mixed binomial process and we write $\Phi \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$. It is easy to see that the k -th factorial moment measure equals $M_\Phi^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[M^{(k)}] \nu^k$, where $\mathbb{E}[M^{(k)}]$ is the k -th factorial moment of M , i.e., $\mathbb{E}[M^{(k)}] = \mathbb{E}[M(M-1) \cdots (M-k+1)]$. With a slight abuse of notation, we will also write $\Phi \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$ even when ν is a generic finite measure, with the understanding that this is interpreted after normalization.

Our mathematical treatment of extended feature allocations is based on Palm calculus. Hence, we now review key definitions and concepts, following the notation of [Baccelli et al. \(2020\)](#). The Campbell measure \mathcal{C}_Φ of Φ is a measure on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{X}$ defined as $\mathcal{C}_\Phi(C \times L) := \mathbb{E}[\Phi(C) \mathbb{1}(\Phi \in L)]$ for $C \in \mathcal{X}$ and $L \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{X}$. Provided that the mean measure M_Φ is σ -finite, the Palm kernel $\{\mathbf{P}_\Phi^x\}_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$ of Φ is defined as the (a.s.) unique disintegration probability kernel of \mathcal{C}_Φ with respect to M_Φ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_\Phi(C \times L) = \int_C \mathbf{P}_\Phi^x(L) M_\Phi(dx).$$

Formally, the Palm kernel is an extension of the concept of regular conditional distribution to the case of point processes. Informally, \mathbf{P}_Φ^x can be understood as the probability distribution of Φ given that Φ has an atom at x . A point process Φ_x with distribution \mathbf{P}_Φ^x is called the *Palm version of Φ at $x \in \mathbb{X}$* , and of course $\mathbb{P}(\Phi_x(\{x\}) \geq 1) = 1$, i.e., x is a trivial atom of Φ_x . As a consequence, one can define the point process $\Phi_x^! := \Phi_x - \delta_x$, which is called the *reduced Palm version of Φ at $x \in \mathbb{X}$* , whose associated reduced Palm kernel is indicated by $\mathbf{P}_{\Phi^!}^x$. In a similar fashion, under the assumption that the k -th factorial moment measure $M_\Phi^{(k)}$ is σ -finite, it is

possible to construct the family of k -th order Palm distributions $\{\mathbf{P}_{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}^k}$, and the generic probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}$ can be interpreted as the distribution of Φ given that $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ are atoms of Φ . Again, by removing the trivial atoms (x_1, \dots, x_k) , we obtain the reduced Palm distributions $\mathbf{P}_{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}!}$, namely the probability law of

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^! := \Phi_{\mathbf{x}} - \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_{x_j}.$$

For the remainder of the paper, we denote by \mathbb{X} the space of all possible feature labels. The point processes central to our statistical modeling, introduced in the next section, are defined on the product space $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$.

2.2 EXTENDED FEATURE ALLOCATION MODELS

Let $(X_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{X} -valued random variables, hereafter interpreted as “feature labels”. An extended feature allocation model is a stochastic model for observations $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ such that each Z_i is characterized by its expressed features, or equivalently by the sequence of pairs $((A_{i,j}, X_j))_{j \geq 1}$, where $A_{i,j} = 1$ if the feature X_j belongs to the i -th individual, $A_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. Equivalently, we can represent each Z_i as a point process on \mathbb{X} , namely

$$Z_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} A_{i,j} \delta_{X_j}. \quad (1)$$

We assume that, for any $j \geq 1$, the $A_{i,j}$ ’s are conditionally i.i.d. Bernoulli variables with a strictly positive random probability S_j , which entails both exchangeability of the Z_i ’s and regularity of the feature allocation (Broderick et al., 2013). Namely, no feature appears in only a single observation within $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$, or, equivalently, if a label is observed in some individual, then it is observed in infinitely many individuals with probability one.

The feature labels X_j ’s and parameters S_j ’s, i.e., the probability of displaying feature X_j , are collected in the simple point process on $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$ defined by $\Psi := \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X_j, S_j)}$ or in its functional

$$\mu(B) = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} s \mathbb{1}_B(x) \Psi(dx ds), \quad B \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_B$ denotes the indicator function of the Borel set B . We say that Z_i in (1) is a Bernoulli process with parameter μ , indicated as $Z_i \sim \text{BeP}(\mu)$. According to our point process formulation, we observe that Z_i in (1) is obtained by first thinning Ψ with retention function $p(x, s) = s$ and then removing the second component. Summing up, we are dealing with the

following statistical model

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i | \mu &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{BeP}(\mu), \\ \mu &\sim \mathcal{Q}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where \mathcal{Q} is the law of μ . In other terms, $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ is a sequence of exchangeable observations with de Finetti measure \mathcal{Q} .

We call model (3) an *extended feature allocation model*. Here, extended refers to the generality of the prior \mathcal{Q} , compared to the previous proposals in the literature. Indeed, previous models focused exclusively on i.i.d. feature labels. Moreover, the distributions for the jumps $(S_j)_{j \geq 1}$ previously considered were based either on the Poisson process or suitable transformations. By contrast, we allow for arbitrary interactions among the points of Ψ . For instance, the feature labels could exhibit a repulsive or attractive behavior, or the weights could depend on all the feature labels.

2.3 RELATED MODELS

Extended feature allocation models can be used as feature allocation models (Broderick et al., 2013). In this context, data contain information about sharing some observed features among the sampled individuals, which can be mathematically formalized as a *feature allocation*, namely a sequence of non-empty sets. Indeed, consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from (3), and suppose that it contains $K_n = k$ features with labels x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* . One can recover the associated feature allocation $F_n = (B_{n,1}, \dots, B_{n,K_n})$, where the set $B_{n,\ell}$ contains the indexes of the individuals exhibiting the ℓ -th feature, with label x_ℓ^* , as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Feature allocation models describe probability distributions on the object F_n . Remarkably, extended feature allocation models induce the entire class of regular feature allocation models admitting an EFPF. See Broderick et al. (2013) for the properties of this probabilistic object.

Another class of related model is the one of *trait processes* (Campbell et al., 2018; Masoero et al., 2018; James, 2017), that generalize model (3) by assuming $Z_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} A_{i,j} \delta_{X_j}$ where $A_{i,j}$ are integer or real-valued random variables. Consequently, the weights of the random measure μ might not need to be restricted on $(0, 1]$. Examples of trait processes include the beta negative binomial process where the $A_{i,j}$'s follow a negative binomial distribution and μ is distributed as a beta process. See Broderick et al. (2014) and Heaukulani and Roy (2016) for a detailed treatment. We finally mention that there exists a generalization of the EFPF to trait allocation models, called exchangeable trait probability function (Campbell et al., 2018).

3 BAYESIAN ANALYSIS OF EXTENDED FEATURE MODELS

In the present section, we provide the full Bayesian analysis of the class of extended feature allocation models. We focus on the statistical model (3) to describe the marginal distribution of a sample, the predictive structure of the next observation, and the posterior representation of the underlying measure μ . Our results are instrumental in proving the sufficientness postulates of Section 4, but they are also interesting *per se*, as showcased in the application (cf. Section 6).

Throughout the rest of the paper, we assume that the k -th factorial moment measures of Ψ , denoted as $M_\Psi^{(k)}$, are σ -finite for all $k \geq 1$. This is a very mild assumption (for instance, it is verified by all feature allocation models previously considered in the literature) and is essential for the existence of the k -th order Palm distributions. Furthermore, under this assumption, the measure disintegration theorem (Kallenberg, 2021, Theorem 3.4) entails

$$M_\Psi^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s}) = \rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}) \tilde{m}_\xi^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}), \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{m}_\xi^{(k)}(\cdot)$ is a σ -finite measure *equivalent* to $M_\Psi^{(k)}(\cdot \times (0, 1]^k)$, i.e., both measures are absolutely continuous with respect to each other, and $\rho^{(k)}$ is a kernel from \mathbb{X}^k to $(0, 1]^k$.

Remarkably, another common assumption for feature allocation models is that any subject displays a.s. a finite number of features, meaning $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s.. We provide some considerations on this hereafter.

Remark 1. The property $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. is always guaranteed when Ψ has a.s. a finite number of points, for example, when Ψ is a mixed binomial process. Some considerations are needed for priors which entail an infinite number of points for Ψ . Since Z_i is obtained from thinning Ψ and discarding the second component, it follows that the mean measure of any Z_i is $M_Z(B) = \int_{(0,1]} s M_\Psi(B \times ds)$, $B \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, a sufficient condition for $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. stems from $\mathbb{E}[Z_i(\mathbb{X})] < \infty$, which corresponds to $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s M_\Psi(dx ds) < \infty$. However, this is not a necessary condition in general. It can be proved that a necessary condition on the mean measure of Ψ to have $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. is the following:

$$\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s) M_\Psi(dx ds) = \infty.$$

See Proposition S1 for the formal statement and proof. Notably, if Ψ is a Poisson process with (infinite) mean measure ν or a mixed Poisson $\text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, then the condition $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s \nu(dx ds) < \infty$ is both necessary and sufficient for $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s., as stated in Proposition S2. We defer to Proposition S3 further implications of the assumption $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. under Poisson processes.

3.1 GENERAL FORMULAS: MARGINAL, POSTERIOR AND PREDICTIVE DISTRIBUTIONS

We start by describing the marginal distribution of a sample $\mathbf{Z} := (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ from an extended feature model as in (3). The proofs are based on an application of Palm calculus (Baccelli et al., 2020) and deferred to Section S4.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathbf{Z} be a sample from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (2). The probability that \mathbf{Z} displays k features labeled $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*)$ with corresponding vector of frequency counts $\mathbf{m} := (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ is*

$$\int_{(0,1)^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^! (dz dt)} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k s_{\ell}^{m_{\ell}} (1 - s_{\ell})^{n - m_{\ell}} \rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*) \cdot \tilde{m}_{\xi}^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}^*),$$

where $\rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{m}_{\xi}^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x})$ are defined as in (4), and, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}^k$ and $\mathbf{s} \in (0, 1]^k$, $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}}^!$ is the reduced Palm version of Ψ at $((x_1, s_1), \dots, (x_k, s_k))$.

We remark that the law of the induced feature allocation F_n is obtained by marginalizing out the labels \mathbf{x}^* and dividing by $k!$. Clearly, such a law admits EFPF for any extended feature model considered. This means that the induced law on F_n can always be expressed as a symmetric function of the frequency counts m_1, \dots, m_k . Moreover, all these extended feature models are regular by construction.

We proceed by describing the general posterior distribution of the point process Ψ , or equivalently the random measure μ , given a sample of size n from (3).

Theorem 2. *Let \mathbf{Z} be a sample from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (2). Further, suppose that \mathbf{Z} displays k features having labels $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*)$ with corresponding vector of frequency counts $\mathbf{m} := (m_1, \dots, m_k)$. Then, the posterior distribution of μ , conditionally on \mathbf{Z} , satisfies the distributional equality*

$$\mu | \mathbf{Z} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{\ell=1}^k S_{\ell}^* \delta_{x_{\ell}^*} + \mu', \tag{5}$$

where

(i) $\mathbf{S}^* := (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*)$ is a vector of positive random variables with joint distribution

$$f_{\mathbf{S}^*}(d\mathbf{s}) \propto \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^! (dz dt)} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k s_{\ell}^{m_{\ell}} (1 - s_{\ell})^{n - m_{\ell}} \rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*);$$

(ii) conditionally on $\mathbf{S}^* = \mathbf{s}^*$, the random measure μ' admits the representation $\mu' = \sum_{j \geq 1} S'_j \delta_{X'_j}$, where the distribution of $\Psi' := \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X'_j, S'_j)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the distribution of $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!$, with density

$$f'_{\Psi}(\nu) \propto e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \nu(dz dt)}. \quad (6)$$

From Theorem 2, the posterior distribution of μ is decomposed in a part that involves previously observed labels out of the sample and a component that involves hitherto unseen features, i.e., μ' . Note that μ' in point (ii) is an a.s. discrete random measure whose Laplace functional is available and equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\int_{\mathbb{X}} f(z) \mu'(dz)} \mid \mathbf{S}^* = \mathbf{s}^* \right\} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} t f(z) - n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!(dz dt)} \right\}}{\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!(dz dt)} \right\}}. \quad (7)$$

The posterior representation resembles available results in the literature; see, for example, (James, 2017, Theorem 3.1), with the fundamental difference that here the distribution of μ' depends on the previously observed features \mathbf{x}^* via the reduced Palm version of Ψ , thus allowing interacting feature labels.

To conclude the general Bayesian analysis of the extended feature models in (3), we provide the predictive distribution of the next observation, conditionally on the available sample, which easily follows from Theorem 2 by a standard disintegration argument.

Theorem 3. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 2, the conditional distribution of Z_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , satisfies the following distributional equality*

$$Z_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{Z} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{\ell=1}^k B_{n+1, \ell}^* \delta_{x_{\ell}^*} + Z'_{n+1}, \quad (8)$$

where

- (i) $(B_{n+1,1}^*, \dots, B_{n+1,k}^*)$, conditionally on S_1^*, \dots, S_k^* , is a vector of independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*) , which have been defined in Theorem 2;
- (ii) $Z'_{n+1} \sim \text{BeP}(\mu')$ and μ' is distributed according to Theorem 2.

Note that, in the point process language, the latter measure Z'_{n+1} in (ii) is obtained by first thinning the process $\Psi' = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X'_j, S'_j)}$ with retention probability $p(x, s) = s$, and then discarding the second component. Theorem 3 shows that the next individual Z_{n+1} has a positive

probability of displaying the features x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* observed out of the initial sample, and it can display hitherto unseen features, which correspond to the atoms of Z'_{n+1} .

Interestingly, the distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on the whole sampling information, including the feature labels \mathbf{x}^* , indeed it is a Bernoulli process with parameter μ' , whose Laplace functional equals (7). This is a crucial difference with respect to previous works. Indeed, from (James, 2017, Proposition 3.2) it is apparent that if μ is a CRM, the distribution of the component involving hitherto unseen features depends on \mathbf{Z} only through the sample size n . As for the scaled processes in (Camerlenghi et al., 2023, Proposition 2), Z'_{n+1} depends on n , k , and the frequency counts, but again not on the feature labels.

4 PREDICTIVE CHARACTERIZATIONS

In the same spirit as sufficientness postulates for species sampling models, we now consider the problem of characterizing prior distributions in extended feature allocation models, leading to predictive distributions that satisfy specific properties. In particular, we focus our analysis on how the Bernoulli process Z'_{n+1} in (8) depends on the sampling information encoded in \mathbf{Z} . As we will clarify in Section 7, there is no gain in considering Z_{n+1} in place of Z'_{n+1} .

From point (ii) of Theorem 3, it is clear that the distribution of Z'_{n+1} is uniquely characterized by the random measure μ' in (5) with Laplace functional (7). Therefore, in general, the predictive distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on the sample size n , as well as the couples of feature labels \mathbf{x}^* and their frequencies \mathbf{m} . Of course, from exchangeability, the order in which features are recorded, as well as the indices of observations displaying each feature, is irrelevant. However, special cases of extended feature models, previously studied in the literature, lead to much simpler predictive laws. For instance, the treatment in James (2017) (see also Corollary 1 below) shows that if μ is a CRM, the law of Z'_{n+1} depends only on the sample size n . Instead, in the case of the stable beta scaled process in Camerlenghi et al. (2023) and for feature models having a product form EFPF (Battiston et al., 2018; Ghilotti et al., 2024), such predictions may also depend on the number of distinct features k .

