

Multivariate Species Sampling Models

Beatrice Franzolini, Antonio Lijoi, Igor Prünster

Bocconi Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University, Italy

Giovanni Rebaudo

ESOMAS Dept., University of Torino and Collegio Carlo Alberto, Italy

Abstract

Species sampling processes have long served as the framework for studying random discrete distributions. However, their statistical applicability is limited when partial exchangeability is assumed as probabilistic invariance for the observables. Despite numerous discrete models for partially exchangeable observations, a unifying framework is currently missing, leaving many questions about the induced learning mechanisms unanswered in this setting. To fill this gap, we consider the natural extension of species sampling models to a multivariate framework, obtaining a general class of models characterized by their partially exchangeable partition probability function. A notable subclass, named regular multivariate species sampling models, exists among these models. In the subclass, dependence across processes is accurately captured by the correlation among them: a correlation of one equals full exchangeability and a null correlation corresponds to independence. Regular multivariate species sampling models encompass discrete processes for partial exchangeable data used in Bayesian models, thereby highlighting their core distributional properties and providing a means for developing new models.

Keywords: Bayesian nonparametrics, Dependent nonparametric prior, Hierarchical process, Multi-armed bandit, Partial exchangeability, Predictive distribution, Random partition

1 Introduction

A fundamental homogeneity assumption in Bayesian models is the exchangeability of observables. Formally, a sequence of random variables $\mathbf{X}_{1:n} = (X_i, i = 1, \dots, n)$ is considered exchangeable with respect to a given probability measure \mathbb{P} , if its finite distributions are invariant under permutations of the random variables themselves, e.g., $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, X_2 \in A_2) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_2, X_2 \in A_1)$. In addition, when exchangeability is assumed for an infinite sequence of observations (i.e., $\mathbf{X} = (X_i, i \geq 1)$), it implies the existence of a common random probability measure. Conditional on this measure, the random variables in \mathbf{X} are independent and identically distributed, establishing a link between exchangeability assumptions in Bayesian models and the i.i.d. assumption in frequentist statistics. Arguably, the most renowned Bayesian nonparametric prior for exchangeable data is the Dirichlet process (DP) of Ferguson (1973). The DP offers remarkable flexibility compared to its parametric counterparts thanks to its full weak support property. It serves as the cornerstone for numerous Bayesian nonparametric models, many of which can be seen as extensions of the DP itself. In a seminal work, Pitman (1996) generalized the DP to define a wide class of priors named henceforth species sampling processes (SSPs, Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017). A summary of the setup and results of Pitman (1996) regarding univariate species sampling processes can be found in Section S1 of the Supplementary Material. SSPs provide a unifying framework for understanding and constructing almost surely discrete distributions for modeling exchangeable data. However, their statistical applicability is limited when dealing with heterogeneous data from diverse sources or experimental conditions.

When data are sampled from J distinct populations (e.g., in meta-analyses, topic modeling, two-sample problems, etc.) the homogeneity assumption of exchangeability is too restrictive since it fails to consider heterogeneity across observations in distinct groups. Conversely, the assumption of independence across populations prevents information sharing between experiments, despite this being a key objective in applied multi-sample analyses (see, for instance, Woodcock and LaVange, 2017; Chen and Lee, 2019; Ouma *et al.*, 2022; Su *et al.*, 2022). A natural compromise between the aforementioned extreme cases is the probabilistic framework provided by partial exchangeability (de Finetti, 1938), which entails exchangeability within but not across different populations, while still allowing for dependence between them. Formally, an array of observations $\mathbf{X} = (X_{j,i} : i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in [J])$, where $[J] = \{1, \dots, J\}$, is partially exchangeable if, for all sample sizes (n_1, \dots, n_J) and all sequences of permutations $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J)$, with σ_j permutation of the first n_j natural numbers, $((X_{1,i})_{i=1}^{n_1}, \dots, (X_{J,i})_{i=1}^{n_J}) \stackrel{d}{=} ((X_{1,\sigma_1(i)})_{i=1}^{n_1}, (X_{J,\sigma_J(i)})_{i=1}^{n_J})$, where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. Similarly to what happens in the exchangeable case, partial exchangeability of an array \mathbf{X} , with a number J of columns and infinite rows (indexed by i), implies the existence of a vector of (dependent) random probability measures (P_1, \dots, P_J) , such that $X_{j,i} \mid P_1, \dots, P_J \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i \geq 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$. When considering partially exchangeable observations, many Bayesian nonparametric priors are available in the literature, e.g.,




Figure 1: Probability of observing a new species at the first draw from population j , after having sampled n subjects from population k , i.e., $\mathbb{P}[X_{j,1} \notin \{X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,n}\}]$, as a function of n , for (from left to right) hierarchical Dirichlet processes (HDP, Teh *et al.*, 2006), nested Dirichlet processes (NDP, Rodríguez *et al.*, 2008), and additive Dirichlet processes (+DP, Müller *et al.*, 2004) for varying values of the correlation measure $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)]$.

hierarchical DP (Teh *et al.*, 2006), hierarchical normalized completely random measures (Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2019a), hierarchical species sampling models (Bassetti *et al.*, 2020), nested constructions (Rodríguez *et al.*, 2008; Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2019b), additive constructions (Müller *et al.*, 2004; Lijoi *et al.*, 2014), copula constructions (Leisen and Lijoi, 2011), normalized compound random measures (Griffin and Leisen, 2017), normalized completely random vector (Lijoi *et al.*, 2014; Catalano *et al.*, 2021), single-atoms dependent processes (MacEachern, 1999, 2000; Quintana *et al.*, 2022), compositions of the some of the previous (Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2019b; Beraha *et al.*, 2021; Lijoi *et al.*, 2023; Balocchi *et al.*, 2023; Denti *et al.*, 2023), and many others (e.g. Horiguchi *et al.*, 2024; Yan and Luo, 2023; Bi and Ji, 2023).

Models employing such priors define a dependence among the processes in (P_1, \dots, P_J) and among the observations in \mathbf{X} , facilitating the desired borrowing of information among different populations. The most widely used measure of inter-population dependence corresponds to computing the pairwise correlation of P_j and P_k , for $j \neq k$ on the same set A , namely

$$\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] \tag{1}$$

This measure’s popularity stems from the fact that for most models it does not depend on set A (whatever its choice), which allows us to interpret it as a global measure of dependence. Moreover, (1) effectively summarizes the dependence structure of the models as highlighted by the fact that different correlation values typically translate into highly different behaviors of the law of the observable quantities. As an example, see Figure 1 where the probability of observing a new species is showcased for different correlation values in three popular multivariate processes.

However, it remains unclear why the independence from the set holds generally or what

conditions the prior must satisfy for $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)]$ not to depend on the set A . Similarly, several questions regarding how properties of the processes translate at the level of the observable quantities are still unanswered. How does the correlation among the processes in (P_1, \dots, P_J) manifest in the observables \mathbf{X} ? Are correlations among latent measures (P_1, \dots, P_J) or observable quantities \mathbf{X} reliable indicators of dependence? Specifically, are there models for which $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 1$ if and only if $P_j = P_k$ almost surely (i.e., observations are exchangeable), and $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0$ if and only if $P_j \perp P_k$? Moreover, given that many properties of such models seem common regardless of the specific strategy used to define the nonparametric prior (e.g., additive, hierarchical, nested, or combinations thereof), is it feasible to identify a unified and comprehensive definition for these models?

In this work, we reply to all these questions and define a unifying framework, analogous to the one provided by SSPs for the univariate case, but considering a vector of processes (P_1, \dots, P_J) . Observations sampled from these probabilities are partially exchangeable and, we show that they can be equivalently obtained by firstly sampling a random partition and then associating independent values to each element in the partition. We name the priors in this class multivariate species sampling processes (mSSPs). Importantly, we note that statistical models currently employed under partial exchangeability assumptions belong to a notable subclass, which we refer to as *regular*. Analogously to SSP, which encompasses as special cases the vast majority of priors within the exchangeable framework, their multivariate version generalizes nonparametric priors for the partial exchangeable context. Thus, this class provides a unifying point of view to understand common features of existing models for multi-sample data and delineates how to construct new priors both within and outside this class. Moreover, many results and ideas underlying multivariate species sampling processes can be generalized even beyond partial exchangeability. Finally, it is crucial to clarify that while mSSPs indeed generalize SSPs, the essence of mSSPs lies in their multivariate nature and, in particular, in the dependence induced across populations and, consequently, across elements within the vector (P_1, \dots, P_J) , which is clearly an aspect absent from classical SSPs.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the general definitions of mSSP and the notable subclass of *regular* mSSP. In Section 3 we derive the expressions for marginal and mixed moments of such latent processes in terms of observable quantities. A large part of this section is devoted to the correlation between the random measures and proves how such correlation is an outstanding measure of dependence within the class of regular mSSPs, where uncorrelation implies independence. Section 4 and Section 5 are devoted to studying the random partition induced by mSSPs and the predictive distributions, respectively. Section 6 compares the performance of different regular mSSPs in the multi-armed bandit problem of maximizing the number of species discoveries when sampling species sequentially across multiple sites. Finally, in Section 7 we discuss directions for future works. The Supplementary Material includes a review of univariate species sampling processes, all proofs, and additional details on the illustration. Code to replicate the experiments is available at <https://github.com/GiovanniRebaudo/MSSP>.

2 Multivariate species sampling processes

2.1 General multivariate species sampling processes

When moving from a univariate random probability P to the multivariate problem concerning a whole vector (P_1, \dots, P_J) of random probabilities, the definition of the species sampling process of Pitman (1996) can be naturally generalized to multiple populations according to the following definition.

Definition 1 (mSSP). *A vector of random probability measures (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a multivariate species sampling process (mSSP) if*

$$P_j \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \right) P_0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J,$$

where P_0 is a non-atomic deterministic distribution on a space \mathbb{X} , $\boldsymbol{\pi}_j = (\pi_{j,h})_{h \geq 1}$ is a random sub-probability vector¹ for any j , and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_h)_{h \geq 1}$ are i.i.d from P_0 and independent of $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\boldsymbol{\pi}_j, j = 1, \dots, J) \sim \mathcal{L}_\pi$. We write $(P_1, \dots, P_J) \sim \text{mSSP}(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0)$. Moreover, if $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1$, for any j , (P_1, \dots, P_J) is said proper.

Following standard terminology (see, for instance Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017), we refer to the elements in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as *atoms*, *labels*, or *species*, interchangeably, and to the elements in $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ as the *weights* of the mSSP. From Definition 1 the link between mSSPs and SSPs is evident: it is indeed straightforward to prove that each coordinate of an mSSP is marginally an SSP. More generally, the mSSPs are closed under marginalization.

Proposition 1 (Marginal of mSSP). *If $(P_1, \dots, P_J) \sim \text{mSSP}$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, J\}$ then $(P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_k}) \sim \text{mSSP}$.*

All proofs can be found in Section S2 of the Supplementary Material. In essence, an mSSP arises when many SSPs share possibly the same atoms. However, it is worth noting that Definition 1 is highly general in that the $\pi_{j,h}$'s could potentially be null almost surely, resulting in instances where the random probabilities P_1, \dots, P_J share only a handful or none of the species with positive probability. When analyzing dependence and quantifying shared species across two processes, a different notation may prove beneficial, distinguishing between elements shared across two processes (with positive probability) and those specific to individual populations. For instance, consider the bivariate mSSP (P_1, P_2) obtained marginalizing a J -variate mSSP from Definition 1. Note that the two processes always admit the following almost surely equivalent representation.

¹A vector $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_h)_{h \geq 1}$ is a sub-probability vector if $\pi_h \in [0, 1]$, for any h , and $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_h \leq 1$.

Proposition 2. $(P_1, P_2) \sim mSSP$ iff (P_1, P_2) admits the following almost surely equivalent representation

$$P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(1,2)} \delta_{\theta_{0,h}} + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \delta_{\theta_{j,h'}} + \pi_{j,0}^{(j)} P_0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \quad (2)$$

where $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(1,2)} + \sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} = 1$, for $j = 1, 2$, $\mathbb{P}[\pi_{1,h}^{(1,2)} \pi_{2,h}^{(1,2)} > 0] > 0$, for $h = 1, 2, \dots$, and the atoms are independent from the weights and such that $\theta_{j,h} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P_0$, for $j = 0, 1, 2$, $h = 1, 2, \dots$. We use the convention $\sum_{h=1}^0 x_h = 0$, for any (x_h) .

