

Bayesian Measures of Leverage and Influence

Martyn Plummer

25 March 2025

Abstract

Local sensitivity diagnostics for Bayesian models are described that are analogues of frequentist measures of leverage and influence. The diagnostics are simple to calculate using MCMC. A comparison between leverage and influence allows a general purpose definition of an outlier based on local perturbations. These outliers may indicate areas where the model does not fit well even if they do not influence model fit. The sensitivity diagnostics are closely related to predictive information criteria that are commonly used for Bayesian model choice. A diagnostic for prior-data conflict is proposed that may also be used to measure cross-conflict between different parts of the data.

1 Introduction

Leverage and influence are two closely related concepts in regression model diagnostics. Influence is the effect of deleting an observation on the fit of the model or, more generally, the effect of perturbing its case weight (Cook, 1986). Leverage is the sensitivity of fitted values to changes in the values of the corresponding observations. Leverage is distinguished from influence by being a function of only the predictor variables. An observation with high leverage has an unusual pattern of predictor variables compared with the other observations. This tends to pull the model fit closer to the observed outcome, whatever its value. Thus, models with high leverage can also be influential.

In frequentist inference for linear models, Cook's statistic is widely used to assess influence (Cook and Weisberg, 1982). Leverage in linear models is measured by hat-values, which are the diagonal elements of the hat matrix that projects observed values onto fitted values. Approximate versions of these diagnostics can be calculated for generalized linear models (GLMs) via the iterative weighted least squares algorithm, which represents the fitted GLM as a weighted linear model (Nelder and Wedderburn, 1972). Leverage diagnostics have been extended to linear mixed models (Demidenko and Stukel, 2005; Nobre and Singer, 2011). Influence measures based on case deletion have also been extended to linear mixed models (Christensen et al., 1992). However, a more popular approach to frequentist influence analysis has been the local influence approach of Cook (1986) that perturbs the case weights of each observation. This has led to the development of local influence diagnostics for linear mixed models (Beckman et al., 1987; Lesaffre and Verbeke, 1998) and generalized linear mixed models (Ouwens et al., 2001; Rakhmawati et al., 2017) as well as models with missing data (Zhu and Lee, 2001).

In Bayesian modelling, influence is assessed by changes to either the posterior distribution of the parameters or the posterior predictive distribution for new data. These changes are typically summarized by a divergence measure such as Kullback-Leibler divergence. Bayesian model diagnostics can be broadly classified into two groups: global and local. In global sensitivity analysis, quantities of interest are re-assessed after making a discrete change to the model, such as deleting one or more observations. In local sensitivity analysis, the effects of small perturbations to the model are assessed. In this article, a local sensitivity approach is used to characterize Bayesian influence and leverage. This reveals a surprising connection with predictive information criteria, which are used to assess goodness of fit in Bayesian modelling (Gelman et al., 2014). The title of this article is a self-conscious reference to *Bayesian Measures of Model Complexity and Fit*, the paper that introduced the deviance information criterion (DIC) (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002b, 2014). Since the DIC was introduced, various other predictive information criteria have been proposed (Gelman et al., 2004; Plummer, 2008; Watanabe, 2010). All of these combine a measure of model fit or adequacy with a complexity penalty. The

penalties can be reinterpreted as measures of either leverage or influence. At the risk of pouring new wine into old bottles, one purpose of this article is to highlight the connections between local influence diagnostics and predictive information criteria, and to give insight into how and when the various information criteria will behave differently.

The rest of the article proceeds as follows: Section 2 introduces notation that will be used throughout the article and a simple linear model that can be used to illustrate some of the diagnostics. Section 3 discusses Bayesian influence diagnostics and their relation to the Widely Applicable Information Criterion (WAIC) (Watanabe, 2009, 2010). Section 4 discusses Bayesian leverage diagnostics and their relation to DIC. Section 5 discusses multivariate perturbations and introduces a proposal to detect outlying observations. Section 7 uses a selection of real-world and artificial datasets to illustrate these ideas. In section 9, the complexity penalty proposed by Gelman et al. (2004, p. 182) is examined as a possible diagnostic for prior-data conflict. Section 10 ends with a discussion.

2 Notation

Suppose that the data consist of pairs $\{\mathbf{x}_i, Y_i\}$ for $i = 1 \dots n$, where the outcome variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n are conditionally independent given the predictor variables $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. Consider a parametric probability model for Y_i given \mathbf{x}_i parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. The likelihood function for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is

$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (1)$$

A commonly used framework for Bayesian local influence is the weighted pseudo-likelihood

$$L_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})^{w_i} \quad (2)$$

where $w_1 \dots w_n$ are non-negative real-valued case weights. If w_i is an integer, then the weighted likelihood (2) corresponds to observing w_i identical copies of observation i . This includes $w_i = 0$, which corresponds to observing no copies or, equivalently, deleting the observation.

If $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the prior density function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ then the pseudo-posterior $p_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})$ is derived by applying Bayes theorem using the weighted likelihood

$$p_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}) \propto \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})L_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (3)$$

The effect on the posterior of using the weighted pseudo-likelihood (2) instead of the likelihood (1) can be measured using phi-divergences. A phi-divergence between two density functions $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}), g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be written in integral form as

$$\Delta(f, g) = \int \varphi \left(\frac{g(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right) f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad (4)$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function such that $\varphi(1) = 0$. Phi-divergences are always non-negative and are exactly equal to zero only if the two densities f, g are equal. The family of phi-divergences includes the Kullback-Leibler divergence (for $\varphi(r) = -\log(r)$), the reverse Kullback-Leibler divergence (for $\varphi = r \log(r)$), the squared Hellinger distance (for $\varphi(r) = 1 - \sqrt{r}$), and the total variation distance (for $\varphi(r) = |r - 1|/2$). However, attention will be restricted to divergences where $\varphi(r)$ is twice differentiable at $r = 1$, which excludes the total variation distance.

2.1 Normal linear model

None of the diagnostics discussed in this article depend on simplifying assumptions such as linearity. Nevertheless, it can be helpful to illustrate how measures of leverage and influence behave in simple models. This will be done throughout the text with the normal-normal linear model.

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &\sim N(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\theta}, \sigma^2) \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} &\sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \Psi^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For simplicity, the residual variance σ^2 is assumed known. The non-informative limiting prior is obtained when the largest eigenvalue of the prior precision Ψ tends to zero. Under this limit, the posterior expectation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ coincides with the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

Let X be the design matrix, an $n \times p$ matrix such that row i is \mathbf{x}_i^T . Then the fitted values for \mathbf{Y} are defined by $\bar{Y} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(X\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{Y}) = H\mathbf{Y}$, where H is the hat matrix

$$H = X^T(\Psi\sigma^2 + X^T X)^{-1} X$$

The diagonal elements of the hat matrix $h_{11} \dots h_{nn}$ are the hat-values which are the frequentist measures of leverage for each observation since $\partial\bar{Y}_i/\partial Y_i = h_{ii}$.

The residual for observation i is the difference between the observed and fitted values

$$r_i = y_i - \bar{y}_i$$

3 Local Influence

If all case weights are close to 1 then, assuming sufficient regularity conditions, the divergence $\Delta(\mathbf{w})$ between $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{Y})$ and $p_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{Y})$ can be approximated by a Taylor series expansion

$$\Delta(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{\varphi''(1)}{2}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1})^T V(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}) + o(\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}\|^2) \quad (6)$$

where V is the posterior variance-covariance matrix of the log-likelihood contributions:

$$V_{ij} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\log p(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}), \log p(Y_j \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{Y})$$

Thus all phi-divergences have the same local behaviour up to a constant of proportionality $\varphi''(1)$.

In the case when only observation i is perturbed (*i.e.* $w_j = 1$ for $j \neq i$), the divergence is

$$\Delta(w_i) \approx \frac{\varphi''(1)}{2} (w_i - 1)^2 V_{ii} \quad (7)$$

Based on this approximation, [Millar and Stewart \(2007\)](#) proposed that $V_{ii} = \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\log p(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{Y})$ could be used as a Bayesian influence diagnostic. Further theoretical elaboration of this idea was provided by [van der Linde \(2007\)](#). Following [Millar and Stewart \(2007\)](#), let

$$\text{LINF}_i = V_{ii} = \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\log p(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{Y})$$

be the local influence of observation i .