4.1 SUFFICIENTNESS POSTULATES

We start by characterizing the class of extended feature allocation models for which the law of Z'_{n+1} depends on the initial sample \mathbf{Z} only through the sample size n .

Theorem 4 (Sufficientness postulate for the dependence on n). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3). The distribution of Z'_{n+1} in Theorem 3 depends on the observed sample \mathbf{Z} solely through the sample size n if and only if Ψ in model (3) is a Poisson process.*

This theorem in the feature setting is the most natural counterpart of the results by [Regazzini \(1978\)](#); [Lo \(1991\)](#), who characterized the Dirichlet process as the unique species sampling prior in which the probability of observing a new species depends only on the sample size, and the probability of observing a previously recorded species depends on both the sample size and its frequency. The proof of Theorem 4 is deferred to the supplementary material. Central to the proof is a novel characterization of the Poisson point process in terms of its (higher-order) reduced Palm distribution that might be of independent interest. We report it in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let Φ be a point process with locally finite mean measure M_Φ . Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

(i) Φ is a Poisson process.

(ii) *The law of $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$ does not depend on \mathbf{x} . That is, for $M_\Phi^{(k)}$ -almost all $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $M_\Phi^{(m)}$ -almost all $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$, it holds that $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^! \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_{\mathbf{y}}^!$.*

Moreover, if (ii) holds, then $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^! \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_{\mathbf{y}}^! \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi$.

Other important characterization theorems for species sampling models are contained in [Zabell \(2005\)](#); [Bacallado et al. \(2017\)](#), where both the Pitman-Yor process and Gibbs-type priors are characterized in terms of the prediction rules they induce. According to these characterizations, both the sample size and the number of observed species in the sample play a pivotal role. As for extended feature allocation models, we can prove similar sufficientness postulates. Specifically, we are going to characterize all the models for which the distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on \mathbf{Z} solely on the sample size n and the number of observed features k .

Theorem 5 (Sufficientness postulate for the dependence on n and k). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3). The distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on the observed sample \mathbf{Z} solely through n and k if and only if Ψ in model (3) is a mixed Poisson or mixed binomial process.*

As for Theorem 4, we need a characterization of mixed Poisson and mixed binomial processes to prove Theorem 5. We provide it in the next lemma, whose proof is a slight extension of a result in [Kallenberg \(1973\)](#).

Lemma 2. *Let Φ be a point process with locally finite mean measure M_Φ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) Φ is a mixed Poisson or a mixed binomial point process.

(ii) The law of $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$ depends on \mathbf{x} only through its cardinality. That is, for $M_\Phi^{(k)}$ -almost all $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$, it holds that $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^! \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_{\mathbf{y}}^!$.

Theorem 4 fully characterizes the class of CRM priors analyzed in James (2017). Moreover, Theorem 5 characterizes a broad class of prior distributions that includes, among others, all feature models having a product form EFPF (Battiston et al., 2018), as well as the stable beta scaled processes analyzed in Camerlenghi et al. (2023). From Battiston et al. (2018); Ghilotti et al. (2024), it is not difficult to realize that the point process Ψ associated with a feature model having a product form EFPF could be either (i) a mixed binomial point processes, i.e., $\Psi = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{(X_j, S_j)}$ (cf. Example 2), where M is random, the S_j 's are i.i.d. beta distributed and the X_j 's are i.i.d. from a diffuse measure further independent of the S_j 's, or (ii) a mixed Poisson processes $\text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$ with ν being the Lévy intensity of a three parameter beta process (Teh and Gorur, 2009) and γ a positive random variable (cf. Example 1). However, these classes of processes are only very special cases of mixed binomial and mixed Poisson processes. Hence, while a general treatment of Bayesian feature models with predictions depending exclusively on the sample size n was already available in James (2017), the corresponding framework for predictions based solely on n and the number of distinct features k remains only partially developed. We address this gap in Section 5 below.

4.2 A FRESH LOOK AT SCALED PROCESSES

We now clarify the connection between a stable beta scaled process (Camerlenghi et al., 2023) and a mixed Poisson process, which has been only mentioned at the end of the last section. A scaled process is a random measure $\mu = \sum_{j \geq 1} S_j \delta_{X_j}$, where the X_j 's are i.i.d. random variables from a base measure G_0 on \mathbb{X} , while $(S_j)_{j \geq 1}$ arises as a suitable transformation of a Poisson process on the positive real line with intensity measure $\rho(ds)$. More precisely, to define the sequence of weights, one considers the jumps $(\Delta_j)_{j \geq 1}$ of a Poisson process in decreasing order and set $S_j^{\Delta_1} := \Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_1$. Then, the distribution of $(S_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is obtained by mixing the conditional distribution of $(S_j^{\Delta_1})_{j \geq 1}$, given Δ_1 , with respect to a new distribution for the largest jump Δ_1 . See Camerlenghi et al. (2023) for additional details.

Under a scaled process prior for the model (3), the distribution of Z'_{n+1} in (8) may depend on n , k and \mathbf{m} , and often involves intractable expression (Camerlenghi et al., 2023, Proposition 2). The notable tractable case is represented by scaled processes obtained from stable subordinators, i.e., $\rho(ds) = cs^{-1-\alpha}ds$ for some constants $c > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, referred to as stable beta scaled processes. In this case, Z'_{n+1} depends on the sample only through n and k . However, Theorem 5 claims that such a dependence is retained if and only if Ψ is a mixed Poisson or a mixed binomial process and, at a first glance, the definition of scaled processes does not align with that of mixed Poisson processes. This apparent inconsistency can be solved by resorting to an alternative construction of scaled processes that can be evinced either by (James et al., 2015, Theorem 1.1) or (Camerlenghi et al., 2023, Lemma 1).

Proposition 1. *Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the Lévy intensity of a subordinator, C a positive random variable, and G_0 a diffuse measure on \mathbb{X} . Let $\Psi = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X_j, S_j)}$ be such that*

$$\Psi | C \sim \text{PP} \left(C\rho(Cs) \mathbb{1}_{(0,1]}(s) ds G_0(dx) \right).$$

Then, $\mu = \sum_{j \geq 1} S_j \delta_{X_j}$ is a scaled process.

The construction outlined in Proposition 1 is available for any scaled process, as introduced at the beginning of the section. It becomes clear that Ψ is a mixed Poisson process if and only if for any s and any C , the following factorization holds $C\rho(Cs) = h(C)\tilde{\rho}(s)$ where $\tilde{\rho}(s)$ is a Lévy density and $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a function. When $\rho(s) = s^{-1-\alpha}$, i.e., the case of stable subordinators, we get $C\rho(Cs) = C^{-\alpha}s^{-1-\alpha}$ so that in this case the scaled process μ is induced by a mixed Poisson process Ψ directed by the law of $C^{-\alpha}$. Finally, the predictive characterization (Camerlenghi et al., 2023, Theorem 1) of stable beta scaled processes within the class of scaled processes is straightforward from Theorem 5. Indeed, the Lévy intensities of stable subordinators are the only ρ such that $C\rho(Cs) = h(C)\tilde{\rho}(s)$. Therefore, scaled processes obtained from stable subordinators are the only scaled processes induced by a mixed Poisson process Ψ . Finally, Theorem 5 highlights how the dependence of the distribution of Z'_{n+1} solely on n and k is not a distinctive feature of stable beta scaled processes but pertains to the larger class of priors obtained from mixed Poisson and mixed binomial processes.

5 DETAILED ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC EXTENDED FEATURE MODELS

The previous section highlights the distinctive role of Poisson, mixed Poisson, and mixed binomial process priors in shaping the dependencies of the induced predictive distributions on the observed sample. In this section, we specialize the general Bayesian analysis developed in Section 3.1 to these notable classes of prior distributions, as well as to a prior distribution based on a determinantal point process (Hough et al., 2006) which yields predictions for Z'_{n+1} depending on n, k and the observed features \mathbf{x}^* . Finally, we introduce a tractable model leading to dependence on the whole frequency spectrum.

5.1 THE POISSON PROCESS PRIOR

Consider the model (3), where μ is as in (2) and Ψ is a Poisson process on $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$ with an (infinite) mean measure ν . This is one of the most popular cases in the literature, and the Indian buffet process arises as a specific example. Under the standard assumption that each observation Z_i exhibits a finite number of features a.s., the k -th factorial moment measures are σ -finite, as shown in Proposition S3, point (i). The disintegration in (4) writes as $\nu(dx ds) = \rho(ds | x)G_0(dx)$, where ρ is a kernel from \mathbb{X} to $(0, 1]$ and G_0 is a σ -finite measure on \mathbb{X} . The Bayesian analysis of model (3) under a Poisson process prior for Ψ can be addressed by specializing theorems of Section 3 as in the next result. Let us introduce some shorthand notations that will be useful throughout this section: $\rho_n(ds | x) = (1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x)$.

Corollary 1 (Bayesian analysis under the Poisson process). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a Poisson point process Ψ with intensity measure ν defined via (2).*

(i) *The marginal distribution of the sample \mathbf{Z} , equals*

$$e^{-\varphi_n} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^{n-m_\ell} s^{m_\ell} \rho(ds | x_\ell^*) G_0(dx_\ell^*),$$

where we defined

$$\varphi_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s \rho_i(ds | x) G_0(dx). \quad (9)$$

(ii) *The posterior distribution of μ satisfies the distributional equality in (5), where in this case μ' is a CRM with Lévy intensity measure $\rho_n(ds | x)G_0(dx)$. The weights S_ℓ^* 's of previously*

observed features are independent random variables, and independent of μ' , with marginal density $f_{S_\ell^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_\ell}(1-s)^{n-m_\ell}\rho(ds|x_\ell^*)$, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

(iii) The predictive distribution of a future observation Z_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , equals the distribution of the measure defined in (8), where Z'_{n+1} is a Poisson process on \mathbb{X} with (finite) intensity measure given by $\int_{(0,1]} s\rho_n(ds|x)G_0(dx)$, and the $B_{n+1,\ell}^*$'s are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters S_ℓ^* 's, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

The previous corollary is in agreement with the theory developed by James (2017) for the Poisson process case. We first point out that the Poisson process Z'_{n+1} in point (iii) depends on the observable sample \mathbf{Z} only through the sample size n , and this is not surprising by virtue of Theorem 4. We also observe that if $\rho(ds|x) = \rho(ds)$ is independent of the location, then G_0 can be taken as a probability measure, as evident from Proposition S3, point (ii), and μ turns out to be a homogeneous CRM. In this case, Z'_{n+1} is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(G_0, q_{K'})$, where $q_{K'}$ is the probability mass function of the Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda_n = \int_{(0,1]} s\rho_n(ds)$, where $\rho_n(ds) = (1-s)^n\rho(ds)$. In other words, Z'_{n+1} has $K' \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda_n)$ points, represented as $Z'_{n+1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{K'} \delta_{X'_\ell}$, where the X'_ℓ 's are i.i.d. from G_0 . Again, the distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on the sample only through the sample size n .

5.2 THE MIXED POISSON PROCESS PRIOR

Let now $\Psi \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, where ν is a (infinite) locally finite measure on $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$. That is, Ψ is a Poisson process with random mean measure $\gamma\nu$ and $\gamma \sim f_\gamma$ is a positive random variable, cf. Example 1. As usual, we assume that $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s.. Moreover, we suppose that γ has finite moments of any order $k \geq 1$. Then, the k -th factorial moment measures are σ -finite for any k (cf. Proposition S3) and $\nu(dx ds) = \rho(ds|x)G_0(dx)$, where ρ is a kernel from \mathbb{X} to $(0, 1]$ and G_0 is a σ -finite measure on \mathbb{X} . The following corollary specifies the Bayesian analysis of this extended feature allocation model.

Corollary 2 (Bayesian analysis under the mixed Poisson process). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a mixed Poisson point process Ψ , i.e., $\Psi \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, defined via (2).*

(i) The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left(e^{-\gamma\varphi_n\gamma^k} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^{n-m_\ell} s^{m_\ell} \rho(ds|x_\ell^*) G_0(dx_\ell^*) \right),$$

where φ_n is defined as in (9).

(ii) The posterior distribution of μ satisfies the distributional equality in (5), where $\mu' = \sum_{j \geq 1} S'_j \delta_{X'_j}$ and $\{(X'_j, S'_j)\}_{j \geq 1}$ are the points of a mixed Poisson point process $\Psi' \sim \text{MP}(\nu', f_{\tilde{\gamma}})$, with

$$\nu'(dx ds) = \rho_n(ds | x)G_0(dx) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\tilde{\gamma}}(d\gamma) \propto e^{-\gamma\varphi_n} \gamma^k f_{\gamma}(d\gamma).$$

In addition, the S_{ℓ}^* 's in (5) are independent random variables, and independent of μ' , with marginal density $f_{S_{\ell}^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_{\ell}}(1-s)^{n-m_{\ell}}\rho(ds | x_{\ell}^*)$, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

(iii) The predictive distribution of Z_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , satisfies the distributional equality in (8), where Z'_{n+1} is a mixed Poisson process on \mathbb{X} with distribution

$$Z'_{n+1} \sim \text{MP}\left(\int_{(0,1]} s\rho_n(ds | x)G_0(dx), f_{\tilde{\gamma}}\right), \quad (10)$$

where the first parameter is a finite measure on \mathbb{X} . Moreover, the $B_{n+1,\ell}^*$'s in (8) are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters S_{ℓ}^* 's, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

We emphasize that the process Z'_{n+1} in (10) depends on the initial sample \mathbf{Z} only through the sample size n and the number of distinct features k , which appear in the mixing law $f_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, and on no additional sampling information, as expected from Theorem 5. Finally, if the kernel ρ does not depend on the location x , i.e., $\rho(ds | x) = \rho(ds)$, then G_0 can be taken as a probability measure (see Proposition S3, point (ii)) and μ , conditionally on γ , turns out to be a homogeneous CRM. Thus, thanks to Lemma S1, Z'_{n+1} is a mixed binomial process distributed as $Z'_{n+1} \sim \text{MB}(G_0, q_{K'})$, where $q_{K'} | \tilde{\gamma}$ is a Poisson density with parameter $\tilde{\gamma} \int_{(0,1]} s\rho_n(ds)$, where $\rho_n(ds) = (1-s)^n \rho(ds)$, conditionally on a positive random variable $\tilde{\gamma}$ with probability distribution $f_{\tilde{\gamma}}$. The stable beta scaled process in Camerlenghi et al. (2023) and the mixtures of Indian buffet processes analyzed in Ghilotti et al. (2024) fall under the umbrella of models considered in this section.

5.3 THE MIXED BINOMIAL PROCESS PRIOR

We now consider the other class of priors identified in Theorem 5, i.e., mixed binomial processes. Let $\Psi \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$, where q_M is a probability mass function on the nonnegative integers with finite moments and ν is a probability measure on $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$. Therefore, the disintegration $\nu(dx ds) = \rho(ds | x)G_0(dx)$ always holds, where G_0 is a probability measure on \mathbb{X} , and ρ is a

probability kernel from \mathbb{X} to $(0, 1]$. This follows from a suitable application of (Kallenberg, 2021, Theorem 3.4). The Bayesian analysis of model (3) under the mixed binomial process prior for Ψ is presented in the next result. For ease of notation, we will use κ_n to represent the integral $\kappa_n = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} \rho_n(ds | x) G_0(dx)$.