Importantly and contrary to Definition 1, here we require $\mathbb{P}[\pi_{1,h}^{(1,2)} \pi_{2,h}^{(1,2)} > 0] > 0$ (which is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}[\pi_{1,h}^{(1,2)} > 0, \pi_{2,h}^{(1,2)} > 0] > 0$) for any h in the first sum. The species in the first sum in (2) are common to both processes with positive probability. Thus, each species $\theta_{0,h}$ can be observed in both populations simultaneously. Differently, those in the second sum are almost surely process-specific, meaning that they cannot be observed simultaneously in both populations. Note that P_0 non-atomic entails $\mathbb{P}(\theta_{j,h'} = \theta_{j',\ell'}) = 0$ for all $(j, h') \neq (j', \ell')$. Finally $\pi_{j,0}^{(j)}$ is the cumulative frequency of almost surely non-shared species that are observed just one time in the infinite population sampled from P_j . The advantage of (2), compared to Definition 1, lies in the ability to immediately distinguish between shared and non-shared species among the two processes. This representation can be extended to generic J -variate processes with $J \geq 2$, allowing for the differentiation between species shared across any subset of processes. However, as J increases, the notation may become more convoluted, and thus, we do not report it here. More importantly, representation (2) enables us to identify a notable subclass of mSSPs, as detailed in the next section. While this subclass encompasses J -variate processes (P_1, \dots, P_J) , with $J \geq 2$, adopting the representation in (2) for any couple of processes (P_j, P_k) is sufficient for defining such a class as clarified in the next section. Finally, we define the couple of a collection of random variables \mathbf{X} and the mSSP from which observations are sampled as follows.

Definition 2 (mSSM). *We say that a partially exchangeable array $\mathbf{X} = (X_{j,i} : i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in [J])$, for some $J \in \mathbb{N}$, follows a multivariate species sampling model (mSSM) if its directing measure is an mSSP. That is, for every $j \in [J]$ and for every $i = 1, 2, \dots$*

$$X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j, \quad (P_1, \dots, P_J) \sim mSSP(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0) \quad (3)$$

2.2 Regular multivariate species sampling processes

A notable subclass of mSSPs, which we name *regular*, arises by imposing a simple independence condition on the weights associated with non-shared species. First, consider a bivariate

mSSP (P_1, P_2) and define

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(j)} = \left(\frac{\pi_{j,h'}^{(j)}}{\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \pi_{j,\ell}^{(j)}} \right)_{h' \geq 0} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2$$

where the weights $\pi_{j,h'}^{(j)}$ are as defined in (2) and we use the convention $0/0 = 0$.

Definition 3 (rmSSP). *A bivariate mSSP (P_1, P_2) is said regular (rmSSP) if $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)} \perp \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(2)}$. A J -variate mSSP (P_1, \dots, P_J) , with $J > 2$, is said regular if (P_j, P_k) is a rmSSP for any $j, k \in [J]$, with $j \neq k$.*

Intuitively, regularity requires that the relative frequencies within non-shared species are independent between each couple (P_j, P_k) of populations. Note that if either P_j or P_k or both have no non-shared species in the representation in (2), i.e., $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{\ell,h'}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$, regularity is trivially satisfied. From a statistical modeling perspective, it is worth noting that the independence condition mandated by Definition 3 is relatively mild and arguably reasonable in most applied contexts. This condition dictates that information regarding the relative frequencies of almost surely non-shared species, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(j)}$, should not contribute to the shared information across groups, once the total frequency $\sum_{k \geq 0} \pi_{j,k}^{(j)}$ of such species has already been taken into account. This seems quite reasonable since these species are, in fact, not shared among groups almost certainly.

In the following, specific attention is reserved to rmSSPs and their uses in Bayesian nonparametric (BNP) models, while we plan to investigate further general mSPPs from a more probabilistic standpoint in forthcoming works. Special attention to the regular subclass is warranted for two main reasons. Firstly, rmSSPs differ from non-regular mSSPs due to the distinctive dependence structure in rmSSPs, which allows for an outstanding characterization in terms of correlation between the measures. As demonstrated in the following, this result does not extend to the general class of mSSP, leading to fundamental distinctions between regular and non-regular processes. Secondly, the rmSSP subclass is of particular interest in statistics, as it encompasses all mSSPs studied and utilized in Bayesian nonparametrics to date (e.g., hierarchical processes, nested processes, dependent normalized random measures, etc.), as illustrated in the following examples.

In the following, $\text{DP}(\alpha, P_0)$ denotes the law of a Dirichlet Process with concentration parameter α and base measure P_0 (Ferguson, 1973) and $\text{GEM}(\alpha)$ denotes a Griffiths-Engen-McCloskey distribution (Sethuraman, 1994). $\text{PYP}(\sigma, \alpha, P_0)$ denotes the law of a Pitman-Yor process with discount parameter σ , concentration parameter α , and base measure P_0 (Pitman and Yor, 1997). $\text{CRM}(\rho(s), c, P_0)$ and $\text{NRMI}(\rho(s), c, P_0)$ denote respectively the laws of a completely random measure and a normalized completely random measure with intensity $\rho(s)$, total mass parameter c , and base measure P_0 (Regazzini *et al.*, 2003). $\text{GN}(\gamma, P_0)$ denotes the law of a Gnedin process with parameter γ , and base measure P_0 (Gnedin, 2010), $\text{DM}_M(\rho, P_0)$ is the law of a symmetric Dirichlet-Multinomial process with M number of

categories, concentration parameter ρ , and base measure P_0 (Richardson and Green, 1997), and $\text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0)$ denotes the law of a (univariate) species sampling process with weights distribution defined by \mathcal{L}_π and base measure P_0 (Pitman, 1996). See Section S.1 of the Supplementary Material for more details about (univariate) SSP, related exchangeable probability partition function (EPPF), predictive schemes, and specific examples within the SSP class. In the following, P_0 always denotes a generic non-atomic deterministic distribution.

Example 1 (Hierarchical processes). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to any of the processes in the following table*

Table 1: Hierarchical processes (Teh *et al.*, 2006; Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2019a; Bassetti *et al.*, 2020)

Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{DP}(\alpha, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{DP}(\alpha_0, P_0)$
Hierarchical Pitman-Yor Process (HPY)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{PYP}(\sigma, \alpha, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{PYP}(\sigma_0, \alpha_0, P_0)$
Hierarchical normalized completely random measure (HNRMI)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{NRMI}(\rho(s), c, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{NRMI}(\rho_0(s), c_0, P_0)$
Hierarchical Dirichlet-Multinomial (HDM):	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{DM}_M(\rho, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{DM}_{M_0}(\rho_0, P_0)$
Hierarchical Gnedin Process (HGN)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{GN}(\gamma, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{GN}(\gamma_0, P_0)$
Hierarchical Species Sampling Process (HSSP)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_{\pi,j}, Q), \quad Q \sim \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_{\pi,0}, P_0)$

then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Note that with the abuse of notation $\text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_{\pi,j}, Q)$ we naturally extend the standard definition of SSP (Pitman, 1996) to the case where the “base measure” Q can be an atomic discrete random measure. However, after marginalizing out such a random discrete probability we are back to our definition of mSSP with a non-atomic base measure.

Example 2 (Nested processes). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to any of the processes in the following table*

Table 2: Nested processes (Rodríguez *et al.*, 2008; Zuanetti *et al.*, 2018)

Nested Dirichlet Process (NDP)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, \text{DP}(\beta, P_0))$
Nested Pitman-Yor Process (NPY)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q \sim \text{PYP}(\sigma_\alpha, \alpha, \text{PYP}(\sigma_\beta, \beta, P_0))$
Nested Dirichlet-Multinomial (NDM)	$Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q \sim \text{DM}_{M_\alpha}(\rho_\alpha, \text{DM}_{M_\beta}(\rho_\beta, P_0))$
Nested Gnedin Process (NGN)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q \sim \text{GN}(\gamma_\alpha, \text{GN}(\gamma_\beta, P_0))$
Nested Species Sampling Process (NSSP)	$P_j Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q \sim \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_{\pi,0}, \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0))$

then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 3 (Additive processes). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to any of the processes in the following table*

Table 3: Additive processes (Müller *et al.*, 2004)

Additive Dirichlet Process (+DP)	$P_j = \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j)Q_j, \quad Q_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} DP(\alpha_j, P_0), j = 0, 1, \dots, J$
Additive Pitman-Yor Process (+PY)	$P_j = \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j)Q_j, \quad Q_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} PYP(\sigma_j, \alpha_j, P_0), j = 0, 1, \dots, J$
Additive Dirichlet-Multinomial (+DM)	$P_j = \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j)Q_j, \quad Q_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} DM_M(\rho_j, P_0), j = 0, 1, \dots, J$
Additive Gnedin Process (+GN)	$P_j = \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j)Q_j, \quad Q_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} GN(\gamma_j, P_0), j = 0, 1, \dots, J$
Additive Species Sampling Process (+SSP)	$P_j = \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j)Q_j, \quad Q_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} SSP(\mathcal{L}_{\pi,j}, P_0), j = 0, 1, \dots, J$

then, for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(j)} \perp \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(k)}$. Thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSSP*.

Example 4. (Completely random vectors, Catalano *et al.*, 2021). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to any of the following:

- *GM-dependent DP (GM-DP, Lijoi *et al.*, 2014):*

$$P_j = \frac{\mu_0 + \mu_j}{\mu_0(\mathbb{X}) + \mu_j(\mathbb{X})}, \quad \mu_0 \sim CRM((1 - z) \frac{\exp\{-s\}}{s}, c, P_0), \quad \mu_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} CRM(z \frac{\exp\{-s\}}{s}, c, P_0)$$

- *GM-dependent σ -stable (GM- σ , Lijoi *et al.*, 2014):*

$$P_j = \frac{\mu_0 + \mu_j}{\mu_0(\mathbb{X}) + \mu_j(\mathbb{X})}, \quad \mu_0 \sim CRM((1 - z) \frac{\sigma s^{-1-\sigma}}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)}, c, P_0), \quad \mu_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} CRM(z \frac{\sigma s^{-1-\sigma}}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)}, c, P_0)$$

then, for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(j)} \perp \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(k)}$. Thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to a normalized compound random measures vector (Griffin and Leisen, 2017), then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 5 (Hidden hierarchical DP). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to a Hidden Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HHDP, James, 2008; Lijoi *et al.*, 2023):

$$P_j | Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q | Q_0 \sim DP(\alpha, DP(\beta, Q_0)) \quad Q_0 \sim DP(\beta_0, P_0)$$

then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 6 (Semi hierarchical DP). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to a Semi Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (semi-HDP, Beraha *et al.*, 2021):

$$P_j | Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q | Q_0 \sim DP(\alpha, DP(\beta, \kappa P_0 + (1 - \kappa)Q_0)) \quad Q_0 \sim DP(\beta_0, P_0)$$

then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 7 (Stick-breaking based processes). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to any of the following:

- *nested common atoms processes (nCAM, Denti *et al.*, 2023):*

$$P_j | Q \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Q, \quad Q = \sum_{s \geq 1} \pi_s \delta_{G_s}, \quad G_s = \sum_{t \geq 1} \omega_{t,s} \delta_{\theta_t}, \quad (\pi_s)_{s \geq 1} \sim GEM(\alpha), \quad (\omega_{t,s})_{t \geq 1} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} GEM(\beta)$$

- *tree stick-breaking with covariates processes (treeSB, Horiguchi *et al.*, 2024):*

$$P_j \sim treeSB(P_0, \{F_{j,\epsilon}\}, \tau)$$

then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 8 (Vectors of normalized independent finite point processes). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is distributed according to a Vectors of finite Dirichlet process (*Vec-FDP*, Colombi et al., 2024), i.e., $(P_1, \dots, P_J) \sim \text{Vec-FDP}(\Lambda, \gamma, P_0)$, then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ and, thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSPP*.

Example 9 (Independent processes). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) are independent SSPs then then for any couple (P_j, P_k) , $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(j)} \perp \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(k)}$. Thus, (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a *rmSSP*.

3 Dependence structure and moments of mSSPs

3.1 Correlation and dependence

As already mentioned, the crucial aspect necessary to move from univariate SSP to their multivariate version is the dependence between the elements in the vector (P_1, \dots, P_J) . In this section, we provide easily interpretable expressions for the correlation across pairs of random probability measures in terms of observable variables, prove that the correlation equals one if and only if data are actually fully exchangeable, and, furthermore, show how zero correlation characterizes independence in *regular* mSSP. Before proceeding with this analysis, it is essential to compute the marginal expected value and variance of the processes.