3.1 Local influence and WAIC

The Widely Applicable Information Criterion (WAIC) [Watanabe \(2010\)](#) is a predictive information criterion derived from singular learning theory ([Watanabe, 2009](#)). In fact, there are two versions of WAIC which use different loss functions to assess the goodness of fit of a Bayesian model. The first version is based on the Bayes generalization loss function

$$BL_g = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{Y_i^t} \{\log E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [p(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{Y}] \mid \mathbf{x}_i\} \quad (8)$$

where the outer expectation $E_{Y_i^t}$ is over the true distribution of Y_i given \mathbf{x}_i . Since this distribution is unknown, we replace BL_g with its empirical estimate to get the Bayes training loss.

$$BL_t = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [p(Y_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{Y}] \quad (9)$$

The second version of WAIC is derived from the Gibbs generalization loss

$$GL_g = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \{ \mathbf{E}_{Y_i}^t [\log p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{x}_i] | \mathbf{Y} \} \quad (10)$$

and its empirical estimate, the Gibbs training loss:

$$GL_t = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\log p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}] \quad (11)$$

In both cases, the training loss systematically underestimates the generalization loss because it uses the data twice: once to estimate the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and again to estimate the expectation of the loss. This bias can be corrected by adding a penalty to give Widely Applicable Information Criteria

$$\text{WAIC}_1 = BL_t + \frac{p_W}{n} \quad (12)$$

$$\text{WAIC}_2 = GL_t + \frac{p_W}{n} \quad (13)$$

where the WAIC penalty is

$$p_W = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\log p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}] \quad (14)$$

In singular learning theory, $p_W/2$ is an estimate of the *singular fluctuation*, one of two bilateral invariants that define the dimensions of a model (Watanabe, 2009). The other bilateral invariant is the *real log canonical threshold*, which is used in the construction of the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) for singular models Drton and Plummer (2017).

Both WAIC_1 and WAIC_2 are asymptotically unbiased estimates of their respective generalization losses to order $o(n^{-1})$ even when the model is misspecified, *i.e.* when the true data-generating distribution of \mathbf{Y} is not one of the distributions parametrized by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (Watanabe, 2010).

The WAIC penalty p_W can be rewritten as the sum of the local influence values for individual observations.

$$p_W = \sum_{i=1}^n V_{ii} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{LINF}_i$$

Thus observations that are more influential contribute more to the WAIC penalty.

Watanabe (2009) also proposed an alternate penalty based on the difference between the Gibbs and Bayes training losses:

$$p_W^* = 2n(GL_t - BL_t)$$

This alternative WAIC penalty can also be interpreted in terms of sensitivity. If the quadratic approximation (7) holds in the interval $w_i \in [0, 2]$ then we can, paradoxically, estimate the effect of deleting an observation ($w_i = 0$) by doubling its weight instead ($w_i = 2$). This is represented by the weight vector $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^i$, where $\delta_j^i = I(i = j)$. This not a local perturbation, so different phi-divergences will give different expressions. Choosing the Kullback-Leibler divergence gives

$$\Delta_{KL}(\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^i) = -\mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\log p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}] + \log \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}]$$

which is the difference between the contributions of observation i to the Gibbs training loss and the Bayes training loss. Hence, if we define the *doubling influence* for observation i as

$$\text{DINF}_i = 2\Delta_{KL}(\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^i)$$

then the alternate WAIC penalty can be written as

$$p_W^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{DINF}_i$$

The two WAIC penalties p_W and p_W^* are asymptotically equivalent (Watanabe, 2009), but they can behave differently in small samples. In a survey of predictive information criteria Gelman et al. (2014) note that p_W gives a better approximation to leave-one-out cross-validation error than p_W^* .

3.2 Influence in the linear model

For the linear model of section 2.1, the local influence of observation i can be expressed in terms of its residual r_i and hat-value h_{ii} . We can do the same for the doubling influence DINF_i , as well as the zeroing influence $\text{ZINF}_i = \Delta_{KL}(\mathbf{1} - \delta^i)$ which sets the weight of observation i to zero, equivalent to deleting the observation.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{LINF}_i &= \frac{r_i^2 h_{ii}}{\sigma^2} + \frac{h_{ii}^2}{2} \\ \text{DINF}_i &= \frac{r_i^2 h_{ii}}{\sigma^2(1+h_{ii})} + h_{ii} - \log(1+h_{ii}) \\ \text{ZINF}_i &= \frac{r_i^2 h_{ii}}{\sigma^2(1-h_{ii})} - h_{ii} - \log(1-h_{ii})\end{aligned}$$

Asymptotically these influence measures are all equivalent as $h_{ii} = O(n^{-1})$. In small samples they may be quite different for observations with large hat-values. In particular there is a strict ordering $\text{DINF}_i < \text{LINF}_i < \text{ZINF}_i$ for $h_{ii} \in (0, 1]$. If the aim is to estimate the influence of deleting an observation (ZINF) then LINF is a better approximation than DINF. This is consistent with the finding of Gelman et al. (2014) that p_W gives a better approximation than p_W^* to cross-validation loss.

In the non-informative limit, all three Bayesian influence measures may be compared with Cook's distance

$$D_i^{\text{Cook}} = \frac{1}{k} \frac{r_i^2 h_{ii}}{\sigma^2(1-h_{ii})^2}$$

For high-leverage observations, as the hat-value h_{ii} approaches its maximum value of 1, both ZINF_i and D_i^{Cook} tend to infinity, whereas LINF_i and DINF_i do not.

4 Leverage

As noted in the introduction, the leverage of an observation is a function of its predictor variables \mathbf{x}_i and does not depend directly on the observed outcome Y_i , although it may depend indirectly via the contribution of Y_i to parameter estimation. In Bayesian inference, this direct dependence on the outcome can be attained by adopting a posterior predictive approach. Consider a replicate observation Y_i^r , which is conditionally independent of \mathbf{Y} given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ but has the same predictors \mathbf{x}_i and the same distribution as Y_i given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The expected effect of observing Y_i^r on the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be assessed using the expected divergence:

$$\bar{\Delta}_i = \iint \varphi \left(\frac{p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}, Y_i^r)}{p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})} \right) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, Y_i^r | \mathbf{Y}) dY_i^r d\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad (15)$$

Although (15) is conceptually useful for understanding how to define leverage in a Bayesian context, it is of limited practical value. Each phi-divergence gives a different value of $\bar{\Delta}$ and the double integral cannot be easily calculated, even for the Kullback-Leibler divergence. See Ryan et al. (2016) who discuss the difficulty of estimating these divergences in the context of Bayesian experimental design. For sensitivity analysis, these problems can be overcome by returning to the idea of local perturbations. Instead of using all the information from the replicate measurement, consider using partial information with the pseudo-likelihood

$$L_{\mathbf{w}^r}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = L(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_i p(Y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta})^{w_i^r}$$

where $w_1^r \dots w_n^r$ are non-negative case weights for the replicate outcomes $Y_1^r \dots Y_n^r$. Defining the pseudo-posterior

$$p_{\mathbf{w}^r}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}^r) \propto \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) L_{\mathbf{w}^r}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

the expected local divergence given \mathbf{w}^r is

$$\bar{\Delta}(\mathbf{w}^r) = \iint \varphi \left(\frac{p_{\mathbf{w}^r}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}^r)}{p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})} \right) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{Y}^r | \mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y}^r d\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad (16)$$

Assuming sufficient regularity conditions, a Taylor expansion for values of \mathbf{w}^r close to zero gives

$$\bar{\Delta}(\mathbf{w}^r) = \varphi'(1) \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^r h_i + o(\|\mathbf{w}^r\|) \quad (17)$$

where h_i is the *Bayesian hat-value*

$$h_i = \mathbb{E}_{Y_i^r} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\log p(Y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}, Y_i^r] - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\log p(Y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}] | \mathbf{Y} \} \quad (18)$$

As with local influence, all phi-divergences have the same local behaviour up to a constant of proportionality. In contrast to equation (6), which is quadratic in terms of the case weights for the observations $w_1 \dots w_n$, equation (18) is linear in the replicate case weights $w_1^r \dots w_n^r$.