Corollary 3 (Bayesian analysis under the mixed binomial process). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a mixed binomial point process Ψ , i.e., $\Psi \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$, defined via (2).*

(i) *The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} equals*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ (\kappa_n)^{\tilde{M}} \right\} \mathbb{E}(M^{(k)}) \prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{(0, 1]} s^{m_\ell} (1-s)^{n-m_\ell} \rho(ds | x_\ell^*) G_0(dx_\ell^*),$$

where the first expected value is taken with respect to a nonnegative integer-valued random variable \tilde{M} having probability mass function

$$q_{\tilde{M}}(m) \propto q_M(m+k) \frac{(m+k)!}{m!}.$$

(ii) *The posterior distribution of μ satisfies the distributional equality in (5), where $\mu' = \sum_{j \geq 1} S'_j \delta_{X'_j}$ and $\{(X'_j, S'_j)\}_{j \geq 1}$ are the points of a mixed binomial process $\Psi' \sim \text{MB}(\nu', q_{M'})$ with*

$$\nu'(ds dx) = \rho_n(ds | x) G_0(dx) \quad \text{and} \quad q_{M'}(m) \propto (\kappa_n)^m q_{\tilde{M}}(m).$$

Moreover, the S_ℓ^* 's are independent random variables, and independent of μ' , with marginal density $f_{S_\ell^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_\ell} (1-s)^{n-m_\ell} \rho(ds | x_\ell^*)$, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

(iii) *The predictive distribution of a future observation Z_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , satisfies the distributional equality in (8), where Z'_{n+1} is a mixed binomial point process on \mathbb{X} with parameters $(\tilde{G}, q_{K'})$, with $\tilde{G}(dx) = \int_{(0, 1]} s \rho_n(ds | x) G_0(dx)$ and*

$$q_{K'}(m) \propto \sum_{z \geq m} \binom{z}{m} \kappa_n^z q_M(z+k) c_p^m (1-c_p)^{z-m} \frac{(z+k)!}{z!},$$

having set

$$c_p = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} s \rho_n(ds | x) G_0(dx)}{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} \rho_n(ds | x) G_0(dx)}.$$

Moreover, the $B_{n+1, \ell}^*$'s in (8) are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters S_ℓ^* 's, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

As expected, the distribution of Z'_{n+1} in point (iii) of the previous corollary depends on the sample only through the sample size n and the number of observed features k . A special case of interest is obtained by assuming that $\rho(ds|x) = \rho(ds)$, so that $\rho_n(ds|x) = \rho_n(ds) = (1-s)^n \rho(ds)$. Under this assumption, Z'_{n+1} is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(G_0, q_{K'})$ and $q_{K'}$ does not depend on G_0 . We further specialize this case to two choices of $M \sim q_M$.

If $M \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda)$, then Ψ is a Poisson process with finite intensity measure. In this case, Ψ' is a Poisson process with finite intensity $\lambda \rho_n(ds) G_0(dx)$, having $M' \sim \text{Poi}(\rho_n(0,1])$ points. In addition, Z'_{n+1} is a Poisson process with finite intensity, having K' points, with K' being a Poisson random variable with mean $\lambda \int_{(0,1]} s \rho_n(ds)$.

Let now M be a negative binomial random variables with parameters (r, p) , where $p \in [0, 1]$ denotes the success probability and $r > 0$ is the number of successes. In this case, Ψ' is a mixed binomial process with M' points, where M' is a negative binomial random variable with updated parameters $r' = r + k$ and $p' = 1 - \kappa_n(1 - p)$. Moreover, the process involving new features Z'_{n+1} is a mixed binomial process with K' points, where K' is a negative binomial with parameters $r^{th} = r + k$ and

$$p^{th} = \frac{p'}{p' + (1-p) \int_{(0,1]} s \rho_n(ds)}.$$

We finally point out that the Gibbs-type feature models with finitely many features introduced in [Ghilotti et al. \(2024\)](#) correspond to specific choices of the two models specified above.

5.4 THE INDEPENDENTLY MARKED (REPULSIVE) DETERMINANTAL PROCESS PRIOR

In this section, we provide a prior for Ψ such that the distribution of Z'_{n+1} in the prediction rule (8) depends on the sample also through the observed feature labels \mathbf{x}^* . To this end, consider a determinantal point process (DPP) ξ on a compact region $R \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ([Hough et al., 2006](#); [Lavancier et al., 2015](#)). The DPP ξ is specified by a covariance kernel $C : R \times R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that $M_\xi^{(k)}$ has density with respect to the k -fold product of the Lebesgue measure given by

$$\eta^{(k)}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \det\{C(x_h, x_w)_{h,w=1,\dots,k}\}, \quad x_1, \dots, x_k \in R,$$

where $C(x_h, x_w)_{h,w=1,\dots,k}$ is the $k \times k$ matrix with entries $C(x_h, x_w)$. Now $\Psi = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{(X_j, S_j)}$ in (2) is obtained by marking each point in $\xi = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{X_j}$ by independent random variables $S_j | X_j = x_j \sim H(\cdot | x_j)$ with values in $(0, 1]$, that is Ψ is an *independently marked point process*

with ground point process ξ and mark kernel H , according to [Baccelli et al. \(2020\)](#). We write for convenience $\Psi \sim \text{imDPP}(C, H)$, where C is the covariance kernel of the determinantal ground process and H is the mark probability kernel. As for any independently marked process, the k -th factorial moment measure equals $M_{\Psi}^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x} ds) = M_{\xi}^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}) \prod_{\ell=1}^k H(ds_{\ell} | x_{\ell})$ and it is σ -finite, since $M_{\xi}^{(k)}$ is σ -finite.

We also recall that the reduced Palm version of a DPP is still a DPP. Namely, for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ such that the x_j 's are distinct, $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$ is a DPP with kernel $K_{\mathbf{x}}(y_1, y_2) = C(y_1, y_2) - \tilde{c}_{\mathbf{x}}(y_1)^T \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \tilde{c}_{\mathbf{x}}(y_2)$, for any $y_1, y_2 \in R$, where $\tilde{c}_{\mathbf{x}}(y) = (C(y, x_1), \dots, C(y, x_k))^T$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = C(x_h, x_w)_{h,w=1,\dots,k}$. See, e.g., [Lavancier and Rubak \(2023\)](#) for further details.

Corollary 4 (Bayesian analysis under the independently marked DPP). *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of an independently marked point process Ψ , i.e., $\Psi \sim \text{imDPP}(C, H)$, defined via (2).*

(i) *The marginal distribution of the sample \mathbf{Z} equals*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n H(ds | x) \right\} \right] \prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{(0,1]} s^{m_{\ell}} (1-s)^{n-m_{\ell}} H(ds | x_{\ell}^*) \cdot M_{\xi}^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}^*),$$

where we remind that $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}$ denotes the Laplace functional of the DPP $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$.

(ii) *The posterior distribution of μ satisfies the distributional equality in (5), where the weights S_{ℓ}^* 's are independent random variables, further independent of μ' , with marginal density $f_{S_{\ell}^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_{\ell}} (1-s)^{n-m_{\ell}} H(ds | x_{\ell}^*)$, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Moreover, μ' in (5) can be represented as $\mu' = \sum_{j=1}^{M'} S'_j \delta_{X'_j}$, where the X'_j 's are the atoms of a point process ξ' on \mathbb{X} specified by the Laplace functional*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi'}(f) = \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left\{ f - \log \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n H(ds | x) \right\}}{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left\{ -\log \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n H(ds | x) \right\}}, \quad (11)$$

and the S'_j 's are independent marks with conditional density $S'_j | X'_j = x'_j \sim H'(\cdot | x'_j)$, where $H'(ds | x'_j) \propto (1-s)^n H(ds | x'_j)$.

(iii) *The predictive distribution of Z_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , satisfies the distributional equality in (8), where Z'_{n+1} is a Bernoulli process with parameter μ' , and the $B_{n+1,\ell}^*$'s are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters S_{ℓ}^* 's, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.*

Some remarks are in order. First, observe that in the Poisson, mixed Poisson, and mixed binomial examples, the atoms X_j 's of the underlying point process Ψ are marginally i.i.d.

from some distribution on \mathbb{X} . On the other hand, if Ψ is built starting from a DPP or any other repulsive process, the X_j 's have a joint law that encourages a priori “well separated” configurations, i.e., for $h \neq w$, the probability that X_h “is close to” X_w is small. In addition, under this prior choice, the process Z'_{n+1} appearing in the predictive distribution of Corollary 4, point (iii), depends on the sample \mathbf{Z} through the feature labels \mathbf{x}^* , since the parameter μ' depends on \mathbf{x}^* , as well as the sample size n and the cardinality k of \mathbf{x}^* . However, such a distribution is not affected by other sample statistics, i.e., the frequency counts. We conclude with an example, where we focus on a specific choice of the distribution of the S_j 's.

Example 3. We consider $\Psi \sim \text{imDPP}(C, H)$, where $H(\cdot | x)$ does not depend on x and equals the beta distribution with parameters (a, b) , namely $S_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(a, b)$, where $\text{Beta}(a, b)$ denotes the beta distribution. In this particular case, the distributional results in Corollary 4 simplify. It is worth noticing that the posterior distribution of μ satisfies the distributional equality in (5), where each weight S_ℓ^* has a beta distribution with parameters $(m_\ell + a, n - m_\ell + b)$, as $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Moreover, the distribution of the point process ξ' , and, as a consequence, of μ' in (5), becomes much more manageable. Indeed, from (11), the distribution of ξ' has a density with respect to the distribution of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$ given by

$$f_{\xi'}(\nu) \propto \left\{ \frac{B(a, b + n)}{B(a, b)} \right\}^{\nu(\mathbb{X})} =: g(n; a, b)^{\nu(\mathbb{X})},$$

having denoted by $B(a, b)$ the Euler's beta function. The associated marks S_j 's are i.i.d. from a beta distribution with parameters $(a, b + n)$. In more detail, the distribution of the number of points in ξ' , denoted with M' , has a density with respect to the distribution of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!(\mathbb{X})$ given by

$$f_{M'}(m) \propto \left\{ \frac{B(a, b + n)}{B(a, b)} \right\}^m. \quad (12)$$

Finally, the mean measure $M_{\xi'}$ has density with respect to $M_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}$ defined as $m_{\xi'}(y) := g(n; a, b) \mathbf{E} \left[f_{\xi'} \left\{ \xi_{(\mathbf{x}^*, y)}^! \right\} \right]$

5.5 PREDICTIONS DEPENDING ON THE WHOLE FREQUENCY SPECTRUM

In the examples analyzed so far, we have found predictive distributions for Z'_{n+1} depending either solely on n , or n and k , or n and \mathbf{x}^* (including k). As shown in James et al. (2015); Camerlenghi et al. (2023) and as discussed at the end of Section 4, in general, scaled processes yield predictive distributions for the newly discovered features which depend on the sampling information through n, k and the frequency spectrum m_1, \dots, m_k . However, outside the case of

stable beta scaled processes, the resulting expressions for the posterior and marginal distributions (and the associated computations) are somewhat involved. For instance, if one considers scaled processes built from gamma and generalized gamma subordinators, the distribution of μ' involves intractable integrals that must be evaluated numerically.

Here, we propose a different and straightforward strategy to induce predictive distribution depending on the whole frequency spectrum while maintaining computational convenience. The idea is simple and generally applicable: starting from the expression of the Lévy intensity ρ of a subordinator, assign a prior distribution to a parameter that does not enter only multiplicatively in the expression. For simplicity and specificity, we will consider here the case of the three-parameter beta process (Teh and Gorur, 2009; Broderick et al., 2014), i.e., model (3) with μ a homogeneous CRM having Lévy intensity measure

$$\rho(ds) G_0(dx) = s^{-1-\alpha}(1-s)^{\beta+\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1]}(s) ds G_0(dx), \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta > -\alpha$. The next proposition shows how considering α random yields the desired predictive distribution.

Proposition 2. *Consider a sample \mathbf{Z} from the statistical model (3), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (2) and Ψ is such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi \mid \alpha &\sim \text{PP}(\gamma s^{-1-\alpha}(1-s)^{\beta+\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1]}(s) ds G_0(dx)), \\ \alpha &\sim \pi_\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma > 0, \beta > 0$, G_0 is a diffuse probability measure on \mathbb{X} and π_α is supported on $(0, 1)$. Then, if π_α is not a degenerate (Dirac) measure, the predictive distribution of Z'_{n+1} , given the sample \mathbf{Z} , depends on n, k and m_1, \dots, m_k .

To the best of our knowledge, there is no conjugate prior for α . However, inference under this model is straightforward by means of Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms. Indeed, conditionally to α , marginal, posterior, and predictive distributions are readily available, and the posterior distribution of α has a simple density function that is amenable to posterior simulation algorithms.

6 AN APPLICATION OF EXTENDED FEATURE ALLOCATION MODELS TO SPATIAL STATISTICS

We consider here an extension to the problem proposed by [Ord \(1978\)](#), see also [Diggle \(2013\)](#). Informally, assume that trees are randomly distributed in a forest. Each observation Z_i is generated by a surveyor who, walking in the forest, annotates the location of some trees. Thus, Z_i contains the locations recorded by the i -th surveyor. [Ord \(1978\)](#) assumes the scenario in which a single surveyor is present, selecting trees at random, and considers the problem of estimating the total number of trees in the forest using only a single set of recorded locations. We adopt a slightly weakened hypothesis by assuming that the probability of observing each tree is independent of the location but could be influenced by some unavailable tree-specific characteristic (e.g., height), eventually modeled as a random variable. Our goals extend beyond those of [Ord \(1978\)](#). In addition to estimating the number of trees in the forest by leveraging multiple observations, we also aim to identify the locations of unobserved trees.

6.1 FITTING DETAILS AND NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION

Formally, we assume that $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ follows [\(3\)](#), where $\mu = \sum_{j \geq 1} S_j \delta_{X_j}$, and the X_j 's correspond to the locations of the trees in the forest, whereas the S_j 's are the tree-specific probabilities of observing tree j in any survey. We also indicate the point process containing all the locations by $\xi = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{X_j}$. We further assume that the S_j 's are i.i.d. beta random variables with common parameters (a, b) , and ξ is a DPP on a rectangular region $R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, as in [Section 5.4](#). Indeed, it is well understood that trees often exhibit repulsive behavior. For the purpose of illustration, we will assume that ξ follows a Gaussian DPP ([Lavancier et al., 2015](#)) with parameters (ρ, α) , subject to the condition $\rho < (\pi\alpha^2)^{-1}$ to ensure the process is well-defined. The covariance kernel of this Gaussian DPP is given by $C(x, y) = \rho \exp\{-\|(x-y)/\alpha\|^2\}$. We refer to [Møller and Waagepetersen \(2003\)](#); [Lavancier et al. \(2015\)](#) for other examples of repulsive point processes.

Supposing we observe n surveys Z_1, \dots, Z_n , which report the locations of k distinct trees, we now address the problem of predicting the number and locations of the missing trees. The posterior distribution of the total number of trees is equal to $M' + k$, where the law of M' is given in [Example 3](#). In addition to estimating the number of trees in the forest, a natural and more challenging question is to locate the unobserved trees. With the notation of [Example 3](#), the infinitesimal probability that an unobserved tree would occupy position dx equals $\mathbf{E}\{\Psi'(dx \times (0, 1])\} = M_{\xi'}(dx)$.

Both tasks require to handle the distribution of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!(\mathbb{X})$, for some specific points \mathbf{x} . From Corollary 4, $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$ is a DPP on R with kernel $K_{\mathbf{x}}$, and associated Mercer decomposition $K_{\mathbf{x}}(y_1, y_2) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^* \varphi_k^*(y_1) \overline{\varphi_k^*(y_2)}$. Then, from Hough et al. (2006) (see also Lavancier et al., 2015), we have that $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!(\mathbb{X})$ follows a Poisson-binomial distribution with parameters $(\lambda_k^*)_{k \geq 1}$. Unfortunately, as discussed in Lavancier and Rubak (2023), the eigendecomposition of $K_{\mathbf{x}}$ is generally not analytically available. We consider two approaches: the first consists of approximating the eigendecomposition numerically, and the second exploits an approximation of the Poisson-binomial distribution that does not require such an eigendecomposition.