Proposition 3 (First and second marginal moments). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A)] = P_0(A), \quad \text{Var}[P_j(A)] = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{j,2})P_0(A)[1 - P_0(A)].$$

By marginal exchangeability, the probability of the tie $\mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{j,m})$ between observations extracted from population j does not depend on the indexes (i, m) . Moreover, such probability can be written in terms of the weights in the representation in (2) as

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{j,2}) = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\pi_{j,h}^{(j,k)} \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \right)^2 \right].$$

Analogously, the probability of a tie across populations j and k , $\mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m})$, it does not depend on the indexes (i, m) and equals

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1}) = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_{j,h}^{(j,k)} \pi_{k,h}^{(j,k)} \right].$$

In section 4, we will also express the probability of a tie in terms of the more general law of the partition induced at the level of the observable. We are now ready to compute the correlation.

Proposition 4 (Correlation). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, then (for every measurable A such that $0 < P_0(A) < 1$),*

$$\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1})}{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{j,2})}\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X_{k,1} = X_{k,2})}} \quad \forall j \neq k \in [J].$$

Proposition 4 expresses the correlation between the coordinates of any mSSP in terms of the probability of ties of the observable across and within populations. Remarkably, it illustrates why the correlation in mSSPs remains unaffected by the specific measurable set A (as found case by case for any processes within this highly general class): correlation between random probabilities is a consequence uniquely of ties between the observable species. Moreover, Proposition 4 offers a few other important insights on the correlation as a measure of global dependence which the following corollary clarifies.

Corollary 1 (Correlation). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP, $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, and A is a measurable set such that $0 < P_0(A) < 1$ then, $\forall j \neq k \in [J]$*

(c-i) $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] \geq 0;$

(c-ii) $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0$ iff $\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1}) = 0$ iff $\mathbb{E}[\pi_{j,h}\pi_{k,h}] = 0$, for any h ;

(c-iii) If P_j and P_k are equal in distribution, then $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1}=X_{k,1})}{\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1}=X_{j,2})}$.

While Proposition 1 provides a useful interpretation of the correlation in terms of properties of observable quantities, an important open question still regards how well the correlation can capture dependence across different processes. The next Proposition shows that a correlation equal to 1 implies full exchangeability of the observable.

Proposition 5 (Unitary correlation). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP, $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, then, $\forall j \neq k \in [J]$*

$$\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} P_k$$

and $\mathbf{X} = (X_{\ell,i}, i \geq 1, \ell \in \{j, k\})$ is exchangeable.

Results in (c-iii) of Corollary 1 and Proposition 5 jointly provide a very straightforward interpretation of what happens when the probability of a tie across samples approaches the probability of a tie within: the correlation increases towards one and the observations move from partial exchangeability towards full exchangeability. As anticipated the peculiarity

of rmSSP is that within this class, the correlation can perfectly capture the presence of dependence between any two processes. More precisely, as shown in the next theorem, it is impossible to construct zero-correlated rmSSPs whose components are not pairwise independent.

Theorem 1 (Null correlation). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a rmSSP, then $\forall j \neq k \in [J]$*

$$\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad P_j \perp P_k.$$

Within the class of rmSSP, it is notable that not only a correlation equal to one does imply exchangeability (as for all mSSP), but also a correlation equal to zero implies independence among processes and across groups of observations.

Not all rmSSPs can achieve an exact correlation of zero or one in their standard definitions. Consider, as an example, those processes lacking idiosyncratic and improper components (i.e., $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(i,j)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 1$), such as hierarchical constructions. Scenarios involving independence across groups must be interpreted as limiting cases for such processes. For instance, we can naturally define a HDP with $\alpha_0 = +\infty$ as J independent DP. Table 4 presents the correlation, probability of ties, and the values of hyperparameters to attain independence and exchangeability.

Arguably, the relevance of the dependence structure among the latent processes (P_1, \dots, P_J) lies solely in its induced dependence among the observations. In this regard, we have already shown how perfectly correlated mSSP implies exchangeability of the observable and uncorrelated rmSSP implies independence among groups of observations. Nonetheless, in the following proposition and corollary, we demonstrate how the correlation among observables coincides with the probability of a tie and elucidate the implications of this result on the induced dependence structure among the variables in \mathbf{X} . The following results hold for the entire class of mSSP.

Proposition 6 (Correlation of the observables). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, with $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}$, then $\forall j, k \in [J]$ and $\forall i, m$*

$$\text{Cor}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m} \mid X_{k,m}).$$

Proposition 6 holds true both within (i.e., $j = k$) and across (i.e., $j \neq k$) groups, and thus, also for (univariate) SSP.

Corollary 2 (Correlation of the observables). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, with $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}$, then $\forall j \neq k \in [J]$*

$$(c-i) \quad \text{Cor}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) \geq 0;$$

$$(c-ii) \quad \text{Cor}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad X_{j,i} \perp X_{k,m};$$

(c-iii) $\text{Cor}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) = 0$ iff $\mathbb{E}[\pi_{j,h}\pi_{k,h}] = 0$, for any h .

Table 4: Correlation among processes and probability of ties for different mSSP, notation is defined in the examples in Section 2.2. The last two columns indicate the values to which the hyperparameters should converge for the correlation to converge respectively to 0 and 1 (while $P(\text{Ties Within})$ does not converge to 0 or 1).

Process	Correlation	$P(\text{Ties Across})$	$P(\text{Ties Within})$	Indep.	Exchang.
HDP	$\frac{1+\alpha}{1+\alpha+\alpha_0}$	$\frac{1}{1+\alpha_0}$	$\frac{1+\alpha+\alpha_0}{(1+\alpha)(1+\alpha_0)}$	$\alpha_0 \rightarrow +\infty$	$\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$
HPY	$\frac{(1+\alpha)(1-\sigma_0)}{(1-\sigma_0)+\alpha(1-\sigma_0)+\alpha_0(1-\sigma)}$	$\frac{1-\sigma_0}{1+\alpha_0}$	$\frac{(1-\sigma_0)+\alpha(1-\sigma_0)+\alpha_0(1-\sigma)}{(1+\alpha)(1+\alpha_0)}$	$\alpha_0 \rightarrow +\infty$ or $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 1$	$\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$ or $\sigma \rightarrow 1$
HDM	$\frac{(1+\rho_0)(1+\rho M)}{(1+\rho M)(1+\rho_0 M_0) - \rho\rho_0(M-1)(M_0-1)}$	$\frac{1+\rho_0}{1+\rho_0 M_0}$	$\frac{(1+\rho M)(1+\rho_0 M_0) - \rho\rho_0(M-1)(M_0-1)}{(1+\rho M)(1+\rho_0 M_0)}$	$M_0 \rightarrow +\infty$	$M \rightarrow +\infty$
HGN	$\frac{\gamma_0(\gamma+1)}{(\gamma+\gamma_0)}$	$\frac{2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1}$	$\frac{2(\gamma+\gamma_0)}{(\gamma+1)(\gamma_0+1)}$	$\gamma_0 \rightarrow 0$	$\gamma \rightarrow 0$
HSSP	$\frac{\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)}{\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2)+\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(1,1)\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)}$ *	$\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2) + \text{EPPF}_{2,1}^{(2)}(1,1)\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) = 0$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2) = 0$
NDP	$\frac{1}{1+\alpha}$	$\frac{1}{(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)}$	$\frac{1}{1+\beta}$	$\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$	$\alpha \rightarrow 0$
NPY	$\frac{1-\sigma_\alpha}{1+\alpha}$	$\frac{(1-\sigma_\alpha)(1-\sigma_\beta)}{(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)}$	$\frac{1-\sigma_\beta}{1+\beta}$	$\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$ or $\sigma_\alpha \rightarrow 1$	$(\alpha, \sigma_\alpha) \rightarrow (0, 0)$
NDM	$\frac{1+\rho_\alpha}{1+\rho_\alpha M_\alpha}$	$\frac{(1+\rho_\alpha)(1+\rho_\beta)}{(1+\rho_\alpha M_\alpha)(1+\rho_\beta M_\beta)}$	$\frac{1+\rho_\beta}{1+\rho_\beta M_\beta}$	$M_\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$	$M_\alpha \rightarrow 1$
NGN	$\frac{2\gamma_\alpha}{\gamma_\alpha+1}$	$\frac{4\gamma_\alpha\gamma_\beta}{(\gamma_\alpha+1)(\gamma_\beta+1)}$	$\frac{2\gamma_\beta}{\gamma_\beta+1}$	$\gamma_\alpha \rightarrow 0$	$\gamma_\alpha \rightarrow 1$
NSSP	$\frac{\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)}{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k}$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2)$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2)$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) = 0$	$\text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2) = 1$
+DP	$\frac{\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k}{1+\alpha_0}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2}{1+\alpha_j}\right)\left(\frac{\epsilon_k^2}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_k)^2}{1+\alpha_k}\right)}}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k}{1+\alpha_0}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2}{1+\alpha_j}$	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 1$
+PY	$\frac{\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k (1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_j^2(1-\sigma_0)}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2(1-\sigma_j)}{1+\alpha_j}\right)\left(\frac{\epsilon_k^2(1-\sigma_0)}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_k)^2(1-\sigma_k)}{1+\alpha_k}\right)}}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k (1-\sigma_0)}{1+\alpha_0}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j^2(1-\sigma_0)}{1+\alpha_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2(1-\sigma_j)}{1+\alpha_j}$	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 1$
+DM	$\frac{\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k (1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_j^2(1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2(1+\rho_j)}{1+\rho_j M_j}\right)\left(\frac{\epsilon_k^2(1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_k)^2(1+\rho_k)}{1+\rho_k M_k}\right)}}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k (1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j^2(1+\rho_0)}{1+\rho_0 M_0} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2(1+\rho_j)}{1+\rho_j M_j}$	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 1$
+GN	$\frac{\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k 2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_j^2 2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2 2\gamma_j}{\gamma_j+1}\right)\left(\frac{\epsilon_k^2 2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_k)^2 2\gamma_k}{\gamma_k+1}\right)}}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k 2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1}$	$\frac{\epsilon_j^2 2\gamma_0}{\gamma_0+1} + \frac{(1-\epsilon_j)^2 2\gamma_j}{\gamma_j+1}$	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 1$
+SSP	$\frac{\epsilon_j \epsilon_k \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)}{\sqrt{\epsilon_j^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) + (1-\epsilon_j)^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) + \epsilon_k^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) + (1-\epsilon_k)^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)}}$	$\epsilon_j \epsilon_k \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2)$	$\epsilon_j^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,0}^{(2)}(2) + (1-\epsilon_j)^2 \text{EPPF}_{1,1}^{(2)}(2)$	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 1$
GM-DP	$\frac{(1-z)c}{1+c} {}_3F_2(a, 1, 1; b, b; 1)$ *	$\frac{(1-z)c}{(1+c)^2} {}_3F_2(a, 1, 1; b, b; 1)$ **	$\frac{1}{1+c}$	$z = 1$	$z = 0$
GM- σ	$(1-z)g(c, z)$ ***	$(1-z)(1-\sigma)g(c, z)$	$1-\sigma$		
HHDP	$1 - \frac{\alpha\beta_0}{(1+\alpha)(\beta_0+\beta+1)}$	$\frac{1}{\beta_0+1} + \frac{\beta_0}{(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)(1+\beta_0)}$	$\frac{1+\beta+\beta_0}{(1+\beta)(1+\beta_0)}$	$(\alpha, \beta_0) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$	$\alpha \rightarrow 0$
nCAM	$1 - \frac{\beta\alpha}{(2\beta+1)(1+\alpha)}$	$\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{1+\beta} + \frac{\alpha}{2\beta+1} \right)$	$\frac{1}{1+\beta}$	None	$\alpha \rightarrow 0$

* $\text{EPPF}_{\cdot,1}$ and $\text{EPPF}_{\cdot,0}$ are induced by $\mathcal{L}_{\pi,1} = \dots = \mathcal{L}_{\pi,j}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\pi,0}$, respectively. ** ${}_3F_2$ is the generalized hypergeometric function and $a = \alpha(1-z) + 2, b = \alpha + 2$ *** $g(c, z) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_0^1 \frac{t^{1/\sigma-1}}{[1+(1-\omega)t^\sigma]^\sigma [1-\omega]^\sigma} d\omega$

3.2 Higher moments of mSSPs

We provide here both marginal and mixed moments, of any order, for the general class of mSSPs. These results can also be seen as generalizations to all SSP and mSSP of the results of joint moments of normalized homogeneous completely random measures in the seminal work by James *et al.* (2006) and, more recently, of hierarchical normalized completely random measures in Camerlenghi *et al.* (2019a). Such results rely on the characterization of completely random measures in terms of Laplace functional, while we show here that

they can be computed with ease in the class of mSSP also for those processes not based on completely random measures and/or hierarchical processes. The following two propositions provide the expressions for the marginal moments.