In the case when only one replicate is introduced (*i.e.* $w_j^r = 0$ for $j \neq i$), the expected local divergence is

$$\bar{\Delta}(w_i^r) \approx \varphi'(1) w_i^r h_i$$

This suggests that the Bayesian hat-value h_i can be used as a measure of leverage for observation i .

$$\text{LLEV}_i = h_i$$

The double expectation on the right hand side of equation (18) can be expressed in a more computationally tractable integral form (Plummer, 2002, 2008) as

$$h_i = \iint \Delta_{KL} \left(p(y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}), p(y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}) \right) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)} | \mathbf{Y}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)} | \mathbf{Y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)} d\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)} \quad (19)$$

Hence h_i can be estimated by drawing two independent samples $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}$ from the posterior distribution. For example, when using MCMC this can be done using parallel chains. The integrand in (19) is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the predictive distributions for a replicate measurement y_i^r . If this is not available in algebraic form then it can be estimated empirically by drawing replicate samples to get an unbiased estimate of Δ_{KL} .

4.1 Local leverage and DIC

Spiegelhalter et al. (2002b) introduced the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) as a Bayesian generalization of the Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike, 1973). Let $D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -2 \log p(\mathbf{Y} | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the deviance, and let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})$ be the posterior expectation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Then

$$\text{DIC} = D(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + 2 p_D$$

DIC combines a measure of model fit or adequacy $D(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ with a complexity penalty

$$p_D = D(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \bar{D} \quad (20)$$

where $\bar{D} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y})$ is the posterior expectation of D . Other variants of DIC are possible using different plug-in estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ such as the posterior median or mode.

Spiegelhalter et al. (2002b) called p_D the *effective number of parameters*, noting that if there is a non-informative limit for the prior distribution $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ then $p_D \rightarrow k$, the dimension of the parameter space Θ .

The penalty p_D has some theoretical problems which were the subject of vigorous discussion when the DIC was introduced (Brooks et al., 2002). Firstly, p_D is not parametrization invariant, *e.g.* for a variance parameter the value of p_D changes depending on whether it is parametrized as a variance, a standard deviation, or a precision parameter. This can be mitigated by using the posterior median instead of the mean. Secondly, p_D may be negative when the likelihood is not log-concave in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. This is not consistent with its interpretation as the effective number of parameters. To address these problems, Plummer (2008) suggested an alternative definition of the effective number of parameters

$$p_D^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{Y_i^r} [\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\log p(Y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}, Y_i^r) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\log p(Y_i^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}) | \mathbf{Y}] \quad (21)$$

The derivation of p_D^* is based on an explicit attempt to measure the optimism of the expected log likelihood which is a scaled version of the Gibbs training loss (11), and hence is biased due to using the data twice. Equation (21) compares the expected log likelihood of a new observation Y_i^r under two posteriors: one that only uses the current observations \mathbf{Y} , and one that incorporates information from Y_i^r into the posterior of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The difference between these two expectations is an approximation to the rational penalty that should be paid for using the observation Y_i twice (Plummer, 2008).

The summand on the right hand side of equation (21) is recognizable as the Bayesian hat-value from equation (18). Hence we can write

$$p_D^* = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{LLEV}_i$$

In the same way that p_W and p_W^* can be expressed as the sum of influence values, p_D^* can be expressed as the sum of local leverage values.

Local leverage has an interesting connection with Value-of-Information (VoI) analysis, a branch of decision theory that is concerned the cost-effectiveness of collecting additional data. Jackson et al. (2022) discuss how VoI can assess the sensitivity of models to different sources of uncertainty and also how it can be applied to estimation problems. Suppose that the utility of the posterior distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})$ is measured by the expected log-likelihood of a replicate data set $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\log p(\mathbf{Y}^r | \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{Y}]$. The Bayesian hat-value h_i is the expected increase in utility from observing Y_i^r before calculating the posterior distribution. In VoI terms this is called the *expected value of sample information* (EVSI). Likewise, $p_D^* = \sum_i h_i$ is the EVSI for observing the whole replicate data set \mathbf{Y}^r .

4.2 Leverage in the linear model

In the linear model of section 2.1, the Bayesian hat-value of observation i is the i th diagonal element of the hat matrix, *i.e.* $h_i = h_{ii}$ and hence coincides with the frequentist measure of leverage. Additionally, the alternate definition of the effective number of parameters p_D^* (21) coincides with the original definition p_D (20) and both are equal to the trace of the hat matrix

$$p_D = p_D^* = \text{tr}(H)$$

The connection between p_D and the trace of the hat matrix in the linear model was highlighted by Spiegelhalter et al. (2002b), who also noted that there had been previous proposals to characterize the effective number of parameters as the trace of the hat matrix in spline models (Wahba, 1990), generalized additive models (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990) and hierarchical linear models (Hodges and Sargent, 2001). They also suggested that individual contributions to p_D could be used as leverages. The derivation of the Bayesian hat-value from the expected local divergence (16) formalizes this relationship and justifies its application to general Bayesian models.

5 Multivariate perturbations

While the diagnostics LLEV_i and LINF_i may be useful ways to characterize the leverage and influence of individual observations, these diagnostics are derived from a much richer set of model perturbations in equations (6) and (17). More useful diagnostic information may be obtained by considering this larger perturbation set. This presents a problem that the local influence and leverage perturbations are not directly comparable. The case weights \mathbf{w} allow both positive and negative perturbations, whereas only positive perturbations of the replicate weights \mathbf{w}^r are allowed. Moreover, the divergence used to measure influence is locally quadratic in $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}$ but the expected divergence used to measure leverage is locally linear in \mathbf{w}^r . In order to make the local behaviour of these divergences comparable, we consider perturbations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} w_i &= 1 + \epsilon_i \\ w_i^r &= \epsilon_i^2 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

so that both divergences are locally quadratic in ϵ . This is a redundant parametrization of the possible perturbations of the replicate weights. Nevertheless, it can be a useful way to construct a set of complementary perturbations. If $\epsilon^1 \dots \epsilon^n$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n then the corresponding replicate weights $\mathbf{w}^{r1} \dots \mathbf{w}^{rn}$ represent a factorization of the likelihood for the replicate observations

$$\prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i^r | \theta) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i^r | \theta)^{w_i^{rj}} \right)$$

where $\sum_i w_i^{rj} = 1$ so that each vector \mathbf{w}^{rj} represents a perturbation to the model equivalent to one observation on a linear scale.

Two important developments in frequentist inference provide a model for multivariate perturbations of Bayesian models. Firstly, [Cook \(1986\)](#) developed local influence diagnostics based on the likelihood displacement

$$LD(\mathbf{w}) = 2 \left[\log L(\hat{\theta}) - \log L(\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}) \right]$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}$ is the estimate of θ obtained by maximizing the weighted likelihood $L_{\mathbf{w}}(\theta)$. For case weights close to 1, the likelihood displacement is

$$LD(\mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1})^T M (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}) / 2 + o(\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}\|^2)$$

where M is the Hessian matrix

$$M = \left. \frac{\partial^2 LD}{\partial \mathbf{w} \partial \mathbf{w}^T} \right|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{1}_n}$$

Eigenvalue decomposition of M indicates the multivariate perturbations of the case weights that correspond to maximum influence.