To numerically approximate the λ_k^* 's, we proceed as follows. Let R_g be a grid of $(N_g)^2$ equispaced points in R , define the $N_g^2 \times N_g^2$ matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ by $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{i,j} = K_{\mathbf{x}}(y_{1,i}, y_{2,j})$ for $(y_{1,i}, y_{2,j}) \in R_g \times R_g$. Let $\Delta = \prod_{i=1}^2 L_i/N_g$ where L_i is the length of the i -th side of R . Of course, $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ is positive definite since $K_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a covariance kernel, with eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{N_g^2}$. Then, we set $\lambda_k^* \approx \tilde{\lambda}_k \Delta$ for $k = 1, \dots, N_g^2$ and $\lambda_k^* = 0$ for $k > N_g^2$, and approximate the law of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!(\mathbb{X})$ with a Poisson-binomial distribution of parameters $(\tilde{\lambda}_1 \Delta, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{N_g^2} \Delta)$. In our experiments presented in the subsequent sections, the decreasingly ordered sequence of λ_k^* decreases extremely fast with k so that the truncation error is negligible. We checked the accuracy of the numerical approximation of λ_k^* against the analytical value in the case of a Gaussian covariance, reporting errors of the order of 0.01 for the largest 50 eigenvalues. To compute the probability mass function of a Poisson-binomial distribution, we use the Python package `fast-poibin`. Evaluating the distribution on the whole support takes less than one second for $N_g^2 = 2500$. Further speed-ups can be achieved by truncating the series of eigenvalues earlier, for example, by keeping only those eigenvalues exceeding a pre-specified threshold.

An alternative strategy would focus on approximating the Poisson-binomial distribution via Le Cam's theorem (Steele, 1994), i.e., approximating the law of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!(\mathbb{X})$ with a Poisson distribution with parameter $\sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^*$. Since the sum of eigenvalues is equal to the trace of $K_{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e., $\int_R K_{\mathbf{x}}(y, y) dy$, using Le Cam's approximation does not require performing any numerical eigendecomposition. However, Le Cam's approximation introduces a non-negligible error. In particular, the total variation between the true distribution of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!(\mathbb{X})$ and its approximation is bounded by above by $\sum_{k \geq 1} (\lambda_k^*)^2$.

Finally, as illustrated in this context, the distribution of the independently marked DPP Ψ is controlled by a set of hyperparameters that must be specified. Specifically, we need to elicit the parameters (a, b) of the beta distribution for the marks S_j 's, as well as the parameters (ρ, α) of the Gaussian DPP ξ . To this end, we resort to an empirical Bayes approach, choosing such

hyperparameters by maximizing the likelihood function (3) of the model with respect to these four parameters.

6.2 SYNTHETIC SCENARIOS




Figure 1: Posterior distribution of the total number of trees in the synthetic scenario of Section 6.2. From left to right: calculations performed using Le Cam’s approximation of the Poisson-binomial, exact computations, and posterior of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!(\mathbb{X})$. Different line colors correspond to different sample sizes; the black vertical line indicates the true number of trees.

We generate data by simulating the true point process of the “trees”, denoted with ξ_0 , from a Gaussian DPP on $[0, 1]^2$ with intensity parameter $\rho = 100$ and scale $\alpha = 0.0535$. To the points in ξ_0 we attach i.i.d. marks S_j ’s from the beta distribution of parameters (1, 5), therefore obtaining a realization for Ψ and μ . Observations Z_i ’s are obtained by simulating i.i.d. Bernoulli processes conditionally to μ , mimicking the collection of data from the surveyors.

For different sample sizes $n \in \{5, 15, 25, 50\}$, we compute the distribution of the total number of trees as $M' + k$, where M' is defined in Example 3, and compare it with the total number of trees in ξ_0 . We compare inference obtained using the exact computation of the Poisson-binomial distribution and Le Cam’s approximation. Additionally, we consider a naive approach where we disregard the Z_i ’s, retaining only the distinct locations \mathbf{x}^* and computing the law of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$. Beyond predicting the total number of trees, we address the problem of locating the unobserved trees through $M_{\xi'}$, as discussed in Section 6.1. When adopting the naive approach, this task is tackled by considering the mean measure of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$. All results presented here are




Figure 2: Locating the unobserved trees for $n = 15$ in the synthetic scenario of Section 6.2: infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree in a given location. Left plot: the mean measure of ξ' . Right plot: the mean measure of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$. The red dots represent the observed trees in the sample. The black crosses indicate the unseen trees. Note that the color scales of the two plots are different.

obtained by estimating the hyperparameters of the model via the empirical Bayes approach described in Section 6.1. For completeness, Section S7 in the supplementary material provides the corresponding analyses under an oracle scenario, where all hyperparameters are fixed at their true values.

Figures 1 and 2 highlight the key features of our predictions: in estimating the total number of trees, Figure 1 clearly shows that the naive approach performs poorly across all sample sizes. Le Cam’s approximation, albeit faster, introduces some errors that lead to slightly underestimating the number of trees. In contrast, the exact posterior looks centered around the true number of trees, with its variance shrinking as the sample size increases. Figure 2 addresses the problem of locating unseen trees for a sample size of $n = 15$, comparing our proposed model with the naive approach. Refer to Section S7 in the supplementary material for the corresponding plots when $n \in \{5, 25, 50\}$. Beyond the substantial discrepancy between the two scales, caused by the naive approach significantly overestimating the number of trees, further remarks are needed. Specifically, consider the infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree at location $d\mathbf{x}$. Since $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$ is a DPP, the naive approach assumes that the farther $d\mathbf{x}$ is from the observed trees \mathbf{x}^* , the more likely it is to contain an unseen tree. On the other hand,

the repulsive pattern of ξ' is peculiar, leading to a different behavior: our model predicts that it is unlikely to find a tree at dx if it is too close to an observed tree, as expected. However, it also predicts that locations “too far” from observed trees may have small probabilities of containing a tree, as they might not align with the accumulation patterns estimated from the data.

Finally, we briefly discuss the utility of imposing repulsiveness between the points X_j 's of Ψ . Consider any prior process for Ψ where the points X_j 's are marginally i.i.d. from some diffuse distribution G_0 , such as the Poisson, mixed Poisson, or mixed binomial processes. From the predictive characterizations in Theorem 4 and Theorem 5, we know that the locations of the unseen trees X'_j 's in Ψ' are independent of the observed locations \mathbf{x}^* . Furthermore, these locations remain marginally i.i.d. from G_0 , as demonstrated in Corollary 1, Corollary 2, and Corollary 3. Therefore, for these models, the task of locating the unobserved trees is answered by G_0 , which provides no informative structure about the spatial arrangement of the unseen trees. This highlights the advantage of incorporating repulsiveness in this spatial illustration, as our model provides a more informative and structured prediction of tree locations.

6.3 ANALYSIS OF NORWEGIAN SPRUCES




Figure 3: Locating the unobserved trees for $n \in \{10, 20, 30\}$ in the analysis of the spruces dataset of Section 6.3: infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree in a given location. The three plots report $M_{\xi'}$ for the three sample sizes. The red dots represent the observed trees in the sample. The black crosses indicate the unseen trees. Note that the plots have different color scales.

We analyze the `spruces` dataset from the R package `spatstat`, which contains the spatial locations of 134 Norwegian spruce trees in a natural forest stand in Saxony, Germany. These tree locations are represented as the point configuration ξ_0 . We assign an i.i.d. mark S_j sampled

from a beta distribution with parameters $(1, 20)$ to each tree. Using these marks, we generate surveys Z_i 's by retaining each tree with probability S_j . We consider samples of increasing sizes $n \in \{10, 20, 30\}$ and estimate model hyperparameters using the empirical Bayes approach.

We infer the total number of trees as $M' + k$, where M' is defined in Example 3. Employing Le Cam's approximation, our model provides reliable predictions, although with a slight underestimation. Specifically, the expected values of $M' + k$ are respectively 115, 111, 114, for the increasing sample sizes. This systematic underestimation aligns with the comments of Figure 1, where exact computations yielded more accurate results than Le Cam's approximation. The choice of Le Cam's approximation is justified by its computational efficiency.

The main problem we address is the prediction of the locations of unobserved trees. In our framework, this is achieved via $M_{\mathcal{E}'}$, as detailed in Section 6.1, which is reported in Figure 3. Across all sample sizes, our predictions exhibit the peculiar repulsive structure highlighted in the simulated example. The regions predicted to most likely contain unseen trees align well with the locations of the actual unobserved trees, as indicated by the black crosses in the figure. The difference in plot scales arises from the reduction in the number of unseen trees as the sample size increases.

7 DISCUSSION

Feature allocations are routinely employed in several applied fields ranging from text mining to online A/B testing. In this paper, we have investigated the class of extended feature allocation models, which allows for generic dependence structures across the feature labels and weights. As noted by Lui et al. (2023), assuming a repulsive dependence among features reduces overfitting and leads to more interpretable posterior summaries of hierarchical models where features are present at a latent level, which are common in tasks such as image segmentation (Griffiths and Ghahramani, 2011; Broderick et al., 2015), matrix factorization (Zhou et al., 2012, 2017), and cellular biology (Lui et al., 2023). Our analysis lays the foundation for such models and their applications since the posterior and predictive distributions can be leveraged to design posterior inference algorithms.

Within the class of extended feature models, we have characterized those priors leading to *simple* predictive distributions, whereby the probability distribution of "new" features depends exclusively on the sample size, or on the sample size and the number of distinct features in the sample. These postulates are entirely absent from the existing literature and serve as essential

tools to guide the prior elicitation. Moreover, predictive characterizations offer a bridge between the classical Bayesian paradigm, based on likelihood and prior, and the *predictive* approach to inference, predicated by de Finetti, that recently gained popularity (Fong et al., 2023; Berti et al., 2025), by allowing the statistician to choose a system of prior and likelihood based on their subjective idea of the predictive distribution.

Sufficientness postulates for species sampling models characterize specific prior distributions such as the finite Dirichlet distribution, the Dirichlet process, and the Pitman-Yor process (Bacallado et al., 2017), by imposing conditions on the probability of observing a new species and the probability of re-observing a species recorded in the sample. By contrast, our postulates focus only on the distribution of new features and characterize broad classes of priors. It is then natural to wonder if, by adding further conditions on previously observed features, it is possible to restrict the characterization to specific prior distributions. This question has a negative answer, as clarified by a simple counterexample. In fact, for any Poisson, mixed Poisson, or mixed binomial prior, the probability of re-observing a feature depends exclusively on the sample size and the frequency of that feature. This excludes the possibility of distinguishing within the class of CRMs by adding structural constraints on the predictive law for the previously observed features.

The present paper opens several opportunities for future research. First, a promising research direction is the further development of the model based on the determinantal point process, as described in Section 5.4, along with its extension to high dimensional settings. The resulting prior will be particularly useful as a latent structure in latent factor models. In such cases, we expect computational challenges that may require the development of suitable algorithms for approximate posterior inference. Second, one can explore trait allocations (Campbell et al., 2018), a generalization of feature models in which an expression level is also recorded for each feature. We expect that our theorems extend to the trait allocation setting by virtue of our Palm-calculus-based framework and by adopting the spike-and-slab formulation of trait allocations in James (2017). Finally, we plan to explore more complex models for partially exchangeable data, both generalizing the hierarchical beta process of Thibaux and Jordan (2007) (further developed by James et al., 2023) and proposing alternative prior distributions inspired by the rich literature on partially exchangeable priors for species sampling models. For instance, one could develop analogues of nested (Rodriguez et al., 2008), additive (Lijoi et al., 2014) and compound (Griffin and Leisen, 2017) processes, as well as draw inspiration from the more general constructions in Ascolani et al. (2024); Franzolini et al. (2023); Beraha and Griffin

(2023) to design new models in the feature setting. Work on these problems and related ones is ongoing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Andrea Gilardi (University of Milano-Bicocca) and Jesper Møller (Aalborg University) for helpful discussions and suggestions. The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MUR), “Dipartimenti di Eccellenza” grant 2023-2027.

FUNDING

F. Camerlenghi and L. Ghilotti are supported by the European Union – Next Generation EU funds, component M4C2, investment 1.1., PRIN-PNRR 2022 (P2022H5WZ9).

REFERENCES

- Ascolani, F., B. Franzolini, A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster (2024). Nonparametric priors with full-range borrowing of information. *Biometrika* 111(3), 945–969.
- Ayed, F. and F. Caron (2021). Nonnegative bayesian nonparametric factor models with completely random measures. *Statistics and Computing* 31, 1–24.
- Bacallado, S., M. Battiston, S. Favaro, and L. Trippa (2017). Sufficiency Postulates for Gibbs-Type Priors and Hierarchical Generalizations. *Statistical Science* 32(4), 487 – 500.
- Bacallado, S., S. Favaro, and L. Trippa (2013). Bayesian nonparametric analysis of reversible markov chains. *The Annals of Statistics*, 870–896.
- Bacelli, F., B. Błaszczyszyn, and M. Karray (2020). Random measures, point processes, and stochastic geometry. *HAL preprint available at <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-02460214/>*.
- Battiston, M., S. Favaro, D. M. Roy, and Y. W. Teh (2018). A characterization of product-form exchangeable feature probability functions. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 28(3), 1423 – 1448.

- Beraha, M., R. Argiento, F. Camerlenghi, and A. Guglielmi (2023). Bayesian mixtures models with repulsive and attractive atoms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09034*.
- Beraha, M. and J. E. Griffin (2023). Normalised latent measure factor models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 85(4), 1247–1270.
- Beraha, M., L. Masoero, S. Favaro, and T. Richardson (2024). A nonparametric bayes approach to online activity prediction. *Manuscript available upon request*.
- Berti, P., E. Dreassi, F. Leisen, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo (2025). A Probabilistic View on Predictive Constructions for Bayesian Learning. *Statist. Sci.* 40(1), 25–39.
- Broderick, T., L. Mackey, J. Paisley, and M. I. Jordan (2014). Combinatorial clustering and the beta negative binomial process. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 37(2), 290–306.
- Broderick, T., L. Mackey, J. Paisley, and M. I. Jordan (2015). Combinatorial clustering and the beta negative binomial process. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 37(2), 290–306.
- Broderick, T., J. Pitman, and M. I. Jordan (2013). Feature Allocations, Probability Functions, and Paintboxes. *Bayesian Analysis* 8(4), 801 – 836.
- Broderick, T., A. C. Wilson, and M. I. Jordan (2018). Posteriors, conjugacy, and exponential families for completely random measures. *Bernoulli* 24(4B), 3181 – 3221.
- Camerlenghi, F. and S. Favaro (2021). On Johnson’s “Sufficientness” postulates for feature-sampling models. *Mathematics* 9(22).
- Camerlenghi, F., S. Favaro, L. Masoero, and T. Broderick (2023). Scaled process priors for Bayesian nonparametric estimation of the unseen genetic variation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–12.
- Campbell, T., D. Cai, and T. Broderick (2018, 1). Exchangeable trait allocations. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 12(2), 2290–2322.
- Cremaschi, A., T. M. Wertz, and M. De Iorio (2024). Repulsion, chaos, and equilibrium in mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, qkae096.