Proposition 7 (Marginal moments). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, then, for every natural number q ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A)^q] = \mathbb{E}\left[P_0(A)^{K_{1:q}^{(j)}}\right],$$

where $K_{1:q}^{(j)}$ is the random number of unique species in a sample of size q from P_j .

Proposition 8 (Marginal moments). *Let $\{A_1, \dots, A_h\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint measurable sets. If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP, then, for every sequence of natural numbers q_1, q_2, \dots, q_h ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A_1)^{q_1} \dots P_j(A_h)^{q_h}] = \mathbb{E}\left[P_0(A_1)^{K_{1:q_1}^{(j)}} P_0(A_2)^{K_{q_1+1:q_2}^{(j)}} \dots P_0(A_h)^{K_{q_{h-1}+1:q_h}^{(j)}} \mid E_{\neq}\right] \mathbb{P}(E_{\neq}),$$

where $K_{a:b}^{(j)}$ is the random number of species in the “block of observations” from the a -th to the b -th observation, in a sample of size $q_1 + \dots + q_h$ from P_j , and E_{\neq} is the event of not observing any shared species across the blocks of observations.

The following two theorems provide the expressions for the mixed moments.

Theorem 2 (Mixed moments). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP, then, for every sequence of natural numbers q_1, q_2, \dots, q_J ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[P_1(A)^{q_1} \dots P_J(A)^{q_J}] = \mathbb{E}\left[P_0(A)^{K_{q_1, \dots, q_J}}\right],$$

where K_{q_1, \dots, q_J} is the overall number of species observed in a sample that contains q_j observations from P_j , for $j = 1, \dots, J$.

Theorem 3 (Mixed moments). *Let $\{A_1, \dots, A_J\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint measurable sets. If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an mSSP and $X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) \stackrel{ind}{\sim} P_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $j = 1, \dots, J$, then, for every sequence of natural numbers q_1, q_2, \dots, q_J ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[P_1(A_1)^{q_1} \dots P_J(A_J)^{q_J}] = \mathbb{E}\left[P_0(A_1)^{K_{1:q_1}^{(1)}} \dots P_0(A_J)^{K_{1:q_J}^{(J)}} \mid E_{\neq}\right] \mathbb{P}(E_{\neq}),$$

where $K_{1:q_j}^{(j)}$ is the number of observed species from population j , in a sample which contains q_j observations from P_j , for $j = 1, \dots, J$, and E_{\neq} is the event of not observing any shared species across j .

Importantly, such results show that higher order moments of the mSSP evaluated in measurable sets, and not only the correlation, can be meaningfully interpreted in terms of simple observable quantities such as the random number of observed species within and across groups.

4 Partially exchangeable partition function

Let us consider a finite sample $(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])$. Here, we denote by I_j the sample size of group j and by $n = \sum_{j=1}^J I_j$ the overall sample size. If we consider non-degenerate mSSP (i.e., $\mathbb{P}(P_j \neq P_0) > 0$, for at least one $j \in [J]$), the discrete part of the mSSP entails that with positive probability there can be ties among the variables in the sample $(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])$. Hence, an mSSP induces a random partition of the integers $[n]$ that represent the labels of the observations ordered, by group index $j = 1, \dots, J$ and by arrival within each group, meaning that observation $X_{j,i}$ is associated with the integer label $\sum_{j'=1}^{j-1} I_{j'} + i$. We call this order *order of arrival by group*. The law of such a partition is usually referred to as partially exchangeable partition probability function (pEPPF) (see, e.g., Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2019a; Lijoi *et al.*, 2023), which can be thought to as a natural generalization of the exchangeable partition probability function (EPPF) (see, e.g., Pitman, 2006) to partitions over partially exchangeable observations. Such distribution has a fundamental role in models based on random discrete distributions. In dependent species sampling analyses, where the labels θ_h sampled from P_0 are used only to label different species and have no numerical interpretation, the law of such a partition uniquely determines the marginal likelihood of the observations. Similarly, in model-based clustering techniques for multi-sample data, the pEPPF encapsulates the clustering mechanism. Moreover, marginal posterior sampling schemes require knowledge of the pEPPF to be derived.

To define the pEPPF for mSSM, let D be the number of distinct values among the $n = \sum_{j=1}^J I_j$ observations in the sample $(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])$. Denote the vector of frequency counts in a group j by $\mathbf{n}_j = (n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,D})$ with $n_{j,d}$ indicating the number of elements in the j th group that coincide with the d th distinct value in the order of arrival by groups. Clearly, $n_{j,d} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^J n_{i,d} \geq 1$. $n_{j,d}$ may equal zero, which implies that the d th distinct value is not recorded in the j th group, though by virtue of $\sum_{i=1}^J n_{i,d} \geq 1$ it must be recorded at least in one of the samples. The d th distinct value is shared by any two groups j and k if and only if $n_{j,d} n_{k,d} \geq 1$. The probability law of the random partition is characterized by the pEPPF defined as

$$\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{X}_*^D} \prod_{d=1}^D P_1(dx_d)^{n_{1,d}} \dots P_J(dx_d)^{n_{J,d}} \right], \quad (4)$$

with the constraint $\sum_{d=1}^D n_{j,d} = I_j$, for each $j = 1, \dots, J$ and where \mathbb{X} is the space in which

the $X_{j,i}$'s take values and \mathbb{X}_*^D is the collection of vectors in \mathbb{X}^D whose entries are all distinct. We stress that the expected value in (4) is computed with respect to the joint law of the vector of random probabilities (P_1, \dots, P_J) , that is the mSSP de Finetti measure. Obviously, for a single population, that is $J = 1$, the standard EPPF is recovered.

Proposition 9 (pEPPF as function of weights). *Let (P_1, \dots, P_J) be a proper mSSP. Then*

$$\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h_1 \neq \dots \neq h_D} \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{d=1}^D \pi_{j,h_d}^{n_{j,d}} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Note that, for a bivariate process (P_1, P_2) the probability of a tie across groups simply coincides with $\text{pEPPF}_1^{(2)}(1, 1)$. and, thus, results from Section 3.1 lead to

$$\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = \frac{\text{pEPPF}_1^{(2)}(1, 1)}{\sqrt{\text{EPPF}_{j,1}^{(2)}(1)} \sqrt{\text{EPPF}_{k,1}^{(2)}(1)}},$$

where EPPF_j denotes the marginal EPPF corresponding to P_j . Similarly, $\text{Cor}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) = \text{pEPPF}_1^{(2)}(1, 1)$. Moreover, the pEPPF fully characterizes the corresponding mSSP as shown in the next theorem.

Theorem 4 (Sampling mSSM via pEPPF). *For any $(I_1, \dots, I_J) \in \mathbb{N}^J$ if $(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])$ is generated by an mSSM with a pFPPF obtained as in (4) its law can be obtained hierarchically via the following sampling mechanism*

1. *sample the random partition Π_n from the corresponding pEPPF;*
2. *sample iid unique values to be associated with each set in the partition from P_0 .*

5 Predictive structure and inference

Based on the pEPPF characterizing an mSSP, it is theoretically straightforward to derive the predictive distribution associated with any mSSP via ratios of pEPPFs. As detailed in the next proposition, a sequential sampling scheme can be devised by a generalization of the Chinese restaurant process, where observations correspond to customers in a single restaurant, they arrive sequentially and sit at an already occupied table or a new table. Unlike the univariate case, the probability of sitting at a certain table, in general, depends on not only the current allocation of customers into tables but also the original population of already sat customers and of the customers entering the restaurant. As in the classical metaphor, each table serves a unique dish and when a customer sits at an empty new table, they order a new dish not yet served at any table.

Proposition 10. *If $\mathbf{X} \sim mSSM$ with pEPPF, then a multivariate Chinese restaurant process (mCRP) (i.e., a sequential sampling scheme that allows sampling from the predictive distribution) can be derived as*

$$X_{j,I_j+1} \mid (\mathbf{X}_{j,1:I_j})_{j=1}^J = \begin{cases} X_i^* & w.p. \frac{\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, [n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,l}+1, \dots, n_{1,D}], \dots, \mathbf{n}_J)}{\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, [n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,l}, \dots, n_{j,D}], \dots, \mathbf{n}_J)} \\ X_{new}^* & w.p. \frac{\text{pEPPF}_{D+1}^{(n+1)}([\mathbf{n}_1, 0], [n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,l}, \dots, n_{j,D}, 1], \dots, [\mathbf{n}_J, 0])}{\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, [n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,l}, \dots, n_{j,D}], \dots, \mathbf{n}_J)} \end{cases}$$

where (X_1^*, \dots, X_D^*) are the unique values in $(\mathbf{X}_{j,1:I_j})_{j=1}^J$ recorded in order of arrival by group, $n = \sum_j I_j$, and X_{new}^* is a new species sampled independently from P_0 .

While of easy theoretical derivation, the computational complexity of the predictive scheme in Proposition 10 largely hinges on the feasibility of evaluating ratios of pEPPFs. Unlike in many univariate SSPs, the ratios involved in the predictive scheme of mSSPs are unavailable in simple closed form, except for extremely trivial multivariate processes degenerating onto tractable univariate specifications, e.g., independent or almost-surely equal Gibbs-type priors. See Section S.1 for details about univariate SSP, EPPF, and related tractable predictive schemes for relevant subclasses of SSPs in the Gibbs-type family (Gnedin and Pitman, 2006), which is arguably the most tractable generalization of the DP (De Blasi *et al.*, 2015). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that mSSPs commonly employed in Bayesian models correspond to pEPPFs, which are obtained as mixtures of EPPFs (e.g., HSSP, NSSP, +SSP, and combinations of the previous). Thus, feasible predictive sampling schemes can typically derived through data augmentation techniques. These techniques, utilizing latent variables, simplify the ratios of pEPPF to ratios of the product of EPPF, with the most notable example being the Chinese Franchise restaurant (CRF) for the HDP (Teh *et al.*, 2006). The following examples contain such an augmented version of the pEPPF - based on which tractable predictive schemes and marginal Gibbs samplers can be easily derived - for the three large classes of rmSSP (i.e., HSSP, NSSP, +SSP). Denote with $\text{pEPPF}_{D,\text{aug}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J, \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q})$ the augmented pEPPF in the sense that the pEPPF can be recovered by summing all the possible augmented values $\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q}$, i.e., $\text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q}} \text{pEPPF}_{D,\text{aug}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J, \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q})$.

Example 1 (Continue). *If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an HSSP, then*

$$\text{pEPPF}_{D,\text{aug}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J, \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q}) = \text{EPPF}_{D,0}^{(\ell, \cdot)}(\ell_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \ell_{\cdot,D}) \prod_{j=1}^J \text{EPPF}_{\ell_{j,\cdot}, j}^{(I_j)}(q_{j,1}, \dots, q_{j,\ell_{j,\cdot}}), \quad (6)$$

where for $j = 1, \dots, J$, $\text{EPPF}_{\ell_{j,\cdot}, j}^{(I_j)}(q_{j,1}, \dots, q_{j,\ell_{j,\cdot}})$ is the EPPF induced by $\mathcal{L}_{\pi, j}$ that characterized a latent partition of the I_j observations from group j into $\ell_{j,\cdot}$ blocks of cardinalities $q_{j,1}, \dots, q_{j,\ell_{j,\cdot}}$. Conditionally on such partitions, all the $\ell_{\cdot, \cdot} = \sum_{j=1}^J \ell_{j,\cdot}$ (we use the \cdot symbol to indicate a summation over an index set) blocks are clustered together in a coarser partition of D blocks (where each block is associated to a different observed species) whose distribution is characterized by the $\text{EPPF}_{D,0}^{(\ell, \cdot)}(\ell_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \ell_{\cdot,D})$ induced by Q .

Example 2 (Continue). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is an NSSP, then

$$\text{pEPPF}_{D, \text{aug}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J, \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q}) = \text{EPPF}_{R,0}^{(J)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_R) \prod_{r=1}^R \text{EPPF}_{D_r}^{(I_r^*)}(q_{1,r}, \dots, q_{D_r,r}), \quad (7)$$

where $\text{EPPF}_{R,0}^{(J)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_R)$ is the EPPF induced by $\mathcal{L}_{\pi,0}$ that controls the clustering of the group labels $j = 1, \dots, J$ into R blocks (obtained from the ties between the P_j 's). Let $P_r^* \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_{\pi}, P_0)$ $r = 1, \dots, R$ be the unique values of $(P_j)_{j=1}^J$ in order of arrival and $I_r^* = \sum_{j:P_j=P_r^*} I_j$ be the number of observations from the ℓ_r groups assigned to P_r^* . Conditionally on such clustering of the groups, for $r = 1, \dots, R$, the $\text{EPPF}_{D_r}^{(I_r^*)}(q_{1,r}, \dots, q_{D_r,r})$ is the EPPF induced by P_r^* that characterizes the clustering of the I_r^* observations assigned to P_r^* into D_r unique species. The fact that the P_r^* 's do not share species a.s. entails that $D = \sum_{r=1}^R D_r$.