[Cook \(1986\)](#) suggested that this approach could be adapted to Bayesian inference by substituting the Kullback-Leibler divergence for the the likelihood displacement and this idea was taken up by [McCulloch \(1989\)](#). Similarly, [Lavine \(1992\)](#) looked at multivariate perturbations of case-weights but looked at divergence of the posterior predictive distribution $p(\mathbf{Y}^r | \mathbf{Y})$ instead of the poster distribution of the parameters. In the linear model of section 2.1, this gives a measure of local influence that takes the same algebraic form as $LINF_i$ but with h_{ii} replaced by $h_{ii}/(1 + h_{ii})$ and hence more closely resembles the doubling influence $DINF_i$

The observation by [Millar and Stewart \(2007\)](#) that the Hessian matrix of the posterior divergence with respect to the case weights is the variance-covariance matrix V cuts through the algebraic complexity of this approach and enables straightforward estimation when using simulation-based Bayesian inference. The eigenvector of V corresponding to the largest eigenvalue indicates the maximally influential perturbation. More generally, multivariate analysis techniques applied to V can reveal clusters of influential points that may otherwise be hidden by masking and swamping effects as shown by [Thomas et al. \(2018\)](#).

The second key development in frequentist inference was the proposal of [Poon and Poon \(1999\)](#) to summarize the influence of a perturbation ϵ in terms of the conformal normal curvature.

$$\frac{\epsilon^T M \epsilon}{\text{tr}(M^2)^{1/2} (\epsilon^T \epsilon)}$$

which depends on the direction but not the magnitude of the perturbation, and is invariant under conformal transformations of the perturbation space. A simplified definition of conformal normal curvature suitable for positive definite matrices is given by [Zhu and Lee \(2001\)](#)

$$\frac{\epsilon^T M \epsilon}{\text{tr}(M) (\epsilon^T \epsilon)}$$

Using this definition, we can define the conformal local influence

$$\text{CLINF}(\epsilon) = \frac{\epsilon^T V \epsilon}{\text{tr}(V) (\epsilon^T \epsilon)} = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j V_{ij} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j}{(\sum_i v_{ii}) (\sum_j \epsilon_j^2)}$$

and conformal local leverage

$$\text{CLLEV}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T H \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{\text{tr}(H)(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon})} = \frac{\sum_i h_i \epsilon_i^2}{(\sum_i h_i)(\sum_j \epsilon_j^2)}$$

where $H = \text{diag}(h_1 \dots h_n)$.

If $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^1 \dots \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^n$ form an orthogonal basis for \mathbb{R}^n then

$$\sum_i \text{CLINF}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^i) = \sum_i \text{CLLEV}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^i) = 1$$

So that the conformal local influence measures the proportion of total influence attributable to a perturbation in direction $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^i$. Likewise the conformal local leverage measures the proportion of total leverage. Univariate perturbations give conformal local influence and leverage statistics for each observation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CLINF}_i &= \text{CLINF}(\boldsymbol{\delta}^i) = \frac{V_{ii}}{\sum_j V_{jj}} = \frac{\text{LINF}_i}{p_W} \\ \text{CLLEV}_i &= \text{CLLEV}(\boldsymbol{\delta}^i) = \frac{h_i}{\sum_j h_j} = \frac{\text{LLEV}_i}{p_D^*} \end{aligned}$$

which are the proportional contributions of observation i to p_W and p_D^* , respectively.

Millar and Stewart (2007) proposed a similar standardization of the local influence statistic to CLINF_i . Noting that the influence statistic V_{ii} tends to grow with model complexity, and that Gelman et al. (2004, p. 182) had proposed $p_V = 2 \text{LINF}(\mathbf{1})$ as an alternative estimate of model complexity, Millar and Stewart (2007) proposed a standardized influence measure $\text{LINF}(\boldsymbol{\delta}^i)/\text{LINF}(\mathbf{1}) = V_{ii}/\sum_{jk} V_{jk}$. At the time, it was not widely understood that $p_V = \sum_i V_{ii}$ is also a measure of model dimension as this preceded the work of Watanabe (2009, 2010). The connection between local influence and the WAIC penalty p_W was made later by Millar (2018).

6 Outlier detection

Separation of the concepts of leverage and influence allows a more fine-grained analysis of anomalous observations. If an observation has high leverage then we may consider it influential by design and look more closely at its predictor variables \mathbf{x}_i . If an observation has high influence but low leverage then we may investigate whether its outcome Y_i has an unusual or extreme value, in which case it would be classified as an outlier. Outliers represent observations that are not well predicted by the model – regardless of whether they are influential or not – and may point to possible elaborations of the model that would improve the fit.

Formalising this notion, define the conformal local outlier statistic

$$\text{CLOUT}_i = \frac{\text{CLINF}_i}{\text{CLLEV}_i} = \frac{V_{ii} \sum_j h_j}{h_i \sum_j V_{jj}}$$

as the ratio between conformal local influence and leverage. Observations with high values of CLOUT_i may be considered outliers. The CLOUT diagnostic is non-directional. For scalar outcomes it does not tell us if Y_i is unusually high or low. On the other hand, it has the advantage of applying to multivariate outcomes.

The idea of comparing leverage and influence diagnostics in order to identify outliers was proposed by Parsons and Bao (2022), who developed a general decision-theoretic framework based on value-of-information (VoI) analysis (Jackson et al., 2022). Under VoI, the value of sample information (VSI) is the change in loss due to observing new data. Parsons and Bao (2022) proposed a measure of leverage – the prospective expected VSI of Y_i – based on the leave-one-out posterior $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_{-i})$, and a measure of influence – the retrospective expected VSI of Y_i – based on the full posterior $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y})$. The ratio between these two statistics give expected value of information ratio $\text{EVOIR}(Y_i | \mathbf{Y}_{-i})$, which has the property

$$E_{Y_i} [\text{EVOIR}(Y_i | \mathbf{Y}_{-i}) | \mathbf{Y}_{-i}] = 1$$

Hence observations with $\text{EVOIR} > 1$ are more influential than expected given the other data.

While CLOUT has a similar purpose to EVOIR, it does not have the same decision-theoretic foundation. The lack of rigorous justification is compensated by ease of computation since CLOUT statistics can be calculated from the full posterior for all observations. In addition, since CLOUT is based on local influence, it may be extended to multivariate perturbations.

6.1 Multivariate outliers

Generalizing the CLOUT diagnostic to multivariate perturbations of the form (22), define the outlier matrix.

$$\Omega = \frac{\text{tr}(H)}{\text{tr}(V)} H^{-1/2} V H^{-1/2} \quad (23)$$

and the generalized CLOUT diagnostic

$$\text{CLOUT}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T \Omega \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$$

The diagonal elements of Ω then correspond to univariate perturbations of individual observations, *i.e.* $\text{CLOUT}(\boldsymbol{\delta}^i) = \Omega_{ii} = \text{CLOUT}_i$.

Eigenvalue decomposition of the outlier matrix Ω indicates which multivariate perturbations are informative about outlying observations. If $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^1 \dots \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^n$ are the corresponding eigenvectors of Ω then $\text{CLOUT}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^i) = \lambda_i$. Hence the principal eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^1$ is the perturbation that is maximally outlying and the observations that contribute to this perturbation can be identified by inspecting the elements of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^1$.

Focusing on the principal eigenvalue works best when Ω has a large spectral gap so that the principal eigenvector accounts for most of the anomalous observations. In high-dimensional problems it is possible for Ω to have multiple large eigenvalues that all correspond to perturbations of interest. One approach to this situation is to use clustering methods to identify groups of observations as in [Thomas et al. \(2018\)](#). Another possibility, which will be used in section 8, is to look at the aggregate effect of multiple perturbations. This can be done by noting that the univariate CLOUT statistics can be written

$$\text{CLOUT}_i = \Omega_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j (\epsilon_i^j)^2$$

Hence we can define a truncated CLOUT statistic that only considers contributions from the m largest eigenvalues

$$\text{trunc}(\text{CLOUT}_i, m) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j (\epsilon_i^j)^2$$

In the limit $m = 1$

$$\text{trunc}(\text{CLOUT}_i, 1) = \lambda_1 (\epsilon_i^1)^2$$

which is equivalent to inspecting the squared elements of the principal eigenvector.