- Daley, D. J. and D. Vere-Jones (2008). *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. II* (Second ed.). Probability and its Applications (New York). New York: Springer. General theory and structure.
- De Blasi, P., S. Favaro, A. Lijoi, R. H. Mena, I. Prünster, and M. Ruggiero (2015). Are gibbs-type priors the most natural generalization of the dirichlet process? *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 37(2), 212–229.
- Diggle, P. J. (2013). *Statistical analysis of spatial and spatio-temporal point patterns*. CRC press.
- Favaro, S., A. Lijoi, R. H. Mena, and I. Prünster (2009). Bayesian non-parametric inference for species variety with a two-parameter poisson–dirichlet process prior. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 71(5), 993–1008.
- Favaro, S., A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster (2012). Asymptotics for a Bayesian nonparametric estimator of species variety. *Bernoulli* 18(4), 1267 – 1283.
- Favaro, S., B. Nipoti, and Y. W. Teh (2016). Rediscovery of good–turing estimators via bayesian nonparametrics. *Biometrics* 72(1), 136–145.
- Fong, E., C. Holmes, and S. G. Walker (2023). Martingale posterior distributions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 85(5), 1357–1391.
- Fortini, S. and S. Petrone (2012). Predictive construction of priors in Bayesian nonparametrics. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics* 26(4), 423 – 449.
- Franzolini, B., M. De Iorio, and J. Eriksson (2023). Conditional partial exchangeability: a probabilistic framework for multi-view clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01152*.
- Ghahramani, Z. and T. Griffiths (2005). Infinite latent feature models and the indian buffet process. In Y. Weiss, B. Schölkopf, and J. Platt (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 18. MIT Press.
- Ghilotti, L., F. Camerlenghi, and T. Rigon (2024). Bayesian analysis of product feature allocation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15806*.
- Gnedin, A. and J. Pitman (2005). Exchangeable Gibbs partitions and Stirling triangles. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* 325, 83–102.

- Good, I. J. and G. H. Toulmin (1956). The number of new species, and the increase in population coverage, when a sample is increased. *Biometrika* 43(1-2), 45–63.
- Griffin, J. E. and F. Leisen (2017). Compound random measures and their use in bayesian non-parametrics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 79(2), 525–545.
- Griffiths, T. L. and Z. Ghahramani (2011). The indian buffet process: An introduction and review. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12(32), 1185–1224.
- Heaukulani, C. and D. M. Roy (2016). The combinatorial structure of beta negative binomial processes. *Bernoulli* 22(4), 2301 – 2324.
- Hough, J. B., M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Viràg (2006). Determinantal processes and independence. *Probability Surveys* 3, 206–229.
- Hu, Y., K. Zhai, S. Williamson, and J. Boyd-Graber (2012). Modeling images using transformed Indian buffet processes. In *International Conference of Machine Learning*.
- James, L. (2002). Poisson process partition calculus with applications to exchangeable models and Bayesian nonparametrics. *Preprint arXiv:math/0205093*.
- James, L. F. (2017, October). Bayesian Poisson calculus for latent feature modeling via generalized Indian Buffet Process priors. *The Annals of Statistics* 45(5), 2016–2045.
- James, L. F., J. Lee, and A. Pandey (2023). Bayesian analysis of generalized hierarchical Indian buffet processes for within and across group sharing of latent features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05244*.
- James, L. F., J. Lee, and A. Pandey (2025). Poisson hierarchical indian buffet processes for within and across group sharing of latent features-with indications for microbiome species sampling models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01919*.
- James, L. F., P. Orbanz, and Y. W. Teh (2015). Scaled subordinators and generalizations of the indian buffet process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.07309*.
- Kallenberg, O. (1973). Characterization and convergence of random measures and point processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 27(1), 9–21.

- Kallenberg, O. (1984). An informal guide to the theory of conditioning in point processes. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique* 52(2), 151–164.
- Kallenberg, O. (2017). *Random measures, theory and applications*, Volume 1. Springer.
- Kallenberg, O. (2021). *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer.
- Last, G. and M. Penrose (2017). *Lectures on the Poisson process*, Volume 7. Cambridge University Press.
- Lavancier, F., J. Møller, and E. Rubak (2015). Determinantal point process models and statistical inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 77(4), 853–877.
- Lavancier, F. and E. Rubak (2023, October). On simulation of continuous determinantal point processes. *Statistics and Computing* 33(45). Publisher Copyright: © 2023, The Author(s).
- Lijoi, A., R. H. Mena, and I. Prünster (2007). Bayesian nonparametric estimation of the probability of discovering new species. *Biometrika* 94(4), 769–786.
- Lijoi, A., R. H. Mena, and I. Prünster (2007). Controlling the reinforcement in Bayesian non-parametric mixture models. *J. Royal Stat. Soc. B* 69, 715–740.
- Lijoi, A., B. Nipoti, and I. Prünster (2014). Bayesian inference with dependent normalized completely random measures. *Bernoulli* 20(3), 1260 – 1291.
- Lijoi, A., I. Prünster, and S. G. Walker (2008). Investigating nonparametric priors with gibbs structure. *Statistica Sinica*, 1653–1668.
- Lo, A. Y. (1991). A characterization of the dirichlet process. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 12(3), 185–187.
- Lui, A., J. Lee, P. F. Thall, M. Daher, K. Rezvani, and R. Basar (2023). A Bayesian feature allocation model for identifying cell subpopulations using CyTOF data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C. Appl. Stat.* 72(3), 718–738.
- Masoero, L., M. Beraha, S. Favaro, and T. Richardson (2024). Improved prediction of future user activity in online a/b testing. *Manuscript available upon request.*

- Masoero, L., F. Camerlenghi, S. Favaro, and T. Broderick (2018). Posterior representations of hierarchical completely random measures in trait allocation models. In *NeurIPS Workshop on All of Bayesian Nonparametrics*.
- Masoero, L., F. Camerlenghi, S. Favaro, and T. Broderick (2022). More for less: predicting and maximizing genomic variant discovery via Bayesian nonparametrics. *Biometrika* 109(1), 17–32.
- Masoero, L., J. Schraiber, and T. Broderick (2021). Bayesian nonparametric strategies for power maximization in rare variants association studies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.02032*.
- Miller, K., M. Jordan, and T. Griffiths (2009). Nonparametric latent feature models for link prediction. In Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. Lafferty, C. Williams, and A. Culotta (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Møller, J. and R. P. Waagepetersen (2003). *Statistical inference and simulation for spatial point processes*. CRC Press.
- Muliere, P. and S. Walker (1999). A characterization of a neutral to the right prior via an extension of Johnson’s sufficientness postulate. *The Annals of Statistics* 27(2), 589 – 599.
- Ord, K. (1978). How many trees in a forest? *The Mathematical Scientist* 3, 23–33.
- Orlitsky, A., A. T. Suresh, and Y. Wu (2016). Optimal prediction of the number of unseen species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(47), 13283–13288.
- Petralia, F., V. Rao, and D. Dunson (2012). Repulsive mixtures. In F. Pereira, C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Weinberger (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 25. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Pitman, J. (1995). Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability theory and related fields* 102(2), 145–158.
- Pitman, J. (1996). Some developments of the Blackwell-MacQueen urn scheme. In *Statistics, probability and game theory*, Volume 30 of *IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.*, pp. 245–267. Inst. Math. Statist., Hayward, CA.
- Pitman, J. (2003). Poisson-kingman partitions. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 1–34.

- Pitman, J. and M. Yor (1997). The two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *The Annals of Probability* 25(2), 855 – 900.
- Prünster, I. (2002). *Random probability measures derived from increasing additive processes and their application to Bayesian statistics*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Pavia.
- Regazzini, E. (1978). Intorno ad alcune questioni relative alla definizione del premio secondo la teoria della credibilità. *G. Ist. Ital. Attuari* 41, 77–89.
- Regazzini, E., A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster (2003). Distributional results for means of normalized random measures with independent increments. *Ann. Stat.* 31, 560–585.
- Rodriguez, A., D. B. Dunson, and A. E. Gelfand (2008). The nested dirichlet process. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 103(483), 1131–1154.
- Rolles, S. W. (2003). How edge-reinforced random walk arises naturally. *Probability theory and related fields* 126(2), 243–260.
- Shen, Y., L. Masoero, J. Schraiber, and T. Broderick (2022). Double trouble: Predicting new variant counts across two heterogeneous populations. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Learning Meaningful Representations of Life*.
- Steele, J. M. (1994). Le cam’s inequality and poisson approximations. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 101(1), 48–54.
- Stolf, F. and D. B. Dunson (2024). Infinite joint species distribution models.
- Teh, Y. and D. Gorur (2009). Indian buffet processes with power-law behavior. In Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. Lafferty, C. Williams, and A. Culotta (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 22.
- Thibaux, R. and M. I. Jordan (2007). Hierarchical beta processes and the indian buffet process. In *AISTATS*, Volume 2, pp. 564–571.
- Titsias, M. (2007). The infinite gamma-poisson feature model. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 20. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Xie, F. and Y. Xu (2019). Bayesian repulsive gaussian mixture model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 187–203.

- Zabell, S. L. (1982). W. E. Johnson's "Sufficientness" Postulate. *The Annals of Statistics* 10(4), 1090 – 1099.
- Zabell, S. L. (1995). Characterizing markov exchangeable sequences. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* 8, 175–178.
- Zabell, S. L. (2005). *Symmetry and its discontents*. Cambridge Studies in Probability, Induction, and Decision Theory. Cambridge University Press, New York. Essays on the history of inductive probability, With a preface by Brian Skyrms.
- Zhou, M., S. Favaro, and S. G. Walker (2017). Frequency of frequencies distributions and size-dependent exchangeable random partitions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112(520), 1623–1635.
- Zhou, M., L. Hannah, D. Dunson, and L. Carin (2012, 21–23 Apr). Beta-negative binomial process and poisson factor analysis. In N. D. Lawrence and M. Girolami (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Volume 22 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, La Palma, Canary Islands, pp. 1462–1471. PMLR.
- Zhou, M., O. H. M. Padilla, and J. G. Scott (2016). Priors for random count matrices derived from a family of negative binomial processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 111(515), 1144–1156.

Supplementary material for:
 “Bayesian calculus and predictive characterizations of
 extended feature allocation models”

ORGANIZATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The supplementary material is structured as follows. Section S1 presents useful results on extended feature allocation models, which are referenced in Remark 1 and throughout the paper. Section S2 provides additional results on the class of mixed binomial processes. Section S3 recalls a key formula for working with Palm distributions, namely the Campbell-Little-Mecke (CLM) formula, as well as a fundamental characterization result for mixed Poisson and mixed binomial processes, as stated in (Kallenberg, 1973, Theorem 5.3). Section S4 contains the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, which establish the full Bayesian analysis presented in Section 3.1. Section S5 includes proofs for all results related to the sufficientness postulates discussed in Section 4. Section S6 provides the proofs for Section 5, where specific examples are analyzed. Finally, Section S7 offers additional details on the synthetic experiment examined in Section 6.

To facilitate the reading of the supplementary material, we recall the *extended* feature allocation model for the exchangeable sequence of observations $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$, presented in model (3) of the main text. In particular, we consider $Z_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} A_{i,j} \delta_{X_j}$, for $i \geq 1$, and the statistical model is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i | \mu &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{BeP}(\mu), \\ \mu &\sim \mathcal{Q}, \end{aligned} \tag{S1}$$

where \mathcal{Q} denotes the law of the random measure μ , which is a functional of the point process $\Psi = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X_j, S_j)}$ on $\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$. Specifically, μ is defined as

$$\mu(B) = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} s \mathbb{1}_B(x) \Psi(dx ds), \quad B \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{S2}$$

S1 SOME USEFUL RESULTS ON EXTENDED FEATURE ALLOCATION MODELS

The following proposition formally states the necessary condition, discussed in Remark 1, on the mean measure of Ψ to ensure $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. for any generic element Z_i in the sequence $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined in (S1).

Proposition S1. *Let Z_i be the generic element of the sequence $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined in (S1), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (S2). Assume that Ψ has infinite points a.s. and let M_Ψ denote the mean measure of Ψ . If $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s., then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s) M_\Psi(dx ds) = \infty.$$

Proof. We proceed by proving that $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s) M_\Psi(dx ds) < \infty$ implies $\mathbb{P}(Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty) = 0$. Indeed, define the sequence of events $V_j = \{A_{i,j} = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}$, $j \geq 1$ and observe that the event $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ coincides with the event $\liminf V_j$. We now prove that $\mathbb{P}(\liminf V_j) \leq \mathbb{P}(\limsup V_j) = 0$. Consider

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(V_j) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(A_{i,j} = 0) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(1 - S_j) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - S_j),$$

and define the process $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X_j, \pi_j)}$ on $\mathbb{X} \times [0, 1)$, where $\pi_j = 1 - S_j$. We have that

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(V_j) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \geq 1} \pi_j = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{X} \times [0,1)} t \mathcal{T}(dx dt) \right\} = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times [0,1)} t M_{\mathcal{T}}(dx dt), \quad (\text{S3})$$

where the last equality follows from Campbell averaging formula. Now, defining the function $g : \mathbb{X} \times (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{X} \times [0, 1)$ as $g(x, s) = (x, 1 - s)$, we have that $\mathcal{T} = \Psi \circ g^{-1}$ is the image of Ψ by g . Consequently, $M_{\mathcal{T}}(dx dt) = M_\Psi(g^{-1}(dx, dt)) = M_\Psi(dx ds)$, where $s = 1 - t$. Thus, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{X} \times [0,1)} t M_{\mathcal{T}}(dx dt) = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s) M_\Psi(dx ds) < \infty, \quad (\text{S4})$$

where the inequality holds by hypothesis. Therefore, from (S3) and (S4), we have that $\sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(V_j) < \infty$. By applying the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\limsup V_j) = 0$ and the proof is complete. \square

The following proposition establishes the necessary and sufficient condition, also discussed in Remark 1, on the mean measure of Ψ to ensure that $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s., under the assumption that Ψ is a Poisson or a mixed Poisson process. In particular, when Ψ follows either of these processes, the necessary condition given in Proposition S1 is also sufficient.

Proposition S2. Let Z_i be the generic element of the sequence $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined in (S1), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (S2). Assume Ψ is a Poisson process with (infinite) mean measure ν or a mixed Poisson process $\text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$. Then, $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. if and only if $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s\nu(dx ds) < \infty$.

Proof. We start by proving the statement for Ψ distributed as a Poisson process with mean measure ν . As discussed in Remark 1, the condition $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} sM_\Psi(dx ds) < \infty$ is sufficient for $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s.. Under the Poisson assumption for Ψ , this sufficient condition writes as $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s\nu(dx ds) < \infty$. We are left to show the inverse implication. Consider the Laplace transform of the random variable $Z_i(\mathbb{X})$ evaluated in 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{e^{-Z_i(\mathbb{X})}\} &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{e^{-Z_i(\mathbb{X})} | \mu\}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j \geq 1} \{1 - S_j(1 - e^{-1})\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left[\sum_{j \geq 1} \log \{1 - S_j(1 - e^{-1})\} \right] \right) \\ &= \exp \left\{ -(1 - e^{-1}) \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s\nu(dx ds) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s\nu(dx ds) = \infty$, then $\mathbb{E} \{e^{-Z_i(\mathbb{X})}\} = 0$ and $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) = \infty$ a.s. and the proof is complete.

To prove the result when Ψ is a mixed Poisson process $\text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, we leverage the result just established for the Poisson process. In particular, $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. is equivalent to

$$1 = \mathbb{P}(Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty) = \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{P}(Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty | \gamma) \},$$

which holds true if and only if $\mathbb{P}(Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty | \gamma) = 1$ a.s.. Conditionally to γ , the process Ψ is a Poisson process with mean measure $\gamma\nu$. Thus, leveraging on the result just shown for the Poisson case, it holds that $\mathbb{P}(Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty | \gamma) = 1$ if and only if ν satisfies the condition stated for a Poisson process, namely $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s\nu(dx ds) < \infty$. \square

The next proposition examines notable consequences of satisfying the condition $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. under the assumption that Ψ is a Poisson process.

