Discussion

The formal definition of reference priors
and
Reference priors for discrete parameter spaces

by J.O. Berger, J.M. Bernardo and D. Sun.

Raúl Rueda

IIMAS-UNAM, Mexico

pinky@sigma.iimas.unam.mx

O-Bayes09. June 5-9th, 2009

Philadelphia, USA

This discussion has three goals:

This discussion has three goals:

First: Congratulate the authors.

This discussion has three goals:

First: Congratulate the authors.

BRAVO MUCHACHOS!

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)].

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)].
Introduce $missing\ information$. The key expression was

$$\pi_k(\theta) \propto \exp\left(\int p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \theta) \log p^*(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{z})\, d\boldsymbol{z} \right).$$

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)].
Introduce $missing\ information$. The key expression was

$$\pi_k(\theta) \propto \exp\left(\int p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \theta) \log p^*(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{z})\, d\boldsymbol{z}\right).$$

1992. Berger & B (BB) [the reference prior reloaded].

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)]. Introduce $missing\ information$. The key expression was

$$\pi_k(\theta) \propto \exp\left(\int p(\boldsymbol{z} \,|\, \theta) \log p^*(\theta \,|\, \boldsymbol{z})\, d\boldsymbol{z}\right).$$

1992. Berger & B (BB) [the reference prior reloaded]. Regular multivariate case

$$p_t(\theta_{(j)} \,|\, \theta_{[j-1]}) \propto \exp\left(\int p(z_t \,|\, \theta_{[j]}) \log p(\theta_{(j)} \,|\, z_t, \theta_{[j-1]})\, dz_t\right).$$

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)].
Introduce $missing\ information$. The key expression was

$$\pi_k(\theta) \propto \exp\left(\int p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \theta) \log p^*(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{z}) \, d\boldsymbol{z} \right).$$

1992. Berger & B (BB) [the reference prior reloaded].
Regular multivariate case

$$p_t(\theta_{(j)} \mid \theta_{[j-1]}) \propto \exp\left(\int p(z_t \mid \theta_{[j]}) \log p(\theta_{(j)} \mid z_t, \theta_{[j-1]}) \, dz_t \right).$$

2009. BB& Sun (BBS) [the reference prior revolution!].

Second: A brief history of the reference prior.
1979. Bernardo (B) [The reference prior (posterior)].
Introduce *missing information*. The key expression was

$$\pi_k(\theta) \propto \exp\left(\int p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \theta) \log p^*(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{z})\, d\boldsymbol{z}\right).$$

1992. Berger & B (BB) [the reference prior reloaded].
Regular multivariate case

$$p_t(\theta_{(j)} \mid \theta_{[j-1]}) \propto \exp\left(\int p(z_t \mid \theta_{[j]}) \log p(\theta_{(j)} \mid z_t, \theta_{[j-1]})\, dz_t\right).$$

2009. BB& Sun (BBS) [the reference prior revolution!].
Formal definition

$$f_k(\theta) = \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{T}_k} p(t_k \mid \theta) \log \pi^*(\theta \mid t_k)\, dt_k\right).$$

Third: Some comments.

Third: Some comments.
Central concepts.

Third: Some comments.

Central concepts. Permissible priors [which ensures the propriety of the posterior] and the MMI property [which ensures the existence of the reference prior].

Third: Some comments.
Central concepts. Permissible priors [which ensures the propriety of the posterior] and the MMI property [which ensures the existence of the reference prior].

Some advantages.

Third: Some comments.

Central concepts. Permissible priors [which ensures the propriety of the posterior] and the MMI property [which ensures the existence of the reference prior].

Some advantages. The formal reference prior is independent of the asymptotic behaviour of the posterior and there is no need for an approximation by sequences of compact sets.

Third: Some comments.

Central concepts. Permissible priors [which ensures the propriety of the posterior] and the MMI property [which ensures the existence of the reference prior].

Some advantages. The formal reference prior is independent of the asymptotic behaviour of the posterior and there is no need for an approximation by sequences of compact sets.

BUT ...

Third: Some comments.