7 Examples

7.1 Abalone data

The data set Abalone ([Nash et al., 1994a](#)), from the UCI Machine Learning Repository ([Kelly et al., 2023](#)), contains data on the edible marine shellfish commonly known as Abalone. The Abalone were caught by the Marine Research Laboratories of the Tasmanian State Government during a marine survey in 1988 ([Nash et al., 1994b](#)). The data set contains a small number of anomalous observations which can be readily found using exploratory data analysis. The aim of this example is to show how these anomalous observations can be found after model fitting using local influence diagnostics.

[Vaugh \(1995\)](#) used the data to predict the age of an abalone from physical measurements. Here we consider a different problem of predicting the amount of meat (the ‘‘shucked weight’’) obtained from an abalone based on length, diameter, height, weight, and sex.

After removing the immature individuals, there are $n=2835$ abalone in the data set. A gamma GLM with log link was fitted to the data with log link

$$\log(\mu_i) = \alpha + \beta_l \log(\text{length}) + \beta_d \log(\text{diameter}) + \beta_h \log(\text{height}) + \beta_w \log(\text{weight}) + \beta_s I(\text{sex}=\text{female})$$

Figure 1 shows the three conformal diagnostics for each observation indexed by row number: leverage (CLLEV), influence (CLINF), and the ratio of leverage to influence (CLOUT). Observations 1175 and 2052 have unusually high leverage. Both are also highly influential with 2052 accounting for nearly half of the conformal influence. The ratio of influence/leverage shows that 1175 is not an outlier, but reveals observation 2241, which does not appear outstanding in either the leverage plot or the influence plot.




Figure 1: Conformal local leverage (CLLEV), influence (CLINF), and outlyingness (CLOUT) for the abalone data.

Table 1 shows data for the three anomalous observations. High-leverage observations 1175 and 2052 have unusual height compared with their other dimensions: 1175 is very flat and 2052 is very tall. These values are so far outside the range of variation in the rest of the data that they are most

likely data errors. Outlying observation 2241 has unusually low shucked weight. The median ratio of shucked weight to whole weight in the whole data set is 0.43 with a lower 5th percentile of 0.33. Observation 2241 has a ratio of 0.17 which is the lowest in the data set.

row number	sex	length	diameter	height	whole weight	shucked weight
1175	F	127	99	3	231.3	102.3
2052	F	91	71	226	118.8	66.4
2241	M	83	63	25	77.6	13.6

Table 1: Data for the anomalous observations found by the diagnostic plots in figure 1.

8 Bike sharing data

The data set Bike Sharing (Fanaee-T, 2013), from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (Kelly et al., 2023), contains hourly data on the number of bicycles rented out by the company Capital Bikeshare DC in the years 2011 and 2012. This is a useful data set for illustrating outlier analysis because an explanation for anomalous observations can be found in public media sources.

The number of bicycles hired by users without a subscription – known as “casual users” – was modelled using Poisson regression with predictors based on time of day, season, and various weather indicators. Full details of the model are given in the supplementary materials. The linear predictor also included indicator variables for weekends and for public holidays. The model training data was restricted to the year 2011.

The model is based on hourly rental data, with a separate outcome for each hour of the day giving $n = 8760$ independent observations. For the purposes of evaluating local sensitivity, we are not constrained to keep this fine-grained view of the data. Instead, local influence for each day was assessed using the sum of the log-likelihood contributions from each 24-hour period. Local leverage for each day was obtained by summing the hat-values for each hour.

Figure 3 shows conformal local influence $CLINF_i$ for each day of 2011. There are two outstandingly influential periods which are identified below. There were no days with outstandingly high leverage so a leverage plot is not shown. Figure 4 shows potential outliers based on $CLOUT_i$. In addition to the highly influential days identified by figure 3, this figure highlights several other periods where the model does not fit well. A cleaner version of figure 4 can be obtained by truncating the eigenvalue expansion of the outlier matrix Ω , as described in section 5. A scree plot (not shown) suggests that the first 7 principal components of Ω may be sufficient to capture the most interesting variation. Figure 5 shows only the sum of the contributions to $LOUT_i$ from these 7 principal components. The text labels identify the most important outliers, most of which are associated with public holidays. Interestingly, outlying days do not necessarily coincide with the public holiday but may occur the day before (*e.g.* the Sunday before Labor Day) or after (*e.g.* the Friday following Thanksgiving, popularly known as “Black Friday”). A cluster of outlying days is also visible at the end of the year, and to a lesser extent in the period around Thanksgiving. Figure 5 also highlights 27 August 2011 as an outlier. On this day, hurricane Irene hit the North Eastern United States. Anticipation of the incoming storm led to under-use of the Capital Bikeshare scheme until it was shutdown at 18:00.

The analysis of daily influence and leverage captures important differences in user behaviour that extend across whole days, but misses more short term changes. These can be detected by analysing the data at its original hourly scale. The most outlying hour, as measured by the $CLOUT$ statistic was from 0:00 to 1:00 on 2 May. The second most outlying hour, excluding previously identified holiday periods, was 15:00 to 16:00 on 23 August. Figure 2 shows hourly $CLOUT$ statistics for these two days. The reason for these outliers can be readily identified from the public record. On 1 May 2011 at 23:35, President Obama announced the death of Osama Bin Laden on live television. In the following hours, there were spontaneous gatherings in the centre of Washington, leading to an increase in the number of bicycles hired in the small hours of the morning when the network is typically very quiet. On 26 August at 13:51, there was a magnitude 5.8 earthquake in the Piedmont region of Virginia.




Figure 2: Hourly CLOUT statistics for two days when normal usage was disrupted by unusual events.

This severely disrupted transport networks in Washington DC, leading to an increase in bicycle hiring as commuters sought alternative forms of transport.

8.1 Hawkins-Bradu-Kass data

The Hawkins-Bradu-Kass (HBK) data is an artificial data set (Hawkins et al., 1984) that challenges outlier detection methods based on perturbing a single observation. Figure 6 illustrates the pairwise relationships between the three predictor variables X_1, X_2, X_3 and outcome Y in the HBK data. The observations can be clustered into 3 groups: group A, which constitutes the majority of the observations, shows no relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome; group B consists of observations that have high-leverage with respect to group A but maintain the same null relationship with Y ; group C are all outliers that pull the fitted least squares line away from the null.

The masking effect of multiple outliers makes the detection of the outlying group impossible using univariate methods that consider only one observation at a time. Thomas et al. (2018) show how the 3 clusters of observations can be detected after fitting a Bayesian linear model by applying multivariate analysis methods to the posterior variance matrix V of the log likelihood contributions.

In a frequentist analysis, outlier-robust linear regression methods can be used to identify group C as a set of outliers and, after down-weighting their influence, reveal the underlying null relationship in groups A and B. In a Bayesian analysis, one way to improve robustness of a linear model is to use a 2-component normal mixture for the outcome variable Y . This allows a small proportion of the data to be contaminated with observations with a distinct mean and variance from the rest. Details of the mixture model are given in the supplementary materials. After fitting the mixture model, figure 7 shows the loadings for the first principal component of V (top panel) and Ω (bottom panel). The top panel shows the direction of the perturbation ϵ that is maximally influential. This perturbation puts the highest loads on observations in group C. The bottom panel shows the maximally outlying perturbation, where observations in group C are given almost zero weight. The observations in group C are collectively influential but are not considered outliers in a mixture model that explicitly accounts for the presence of anomalous observations.




Figure 3: Conformal local influence for the bike sharing data.




Figure 4: Outliers for the bike sharing data based on the ratio of conformal local influence to conformal local leverage




Figure 5: Outliers for the bike sharing data based on the first 7 principal components of $H^{-1/2}VH^{-1/2}$




Figure 6: Hawkins-Bradru-Kass (HBK) artificial data set. Group A contains the majority of the data; group B is a set of 4 observations with high leverage; and group C is a set of 10 outliers. The grey line shows a univariate least-squares fit to each predictor variable.