Proposition S3. Let Z_i be the generic element of the sequence $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined in (S1), where μ is the functional of a point process Ψ defined via (S2) and Ψ is a Poisson process with (infinite) mean measure ν . If $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s., then:

- (i) the k -th factorial moment measure $M_\Psi^{(k)} = \nu^k$ is σ -finite, for any k ;

(ii) the following disintegration holds: $\nu(dx ds) = \kappa(dx | s)A_0(ds)$, where κ is a probability kernel from $(0, 1]$ to \mathbb{X} and $A_0(ds) := \nu(\mathbb{X} \times ds)$ is σ -finite. Consequently, Ψ can be seen as an independently marked point process with Poisson ground process on $(0, 1]$ with mean measure A_0 and marks on \mathbb{X} with mark probability kernel κ .

If the mean measure ν is finite, points (i) and (ii) always hold with additional trivial simplifications.

Proof. To prove point (i), we observe that $\nu(\mathbb{X} \times (\epsilon, 1]) < \infty$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Indeed, when Ψ is a Poisson process with mean measure ν , the condition $Z_i(\mathbb{X}) < \infty$ a.s. is equivalent to $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]} s\nu(dx ds) < \infty$ (Proposition S2). Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\nu(\mathbb{X} \times (\epsilon, 1]) = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (\epsilon, 1]} \nu(dx ds) \leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (\epsilon, 1]} s\nu(dx ds) < \infty.$$

Thus, it follows that ν is σ -finite, as well as any ν^k .

We now focus on point (ii). Consider the projected measure $\nu(\mathbb{X} \times ds) =: A_0(ds)$ on $(0, 1]$. From point (i), A_0 is a σ -finite measure. Then, thanks to (Kallenberg, 2021, Theorem 3.4), the following disintegration holds: $\nu(dx ds) = \kappa(dx | s)A_0(ds)$, where κ is a probability kernel from $(0, 1]$ to \mathbb{X} . \square

S2 AUXILIARY RESULTS ON MIXED BINOMIAL PROCESSES

This section presents three distributional results related to mixed binomial processes. The first proposition establishes that the k -th reduced Palm version of any mixed binomial process remains a mixed binomial process. This result is crucial for proving Lemma 2 (see Section S5) and Corollary 3 (see Section S6).

Proposition S4 (Palm distribution of mixed binomial processes). *Let Φ be a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$ defined on \mathbb{X} . Then, the reduced Palm version of Φ at x , denoted with $\Phi_x^!$, is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_{\tilde{M}})$ where*

$$q_{\tilde{M}}(m) = \frac{(m+1)}{\mathbf{E}(M)} q_M(m+1).$$

Similarly, the k -th reduced Palm version of Φ at $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ (distinct points), denoted with $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$, is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_{\tilde{M}}^{(k)})$ where

$$q_{\tilde{M}}^{(k)}(m) = \frac{(m+k)!}{\mathbf{E}\{M^{(k)}\}m!} q_M(m+k).$$

Proof. Let us focus on the reduced Palm distribution of order $k = 1$. Let \mathcal{L}_Φ be the Laplace functional of Φ . By (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.2.1), for any measurable functions $f, g : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the Palm distribution of a point process satisfies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{X}} g(x) \mathcal{L}_{\Phi_x}(f) M_\Phi(dx).$$

Since Φ is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$, its Laplace functional writes as

$$\mathcal{L}_\Phi(f) = \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{E} \left\{ e^{-f(X)} \right\}^M \right], \quad (\text{S5})$$

where M has probability mass function q_M and X has law ν , so that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{X}} g(x) e^{-f(x)} \left[\sum_{m \geq 1} m q_M(m) \mathbf{E} \left\{ e^{-f(X)} \right\}^{m-1} \right] \nu(dx).$$

Multiplying and dividing by $\mathbf{E}(M)$, and thanks to a change of index $k = m - 1$ in the inner summation, we recognize the following expression

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{X}} g(x) e^{-f(x)} \left[\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(k+1) q_M(k+1)}{\mathbf{E}(M)} \mathbf{E} \left\{ e^{-f(X)} \right\}^k \right] M_\Phi(dx).$$

Hence, $\Phi_x = \delta_x + \Phi_x^!$ where $\Phi_x^!$ is distributed as in the statement.

The proof for the Palm distribution of order k follows by induction, by using the Palm algebra property (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.3.9), i.e., $\Phi_{(x_1, x_2)}^! \stackrel{d}{=} (\Phi_{x_1}^!)_{x_2}^!$, for $M_{\Phi^{(2)}}\text{-a.a.}$ (x_1, x_2) . \square

The second proposition examines the effect of thinning a mixed binomial process and establishes that its probability law remains that of a mixed binomial process. This result is applied in the proof of Corollary 3; see the mixed binomial case of Section S6.

Proposition S5 (Thinning of mixed binomial processes). *Let Φ be a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$ defined on \mathbb{X} . Let the retention probability $p : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable function. Then the thinning of Φ by p , denoted by Φ_p , is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu_p, q_{M_p})$, where $\nu_p(dx) = p(x)\nu(dx)/c_p$ is a probability distribution and*

$$q_{M_p}(m) = \sum_{z \geq m} \binom{z}{m} q_M(z) c_p^m (1 - c_p)^{z-m}.$$

Proof. Given a point process Φ , the thinned process Φ_p is characterized by the Laplace functional described in (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 2.2.6), that is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_p}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\Phi \left[-\log \left\{ p(x) e^{-f(x)} + 1 - p(x) \right\} \right].$$

Under the assumption that Φ is a mixed binomial process, its Laplace functional is expressed in (S5). Consequently,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_p}(f) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(1 + \mathbb{E} [p(X) \{e^{-f(X)} - 1\}] \right)^M \right\},$$

where M has probability mass function q_M and X has law ν . Let Z be distributed according to ν_p , where ν_p is as in the statement. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E} [p(X) \{e^{-f(X)} - 1\}] = c_p \mathbb{E} \{e^{-f(Z)}\} - c_p.$$

An application of the binomial theorem leads to

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_p}(f) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=0}^M \binom{M}{j} c_p^j \mathbb{E} \{e^{-f(Z)}\}^j (1 - c_p)^{M-j} \right]$$

and the result follows from Fubini's theorem. \square

Finally, we highlight a simple yet useful result stating that mixed Poisson processes $\text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, where ν is finite, can be viewed as mixed binomial processes.

Lemma S1. *Let $\Phi \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$, where ν is a finite measure on \mathbb{X} and some f_γ . Then $\Phi \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$ for some q_M . In particular, letting $\varrho(t) := \mathbb{E}(e^{-t\gamma})$ and $\varphi(\nu(\mathbb{X})(1 - z)) := \mathbb{E}(z^M)$, it holds that $\varrho = \varphi$ on $[0, \nu(\mathbb{X})]$.*

Proof. Assume that $\Phi \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$. Define a mixed binomial process

$$\tilde{\Phi} | M = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{\tilde{X}_j},$$

with $M | \gamma \sim \text{Poi}(\gamma\nu(\mathbb{X}))$ and $\gamma \sim f_\gamma$. Moreover, consider $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_M | M \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu(\cdot)/\nu(\mathbb{X})$. The probability-generating function of M can be written as

$$\mathcal{G}_M(z) = \mathbb{E}(z^M) = \mathbb{E}[\exp\{-\gamma\nu(\mathbb{X})(1 - z)\}]$$

and the Laplace transform of $f(\tilde{X}_1)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{f(\tilde{X}_1)}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \exp\{-tf(x)\} \nu(dx) / \nu(\mathbb{X}).$$

Consequently, the Laplace functional of $\tilde{\Phi}$ equals

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\Phi}}(f) = \mathcal{G}_M \left(\mathcal{L}_{f(\tilde{X}_1)}(1) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(x)}) \gamma \nu(dx) \right\} \right],$$

therefore $\tilde{\Phi} \sim \text{MP}(\nu, f_\gamma)$ and in particular $\Phi \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\Phi}$. By definition, $\Phi \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\Phi} \sim \text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$, with $\varphi(\nu(\mathbb{X})(1 - z)) := \mathbb{E}(z^M) = \mathbb{E}[\exp\{-\gamma\nu(\mathbb{X})(1 - z)\}]$, thus $\varphi(t) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-t\gamma}) =: \varrho(t)$ for $t \in [0, \nu(\mathbb{X})]$. \square

S3 KEY RESULTS FROM POINT PROCESS THEORY AND PALM DISTRIBUTIONS

First, we recall the primary technical tool used in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2, namely the Campbell-Little-Mecke formula. This formula can be viewed as an extension of Fubini's theorem to the case when both expectation and the integration are taken with respect to a point process.

Lemma S2 (Campbell-Little-Mecke (CLM) formula). *Let Φ be a point process over $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ such that $M_\Phi^{(k)}$ is σ -finite. For all measurable $f : \mathbb{X}^k \times \mathbb{M}_\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{X}^k} f \left(\mathbf{x}, \Phi - \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_{x_j} \right) \Phi^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}) \right\} = \int_{\mathbb{X}^k} \mathbb{E} \{ f(\mathbf{x}, \Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!) \} M_\Phi^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}).$$

Next, we present a key characterization result (Kallenberg, 1973, Theorem 5.3) for mixed Poisson and mixed binomial processes, which relies on properties of the reduced Palm distributions. This result will be crucial for the proof of Lemma 2. However, it is important to note that in Kallenberg's theorem, a point process is defined as a random boundedly finite counting measure, whereas we consider a point process as a random locally finite counting measure. This distinction, while subtle, is crucial. Working with boundedly finite measures excludes Poisson processes with infinite activity. Specifically, in infinite-activity Poisson processes considered in the literature, $\Psi(B \times (0, r]) = \infty$ for any bounded Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{X}$, meaning that Ψ is not a boundedly finite measure. Therefore, we verify that the next result remains valid under our definition of a point process.

Lemma S3 (Theorem 5.3 in Kallenberg (1973)). *Let Φ be a point process with locally finite mean measure M_Φ . Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (i) *The distribution of $\Phi_x^!$ is independent of x , for M_Φ -a.a. x .*
- (ii) *Φ is either a mixed Poisson or mixed binomial process.*

Proof. We proceed by demonstrating the validity of the result in two steps, by separately proving the two implications.

Proof of (ii) \implies (i). We start by remarking that if Φ is either a mixed Poisson or a mixed binomial process, then $\Phi_x^!$ is independent of $x \in \mathbb{X}$, for M_Φ -a.a. x . Assume Φ to be a mixed

Poisson, i.e., $\Phi | \gamma \sim \text{PP}(\gamma\nu)$ and $\gamma \sim f_\gamma$ is an almost surely positive random variable. Then, by (Baccelli et al., 2020, Lemma 2.2.27), its Laplace functional equals

$$\mathcal{L}_\Phi(f) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \mathcal{L}_{\Phi_\gamma}(f) | \gamma \} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left[- \int_{\mathbb{X}} \{1 - e^{-f(x)}\} \gamma \nu(dx) \right] \right).$$

By (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.2.1), the Palm distribution of Φ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{X}} g(x) \mathcal{L}_{\Phi_x}(f) M_\Phi(dx). \quad (\text{S6})$$

We proceed by computing the left-hand side of (S6), under the assumption that Φ is a mixed Poisson process. First, note that $M_\Phi(B) = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{ \Phi(B) | \gamma \}] = \nu(B) \mathbb{E}(\gamma)$, for $B \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, one has

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{E} [h'(0) \exp\{h(0)\} | \gamma]),$$

where $h(t) := - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(x)-tg(x)}) \gamma \nu(dx)$, and thus $h'(t) := - \int_{\mathbb{X}} e^{-f(x)-tg(x)} g(x) \gamma \nu(dx)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{L}_\Phi(f + tg) \Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[- \int_{\mathbb{X}} e^{-f(x)} g(x) \gamma \nu(dx) \cdot \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(x)}) \gamma \nu(dx) \right\} \right] \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{X}} e^{-f(x)} g(x) \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(y)}) \gamma \nu(dy) \right\} \gamma \nu(dx) f_\gamma(d\gamma) \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{X}} g(x) \left[e^{-f(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(y)}) \gamma \nu(dy) \right\} \frac{\gamma}{\mathbb{E}(\gamma)} f_\gamma(d\gamma) \right] M_\Phi(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by comparing the previous expression with (S6), we deduce that, for M_Φ -a.a. $x \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_x}(f) = e^{-f(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(y)}) \gamma \nu(dy) \right\} \frac{\gamma}{\mathbb{E}(\gamma)} f_\gamma(d\gamma)$$

and the Laplace functional of the Palm version is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_x^!}(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X}} (1 - e^{-f(y)}) \gamma \nu(dy) \right\} \frac{\gamma}{\mathbb{E}(\gamma)} f_\gamma(d\gamma),$$

which does not depend on x . In particular, it turns out that $\Phi_x^!$ is a mixed Poisson process such that $\Phi_x^! | \tilde{\gamma} \sim \text{PP}(\tilde{\gamma}\nu)$ and $\tilde{\gamma} \sim f_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ with $f_{\tilde{\gamma}}(d\gamma) \propto \gamma f_\gamma(d\gamma)$.

If instead Φ is a mixed binomial process, $\Phi_x^!$ is described by Proposition S4: it is still a mixed binomial process with law independent of x , for M_Φ -a.a. $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Proof of (i) \implies (ii). Conversely, to prove the opposite implication, we need some preliminary lemmas, which are of independent interest. We start by recalling (Kallenberg, 1973, Lemma 5.1). Given the point process Φ and the set $C \in \mathcal{X}$, we indicate with Φ^C the restriction of Φ on C , i.e., $\Phi^C(B) = \Phi(B \cap C)$, for any $B \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, let \mathbb{N} denote the set of natural numbers $\{1, 2, \dots\}$.