Example 3 (Continue). If (P_1, \dots, P_J) is a +SSP, then

$$\text{pEPPF}_{D, \text{aug}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J, \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{q}) = \prod_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j^{\ell_0} (1 - \epsilon_j)^{\ell_j} \prod_{j=0}^J \text{EPPF}_{D_j,j}^{(\ell_j)}(q_{j,1}, \dots, q_{j,D_j}), \quad (8)$$

where for $j = 1, \dots, J$, $\epsilon_j^{\ell_0} (1 - \epsilon_j)^{\ell_j}$ is the probability of the iid latent assignment of the I_j observations via $\text{Bern}(\epsilon_j)$ to the shared SSP Q_0 , where $\ell_j = I_j - \ell_0$ denotes the observations in group j assigned to the idiosyncratic SSP Q_j instead. Conditionally on such latent assignments, for $j = 0, \dots, J$, $\text{EPPF}_{D_j,j}^{(\ell_j)}(q_{j,1}, \dots, q_{j,D_j})$ is the EPPF induced by Q_j that characterized the clustering of the ℓ_j observations assigned to Q_j into D_j unique species. The fact that the Q_j 's do not share species a.s. entails that $D = \sum_{j=0}^J D_j$.

The hierarchical characterizations in (6), (7), and (8) of the pEPPF in a product of simple EPPF in an augmented space allow simplifying the ratio in Proposition 10 to a product of the tractable predictive expressions analogous to the Chinese restaurant process (CRP).

6 Multi-armed bandits for trees species discovery

In Bayesian statistics, rmSSPs are often employed in mixture models to perform either density estimation or clustering of the observations. Here, instead, we test their performance in devising a strategy for sequentially selecting sampling sites across various locations to maximize the diversity of observed species (see, for instance, Battiston *et al.*, 2018; Camerlenghi *et al.*, 2020, 2017). This task involves making sequential decisions on where to sample next while considering the information gathered from previously sampled species at different locations. Essentially, it entails optimizing the distribution sampling efforts across diverse locations to maximize the number of unique observed species. Problems of this kind are common in ecology and biology, where exploration of different environments is pursued




Figure 2: Empirical distribution functions of the four groups (left) and empirical probabilities of ties (right), based on the entire available dataset. In the left panel, species of all groups are ordered based on their frequency in Group 2.

to uncover new species, and are also encountered in genomics, where often the goal is to detect the greatest possible number of genetic variants (see, for instance, Masoero *et al.*, 2022). The goal of maximizing the number of species discovered via sequential sampling can be formulated as a multi-armed bandit problem, where each arm is constituted by a certain site/population, and a unitary reward is gained when a new species is observed. Let (P_1, \dots, P_J) denote populations from J distinct regions. Each population, i.e., arm, represented by P_j , is assumed to comprise diverse species, initially unknown in terms of both their presence and frequency. Generally, these populations may share common species, with each species potentially varying in frequency across regions.

We consider the dataset of species of trees freely available in the supplementary materials of Condit *et al.* (2002). It contains species of trees observed in South America. 41688 trees have been observed across 100 plots, displaying 802 distinct species. Following Battiston *et al.* (2018), we aggregated the 100 individual plots into 4 bigger groups, according to spatial location. In particular, we joined columns in the dataset with code starting with BCI, P, S, and C. The four groups constitute the $J = 4$ alternatives arms, and the corresponding empirical distributions and empirical probabilities of ties are displayed in Figure 2. For more details on the dataset, we refer to Pyke *et al.* (2001); Condit *et al.* (2002); Battiston *et al.* (2018).

Each tested strategy corresponds to a different rmSSP and subsequently samples one observation from the population with the highest estimated probability of discovering a new species (where the corresponding rmSSP provides the estimate based on the observations \mathbf{X}_{past} collected up to that point from all sites). More explicitly, the arm selected at each step is the one that maximizes the following quantity in j : $\mathbb{P}(X_{j, I_{j+1}} \notin \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}})$. All models include hyperpriors for the hyperparameters: the concentration parameter for the DP-based rmSSP, and both the concentration and discount parameters for the PY-based rmSSP. These hyperpriors are chosen to ensure that the expected value and variance of the probability of ties, both within groups (for all models) and across groups (for models




Figure 3: Tree species data results. Number of species discovered as a function of additional sample sizes in the rmSSPs and the uniform model. The uniform model selects arms randomly.

Tree data							
	Uniform	DP	PY	+DP	+PY	HDP	HPY
Avg. num.	0.2608	0.2965	0.3060	0.2900	0.3186	0.3115	0.3298

Table 5: Tree data: Average number of species discovered per sampling step.

borrowing information across groups), are comparable across all strategies. This selection should guarantee a fair comparison of performance, being the probabilities of ties an excellent summary of dependence (and thus borrowing of information) across groups for rmSSPs. All details about models, algorithms, and hyperpriors can be found in Section S.3 of the Supplementary Material.

Figure 3 showcases the average number of species discovered by two hierarchical species sampling processes, two additive species sampling processes, and two independent processes (no borrowing), as a function of the additional samples observed. Table 5 displays the average number of species discovered per sampling step. The results are averages of 20 runs. For each run, we assume an initial sample of 30 observations per arm to be available (i.e., we sample them without replacement from the entire available dataset), collect a further 300 observations sampled sequentially according to the corresponding strategy, and compare performance in terms of the number of species discovered.

We note that rmSSPs based on the Pitman-Yor process outperform their Dirichlet Process-based counterparts. This result can be explained by the fact that the Pitman-Yor process is more flexible than the Dirichlet Process, having an additional parameter and inducing a power-law behavior of the number of species. More importantly, except for the

+DP ², the borrowing of information across populations appears to improve the performance of the strategy when compared to independent models.

Nonetheless, the *tree dataset* presents high probabilities of ties across samples (see right Panel of Figure 2 and recall that such probabilities are bounded above by the probability of tie within-sample) and, thus, distributions in different locations are highly similar, making quite obvious that borrowing information is desirable. We repeat the analysis on a simulated dataset to assess whether and how the borrowing of information can be harmful in a different scenario. In the simulation, eight populations are considered. The true distribution of each arm is supported on a subset of size 2500, randomly chosen from a total number of 3000 possible species, hence allowing for a partial sharing of the supports. Each arm follows a Zipf distribution, where the mass assigned to the k -th most common species in population j , is proportional to k^{-s_j} , and the parameters are $s_j = 1.3$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $s_j = 2$ for $j = 5, 6, 7, 8$ (cf., Battiston *et al.*, 2018). However, before assigning the Zipf probability mass function, we permute at random the 2500 selected species of each population, resulting in highly different probability mass functions and low probabilities of ties among populations.




Figure 4: Probabilities of ties based on the *true* distributions in the simulated scenario.

See Figure 4. This scenario can be considered a worst-case example for non-independent rmSSPs because, while there exist shared species, borrowing information across populations is undesirable. Figure 5 and Table 6 show that - even in this scenario - hierarchical and additive rmSSP performed almost identically to the independent cases and similar to the oracle model in terms of species discovery. This result is reassuring in that borrowing information, while not necessary, is here still not harmful.

	Simulated Scenario with low prob. of ties							
	Uniform	DP	PY	+DP	+PY	HDP	HPY	Oracle
Avg. num.	0.2335	0.3317	0.3298	0.3312	0.3262	0.3322	0.3237	0.3467
RMSE	NA	0.1563	0.0743	0.1621	0.0655	0.1929	0.0655	0

Table 6: Simulated Scenario: Average number of species discovered per sampling step (Avg. num.) and the root mean squared error of the predictive probability estimates of observing a new species in each population (RMSE). Results are averages of 20 runs.

²Regarding the +DP, note that this model suffers from relatively strong misspecification in this setting, as it assumes that the frequencies of shared species are proportional to one another in different populations, which jointly with the lower flexibility compared to the Pitman-Yor, may explain why it does not lead to an increased performance compared to independent models.




Figure 5: Simulated data with low probability of tie results. Number of species discovered as a function of additional sample sizes in the rmSSPs, the uniform model, and the oracle model. The uniform model selects arms randomly, while the oracle model chooses the arm with the highest *true* frequency of unobserved species. Results are averages of 20 runs.

7 Conclusion

We define and study the class of mSSP, which naturally generalizes the species sampling processes of Pitman (1996) to a partially exchangeable setting, allowing us to derive important results regarding the learning mechanism and the type of induced dependence in a variety of existing Bayesian models, while also providing instruments for elicitation of the hyperparameters, study of existing models, and new model development.

The borrowing of information across populations in mSSPs is driven by ties among observations in different groups and the correlation across measures captures this aspect exactly, leading to its outstanding properties in the class of rmSSPs. Moreover, defining this general class as a framework has allowed us to obtain easily derivable and interpretable expressions for marginal and mixed moments of all processes in the class. There are several directions for future work. In particular, we have proved that all the processes within this class can be obtained by first sampling a partition and then assigning unique values to each element in the partition. Thus, first, we plan to investigate further the class of mSSP and its relation to the set of partitions induced by partially exchangeable observations from a probabilistic standpoint. Secondly, the ideas highlighted in this work can be extended to numerous settings beyond partial exchangeability. Combining a similar sampling mechanism composed of the random partition (whose law is obtained by combining multiple EPPF) and the independent unique values, other invariances and data structures can be achieved.

References

Balocchi, C., George, E. I., and Jensen, S. T. (2023). Clustering areal units at multiple levels of resolution to model crime incidence in Philadelphia. *Preprint at arXiv: 2112.02059*.

- Bassetti, F., Casarin, R., and Rossini, L. (2020). Hierarchical species sampling models. *Bayesian Anal.*, **15**, 809–838.
- Battiston, M., Favaro, S., and Teh, Y. W. (2018). Multi-armed bandit for species discovery: a Bayesian nonparametric approach. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **113**, 455–466.
- Beraha, M., Guglielmi, A., and Quintana, F. A. (2021). The semi-hierarchical Dirichlet process and its application to clustering homogeneous distributions. *Bayesian Anal.*, **16**, 1187–1219.
- Bi, D. and Ji, Y. (2023). A class of dependent random distributions based on atom skipping. *Preprint at arXiv: 2304.14954*, pages 1–75.
- Camerlenghi, F., Lijoi, A., and Prünster, I. (2017). Bayesian prediction with multiple-samples information. *J. Multivar. Anal.*, **156**, 18–28.
- Camerlenghi, F., Lijoi, A., Orbanz, P., and Prünster, I. (2019a). Distribution theory for hierarchical processes. *Ann. Stat.*, **47**, 67–92.
- Camerlenghi, F., Dunson, D. B., Lijoi, A., Prünster, I., and Rodríguez, A. (2019b). Latent nested nonparametric priors (with discussion). *Bayesian Anal.*, **14**, 1303–1356.
- Camerlenghi, F., Dumitrescu, B., Ferrari, F., Engelhardt, B. E., and Favaro, S. (2020). Nonparametric Bayesian multiarmed bandits for single-cell experiment design. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, **14**, 2003–2019.
- Catalano, M., Lijoi, A., and Prünster, I. (2021). Measuring dependence in the Wasserstein distance for Bayesian nonparametric models. *Ann. Stat.*, **49**, 2916–2947.
- Chen, N. and Lee, J. J. (2019). Bayesian hierarchical classification and information sharing for clinical trials with subgroups and binary outcomes. *Biom. J.*, **61**, 1219–1231.
- Colombi, A., Argiento, R., Camerlenghi, F., and Paci, L. (2024). Hierarchical mixture of finite mixtures. *Bayesian Anal.*, **in press**.
- Condit, R., Pitman, N., Leigh Jr., E. G., Chave, J., Terborgh, J., Foster, R. B., Núñez, P., Aguilar, S., Valencia, R., Villa, G., Muller-Landau, H. C., Losos, E., and Hubbell, S. P. (2002). Beta-diversity in tropical forest trees. *Science*, **295**, 666–669.
- De Blasi, P., Favaro, S., Lijoi, A., Mena, R. H., Prünster, I., and Ruggiero, M. (2015). Are Gibbs-type priors the most natural generalization of the Dirichlet process? *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, **37**, 212–229.
- Denti, F., Camerlenghi, F., Guindani, M., and Mira, A. (2023). A common atom model for the Bayesian nonparametric analysis of nested data. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **118**, 405–416.

- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *Ann. Stat.*, **1**, 209–230.
- de Finetti, B. (1938). Sur la condition de “équivalence partielle”. *Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles*, **739**, 5–18.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Gnedin, A. V. (2010). A species sampling model with finitely many types. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, **15**, 79–88.
- Gnedin, A. V. and Pitman, J. (2006). Exchangeable Gibbs partitions and Stirling triangles. *J. Math. Sci.*, **138**, 5674–5685.
- Griffin, J. E. and Leisen, F. (2017). Compound random measures and their use in Bayesian non-parametrics. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol.*, **79**, 525–545.
- Horiguchi, A., Chan, C., and Ma, L. (2024). A tree perspective on stick-breaking models in covariate-dependent mixtures. *Bayesian Anal.*, **in press**.
- James, L. F. (2008). A discussion on: “The nested Dirichlet process” by Rodríguez, A., Dunson, D. B. and Gelfand, A. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **103**, 1131–1154.
- James, L. F., Lijoi, A., and Prünster, I. (2006). Conjugacy as a distinctive feature of the Dirichlet process. *Scand. J. Stat.*, **33**, 105–120.
- Leisen, F. and Lijoi, A. (2011). Vectors of two-parameter Poisson–Dirichlet processes. *J. Multivar. Anal.*, **102**, 482–495.
- Lijoi, A., Nipoti, B., and Prünster, I. (2014). Bayesian inference with dependent normalized completely random measures. *Bernoulli*, **20**, 1260–1291.
- Lijoi, A., Prünster, I., and Rebaudo, G. (2023). Flexible clustering via hidden hierarchical Dirichlet priors. *Scand. J. Stat.*, **50**, 213–234.
- MacEachern, S. N. (1999). Dependent nonparametric processes. In *ASA Proc. Sect. Bayesian Stat. Sci.*, pages 50–55.
- MacEachern, S. N. (2000). Dependent Dirichlet processes. Technical report, The Ohio State Univ.
- Masoero, L., Camerlenghi, F., Favaro, S., and Broderick, T. (2022). More for less: predicting and maximizing genomic variant discovery via Bayesian nonparametrics. *Biometrika*, **109**, 17–32.

- Müller, P., Quintana, F. A., and Rosner, G. (2004). A method for combining inference across related nonparametric Bayesian models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol.*, **66**, 735–749.
- Ouma, L. O., Grayling, M. J., Wason, J., and Zheng, H. (2022). Bayesian modelling strategies for borrowing of information in randomised basket trials. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series C Appl. Stat.*, **71**, 2014–2037.
- Pitman, J. (1996). Some developments of the Blackwell-MacQueen urn scheme. *Lect. Notes-Monogr. Series*, **30**, 245–267.
- Pitman, J. (2006). *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes*. Springer.
- Pitman, J. and Yor, M. (1997). The two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *Ann. Probab.*, **25**, 855–900.
- Pyke, C. R., Condit, R., Aguilar, S., and Lao, S. (2001). Floristic composition across a climatic gradient in a neotropical lowland forest. *J. Veg. Sci.*, **12**, 553–566.
- Quintana, F. A., Müller, P., Jara, A., and MacEachern, S. N. (2022). The dependent Dirichlet process and related models. *Stat. Sci.*, **37**, 24–41.
- Regazzini, E., Lijoi, A., Prünster, I., *et al.* (2003). Distributional results for means of normalized random measures with independent increments. *Ann. Stat.*, **31**, 560–585.
- Richardson, S. and Green, P. J. (1997). On Bayesian analysis of mixtures with an unknown number of components (with discussion). *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol.*, **59**, 731–792.
- Rodríguez, A., Dunson, D. B., and Gelfand, A. E. (2008). The nested Dirichlet process (with discussion). *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **103**, 1131–1154.
- Sethuraman, J. (1994). A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors. *Stat. Sin.*, **4**, 639–650.
- Su, L., Chen, X., Zhang, J., and Yan, F. (2022). Comparative study of Bayesian information borrowing methods in oncology clinical trials. *JCO Precis. Oncol.*, **6**, 1–9.
- Teh, Y. W., Jordan, M. I., Beal, M. J., and Blei, D. M. (2006). Hierarchical Dirichlet processes. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **101**, 1566–1581.
- Woodcock, J. and LaVange, L. M. (2017). Master protocols to study multiple therapies, multiple diseases, or both. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, **377**, 62–70.
- Yan, Y. and Luo, X. (2023). Bayesian tree-structured two-level clustering for nested data analysis. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.*, **32**, 1185–1194.
- Zuanetti, D. A., Müller, P., Zhu, Y., Yang, S., and Ji, Y. (2018). Clustering distributions with the marginalized nested Dirichlet process. *Biometrics*, **74**, 584–594.

Supplementary Materials for Multivariate Species Sampling Models

Beatrice Franzolini, Antonio Lijoi, Igor Prünster

Bocconi Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University, Italy

Giovanni Rebaudo

ESOMAS Dept., University of Torino and Collegio Carlo Alberto, Italy

S.1 Some basics on (univariate) species sampling

In classical species sampling problems, a random sample (X_1, \dots, X_n) is extracted from an unknown and typically discrete distribution and each observed value corresponds to the species of a drawn individual. Denoting with P the unknown distribution of species in the population we have

$$X_i \mid P \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

To develop a Bayesian model for species sampling problems, a prior must be defined over the unknown distribution P . In the univariate setting, the problem can be tackled relying on the large class of priors provided by species sampling processes (SSP), introduced by Pitman (1996) as a generalization of the Dirichlet process of Ferguson (1973).

Definition 1 (SSP). *A random probability measure P is a species sampling process (SSP) if*

$$P \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_h \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_h\right) P_0,$$

where the atoms $(\theta_h)_{h \geq 1}$ are i.i.d. from the non-atomic distribution P_0 and are independent of the random sub-probability vector of the weights $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_h)_h$. Moreover, if $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_h \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 1$, P is said proper.

The corresponding model is defined once the observations are sampled independently from P given P .

Definition 2 (SSM). *An infinite sequence of random variables X_1, X_2, \dots follows a species sampling model (SSM) if it is exchangeable with an SSP directing measure. That is*

$$\begin{aligned} X_i \mid P &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} P \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots) \\ P &\sim \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0). \end{aligned} \tag{S.1}$$

Any sample (X_1, \dots, X_n) arising from a $P \sim \text{SSP}(\mathcal{L}_\pi, P_0)$ induces a random partition of the labels of the observations in the sample, i.e., of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. More precisely, two observation labels i and l belong to the same block of the partition of $[n]$ (i.e., X_i and X_l are clustered together) if and only if $X_i = X_l$. The discrete part of the SSP entails that two observations are clustered together with positive probability since $\mathbb{P}(X_i = X_l) > 0$. The law of such a random partition (denoted Π_n) of $[n]$ is characterized by the exchangeable partition probability functions (EPPF) (Pitman, 1996).

More precisely, let $\{C_1, \dots, C_K\}$ an arbitrary partition of $[n]$ for a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_k = |C_k|$ for $k \in [K]$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(\Pi_n = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}) = \text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K). \quad (\text{S.2})$$

In words, $\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K)$ can be interpreted as the probability of observing a particular (unordered) partition of n observations into K subsets of cardinalities $\{n_1, \dots, n_K\}$. Note that, the EPPF is defined on the space of the compositions of n , which can be interpreted as the space of the frequency of the partition in a given arbitrary order (e.g., the order of arrival). Let $P = \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_h \delta_{\theta_h}$ be a proper SSP. Then the induced EPPF can be computed as

$$\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h_1 \neq \dots \neq h_j} \prod_{k=1}^K \pi_{h_k}^{n_k} \right]. \quad (\text{S.3})$$

The EPPF characterizes the SSM (Pitman, 1996). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if (X_1, \dots, X_n) arises from an SSM, its law can be obtained hierarchically as

1. sample the random partition Π_n from the induced EPPF obtained as in (S.3);
2. sample iid the unique values associated with each set in the partition from P_0 .

The EPPF and the SSP can also be characterized by a specific sequence of predictive distributions (Pitman, 1996) also known as the *generalized Chinese restaurant process* (gCRP). In the culinary metaphor, we can think of observations corresponding to customers in a restaurant, they arrive sequentially and sit at an already occupied table or a new table and each table serves a different dish (iid sampled from P_0).

It is theoretically straightforward to derive the predictive distribution associated with any SSP via ratios of EPPFs as an application of the definition of conditional probability, leading to

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x \mid \mathbf{X}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{EPPF}_K^{(n+1)}(n_1, \dots, n_k+1, \dots, n_K)}{\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_k, \dots, n_K)} & \text{if } x = X_k^* \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K \\ \frac{\text{EPPF}_{K+1}^{(n+1)}(n_1, \dots, n_k, \dots, n_K, 1)}{\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_k, \dots, n_K)} & \text{if } x = X_{K+1}^*, \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.4})$$

where $(X_k^* : k = 1, \dots, K)$ denote the K unique values of X_1, \dots, X_n that were recorded with frequency n_1, \dots, n_K and are iid sampled from P_0 . See Pitman (1996, 2006); Lee *et al.* (2013);

Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017) for details and proofs about different characterizations of (univariate) SSM.

Although the analytical expression of the gCRP is available from the EPPF as shown in (S.4), such expression does not reduce to simple and tractable quantities in general. However, a notable exception is the subclass of Gibbs-type prior (Gnedin and Pitman, 2006; De Blasi *et al.*, 2015), which thanks to the product partition form of the EPPF allows the ratio of EPPF in the gCRP to boil down to a simple ratio of constant for several notable examples as in the well known Chinese restaurant franchise (CRP) (Blackwell and MacQueen, 1973) induced by the Dirichlet process (DP) (Ferguson, 1973). The class of Gibbs-type prior is the most natural tractable generalization of the DP (De Blasi *et al.*, 2015) and it includes the symmetric finite Dirichlet prior (Green and Richardson, 2001), the Pitman-Yor process (PYP) (Pitman and Yor, 1997), the normalized inverse Gaussian (NIG) (Lijoi *et al.*, 2005), the normalized generalized gamma process (NGGP) (Lijoi *et al.*, 2007), mixture of finite symmetric Dirichlet (Nobile, 1994; Richardson and Green, 1997; Nobile and Fearnside, 2007; Miller and Harrison, 2018) and the mixture of DP (MDP) models (Antoniak, 1974). In the following sections, we recall the analytical expression of the three different characterizations (i.e., SSP, EPPF, and gCRP) of some relevant and tractable examples of Gibbs-type prior commonly used in Bayesian analysis.

S.1.1 Pitman-Yor process (PYP)

We say that an SSP(\mathcal{L}_π, P_0) follow a Pitman-Yor process, i.e., $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \gamma; P_0)$, with P_0 a non-atomic measure if it is a proper SSP with $\mathcal{L}_\pi \sim \text{GEM}(\alpha, \gamma)$, where the two parameters GEM distribution, named after Griffiths, Engen, and McCloskey, can be thought as arising from the stick-breaking construction where the π_i 's are such that $\pi_i = v_i \prod_{l=1}^{i-1} v_l$, with $v_i \sim \text{BETA}(1 - \alpha, \gamma + i\alpha)$, $i \geq 1$, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > -\alpha$.

The following EPPF characterizes the PYP

$$\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K; \alpha, \gamma) = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} (\gamma + k\alpha)}{(\gamma + 1)_{n-1}} \prod_{k=1}^K (1 - \alpha)_{n_k-1}, \quad (\text{S.5})$$

where $(x)_n = x(x+1) \cdots (x+n-1)$ is the n th ascending factorial.

Denoting with X_1, X_2, \dots an SSM from $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \gamma; P_0)$, we can derive the well-known gCRP of the PYP from the EPPF in (S.5) applying the definition of conditional probability.