Figure 7: Diagnostics for a normal mixture model fitted to the HBK data. The top panel (influence) shows factor loadings for the first principal component of V corresponding to a maximally influential perturbation. The bottom panel (outlyingness) shows factor loadings for the first principal component of the outlier matrix Ω corresponding to a maximally outlying perturbation.

9 Prior-data conflict

Gelman et al. (2004, p. 182) suggested an alternative penalty for DIC that avoids some of the known problems of p_D discussed in section 4.1. Their penalty is based on the posterior variance of the log-likelihood.

$$p_V = 2 \operatorname{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \log p(Y_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)$$

This superficially resembles the WAIC penalty p_W . However p_V is based on the variance of the sum of the log-likelihood contributions from each observations, whereas p_W is the sum of the variances. Moreover p_V is scaled by a factor of 2 to ensure $p_V \rightarrow k$ in the non-informative limit. In a retrospective review of DIC, Spiegelhalter et al. (2014) reported that they had considered p_V as an alternative penalty to p_D , but rejected it.

Like all of the previously considered penalty functions p_V can be interpreted in terms of local influence. From equation (6), p_V is local influence associated with the perturbation $\mathbf{w} = (1 + \epsilon)\mathbf{1}$ for small values of ϵ . The conformal local influence of this perturbation is

$$\text{CLINF}(\mathbf{1}) = \frac{\mathbf{1}^T V \mathbf{1}}{n \operatorname{tr}(V)} = \frac{1}{2n} \frac{p_V}{p_W}$$

Informally, $\text{CLINF}(\mathbf{1})$ measures the sensitivity of the posterior to the addition of new data that are similar to the observed data. High sensitivity to this perturbation would indicate a problem with the model fit, suggesting that the ratio p_V/p_W could be used directly as a model diagnostic.

9.1 pV in the linear model

Returning to the linear model of section 2.1, the two penalties can be written in terms of residuals r_i and the hat matrix H

$$p_W = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{h_{ii} r_i^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{h_{ii}^2}{2} \right) \quad (24)$$

$$p_V = 2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}^T H \mathbf{r}}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\text{tr}(H^2)}{2} \right) \quad (25)$$

Equation (25) is a multivariate version of (24), with an additional calibration factor of 2. However, the two expressions behave quite differently in the non-informative limit. In this case, the first term in (24) is $k + O_p(n^{-1/2})$ and the second term is $O(n^{-1})$. Conversely, the first term in (25) vanishes for a non-informative prior, and the second term is $\text{tr}(H^2) = \text{tr}(H) = k$ since H is an idempotent matrix of rank k in this case. Thus, although both p_W and p_V tend to k for a non-informative prior, they do so in different ways. This suggests that they are measuring different underlying quantities.

The first term in (25) can be rewritten as

$$2 \frac{\mathbf{r}^T H \mathbf{r}}{\sigma^2} = 2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^T S (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$$

where S is the information sandwich

$$S = J \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathbf{Y}) J$$

and $J = \sigma^{-2} X^T X = \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}$ is the Fisher information. Hence p_V grows when the posterior mean $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is far from the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ according to the metric S . This distance can only be large when there is an informative prior that is pulling the posterior mean $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ away from the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Hence in the linear model p_V/p_W measures conflict between the prior and the data. It is plausible that p_V/p_W could be used as a diagnostic for prior-data conflict in a wider class of models, especially those with a local linear representation.

9.2 Examples of prior-data conflict

Three examples below illustrate the use of p_V/p_W as a diagnostic for prior-data conflict. Two of the examples use the binomial distribution $y_i \sim \text{Bin}(\pi_i, m_i)$ where $\pi_i = \pi_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. There is some ambiguity in the definition of p_W for binomial data. If Y_i is considered the smallest unit of observation, then its contribution to p_W is

$$p_{W_i}^{\text{bin}} = \text{Var}[y_i \log(\pi_i) + (m_i - y_i) \log(1 - \pi_i)] \quad (26)$$

Conversely, if Y_i is considered as the sum of m_i independent Bernoulli trials, each of which can be individually perturbed, then their aggregate contribution to p_W is

$$p_{W_i}^{\text{bern}} = y_i \text{Var}[\log(\pi_i)] + (m_i - y_i) \text{Var}[\log(1 - \pi_i)] \quad (27)$$

The appropriate expression to use depends on the context. If a binomial outcome is obtained by repeated Bernoulli trials on the same observational unit then $p_{W_i}^{\text{bin}}$ is more appropriate. Conversely, if a binomial random variable is created by aggregating Bernoulli outcomes on different observational units that share the same predictor variables then $p_{W_i}^{\text{bern}}$ is more appropriate. These two scenarios give the same likelihood under the model, but suggest different perturbations to the data. In the examples used below, the latter penalty is used.

9.2.1 UNOS data

The first example is adapted from Gelfand (2003) using data from the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS). The data concerns $n = 235$ heart transplants that took place in 10 centres across




Figure 8: Posterior density for fixed-effect parameters μ_α (panel A) and μ_b (panel B) in the UNOS data model (28) using a weakly informative prior. The posterior densities are consistent with the maximum likelihood estimates shown by grey vertical lines. Dotted red lines show an alternative informative prior (29)

5 age groups. Let Y_{ca} represent the number of adverse outcomes – organ rejections or deaths – out of n_{ca} transplants in centre c , age group a . This is modelled by a mixed-effects logistic regression model

$$Y_{ca} \sim \text{Bin}(\pi_{ca}, n_{ca})$$

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_{ca}}{1 - \pi_{ca}}\right) = \mu_\alpha + \alpha_c + (\mu_\beta + \beta_c)X_a \quad (28)$$

where X_a is the midpoint age in group a , centred and scaled so that a unit increase in X_a represents a 10-year age difference.

The parameters μ_α, μ_β are fixed effects and α_c, β_c are centre-specific random effects for the intercept and slope.

$$\alpha_c \sim N(0, \sigma_\alpha^2)$$

$$\beta_c \sim N(0, \sigma_\beta^2)$$

with a sum-to-zero constraint $\sum_c \alpha_c = \sum_c \beta_c = 0$.

Figure 8 shows the posterior distributions of the fixed effects from a reference model that uses diffuse normal priors for μ_α, μ_β and weakly informative half- t priors on $\sigma_\alpha, \sigma_\beta$ (Full details of the model are given in the supplementary materials). The posteriors from this model are consistent with maximum likelihood estimates given by the `glmmer` function in the R package `lme4` (Bates et al., 2015), shown by the vertical grey lines. Figure 8 also shows alternative informative priors represented by the red dotted lines:

$$\mu_\alpha \sim N(-0.9, 0.20^2)$$

$$\mu_\beta \sim N(0.17, 0.05^2) \quad (29)$$

The informative priors take the prior probability mass further away from the maximum likelihood estimates. Focusing on μ_α , we consider the effect of increasing the prior-data conflict in two ways: firstly by shifting the prior mean further away from $\hat{\mu}_\alpha$, and secondly by concentrating the prior distribution about a fixed mean. The results are shown in table 2.

Prior on μ_α		p_D^*	p_W	p_V	p_V/p_W
mean	sd				
Reference		11.5	11.6	18.8	1.6
Mean shift					
-0.9	0.20	10.7	10.6	19.4	1.8
-0.7	0.20	10.4	10.2	20.3	2.0
-0.5	0.20	10.1	9.8	21.8	2.2
-0.3	0.20	10.0	9.6	23.4	2.4
-0.1	0.20	9.8	9.3	26.2	2.8
Concentration					
-0.9	0.20	10.6	10.5	19.4	1.8
-0.9	0.10	9.8	9.4	21.2	2.3
-0.9	0.05	8.6	8.0	20.7	2.6
-0.9	0.02	7.7	7.0	15.9	2.3
-0.9	0.01	7.6	6.9	13.9	2.0

Table 2: Effect of increasing prior-data conflict on penalty functions for DIC (p_D^*), WAIC (p_W), and the alternative DIC penalty suggested by Gelman et al. (2004) (p_V). Mean shift moves the prior mean progressively away from the maximum likelihood estimate. Concentration keeps the prior mean fixed but progressively reduces the prior standard deviation.