Lemma S4. *If Φ is a point process with locally finite mean measure M_Φ , then*

$$\mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L \mid \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) = \mathbf{P}(\Phi_x \in L \mid \Phi_x(C) = n),$$

for $L \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{X}$, $C \in \mathcal{X}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lambda_{C,n}$ -a.a. $x \in C$, where η is the position of a randomly chosen atom of Φ^C and

$$\lambda_{C,n}(dx) = \mathbf{E}\{\Phi(dx) \mid \Phi(C) = n\} \mathbf{P}(\Phi(C) = n) = \mathbf{P}(\Phi_x(C) = n) M_\Phi(dx).$$

Proof. Preliminarily, we need to remark an alternative and limiting characterization of Palm versions in terms of the so-called *local Palm probabilities*, denoted by \mathbf{P}^x and defined on (Ω, \mathcal{A}) (see [Baccelli et al., 2020](#)). Specifically, for M_Φ -a.a. $x \in \mathbb{X}$, the following definition is given, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathbf{P}^x(A) = \frac{\mathbf{E}(\Phi(dx) \mathbb{1}_A)}{M_\Phi(dx)}.$$

Define the family of processes $\{\Phi_x^{loc}\}_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$ whose laws are given as follows: $\mathbf{P}(\Phi_x^{loc} \in L) = \mathbf{P}^x(\Phi^{-1}(L))$, for any $L \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{X}$. Following [Baccelli et al. \(2020\)](#), we observe that $\Phi_x^{loc} \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_x$, thus the Palm versions of Φ can be characterized as follows

$$\mathbf{P}(\Phi_x \in L) = \frac{\mathbf{E}(\Phi(dx) \mid \Phi \in L) \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L)}{M_\Phi(dx)}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

To prove the lemma, consider $x \in C$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) &= \mathbf{P}(\eta \in dx \mid \Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \\ &= \mathbf{E}(\delta_\eta(dx) \mid \Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{E}(\Phi(dx) \mid \Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S8})$$

where the last equality holds since η is a randomly chosen atom of Φ . Moreover, applying (S7) to the event $L' := \{\mu \in \mathbb{M}_\mathbb{X} : \mu \in L, \mu(C) = n\}$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(\Phi(dx) \mid \Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) \mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n) = \mathbf{P}(\Phi_x \in L, \Phi_x(C) = n) M_\Phi(dx).$$

Consequently, plugging the last expression into (S8), it follows that

$$\mathbf{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{P}(\Phi_x \in L, \Phi_x(C) = n) M_\Phi(dx) \quad (\text{S9})$$

and, in particular, choosing $L = \mathbb{M}_\mathbb{X}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{P}(\Phi_x(C) = n) M_\Phi(dx). \quad (\text{S10})$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\Phi \in L \mid \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Phi \in L, \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx)}{\mathbb{P}(\Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Phi_x \in L, \Phi_x(C) = n)}{\mathbb{P}(\Phi_x(C) = n)} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\Phi_x \in L \mid \Phi_x(C) = n),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (S9) and (S10). Clearly, the previous computation holds when $\mathbb{P}(\Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) > 0$, that is $\lambda_{C,n}(dx) = \mathbb{P}(\Phi_x(C) = n)M_\Phi(dx) > 0$. \square

Secondly, we state another key result which we need for the proof, corresponding to (Kallenberg, 2017, Theorem 3.7).

Lemma S5. *Let Φ be a point process on \mathbb{X} and let $C_j \uparrow \mathbb{X}$, $C_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and relatively compact, $j \geq 1$. Then Φ is either a mixed Poisson or mixed binomial process if and only if Φ^{C_j} is a mixed binomial process for every $j \geq 1$.*

We can now prove that (i) implies (ii). Assume that $\Phi_x^!$ is independent of x , that is $\Phi_x^! = \Phi_x - \delta_x \stackrel{d}{=} \xi$, for some point process ξ , for M_Φ -a.a. $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Consider $C \in \mathcal{X}$ relatively compact set and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\xi(C) = n) > 0$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_k) \in \mathcal{X}^{\otimes k}$ whose components are a partition of C . Let $\mathbf{z} \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^k$ and $\mathbf{e}_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ with $k - 1$ zeros. Let η as in Lemma S4. Assume, without loss of generality, that $x \in B_1$; for $\lambda_{C,n}$ -a.a. x , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}((\Phi - \delta_\eta)(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} \mid \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) &= \mathbb{P}(\Phi(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{e}_1 \mid \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\Phi_x(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{e}_1 \mid \Phi_x(C) = n) \\
&= \mathbb{P}((\Phi_x - \delta_x)(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} \mid (\Phi_x - \delta_x)(C) = n - 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\xi(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} \mid \xi(C) = n - 1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma S4 and the last one from the definition of ξ . Therefore, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}((\Phi - \delta_\eta)(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z}, \eta \in dx \mid \Phi(C) = n) \\
&= \mathbb{P}((\Phi - \delta_\eta)(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} \mid \Phi(C) = n, \eta \in dx) \mathbb{P}(\eta \in dx \mid \Phi(C) = n) \quad (\text{S11}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\xi(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{z} \mid \xi(C) = n - 1) \mathbb{P}(\eta \in dx \mid \Phi(C) = n).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, define $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_k)$ as follows: let $k = \bar{k} + 1$, $\bar{k} \leq n$, consider \bar{k} points in C , denoted with $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{\bar{k}}$, and let $B_j = d\bar{x}_j$, $j \leq \bar{k}$, be a neighborhood of \bar{x}_j , such that $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$,

for any $i, j \leq \bar{k}, i \neq j$. Finally, define $B_k = C \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} d\bar{x}_j$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{\bar{k}}, 0)$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} z_j = n - 1$. Then, the factorization in (S11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} (\Phi - \delta_\eta)(d\bar{x}_j) = z_j, (\Phi - \delta_\eta)(C \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} d\bar{x}_j) = 0, \eta \in dx \mid \Phi(C) = n\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} \xi(d\bar{x}_j) = z_j, \xi(C \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{\bar{k}} d\bar{x}_j) = 0 \mid \xi(C) = n - 1\right) \mathbb{P}(\eta \in dx \mid \Phi(C) = n), \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that the distribution of η , conditionally to $\Phi(C) = n$, is independent of the position of the remaining $n - 1$ points. Then, we conclude that a randomly chosen point of $\Phi - \delta_\eta$ is conditionally independent of the others, given that $(\Phi - \delta_\eta)(C) = n - 1$, by repeating the same argument above for the process $\Phi - \delta_\eta$. Note that such an argument applies to $\Phi - \delta_\eta$ since $(\Phi - \delta_\eta)_x - \delta_x = \Phi_x - \delta_x - \delta_\eta = \xi - \delta_\eta$ which does not depend on x . Wrapping up, we have just shown that, conditionally on $\Phi(C) = n$, the n points of Φ are independent between them. Equivalently, Φ^C is a binomial process given $\Phi(C) = n$, that is Φ^C is marginally a mixed binomial process. Then, taking a sequence of sets $C_j \uparrow \mathbb{X}, C_j \in \mathcal{C}$ and relatively compact, $j \geq 1$, it holds that Φ^{C_j} is a mixed binomial process for every $j \geq 1$. Finally, by an application of Lemma S5, we conclude that Φ is either a mixed Poisson or mixed binomial process. \square

S4 PROOF OF THEOREMS 1 AND 2

The proof is based on the study of the Laplace functional of μ . We remind that, for any measurable function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the Laplace functional of μ equals

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{-\int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\mu(dx)\right\}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{-\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} sf(x)\Psi(dx ds)\right\}\right].$$

In the following, we will use the shorthand notations $\mu(f) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\mu(dx)$ and $\Psi(sf) = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} sf(x)\Psi(dx ds)$. Let $\mathbf{Z} := (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ and denote by \mathbf{z} its realization, with associated likelihood function $L(\mathbf{z} \mid \mu)$. An application of Bayes' theorem entails

$$\mathbb{E}\{e^{-\mu(f)} \mid \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}\} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\{e^{-\Psi(sf)} L(\mathbf{z} \mid \mu)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{L(\mathbf{z} \mid \mu)\}}, \quad (\text{S12})$$

where, at the denominator, we recognize the marginal likelihood.

Let x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* be the k distinct features displayed in \mathbf{z} and denote by m_1, \dots, m_k the corresponding frequency counts. Let $\Theta = \mathbb{X} \times (0, 1]$; arguing as in (James, 2017, Appendix A), the likelihood function can be shown to be

$$L(\mathbf{z} \mid \mu) = \int_{\Theta^k} e^{n \int \log(1-t)\Psi(dz dt)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{s_\ell^{m_\ell}}{(1-s_\ell)^{m_\ell}} \delta_{x_\ell^*}(x_\ell) \Psi^k(d\mathbf{x} ds)$$

where Ψ^k is the k -th power of Ψ . Note that the term $\prod_{\ell=1}^k \delta_{x_\ell^*}(x_\ell)$ entails that the integrand is zero on sets of the type

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \Theta^k : x_i = x_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}.$$

Therefore we can replace Ψ^k with the k -th factorial power $\Psi^{(k)}$. Then, an application of the CLM formula (cf. Lemma S2) yields the following expression for the numerator of (S12),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi(sf)} L(\mathbf{z} | \mu) \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{\Theta^k} e^{-\Psi(tf-n \log(1-t))} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{s_\ell^{m_\ell}}{(1-s_\ell)^{m_\ell}} \delta_{x_\ell^*}(x_\ell) \Psi^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{s}) \right\} \\ &= \int_{\Theta^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(tf-n \log(1-t))} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^k e^{-s_\ell f(x_\ell) + n \log(1-s_\ell)} \frac{s_\ell^{m_\ell}}{(1-s_\ell)^{m_\ell}} \delta_{x_\ell^*}(x_\ell) M_\Psi^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{s}). \end{aligned}$$

By assumptions, the disintegration in (4) holds true. Moreover, integrating with respect to the x_ℓ 's, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi(sf)} L(\mathbf{z} | \mu) \right\} &= \int_{(0,1]^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(tf-n \log(1-t))} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^k e^{-s_\ell f(x_\ell^*)} s_\ell^{m_\ell} (1-s_\ell)^{n-m_\ell} \rho^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*) \tilde{m}_\xi^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}^*). \end{aligned} \tag{S13}$$

The expression in Theorem 1 follows by setting $f = 0$ in the equation above, which coincides with the marginal likelihood of the data.

As for the proof of Theorem 2, we can simply evaluate (S12), where the numerator equals (S13), while the denominator coincides with the marginal likelihood, i.e., Equation (S13) when $f = 0$. Thus, the posterior Laplace functional in (S12) boils down to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\mu(f)} | \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} \right\} &= \frac{\int_{(0,1]^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(tf-n \log(1-t))} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k e^{-s_\ell f(x_\ell^*)} s_\ell^{m_\ell} (1-s_\ell)^{n-m_\ell} \rho^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*)}{\int_{(0,1]^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(n \log(1-t))} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k s_\ell^{m_\ell} (1-s_\ell)^{n-m_\ell} \rho^{(k)}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude the proof of Theorem 2, we need to show that the right-hand side above coincides with the Laplace transform of the measure

$$\eta := \sum_{\ell=1}^k S_\ell^* \delta_{x_\ell^*} + \mu'$$

where the laws of S_1^*, \dots, S_k^* and μ' are as in the statement of Theorem 2. This is indeed true, since the Laplace functional of η is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\eta(f)} \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\sum_{\ell=1}^k S_\ell^* f(x_\ell^*) - \mu'(f)} \right\} \\
&= \int_{(0,1]^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\mu'(f)} \mid \mathbf{S}^* = \mathbf{s} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k e^{-s_\ell f(x_\ell^*)} f_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}) \\
&= \int_{(0,1]^k} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(tf - n \log(1-t))} \right\}}{\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(n \log(1-t))} \right\}} \\
&\quad \times \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(n \log(1-t))} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k e^{-s_\ell f(x_\ell^*)} s_\ell^{m_\ell} (1-s_\ell)^{n-m_\ell} \rho^{(k)}(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{x}^*)}{\int_{(0,1]^k} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}}^!(n \log(1-t))} \right\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k s_\ell^{m_\ell} (1-s_\ell)^{n-m_\ell} \rho^{(k)}(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{x}^*)}
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the Laplace functional of μ that we have found before, and this concludes the proof.

S5 RESULTS AND PROOFS OF SECTION 4

S5.1 PROOF OF THEOREM 4

It is clear that the predictive distribution of Z'_{n+1} depends on the sampling information as the law of μ' , or equivalently Ψ' , in Theorem 2 does. Therefore, the statement of Theorem 4 is equivalent to saying that Ψ' depends only on n if and only if Ψ is a Poisson process. From (6), it is clear that Ψ' depends on n and $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!$, where \mathbf{x}^* are the observed distinct feature labels and \mathbf{s}^* is distributed as in Theorem 2. Then, the proof follows from Lemma 1 which characterizes the Poisson process as the unique point process for which the reduced Palm kernel $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!$ does not depend on $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*)$.

S5.2 PROOF OF LEMMA 1

If Φ is a Poisson process, then $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^! \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \Phi_{\mathbf{y}}^! \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \Phi$ by the multivariate Mecke equation (Last and Penrose, 2017, Theorem 4.4). Thus, this shows that (i) implies (ii).

On the other hand, assume that (ii) holds true, we need to show that Φ is a Poisson process. To this end, consider $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$, i.e., \mathbf{y} is defined by adding a single point y to \mathbf{x} . Then, by the Palm algebra (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.3.9) we have

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{y}}^! \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} (\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!)_{\mathbf{y}}^! \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$$

where the last equality holds by hypothesis. That is, we have proven that $\Phi_x^!$ is a Poisson process using Slivnyak-Mecke (Baccelli et al., 2020, Theorem 3.2.4). Setting $k = 1$, we have that $\Phi_x^!$ is Poisson and by hypothesis, the law does not depend on x . Therefore, we conclude that Φ is a Poisson process since the family of Palm distributions of a point process characterizes its law. See, e.g., (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.1.17).

S5.3 PROOF OF THEOREM 5

The proof follows by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4 above but invoking Lemma 2 instead of Lemma 1.

S5.4 PROOF OF LEMMA 2

The proof of our lemma requires the use of Lemma S3. Using this characterization, proceed as follows to prove Lemma 2. First, (ii) implies (i) by using (Kallenberg, 1973, Theorem 5.3). Indeed, by setting $k = 1$, condition (ii) states that $\Phi_x^!$ does not depend on x , which implies Φ to be either a mixed Poisson or a mixed binomial process (Lemma S3). On the other side, (i) implies (ii). Indeed, if Φ is a mixed Poisson process, then $\Phi_{x_1}^!$ does not depend on x_1 (Lemma S3) and it is still a mixed Poisson (see the proof of the inverse implication of Lemma S3). Conversely, if Φ is a mixed binomial process, then $\Phi_{x_1}^!$ is still a mixed binomial process which does not depend on x_1 (see Proposition S4). Therefore, in both cases, $\Phi_{(x_1, x_2)}^! = (\Phi_{x_1}^!)_{x_2}^!$ does not depend on (x_1, x_2) and it is still either a mixed Poisson or a mixed binomial process. Continuing with this argument, the proof follows for any k .

S6 PROOFS OF SECTION 5

S6.1 THE POISSON PROCESS PRIOR: PROOF OF COROLLARY 1

Proof of point (i) of Corollary 1. The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} follows from specializing Theorem 1. In particular, we first observe that $\tilde{m}_\xi^{(k)}(d\mathbf{x}^*) = \prod_{\ell=1}^k G_0(dx_\ell^*)$ and $\rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}^*) = \prod_{\ell=1}^k \rho(ds_\ell | x_\ell^*)$. Moreover, since Ψ is a Poisson process, by Lemma 1, it holds $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^! \stackrel{d}{=} \Psi$. Consequently, the expected value in the marginal expression of Theorem 1 equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^!(dz dt)} \right\} = \exp \left[- \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} \{1 - (1-s)^n\} \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx) \right]. \quad (\text{S14})$$

It is easy to verify that $\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} \{1 - (1 - s)^n\} \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$ equals φ_n , where φ_n is defined in (9). The resulting marginal distribution recovers the marginal expression found in (James, 2017, Proposition 3.1).

Proof of point (ii) of Corollary 1. For the posterior distribution of μ , expressed in Theorem 2, we need to determine the law of the vector $\mathbf{S}^* = (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*)$ and the law of μ' , conditionally to \mathbf{S}^* . From point (i) of Theorem 2 and (S14), the S_ℓ^* 's are independent with marginal laws $f_{S_\ell^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_\ell} (1 - s)^{n - m_\ell} \rho(ds | x_\ell^*)$. Moreover, since $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!$ is a Poisson point process with intensity $\rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$, simple algebra applied to (7) leads to recognizing

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-\int f(z) \mu'(dz)} \mid \mathbf{S}^* = \mathbf{s}^* \right\} = \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1 - e^{-sf(x)}) (1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx) \right\},$$

that is the Laplace functional of a CRM with Lévy measure $(1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$, thus Ψ' is a Poisson process with the same mean measure. Further note that μ' is independent of \mathbf{S}^* .