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x \mid \mathbf{X}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_k - \alpha}{\gamma + n} & \text{if } x = X_k^* \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K \\ \frac{\gamma + \alpha K}{\gamma + n} & \text{if } x = X_{K+1}^*. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.6})$$

S.1.2 Dirichlet process (DP)

If we consider $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \gamma; P_0)$ as in the previous section and we restrict $\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ we obtain the relevant special case of the Dirichlet process, i.e., $P \sim \text{DP}(\gamma; P_0)$. Thus we

can specialize the distribution of the weights to $\text{GEM}(\gamma)$, the induced EPPF in (S.5) that boils down to

$$\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K; \alpha, \gamma) = \frac{\gamma^K \Gamma(\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma + n)} \prod_{k=1}^K (n_k - 1)!, \quad (\text{S.7})$$

and the corresponding CRP

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x \mid \mathbf{X}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_k}{\gamma+n} & \text{if } x = X_k^* \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K \\ \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+n} & \text{if } x = X_{K+1}^*. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.8})$$

S.1.3 Finite symmetric Dirichlet multinomial (symDM)

Here we consider an SSP P with a fixed known number M of species in the population (with $M \in \mathbb{N}$) that follow a finite-dimensional symmetric Dirichlet multinomial (symDM). That is, for a fixed $M \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$P = \sum_{h=1}^M \pi_h \delta_{\theta_h}, \quad (\text{S.9})$$

where $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_M) \sim \text{Dir}(\rho, \dots, \rho) \perp \theta_h \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_0$. We write $P \sim \text{DM}_M(\rho, P_0)$.

Then we can derive the induced EPPF as

$$\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K) = \frac{M!}{(M-K)!} \frac{\Gamma(\rho M)}{\Gamma(n + \rho M) \Gamma(\rho)^K} \prod_{k=1}^K \Gamma(n_k + \rho). \quad (\text{S.10})$$

and the corresponding gCRP

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x \mid \mathbf{X}) \propto \begin{cases} n_k + \rho & \text{if } x = X_k^* \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K \\ \rho(M-K) \mathbf{1}(K \neq M) & \text{if } x = X_{K+1}^*. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.11})$$

S.1.4 Gnedin Process (GN)

Allowing for unknown M in finite-dimensional symmetric Dirichlet multinomial process, the model becomes a mixture of symmetric Dirichlet models. A relevant example is the *Gnedin process* (with discount parameter equals to -1). The corresponding EPPF is

$$\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K \mid M = m) p(M = m), \quad (\text{S.12})$$

where $\text{EPPF}_K^{(n)}(n_1, \dots, n_K \mid M = m)$ is the EPPF of the M -symmetric Dirichlet prior in (S.10), with $\rho = 1$ and $p(M = m) = \frac{\gamma(1-\gamma)^{m-1}}{m!}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

The corresponding gCRP boils down to the following simple tractable expression

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x \mid \mathbf{X}) \propto \begin{cases} (n_k + 1)(n - K + \gamma) & \text{if } x = X_k^* \quad \text{and } k = 1, \dots, K \\ K^2 - K\gamma & \text{if } x = X_{K+1}^*. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.13})$$

We denote the corresponding SSP with $P \sim \text{GN}(\gamma, P_0)$.

S.2 Proofs

S.2.1 Proof of Proposition 1

The proof follows trivially from the Definition of mSSP.

S.2.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. To prove the statement we want to show the non-trivial implication of the iff, i.e., if (P_1, P_2) are a mSSP with non-atomic base measure P_0 they can be rewritten as in (1), that is

$$P_j \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(1,2)} \delta_{\theta_{0,h}} + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} \delta_{\theta_{j,h'}} + \pi_{j,0}^{(j)} P_0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \quad (\text{S.14})$$

where $\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(1,2)} + \sum_{h' \geq 0} \pi_{j,h'}^{(j)} = 1$, for $j = 1, 2$, the atoms are independent from the weights and such that $\theta_{j,h} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_0$, for $j = 0, 1, 2$, $h = 1, 2, \dots$ and $\mathbb{P}[\pi_{1,h}^{(1,2)} > 0, \pi_{2,h}^{(1,2)} > 0] > 0$.

From the definition of mSSP, we write for $j = 1, 2$

$$P_j = \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}\right) P_0 = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \pi_{j,h}\right) P_0,$$

where we denote by $\mathcal{H} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ the set of the indexes of the two sums. Note that $H := \text{card}(\mathcal{H}) \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and we use the convention that, for any $(x_h)_h$, $\sum_{h=1}^0 x_h = \sum_{h \in \emptyset} x_h = 0$. We define $\pi_{j,0}^{(j)} := 1 - \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \pi_{j,h}$ and we partition \mathcal{H} in $\{\mathcal{H}_0, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0\}$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \{h \in \mathcal{H} : \Pr[\pi_{1,h} > 0, \pi_{2,h} > 0] > 0\} = \{h \in \mathcal{H} : \Pr[\pi_{1,h} \pi_{2,h} > 0] > 0\}$$

is the set of shared atoms and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$.

Let us define, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\left((\theta_{0,h}, \pi_{j,h}^{(12)}) : h \in \mathcal{H}_0 \right) := ((\theta_h, \pi_{j,h}) : h \in \mathcal{H}_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\pi_{j,h}^{(j)} : h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0 \right) := (\pi_{j,h} : h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0),$$

and $\theta_{j,h} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_0$, for $j = 1, 2$ and $h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0$, independent from all the previous random variables, i.e., $\left((\theta_{0,h}, \pi_{j,h}^{(12)}) : h \in \mathcal{H}_0 \right)$ and $\left(\pi_{j,h}^{(j)} : h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0 \right)$.

Then note that, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}_0} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \sum_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h}$$

and

$$\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}_0} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}_0} \pi_{j,h}^{(12)} \delta_{\theta_{0,h}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} = \sum_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_0} \pi_{j,h}^{(j)} \delta_{\theta_{j,h}}.$$

To conclude the proof we just relabel the indexes in both \mathcal{H}_0 and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_0$ such that they are ordered integers starting from 1 with no gaps and remap the elements in the corresponding sums accordingly. □

S.2.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. By the law of iterated expectations, the first and second moments of $P_j(A)$ are equal to

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A)] = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A) = P_0(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[P_j(A)^2] = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{j,l} \in A), \quad \text{with } i \neq l.$$

Disintegrating with respect to $\{X_{j,i} = X_{j,l}\}$ to recover independence leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{j,l} \in A) &= \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{j,l}) \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{j,l} \in A \mid X_{j,i} = X_{j,l}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \neq X_{j,l}) \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{j,l} \in A \mid X_{j,i} \neq X_{j,l}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{j,l}) P_0(A) + \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \neq X_{j,l}) P_0(A)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $\text{Var}[P_j(A)] = \mathbb{E}[P_j(A)^2] - \mathbb{E}[P_j(A)]^2 = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{j,l}) P_0(A) [1 - P_0(A)]$. □

S.2.4 Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. For $j \neq k$, by the law of iterated expectations, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A)P_k(A)] = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{k,m} \in A).$$

Disintegrating with respect to $\{X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}\}$ to recover independence leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{k,m} \in A) &= \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m})\mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{k,m} \in A \mid X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \neq X_{k,m})\mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \in A, X_{k,m} \in A \mid X_{j,i} \neq X_{k,m}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m})P_0(A) + \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} \neq X_{k,m})P_0(A)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\text{Cov}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m})P_0(A)[1 - P_0(A)]$. The correlation is obtained using Proposition 3. \square

S.2.5 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. By definition of mSSP, we know that

$$P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}\right) P_0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_k \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{k,h} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{k,h}\right) P_0.$$

Moreover, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have a.s. that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^2 + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}\right)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{k,h}^2 + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{k,h}\right)^2} \\ &\geq \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \pi_{k,h} + \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}\right) \left(1 - \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{k,h}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Assume by contradiction that the event $\{\pi_{j,h} \neq \pi_{k,h} \text{ for at least one } k\}$ has positive probability. This implies that with positive probability the above inequality is strict and thus, with positive probability we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1} \mid P_j, P_k) < \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{j,2} \mid P_j, P_k)} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X_{k,1} = X_{k,2} \mid P_j, P_k)}$$

which implies $\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1}) < \mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{j,2})\mathbb{P}(X_{k,1} = X_{k,2})$ and $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] < 1$. Therefore, we have $\pi_{j,h} = \pi_{k,h}$ a.s., for all h , and thus $P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} P_k$. \square

S.2.6 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Clearly $P_j \perp P_k$ entails $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0$. We want to show that $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0$ entails $P_j \perp P_k$.

Let us consider the representation of (P_j, P_k) as mixtures of two components

$$P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \omega_j^{(j,k)} \sum_{h \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{j,h}^{(j,k)} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \omega_j^{(j,k)}\right) \left(\bar{\pi}_{j,0}^{(j)} P_0 + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{j,h'}^{(j)} \delta_{\theta_{j,h'}} \right)$$

and

$$P_k \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \sum_{h \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{k,h}^{(j,k)} \delta_{\theta_h} + \left(1 - \omega_k^{(j,k)}\right) \left(\bar{\pi}_{j,0}^{(k)} P_0 + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{k,h'}^{(k)} \delta_{\theta_{k,h'}} \right).$$

where $\bar{\pi}_{j,h}^{(j,k)} = \frac{\pi_{j,h}^{(j,k)}}{\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \pi_{j,\ell}^{(j,k)}}$, $\bar{\pi}_{j,h'}^{(j)} = \frac{\pi_{j,h'}^{(j)}}{\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \pi_{j,\ell}^{(j)}}$, and $\omega_j^{(j,k)} = \sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h}^{(j,k)}$. Recall that by Proposition 4, $\text{Cor}[P_j(A), P_k(A)] = 0$ iff $\mathbb{P}(X_{1,j} = X_{1,k}) = 0$.

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1}) = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\omega_j^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{j,h}^{(j,k)} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{k,h}^{(j,k)} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\omega_j^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{j,1}^{(j,k)} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{k,1}^{(j,k)} \right].$$

Therefore, by Definition of rmSSP, we have that $\omega_j^{(j,k)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$.

Indeed, if we assume by contradiction that (w.l.o.g.) $\mathbb{P}(\omega_j^{(j,k)} > 0) > 0$ than by Definition 3 we have that $\mathbb{P}(\omega_j^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{j,1}^{(j,k)} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{k,1}^{(j,k)} > 0) > 0$ that entails

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{j,1} = X_{k,1}) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\omega_j^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{j,1}^{(j,k)} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \bar{\pi}_{k,1}^{(j,k)} \right] > 0$$

that contradicts $\mathbb{P}(X_{1,j} = X_{1,k}) = 0$. Since $\omega_j^{(j,k)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \omega_k^{(j,k)} \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0$ we can rewrite

$$P_j \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \bar{\pi}_{j,0}^{(j)} P_0 + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{j,h'}^{(j)} \delta_{\theta_{j,h'}}$$

and

$$P_k \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \bar{\pi}_{j,0}^{(k)} P_0 + \sum_{h' \geq 1} \bar{\pi}_{k,h'}^{(k)} \delta_{\theta_{k,h'}}$$

and therefore $P_j \perp P_k$. □

S.2.7 Proof of Proposition 6

Proof. Define the random variable Z , so that $Z = 1$, if $X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}$, and $Z = 0$, otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m}) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m} \mid Z)] + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[X_{j,i} \mid Z], \mathbb{E}[X_{k,m} \mid Z]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m} \mid Z)] + 0 \\ &= \text{Cov}(X_{j,i}, X_{k,m} \mid Z = 1)\mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{j,i} = X_{k,m})\text{Var}(X^*). \end{aligned}$$

where $X^* \sim P_0$. □

S.2.8 Proof of Proposition 7

Proof. Define $\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q} = (X_{j,1}, \dots, X_{j,q})$,

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A)^q] = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q} \in A^q).$$

Disintegrate with respect to the random partition $\Pi_q^{(j)}$ induced by the ties in $\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q}$ and taking values in the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q})$ to recover independence and aggregate by symmetry induced by exchangeability. $K_q^{(j)}$ denotes the number of sets in $\Pi_q^{(j)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q})} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q} \in A^q \mid \Pi_q^{(j)}] \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q^{(j)}) = \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^q P_0(A)^s \sum_{\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q}): K_q^{(j)}=s} \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q^{(j)}) = \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^q P_0(A)^s \mathbb{P}(K_q^{(j)} = s) = \mathbb{E}[P_0(A)^{K_q^{(j)}}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

S.2.9 Proof of Proposition 8

Proof. For notational convenience, we prove the proposition for $h = 2$. The general case can be proven with the same argument. Notation is the same as in the proof of Proposition 7.