The first row of table 2 shows the results for the reference model. The ratio $p_V/p_W = 1.6$ may seem surprisingly high for model with a weakly informative prior. Note however that we only expect $p_V \approx p_W$ asymptotically for large n . In this example there are $5 \times 10 = 50$ binomial observations with an effective number of parameters $p_D^* = 11.5$ so the sample size may not be large enough for this asymptotic result to hold.

Row 2 of table 2 shows results for the informative prior (29) which shows a modest increase in p_V/p_W to 1.8. Rows 3-6 show the effect of shifting the prior mean further away from $\hat{\mu}_\alpha$. Each shift, equal to 1 prior standard deviation, leads to a further increase in p_V/p_W .

Rows 7-11 of table 2 show the effect of fixing the prior mean at -0.9 but reducing the prior standard deviation by approximately half each time. The ratio p_V/p_W is not a monotonic function of the concentration. It reaches a maximum of 2.6 for a prior standard deviation $\text{sd}=0.05$, then decreases to 2.3 for $\text{sd}=0.02$ and 2.0 for $\text{sd}=0.01$. This phenomenon may be explained by the fact that a sufficiently strong prior resolves prior-data conflict in favour of the prior, so that the posterior becomes insensitive to perturbations to the data.

9.2.2 Bristol Royal Infirmary inquiry data

In addition to detecting global prior-data conflict, the ratio p_V/p_W may be used to investigate divergent behaviour at different levels of a hierarchical model. This is illustrated with data from the Bristol Royal Infirmary inquiry presented by Marshall and Spiegelhalter (2007). The inquiry investigated claims of excess mortality in paediatric cardiac surgery carried out at the Bristol Royal Infirmary prior to 1995 (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002a). Panel A of figure 9 shows mortality in 12 hospitals where comparable cardiac surgeries took place.

Let Y_i be the number of deaths among n_i operations carried out at hospital i . Then the data can be analysed using a random effects model

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_i &\sim \text{Bin}(\pi_i, n_i) \\
 \log\left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i}\right) &= \theta_i \\
 \theta_i &\sim N(\beta, \omega^2)
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

with uniform priors on the hyper-parameters β, ω .

Taking a cross-validation approach, let \mathbf{Y}_{-i} be the data for all hospitals except hospital i . If the focus of interest is on hospital i then we can consider $p(Y_i | \theta_i)$ as the likelihood and $p(\theta_i | \mathbf{Y}_{-i})$ as a prior distribution for θ_i that subsumes all information from the other hospitals. Then there are 12 sets of paired statistics (p_{W_i}, p_{V_i}) , one for each hospital, where p_{W_i} is defined by perturbing each of the n_i operations individually as in equation (27) and p_{V_i} is defined by a single common perturbation to all operations in hospital i as in equation (26).

Rather than measuring prior-data conflict, the ratio p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} measures cross-conflict between different hospitals, since the cross-validation prior $p(\theta_i | \mathbf{Y}_{-i})$ incorporates information from all other hospitals. Note that the ratio p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} does not require an explicit calculation of of the cross-validation prior, nor does it require that $p(\theta_i | \mathbf{Y}_{-i})$ be expressed in closed form.

The results are shown in panel B of figure 9. As might be expected from the context, the Bristol Royal Infirmary shows the largest cross-conflict with $p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} = 3.1$. This is roughly double the cross-conflict for Leeds ($p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} = 1.6$), where mortality was lower than average (Panel A). The remaining hospitals show cross-conflict values close to 1.




Figure 9: Data from the Bristol Royal Infirmary inquiry into mortality after open-heart operations among children under one year of age. **Panel A:** Estimated mortality and 95% confidence intervals for 12 hospitals. The area of each square is proportional to the number of operations. The vertical dotted line shows the estimated population average mortality from a random-effects model (30). **Panel B:** Cross-conflict defined as the ratio p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} when only only outcomes from hospital i are considered as data and information the other hospitals is absorbed into the prior.

9.2.3 HBK data

The artificial HBK data from section 8.1 illustrates extreme cross-conflict. If any one of the observation groups A,B, or C is removed, then the omitted data will be in contradiction with a linear regression line fitted to the remaining two groups (See Figure 6). To quantify this, the cross-conflict ratio p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} was calculated for each group in turn. The results are shown in table 3. The top row shows the results for a linear model with a normal error distribution. This shows very high cross-conflict ratios for all groups with group A having the highest ratio with $p_{V_A}/p_{W_A} = 59.5$. The second row shows results for the mixture model fitted in section 8.1. Cross-conflict ratios are substantially reduced compared to the linear model but still high for groups A (4.4) and C (7.9). The use of an outlier-robust mixture model does not eliminate the cross-conflict, which is a feature of the data, not the model.

Model	Group		
	A	B	C
Normal	59.5	4.89	17.6
Normal mixture	4.4	1.81	7.9

Table 3: Cross-conflict in the HBK data measured by the ratio p_{V_i}/p_{W_i} when only only outcomes from group $i \in \{A, B, C\}$ are considered as data and information the other two groups is absorbed into the prior.

10 Discussion

Bayesian sensitivity analysis has often concentrated on prior sensitivity (Roos et al., 2015) since the presence of a prior distribution distinguishes Bayesian from frequentist inference. Bayesian and frequentist models share a common problem that they may be sensitive to changes in the data. The sensitivity diagnostics discussed here do not test any specific deviation from the working model, and hence may point to a variety of different issues, including: errors in the data, failure to capture certain data features in the working model, and conflict between the data and an informative prior.

The project management triangle is a theory that competing constraints of cost, scope, and time cannot be simultaneously satisfied. It is often expressed as “Good, fast, cheap. Choose two.” The diagnostics discussed here are fast, since they can be derived from the same MCMC run used to estimate the model parameters. They are cheap, since they involve monitoring quantities that are easy to calculate. The question arises of whether they are good. I hope that the examples show they can be useful. However, there is no guarantee that these diagnostics will work across the entire spectrum of Bayesian modelling. I do not suggest that they can replace more formal diagnostics when the investigator suspects the risk of a particular departure from the model assumptions. Moreover, when they reveal previously unsuspected problems, this should be the start of a more comprehensive diagnostic work-up.

One issue with the conformal diagnostics CLINF, CLLEV and CLOUT is that they are not calibrated. There is no rule that gives a cut-off for anomalous observations. This is a problem that is shared with frequentist measures of leverage and influence. Although some heuristic rules have been suggested for frequentist diagnostics, my view is that the answer will depend on the context and we can only distinguish observations that have relatively high leverage, influence, or outlyingness compared with the others. Some kind of threshold is however required for the use of p_V/p_W as a diagnostic for prior-data conflict since this analysis produces only a single number. Based on the limited exploration in section 9, I would tentatively suggest that $p_V/p_W \geq 3$ could be used as a threshold for further investigation.

There is a strong connection between local influence and predictive information criteria. All information criteria are based on the same principle that aims to correct for optimism in a numeric assessment of model fit by adding a complexity penalty. Over-fitted models are likely to be both highly optimistic – hence requiring a large penalty – and be sensitive to small changes to the data. So intuitively it is not surprising to find this connection. It is interesting that the penalties used by WAIC and DIC can be derived in a rigorous way from the same local sensitivity framework based on phi-divergences. This connection may also help to understand the differences between WAIC and DIC. The WAIC penalty p_W penalizes an aggregate measure of influence whereas the alternative DIC penalty p_D^* penalizes an aggregate measure of leverage. The Bayesian concept of leverage is derived from a posterior predictive framework and is closely related to Value of Information analysis, in which decisions are guided by the assumption that the model is true. Hence the main difference between WAIC and DIC is that the latter incorporates an explicit “good model” assumption.