Proof of point (iii) of Corollary 1. To obtain the predictive distribution of Z'_{n+1} , we observed in Theorem 3 how Z'_{n+1} is obtained by first thinning the process Ψ' with retention probability $p(x, s) = s$, and then discarding the second component. Since Ψ' is a Poisson process with intensity $(1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$, the thinned process is still Poisson with intensity $s(1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$ and the resulting Z'_{n+1} is a Poisson process on \mathbb{X} with intensity $\int_{(0,1]} s(1 - s)^n \rho(ds | x) G_0(dx)$.

S6.2 THE MIXED POISSON PROCESS PRIOR: PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

Proof of point (i) of Corollary 2. The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} follows from exploiting that $\Psi | \gamma \sim \text{PP}(\gamma\nu)$, for which the marginal law is given in point (i) of Corollary 1, and then integrating out the variable γ .

Proof of point (ii) of Corollary 2. For the posterior distribution of μ , expressed in Theorem 2, we need to determine the law of the vector $\mathbf{S}^* = (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*)$ and the law of μ' , conditionally to \mathbf{S}^* . To this end, it is convenient to exploit the disintegration of the law of Ψ into $\Psi | \gamma$ and γ . First, as for the posterior distribution of $\Psi | \gamma$, since $\Psi | \gamma \sim \text{PP}(\gamma\nu)$, we resort to point (ii) of Corollary 1. Specifically, such a posterior is equal in distribution to $\Psi' + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \delta_{(x_\ell^*, S_\ell^*)}$, where $\Psi' | \gamma \sim \text{PP}(\gamma(1 - s)^n \nu(dx ds))$ and $S_\ell^* | \gamma$ are independent random variables, further independent of $\Psi' | \gamma$, with laws $f_{S_\ell^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_\ell} (1 - s)^{n - m_\ell} \rho(ds | x_\ell^*)$. Since the laws of $S_\ell^* | \gamma$ do not depend on γ , then the S_ℓ^* 's and $\Psi' | \gamma$ are independent. Second, the posterior distribution of γ is obtained from the likelihood in point (i) of Corollary 1 and the prior f_γ , thus $\gamma | \mathbf{Z} \sim f_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, with $f_{\tilde{\gamma}}(d\gamma) \propto e^{-\gamma \varphi_n} \gamma^k f_\gamma(d\gamma)$. The thesis in point (ii) follows.

Proof of point (iii) of Corollary 2. To describe the predictive distribution for Z'_{n+1} we proceed as follows: first consider the thinning of the process Ψ' with retention probability $p(x, s) = s$, and then discard the second component. Since Ψ' is a mixed Poisson process $\text{MP}((1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), f_{\tilde{\gamma}})$, the thinned process is still a mixed Poisson $\text{MP}(s(1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), f_{\tilde{\gamma}})$ and the resulting Z'_{n+1} is a mixed Poisson process (on \mathbb{X}) distributed as $\text{MP}(\int_{(0,1]} s(1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), f_{\tilde{\gamma}})$.

S6.3 THE MIXED BINOMIAL PROCESS PRIOR: PROOF OF COROLLARY 3

Proof of point (i) of Corollary 3. The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} is recovered from Theorem 1 as follows. First, it is straightforward to see that $\tilde{m}_{\xi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}(M^{(k)})G_0^k(\mathbf{x})$ and $\rho^{(k)}(d\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^k \rho(ds_{\ell} | x_{\ell})$ satisfy (4). Second, from Proposition S4, we have that if Ψ is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_M)$, then $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^!$ is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_{\tilde{M}})$ with $q_{\tilde{M}}(m) = q_M(m+k)(m+k)!/(\mathbb{E}(M^{(k)})m!)$. Consequently, the expected value in the marginal expression of Theorem 1 equals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^!(dz dt)} \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ n \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{M}} \log(1 - \tilde{S}_j) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s)^n \nu(dx ds) \right\}^{\tilde{M}} \right] = \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}}(\kappa_n), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

where \tilde{M} has probability mass function $q_{\tilde{M}}$ and $(\tilde{X}_j, \tilde{S}_j) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu$, for $j = 1, \dots, \tilde{M}$; moreover, $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}}(z) = \mathbb{E}(z^{\tilde{M}})$ is the probability-generating function of \tilde{M} and $\kappa_n = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s)^n \nu(dx ds)$. It follows that the marginal distribution in Theorem 1 boils down to the expression in point (i) of the statement.

Proof of point (ii) of Corollary 3. For the posterior distribution of μ , expressed in Theorem 2, we need to determine the law of the vector $\mathbf{S}^* = (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*)$ and the law of μ' , conditionally to \mathbf{S}^* . From point (i) of Theorem 2 and (S15), the S_{ℓ}^* 's are independent with marginal laws $f_{S_{\ell}^*}(ds) \propto s^{m_{\ell}}(1-s)^{n-m_{\ell}} \rho(ds | x_{\ell}^*)$, as for the Poisson case. Moreover, from point (ii) of Theorem 2 we have that for any measurable function $g : \mathbb{X} \times (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Psi'}(g) &= \mathcal{L}_{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!}(g(x, s) - n \log(1-s)) / \mathcal{L}_{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}^!}(-n \log(1-s)) \\ &= \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} \exp \{-g(x, s) + n \log(1-s)\} \nu(dx ds) \right) / \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}}(\kappa_n) \\ &= \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} e^{-g(x,s)} (1-s)^n \nu(dx ds) \right) / \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{M}}(\kappa_n) \\ &= \mathcal{G}_{M'} \left(\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} e^{-g(x,s)} (1-s)^n \nu(dx ds) / \kappa_n \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s^*}^!$ is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}(\nu, q_{\tilde{M}})$; moreover, M' is a nonnegative integer-valued random variable with probability mass function $q_{M'}$ with $q_{M'}(m) \propto q_{\tilde{M}}(m) \kappa_n^m \propto \kappa_n^m q_M(m+k)(m+k)!/m!$. Therefore, Ψ' is a mixed binomial process $\text{MB}((1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), q_{M'})$ and it is independent of \mathcal{S}^* .

Proof of point (iii) of Corollary 3. To describe the predictive distribution of Z_{n+1} remind that Z'_{n+1} is obtained by first thinning the process Ψ' with retention probability $p(x, s) = s$, and then discarding the second component, as described in Theorem 3. By Proposition S5, since Ψ' is a mixed binomial process, the thinned process is still mixed binomial, specifically $\text{MB}(s(1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), q_{K'})$, with

$$\begin{aligned} q_{K'}(m) &= \sum_{z \geq m} \binom{z}{m} q_{M'}(z) c_p^m (1-c_p)^{z-m} \\ &\propto \sum_{z \geq m} \binom{z}{m} \kappa_n^z q_M(z+k) c_p^m (1-c_p)^{z-m} (z+k)!/z!, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_p = \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} s(1-s)^n \nu(dx ds) / \int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} (1-s)^n \nu(dx ds)$. Removing the second component of the retained points, we obtain Z'_{n+1} , which is then a mixed binomial $\text{MB}(\int_{(0,1]} s(1-s)^n \nu(dx ds), q_{K'})$.

S6.4 THE INDEPENDENTLY MARKED (REPULSIVE) DETERMINANTAL PROCESS PRIOR: PROOF OF COROLLARY 4 AND DETAILS OF EXAMPLE 3

Proof of point (i) of Corollary 4. The marginal distribution of \mathbf{Z} is recovered from Theorem 1 as follows. Since Ψ is an independently marked process with ground process ξ and mark kernel H , then from (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 3.2.14), the reduced Palm version $\Psi_{x,s}^!$ is still an independently marked process, with ground process $\xi_x^!$ and mark kernel H , thus it does not depend on s . By Palm algebra, we can extend this property by claiming that $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}, s}^!$ is an independently marked process, with ground process $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}^!$ and mark kernel H . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{\int_{\mathbb{X} \times (0,1]} n \log(1-t) \Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^! (dz dt)} \right\} &= \mathcal{L}_{\Psi_{\mathbf{x}^*, s}^!}(-n \log(1-t)) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} (1-t)^n H(dt | x) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{S16}$$

where the second equality follows from (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 2.2.20). The thesis in point (i) of the statement follows.

Proof of point (ii) of Corollary 4. For the posterior distribution of μ , expressed in Theorem 2, we need to determine the law of the vector $\mathbf{S}^* = (S_1^*, \dots, S_k^*)$ and the law of μ' , conditionally to \mathbf{S}^* . From point (i) of Theorem 2 and (S16), which does not depend on \mathbf{s} , the S_ℓ^* 's are independent with marginal laws $f_{S_\ell^*}(\mathrm{d}s) \propto s^{m_\ell}(1-s)^{n-m_\ell}H(\mathrm{d}s | x_\ell^*)$. Moreover, by point (ii) in Theorem 2, the law of Ψ' , conditionally to \mathbf{S}^* , has Laplace functional given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Psi' | \mathbf{S}^* = \mathbf{s}^*}(g) &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\Psi'_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}}(g(x, s) - n \log(1-s))}{\mathcal{L}_{\Psi'_{\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{s}^*}}(-n \log(1-s))} \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} e^{-g(x,s)} (1-s)^n H(\mathrm{d}s | x) \right\} \right]}{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n H(\mathrm{d}s | x) \right\} \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

By (Baccelli et al., 2020, Proposition 2.2.20), this equals the Laplace transform of the independently marked point process $\Psi' = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{(X'_j, S'_j)}$ where $S'_j | X'_j = x'_j \sim H'(\cdot | x'_j) \propto (1-s)^n H(\mathrm{d}s | x'_j)$ and $\xi' = \sum_{j \geq 1} \delta_{X'_j}$ has Laplace transform as in the statement of Corollary 4. *Details of Example 3.* The results in Example 3 are obtained by specializing the treatment to the case where the mark kernel $H(\cdot | x)$ corresponds to the law of a beta with parameters (a, b) . Under this assumption, we get that the law of M' can be determined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{M'}(u) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{-u \xi'(\mathbb{X})} \right\} = \mathcal{L}_{\xi'}(u \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X}}) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[u - \log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n \text{Beta}(\mathrm{d}s; a, b) \right\} \right]}{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} (1-s)^n \text{Beta}(\mathrm{d}s; a, b) \right\} \right]} \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[u - \log \left\{ B(a, b+n)/B(a, b) \right\} \right]}{\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!} \left[-\log \left\{ B(a, b+n)/B(a, b) \right\} \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we focus on the mean measure of ξ' , denoted with $M_{\xi'}$. Indicating with $f_{\xi'}$ the density of the law of ξ' with respect to the law of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$, we have

$$M_{\xi'}(A) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ f_{\xi'}(\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!) \xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!(A) \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_A(y) f_{\xi'}(\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!) \xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!(\mathrm{d}y) \right\}.$$

By applying the alternative statement of the CLM formula in Lemma S2 in terms of the Palm distributions, we obtain that the mean measure of ξ' equals

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\xi'}(A) &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_A(y) f_{\xi'} \left\{ (\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!)_y \right\} \right] M_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_A(y) f_{\xi'} \left\{ (\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!)'_y + \delta_y \right\} \right] M_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_A(y) f_{\xi'} \left\{ \xi_{(\mathbf{x}^*, y)}^! + \delta_y \right\} \right] M_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &= g(n; a, b) \int_A \mathbb{E} \left[f_{\xi'} \left\{ \xi_{(\mathbf{x}^*, y)}^! \right\} \right] M_{\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!}(\mathrm{d}y). \end{aligned}$$

S6.5 PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Conditionally to α , the posterior distribution of μ and the marginal law of the sample \mathbf{Z} are as in Corollary 1. Moreover, the posterior law of α is given by

$$\pi_{\alpha|\mathbf{Z}}(\mathrm{d}a) \propto \exp\{-\varphi_n(a)\} \prod_{\ell=1}^k B(m_\ell - a, n - m_\ell + \beta + a) \times \pi_\alpha(\mathrm{d}a) \quad (\text{S17})$$

where $\varphi_n(a) = \gamma \int_{(0,1]} \{1 - (1 - s)^n\} s^{-1-a} (1 - s)^{\beta+a-1} \mathrm{d}s = \sum_{h=0}^{n-1} B(-a + 1, h + \beta + a)$.

From the posterior distribution of μ given α and the posterior density of α in (S17), it is evident that the predictive distribution for the newly discovered features depends on the observed sample through n , k and m_1, \dots, m_k , while it does not depend on the labels x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* .

S7 ADDITIONAL DETAILS ABOUT THE SYNTHETIC SCENARIOS

We present here the analysis of the synthetic scenarios from Section 6.2 under the oracle strategy, which assumes knowledge of the true values of all hyperparameters used to generate the data. First, we examine inference on the total number of trees, $M' + k$, across different sample sizes, $n \in \{5, 15, 25, 50\}$. Figure S1 compares results obtained via the exact computation of the Poisson-binomial distribution and Le Cam's approximation. Additionally, we assess the naive approach described in Section 6.2. The same observations made for Figure 1 apply here. Specifically, the naive approach performs poorly across all sample sizes when estimating the total number of trees. While Le Cam's approximation is computationally faster, it introduces some errors, leading to a slight underestimation of the tree count. In contrast, the exact posterior distribution is centered around the true number of trees, with its variance decreasing as the sample size increases.

Next, we address the problem of locating unobserved trees through $M_{\xi'}$, as discussed in Section 6.1. Under the naive approach, this task is performed using the mean measure of $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$. Figure S2 compares inference from our model and the naive alternative for $n = 15$, while Figure S3 presents results from our model for $n \in \{5, 25, 50\}$. Similar insights to those discussed for Figure 2 apply. In particular, Figure S2 shows that the naive approach assumes a higher probability of finding an unobserved tree at locations farther from the observed trees \mathbf{x}^* , as inference is based on $\xi_{\mathbf{x}^*}^!$, which is a DPP. In contrast, Figures S2 and S3 reveal the distinctive repulsive structure of ξ' across different sample sizes. Specifically, our model predicts a low probability of finding a tree at $\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$ if it is too close to an observed tree, as expected. However,

it also suggests that locations "too far" from observed trees may have a small probability of containing a tree, as they might not align with the accumulation patterns inferred from the data.

For completeness, Figure S4 presents inference on the locations of unobserved trees through $M_{\xi'}$ for $n \in \{5, 25, 50\}$ under the scenario where hyperparameters are estimated via the empirical Bayes approach from Section 6.2. As aimed for, the results are consistent with those obtained under the oracle strategy, as evidenced by the clear similarity between Figures S4 and S3.




Figure S1: Posterior distribution of the total number of trees. From left to right: calculations performed using Le Cam's approximation of the Poisson-binomial, exact computations, and posterior of $\xi_{x^*}^!(\mathbb{X})$. Different line colors correspond to different sample sizes; the black vertical line indicates the true number of trees.




Figure S2: Locating the unobserved trees for $n = 15$: infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree in a given location. Left plot: the mean measure of ξ' . Right plot: the mean measure of $\xi_{w^*}^1$. The red dots represent the observed trees in the sample. The black crosses indicate the unseen trees. Note that the color scales of the two plots are different.




Figure S3: Locating the unobserved trees for $n \in \{5, 25, 50\}$: infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree in a given location. The three plots report $M_{\xi'}$ for the three sample sizes. The red dots represent the observed trees in the sample. The black crosses indicate the unseen trees. Note that the color scales of the plots are different.




Figure S4: Locating the unobserved trees for $n \in \{5, 25, 50\}$: infinitesimal probability of observing an unseen tree in a given location. The three plots report $M_{\xi'}$ for the three sample sizes. The red dots represent the observed trees in the sample. The black crosses indicate the unseen trees. Note that the color scales of the plots are different.