$$\mathbb{E}[P_j(A_1)^{q_1} P_j(A_2)^{q_2}] = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{j,1:q} \in A_1^{q_1} \times A_2^{q_2}],$$

where $q = q_1 + q_2$. Denote now with $\mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q})$ the set of all possible partitions $\Pi_q^{(j)}$ induced by the ties in $\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q}$ such that the elements in $\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q_1}$ and in $\mathbf{X}_{j, q_1+1:q_2}$ do not have ties. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q} \in A_1^{q_1} \times A_2^{q_2}] &= \mathbb{P}[(\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q} \in A_1^{q_1} \times A_2^{q_2}) \cap (\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2})] = \\
 &= \sum_{s_1=1}^{q_1} \sum_{s_2=1}^{q_2} \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2}, K_{q_1}^{(j)} = s_1, K_{q_1+1:q_2}^{(j)} = s_2) \times \\
 &\quad \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q} \in A_1^{q_1} \times A_2^{q_2} \mid \Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2}, K_{q_1}^{(j)} = s_1, K_{q_1+1:q_2}^{(j)} = s_2) = \\
 &= \sum_{s_1=1}^{q_1} \sum_{s_2=1}^{q_2} P_0(A_1)^{s_1} P_0(A_2)^{s_2} \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2}, K_{q_1}^{(j)} = s_1, K_{q_1+1:q_2}^{(j)} = s_2) \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[P_0(A_1)^{K_{q_1}^{(j)}} P_0(A_2)^{K_{q_1+1:q_2}^{(j)}} \mid \Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2} \right] \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q^{(j)} \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, q_2}).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

S.2.10 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}[P_1(A)^{q_1} \dots P_J(A)^{q_J}] = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q_j} \in A^{q_j} : j = 1, \dots, J).$$

Disintegrate with respect to the possible partitions Π_q of $\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J}$ to recover independence and aggregate by symmetry.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{\Pi_q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J})} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q_j} \in A^{q_j} : j = 1, \dots, J \mid \Pi_q) \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q) = \\
 &= \sum_{s=1}^q P_0(A)^s \sum_{\Pi_q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J}) : K_{q_1, \dots, q_J} = s} \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q) \\
 &= \sum_{s=1}^q P_0(A)^s \mathbb{P}(K_{q_1, \dots, q_J} = s) = \mathbb{E}[P_0(A)^{K_{q_1, \dots, q_J}}].
 \end{aligned}$$

□

S.2.11 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. First note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^J P_j(A_j)^{q_j} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J} \in \times_{j=1}^J A_j^{q_j} \right).$$

Denote now with $\mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J})$ the set of all possible partitions Π_q of the elements in $\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J}$ such that the elements in $\mathbf{X}_{j, 1:q_j}$ and in $\mathbf{X}_{j', 1:q_{j'}}$ do not belong to the same set, for any $j \neq j'$ according to Π_q .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J} \in \times_{j=1}^J A_j^{q_j} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left[\left(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J} \in \times_{j=1}^J A_j^{q_j} \right) \cap (\Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}) \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}) \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J} \in \times_{j=1}^J A_j^{q_j} \mid \Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J} \right) = \\ &= \sum_{s_1=1}^{q_1} \cdots \sum_{s_J=1}^{q_J} \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}, K_{q_1}^{(1)} = s_1, \dots, K_{q_J}^{(J)} = s_J) \times \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{X}_{1:q_1, \dots, 1:q_J} \in \times_{j=1}^J A_j^{q_j} \mid \Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}, K_{q_1}^{(1)} = s_1, \dots, K_{q_J}^{(J)} = s_J \right) = \\ &= \sum_{s_1=1}^{q_1} \cdots \sum_{s_J=1}^{q_J} P_0(A_1)^{s_1} \cdots P_0(A_J)^{s_J} \times \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}, K_{q_1}^{(1)} = s_1, \dots, K_{q_J}^{(J)} = s_J) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[P_0(A_1)^{K_{q_1}^{(1)}} \cdots P_0(A_J)^{K_{q_J}^{(J)}} \mid \Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J} \right] \mathbb{P}(\Pi_q \in \mathcal{A}_{q_1, \dots, q_J}). \end{aligned}$$

□

S.2.12 Proof of Proposition 9

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pEPPF}_D^{(n)}(\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_J) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{X}_*^D} \prod_{d=1}^D P_1(dx_d)^{n_{1,d}} \cdots P_J(dx_d)^{n_{J,d}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{X}_*^D} \prod_{d=1}^D \prod_{j=1}^J \left[\sum_{h \geq 1} \pi_{j,h} \delta_{\theta_h}(dx_d) \right]^{n_{j,d}} \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h_1 \neq \dots \neq h_D} \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{d=1}^D \pi_{j,h_d}^{n_{j,d}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

S.2.13 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. For any family of sets $(A_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}[(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J]) \in (A_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J])] \\
 = & \sum_{\Pi_n \in \mathbb{P}[\Pi_n] \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:I_1, \dots, 1:I_J})} \mathbb{P}[(X_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J]) \in (A_{j,i} : i \in [I_j], j \in [J]) \mid \Pi_n] \\
 = & \sum_{\substack{\{C_1, \dots, C_D\} \\ \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:I_1, \dots, 1:I_J})}} \mathbb{P}[\Pi_n = \{C_1, \dots, C_D\}] \prod_{d=1}^D P_0 \left(\bigcap_{(j,i): \sum_{j'=1}^{j-1} I_{j'} + i \in C_d} A_{j,i} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where C_1, \dots, C_D are the set in Π_n , whose elements are collected according to the order of arrival by groups. \square

S.2.14 Proof of Proposition 10

The proof follows trivially by the definition of conditional probability.

S.3 Algorithms and models details for the multi-armed bandit illustration

The algorithms used for all six strategies considered in Section 6 are Markov chain Monte Carlo marginal algorithms. These algorithms are obtained using the augmented representation of the pEPPF described in Section 5 for the additive and hierarchical processes, and the sequential sampling schemes detailed in Section S1 for the independent processes. All models are generalized to accommodate random hyperparameters to achieve greater flexibility in the learning mechanisms, leading to the following specifications for the six strategies.

- Independent Dirichlet Process

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) & \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\
 P_j \mid \alpha_j & \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{DP}(\alpha_j) \\
 \alpha_j & \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(0.75, 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Gamma}(a, b)$ denotes a Gamma distribution with expected value equal to a/b .

- Independent Pitman-Yor Process

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\ P_j \mid \sigma_j, \alpha_j &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{PYP}(\sigma_j, \alpha_j) \\ \sigma_j &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, 3) \quad \alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(0.2, 1). \end{aligned}$$

where Beta denotes a Beta distribution.

- Additive Dirichlet Process

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\ P_j &= \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j) Q_j \\ \epsilon_j &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} 0.15 \delta_0 + 0.15 \delta_1 + 0.7 \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \\ Q_j \mid \alpha_j &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{DP}(\alpha_j) \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, J \\ \alpha_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(0.5, 2), \quad \alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(6, 2) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \end{aligned}$$

- Additive Pitman-Yor Process

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\ P_j &= \epsilon_j Q_0 + (1 - \epsilon_j) Q_j \\ \epsilon_j &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} 0.1 \delta_0 + 0.1 \delta_1 + 0.8 \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \\ Q_j \mid \sigma_j, \alpha_j &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{PYP}(\sigma_j, \alpha_j) \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, J \\ \sigma_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, 3), \quad \sigma_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, 2) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J \\ \alpha_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(0.25, 4), \quad \alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(2, 2) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \end{aligned}$$

- Hierarchical Dirichlet Process

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) &\stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\ P_j \mid Q &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{DP}(\alpha, Q), \\ Q &\sim \text{DP}(\alpha_0, P_0) \\ \alpha_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(1, 1/3), \quad \alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(1, 1/2) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \end{aligned}$$

- Hierarchical Pitman-Yor Process

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_{j,i} \mid (P_1, \dots, P_J) &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \\
 P_j \mid Q &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{PYP}(\sigma, \alpha, Q), \\
 Q &\sim \text{PYP}(\sigma_0, \alpha_0, P_0) \\
 \sigma_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, 2), \quad \sigma_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, 2) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J \\
 \alpha_0 &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(1, 1), \quad \alpha_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(1, 1) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, J.
 \end{aligned}$$

The choice of the parameters of the hyperpriors on discount and concentration parameters is performed as follows. We use the values suggested in Battiston *et al.* (2018) for the Hierarchical Pitman-Yor Process, and then we fix the ones of the other strategies considering the probabilities of ties as a function of the hyperparameters and approximately match their expected values and variances. This selection procedure ensures a fair performance comparison, as the probabilities of ties provide an excellent summary of dependence for rmSSPs. The resulting expected probability of ties and corresponding variances are reported in Table S.1.

Model	$\mathbb{E}[\text{prob tie across}]$	$\mathbb{V}[\text{prob tie across}]$	$\mathbb{E}[\text{prob tie within}]$	$\mathbb{V}[\text{prob tie within}]$
Independent DP	0	0	0.672	0.049
Independent PYP	0	0	0.669	0.047
+DP	0.388	0.092	0.666	0.052
+PY	0.400	0.064	0.628	0.038
HDP	0.389	0.056	0.671	0.041
HPY	0.397	0.043	0.638	0.033

Table S.1: Expected probabilities of ties within and across as functions of the hyperparameters and corresponding variances. Values are obtained via Monte Carlo approximation simulating 2000 samples of the hyperparameters from the hyperpriors per each model.

To sample the concentration parameters of the Dirichlet processes, we employed a Gibbs Sampler via an augmented representation of the full-conditional of the concentration parameter, avoiding a Metropolis within the Gibbs step. For the hyperparameters of the Pitman-Yor processes, we devised an adaptive Metropolis-Hasting, obtained via 10 repeated steps within the main Gibbs algorithm. At each of the 30 sequential sampling steps of the multi-armed bandit problem, we perform 200 iterations of the MCMC algorithm, leading to a total of 6000 iterations (not including the Metropolis-Hasting steps, when present) per strategy. After observing a new data point in a sequential step, we initialize the MCMC for the next step with a warm start based on the last iteration of the MCMC output in the previous step. For instance, we initialize the values of the hyperparameters with the last sampled value in the previous MCMC chain that targets their posterior distribution without conditioning to the new data point.

Moreover, for hierarchical processes, we perform 1000 iterations of the MCMC before estimating the probability of discovery at the first sequential sampling step to achieve a

warm start also at the first sampling step. Code for all six strategies is freely available at <https://github.com/GiovanniRebaudo/MSSP>.

References

- Antoniak, C. E. (1974). Mixtures of Dirichlet processes with applications to Bayesian non-parametric problems. *Ann. Stat.*, **2**, 1152–1174.
- Battiston, M., Favaro, S., and Teh, Y. W. (2018). Multi-armed bandit for species discovery: a Bayesian nonparametric approach. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **113**, 455–466.
- Blackwell, D. and MacQueen, J. B. (1973). Ferguson distributions via Pólya urn schemes. *Ann. Stat.*, **1**, 353–355.
- De Blasi, P., Favaro, S., Lijoi, A., Mena, R. H., Prünster, I., and Ruggiero, M. (2015). Are Gibbs-type priors the most natural generalization of the Dirichlet process? *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, **37**, 212–229.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *Ann. Stat.*, **1**, 209–230.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Gnedin, A. V. and Pitman, J. (2006). Exchangeable Gibbs partitions and Stirling triangles. *J. Math. Sci.*, **138**, 5674–5685.
- Green, P. J. and Richardson, S. (2001). Modelling heterogeneity with and without the Dirichlet process. *Scand. J. Stat.*, **28**, 355–375.
- Lee, J., Quintana, F. A., Müller, P., and Trippa, L. (2013). Defining predictive probability functions for species sampling models. *Stat. Sci.*, **28**, 209–222.
- Lijoi, A., Mena, R. H., and Prünster, I. (2005). Hierarchical mixture modeling with normalized inverse-Gaussian priors. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **100**, 1278–1291.
- Lijoi, A., Mena, R. H., and Prünster, I. (2007). Controlling the reinforcement in Bayesian non-parametric mixture models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol.*, **69**, 715–740.
- Miller, J. W. and Harrison, M. T. (2018). Mixture models with a prior on the number of components. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **113**, 340–356.
- Nobile, A. (1994). *Bayesian Analysis of Finite Mixture Distributions*. Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon Univ.
- Nobile, A. and Fearnside, A. T. (2007). Bayesian finite mixtures with an unknown number of components: the allocation sampler. *Stat. Comput.*, **17**, 147–162.

- Pitman, J. (1996). Some developments of the Blackwell-MacQueen urn scheme. *Lect. Notes-Monogr. Series*, **30**, 245–267.
- Pitman, J. (2006). *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes*. Springer.
- Pitman, J. and Yor, M. (1997). The two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *Ann. Probab.*, **25**, 855–900.
- Richardson, S. and Green, P. J. (1997). On Bayesian analysis of mixtures with an unknown number of components (with discussion). *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B Stat. Methodol.*, **59**, 731–792.