The alternative DIC penalty p_V measures sensitivity to a particular perturbation of the data that may reveal prior-data conflict. Whereas p_W and p_D^* are often numerically very similar, section 9 shows that p_V may penalize models much more strongly in the presence of prior-data conflict. This phenomenon might actually make p_V a more attractive penalty for model choice since *ceteris paribus* we would normally want to choose a model without prior-data conflict. However, p_V currently only has a heuristic justification in the model choice context. The p_V/p_W ratio may be re-purposed to

diagnose cross-conflict between different parts of the data. This may have interesting applications in modular inference, where the presence of cross-conflict is the justification for departing from the standard rules of Bayesian updating (Jacob et al., 2017; Carmona and Nicholls, 2020).

A Supplementary Material

R and JAGS code for all examples is available at

<https://github.com/martynplummer/bayesian-influence>.

The examples require JAGS 5.0.0 or later.

References

- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 267–281.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48.
- Beckman, R. J., Nachtsheim, C. J., and Cook, R. D. (1987). Diagnostics for mixed-model analysis of variance. *Technometrics*, 29(4):413.
- Brooks, S. P., Smith, J., Vehtari, A., Plummer, M., Stone, M., Robert, C. P., Titterton, D. M., Nelder, J. A., Atkinson, A., Dawid, A. P., et al. (2002). Discussion on the paper by Spiegelhalter, Best, Carlin and van der Linde. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 64(4):616–639.
- Carmona, C. and Nicholls, G. (2020). Semi-modular inference: enhanced learning in multi-modular models by tempering the influence of components. In Chiappa, S. and Calandra, R., editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4226–4235. PMLR.
- Christensen, R., Pearson, L. M., and Johnson, W. (1992). Case-deletion diagnostics for mixed models. *Technometrics*, 34(1):38–45.
- Cook, R. D. (1986). Assessment of local influence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Methodological*, 48(2):133–169.
- Cook, R. D. and Weisberg, S. (1982). *Residuals and influence in regression*. Chapman and Hall, London;New York;.
- Demidenko, E. and Stukel, T. A. (2005). Influence analysis for linear mixed-effects models. *Statistics in medicine*, 24(6):893–909.
- Drton, M. and Plummer, M. (2017). A Bayesian information criterion for singular models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 79(2):323–380.
- Fanaee-T, H. (2013). Bike Sharing. UCI Machine Learning Repository.
- Gelfand, A. E. (2003). Some comments on model criticism. In Green, P. J., Hjort, N. L., and Richardson, S., editors, *Highly Structured Stochastic Systems*, pages 449–454. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., and Stern, Hal S. Rubin, D. B. (2004). *Bayesian Data Analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2 edition.
- Gelman, A., Hwang, J., and Vehtari, A. (2014). Understanding predictive information criteria for bayesian models. *Statistics and computing*, 24(6):997–1016.
- Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (1990). *Generalized additive models*, volume 43. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Hawkins, D. M., Bradu, D., and Kass, G. V. (1984). Location of several outliers in multiple-regression data using elemental sets. *Technometrics*, 26(3):197–208.
- Hodges, J. S. and Sargent, D. J. (2001). Counting degrees of freedom in hierarchical and other richly-parameterised models. *Biometrika*, 88(2):367–379.
- Jackson, C. H., Baio, G., Heath, A., Strong, M., Welton, N. J., and Wilson, E. C. F. (2022). Value of information analysis in models to inform health policy. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 9(1):95–118.

- Jacob, P., Murray, L., Holmes, C., and Robert, C. (2017). Better together? statistical learning in models made of modules. *arXiv*.
- Kelly, M., Longjohn, R., and Nottingham, K. (2023). The UCI machine learning repository. Accessed: 2024-02-18.
- Lavine, M. (1992). Local predictive influence in Bayesian linear models with conjugate priors. *Communications in statistics. Simulation and computation*, 21(1):269–283.
- Lesaffre, E. and Verbeke, G. (1998). Local influence in linear mixed models. *Biometrics*, 54(2):570–582.
- Marshall, E. C. and Spiegelhalter, D. J. (2007). Identifying outliers in Bayesian hierarchical models: a simulation-based approach. *Bayesian analysis*, 2(2).
- McCulloch, R. E. (1989). Local model influence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406):473–478.
- Millar, R. B. (2018). Conditional vs marginal estimation of the predictive loss of hierarchical models using waic and cross-validation. *STATISTICS AND COMPUTING*, 28(2):375–385.
- Millar, R. B. and Stewart, W. S. (2007). Assessment of locally influential observations in Bayesian models. *Bayesian Analysis*, 2(2):365 – 383.
- Nash, W., Sellers, T., Talbot, S., Cawthorn, A., and Ford, W. (1994a). Abalone. UCI Machine Learning Repository.
- Nash, W., Sellers, T., Talbot, S., Cawthorn, A., and Ford, W. (1994b). The population biology of abalone (haliotis species) in tasmania. i. blacklip abalone (h. rubra) from the north coast and islands of bass strait. Technical Report 48, Sea Fisheries Division.
- Nelder, J. A. and Wedderburn, R. W. M. (1972). Generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 135(3):370–384.
- Nobre, J. S. and Singer, J. M. (2011). Leverage analysis for linear mixed models. *Journal of applied statistics*, 38(5):1063–1072.
- Ouwens, M. J. N. M., Tan, F. E. S., and Berger, M. P. F. (2001). Local influence to detect influential data structures for generalized linear mixed models. *Biometrics*, 57(4):1166–1172.
- Parsons, J. and Bao, L. (2022). A unified approach for outliers and influential data detection: The value of information in retrospect. *Stat (International Statistical Institute)*, 11(1):e442.
- Plummer, M. (2002). Discussion on the paper by Spiegelhalter, Best, Carlin and van der Linde. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 64(4):620 –621.
- Plummer, M. (2008). Penalized loss functions for Bayesian model comparison. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):523–539.
- Poon, W.-Y. and Poon, Y. S. (1999). Conformal normal curvature and assessment of local influence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 61(1):51–61.
- Rakhmawati, T. W., Molenberghs, G., Verbeke, G., and Faes, C. (2017). Local influence diagnostics for generalized linear mixed models with overdispersion. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 44(4):620–641.
- Roos, M., Martins, T. G., Held, L., and Rue, H. (2015). Sensitivity analysis for Bayesian hierarchical models. *Bayesian analysis*, 10(2).
- Ryan, E. G., Drovandi, C. C., McGree, J. M., and Pettitt, A. N. (2016). A review of modern computational algorithms for Bayesian optimal design. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 84(1):128–154.

- Spiegelhalter, D. J., Aylin, P., Best, N. G., Evans, S. J. W., and Murray, G. D. (2002a). Commissioned analysis of surgical performance using routine data: lessons from the bristol inquiry. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A, Statistics in society*, 165(2):191–221.
- Spiegelhalter, D. J., Best, N. G., Carlin, B. P., and van der Linde, A. (2002b). Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 64(4):583–639.
- Spiegelhalter, D. J., Best, N. G., Carlin, B. P., and van der Linde, A. (2014). The deviance information criterion: 12 years on. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(3):485–493.
- Thomas, Z. M., MacEachern, S. N., and Peruggia, M. (2018). Reconciling curvature and importance sampling based procedures for summarizing case influence in bayesian models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(524):1669–1683.
- van der Linde, A. (2007). Local influence on posterior distributions under multiplicative modes of perturbation. *Bayesian Analysis*, 2(2):319 – 332.
- Wahba, G. (1990). *Spline models for observational data*, volume 59. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Watanabe, S. (2009). *Algebraic Geometry and Statistical Learning Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Watanabe, S. (2010). Asymptotic equivalence of bayes cross validation and widely applicable information criterion in singular learning theory. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(116):3571–3594.
- Waugh, S. (1995). *Extending and benchmarking Cascade-Correlation : extensions to the Cascade-Correlation architecture and benchmarking of feed-forward supervised artificial neural networks*. PhD thesis, University of Tasmania.
- Zhu, H.-T. and Lee, S.-Y. (2001). Local influence for incomplete data models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 63(1):111–126.