Central concepts. Permissible priors [which ensures the propriety of the posterior] and the MMI property [which ensures the existence of the reference prior].

Some advantages. The formal reference prior is independent of the asymptotic behaviour of the posterior and there is no need for an approximation by sequences of compact sets.

BUT ...

The formal definition is only valid for the continuous univariate setting!

Ah!

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case.

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things wrong!

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things wrong!

I agree with the authors in selecting approach two as the best solution, when it is possible to do so. This approach is more in the philosophy of the reference $algorithm$.

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things wrong!

I agree with the authors in selecting approach two as the best solution, when it is possible to do so. This approach is more in the philosophy of the reference $algorithm$.

Again ..

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things wrong!

I agree with the authors in selecting approach two as the best solution, when it is possible to do so. This approach is more in the philosophy of the reference $algorithm$.

Again .. BUT ...

Ah! In the second paper, BBS tell us how to deal with the discrete case. The fundamental ideas of 1979 are revisited in approaches three and four, while approach one is an easy way of doing things wrong!

I agree with the authors in selecting approach two as the best solution, when it is possible to do so. This approach is more in the philosophy of the reference $algorithm$.

Again .. BUT ...

All of the four proposals are far from "the formal definition"!!!

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.
I like it very much!

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.
I like it very much!

Second: The new reference priors found by BBS shed new light on old problems.

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.
I like it very much!

Second: The new reference priors found by BBS shed new light on old problems.
I’ll buy them!

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.
I like it very much!

Second: The new reference priors found by BBS shed new light on old problems.
I'll buy them!

Third: It is clear that a unique definition [formal or heuristic] of a reference prior is impossible, at least until now [papers number seven and eight or so of the series], in special, the multivariate case, so

What can I say about all these “reference algorithms”?

First: The idea of defining an objective prior based in a mathematical concept of information has a great appeal.
I like it very much!

Second: The new reference priors found by BBS shed new light on old problems.
I'll buy them!

Third: It is clear that a unique definition [formal or heuristic] of a reference prior is impossible, at least until now [papers number seven and eight or so of the series], in special, the multivariate case, so

MUCHACHOS ... LES FALTA!

I take this opportunity to pay a debt:

I take this opportunity to pay a debt:

In the discussion to another paper, I forgot to congratulate the authors. Please believe me when I say it was completely involuntary.

I take this opportunity to pay a debt:

In the discussion to another paper, I forgot to congratulate the authors. Please believe me when I say it was completely involuntary.

BRAVO!!

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Suppose θ is some quantity greater than zero unknown to you.

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Suppose θ is some quantity greater than zero unknown to you.

I take n boxes and deposit θ dollars in the first box, 2θ in the second and so on, up to the nth box in which I deposit $n\theta$ dollars.

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Suppose θ is some quantity greater than zero unknown to you.

I take n boxes and deposit θ dollars in the first box, 2θ in the second and so on, up to the nth box in which I deposit $n\theta$ dollars.

Now suppose that you randomly select a box and observe that the box contains, say, z dollars. Therefore, θ is one of $\{z, z/2, \ldots, z/n\}$.

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Suppose θ is some quantity greater than zero unknown to you.

I take n boxes and deposit θ dollars in the first box, 2θ in the second and so on, up to the nth box in which I deposit $n\theta$ dollars.

Now suppose that you randomly select a box and observe that the box contains, say, z dollars. Therefore, θ is one of $\{z, z/2, \ldots, z/n\}$.

What is the reference prior for θ in this case?

Finally I want to leave them with the following problem:

Suppose θ is some quantity greater than zero unknown to you.

I take n boxes and deposit θ dollars in the first box, 2θ in the second and so on, up to the nth box in which I deposit $n\theta$ dollars.

Now suppose that you randomly select a box and observe that the box contains, say, z dollars. Therefore, θ is one of $\{z, z/2, \ldots, z/n\}$.

What is the reference prior for θ in this case?

Is it continuous or discrete?

THANKS!

THANKS!

OR ...

THANKS!

OR ...

MUCHAS GRACIAS!!