


Statistics for Particle Physics

Lecture 3



Taller de Altas Energías
Benasque, Spain
4,5 September 2025

<http://benasque.org/2025tae/>

Glen Cowan
Physics Department
Royal Holloway, University of London
g.cowan@rhul.ac.uk
www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan

Outline

Thursday 11:30: Introduction

Probability

Hypothesis tests

Thursday 12:30: Parameter estimation

Confidence limits

Thursday 16:30: Tutorial on parameter estimation

https://www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan/stat/exercises/cowan_stat_exercises.pdf

→ Friday 11:30: Systematic uncertainties


Experimental sensitivity

Almost everything is a subset of the University of London course:

http://www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan/stat_course.html

Systematic uncertainties and nuisance parameters

In general, our model of the data is not perfect:



Can improve model by including additional adjustable parameters.

$$P(x|\mu) \rightarrow P(x|\mu, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Nuisance parameter $\leftrightarrow$ systematic uncertainty. Some point in the parameter space of the enlarged model should be “true”.

Presence of nuisance parameter decreases sensitivity of analysis to the parameter of interest (e.g., increases variance of estimate).

Profile Likelihood

Suppose we have a likelihood $L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with N parameters of interest $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$ and M nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M)$. The “profiled” (or “constrained”) values of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are:

$$\hat{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

and the profile likelihood is: $L_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \hat{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})$

The profile likelihood depends only on the parameters of interest; the nuisance parameters are replaced by their profiled values.

The profile likelihood can be used to obtain confidence intervals/regions for the parameters of interest in the same way as one would for all of the parameters from the full likelihood.

Profile Likelihood Ratio – Wilks theorem

Goal is to test/reject regions of μ space (param. of interest).

Rejecting a point μ should mean $p_\mu \leq \alpha$ for all possible values of the nuisance parameters θ .

Test μ using the “profile likelihood ratio”:
$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\theta})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta})}$$

Let $t_\mu = -2 \ln \lambda(\mu)$. Wilks’ theorem says in large-sample limit:

$$t_\mu \sim \text{chi-square}(N)$$

where the number of degrees of freedom is the number of parameters of interest (components of μ). So p -value for μ is

$$p_\mu = \int_{t_{\mu, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(t_\mu | \mu, \theta) dt_\mu = 1 - F_{\chi_N^2}(t_{\mu, \text{obs}})$$

Profile Likelihood Ratio – Wilks theorem (2)

If we have a large enough data sample to justify use of the asymptotic chi-square pdf, then if μ is rejected, it is rejected for any values of the nuisance parameters.

The recipe to get confidence regions/intervals for the parameters of interest at $CL = 1 - \alpha$ is thus the same as before, simply use the profile likelihood:

$$\ln L_p(\mu) = \ln L_{\max} - \frac{1}{2} F_{\chi_N^2}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

where the number of degrees of freedom N for the chi-square quantile is equal to the number of parameters of interest.

If the large-sample limit is not justified, then use e.g. Monte Carlo to get distribution of t_μ .

Prototype search analysis

Search for signal in a region of phase space; result is histogram of some variable x giving numbers:

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$$

Assume the n_i are Poisson distributed with expectation values

$$E[n_i] = \mu s_i + b_i$$

strength parameter

where

$$s_i = s_{\text{tot}} \int_{\text{bin } i} f_s(x; \boldsymbol{\theta}_s) dx, \quad b_i = b_{\text{tot}} \int_{\text{bin } i} f_b(x; \boldsymbol{\theta}_b) dx.$$

signal

background

Prototype analysis (II)

Often also have a subsidiary measurement that constrains some of the background and/or shape parameters:

$$\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_M)$$

Assume the m_i are Poisson distributed with expectation values

$$E[m_i] = u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

 nuisance parameters ($\theta_s, \theta_b, b_{\text{tot}}$)

Likelihood function is

$$L(\mu, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{(\mu s_j + b_j)^{n_j}}{n_j!} e^{-(\mu s_j + b_j)} \prod_{k=1}^M \frac{u_k^{m_k}}{m_k!} e^{-u_k}$$

The profile likelihood ratio

Base significance test on the profile likelihood ratio:

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

maximizes L for specified μ

maximize L

Define critical region of test of μ by the region of data space that gives the lowest values of $\lambda(\mu)$.

Important advantage of profile LR is that its distribution becomes independent of nuisance parameters in large sample limit.

Test statistic for discovery

Suppose relevant alternative to background-only ($\mu = 0$) is $\mu \geq 0$.

So take critical region for test of $\mu = 0$ corresponding to high q_0 and $\hat{\mu} > 0$ (data characteristic for $\mu \geq 0$).

That is, to test background-only hypothesis define statistic

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(0) & \hat{\mu} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} < 0 \end{cases}$$

i.e. here only large (positive) observed signal strength is evidence against the background-only hypothesis.

Note that even though here physically $\mu \geq 0$, we allow $\hat{\mu}$ to be negative. In large sample limit its distribution becomes Gaussian, and this will allow us to write down simple expressions for distributions of our test statistics.

Distribution of q_0 in large-sample limit

Assuming approximations valid in the large sample (asymptotic) limit, we can write down the full distribution of q_0 as

$$f(q_0|\mu') = \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)\right) \delta(q_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{q_0} - \frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)^2\right]$$

The special case $\mu' = 0$ is a “half chi-square” distribution:

$$f(q_0|0) = \frac{1}{2} \delta(q_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}} e^{-q_0/2}$$


In large sample limit, $f(q_0|0)$ independent of nuisance parameters; $f(q_0|\mu')$ depends on nuisance parameters through σ .

p -value for discovery

Large q_0 means increasing incompatibility between the data and hypothesis, therefore p -value for an observed $q_{0,\text{obs}}$ is

$$p_0 = \int_{q_{0,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_0|0) dq_0$$

use e.g. asymptotic formula



From p -value get equivalent significance,

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p)$$

Cumulative distribution of q_0 , significance

From the pdf, the cumulative distribution of q_0 is found to be

$$F(q_0|\mu') = \Phi\left(\sqrt{q_0} - \frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)$$

The special case $\mu' = 0$ is

$$F(q_0|0) = \Phi(\sqrt{q_0})$$

The p -value of the $\mu = 0$ hypothesis is

$$p_0 = 1 - F(q_0|0)$$

Therefore the discovery significance Z is simply

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p_0) = \sqrt{q_0}$$

Monte Carlo test of asymptotic formula

$$n \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu s + b)$$


$$m \sim \text{Poisson}(\tau b)$$

μ = param. of interest

b = nuisance parameter

Here take s known, $\tau = 1$.


Asymptotic formula is good approximation to 5σ level ($q_0 = 25$) already for $b \sim 20$.



How to read the p_0 plot

The “local” p_0 means the p -value of the background-only hypothesis obtained from the test of $\mu = 0$ at each individual m_H , without any correct for the Look-Elsewhere Effect.

The “Expected” (dashed) curve gives the median p_0 under assumption of the SM Higgs ($\mu = 1$) at each m_H .



The blue band gives the width of the distribution ($\pm 1\sigma$) of significances under assumption of the SM Higgs.

Test statistic for upper limits

For purposes of setting an upper limit on μ use

$$q_\mu = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(\mu) & \hat{\mu} \leq \mu \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} > \mu \end{cases} \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

I.e. when setting an upper limit, an upwards fluctuation of the data is not taken to mean incompatibility with the hypothesized μ :

From observed q_μ find p -value:
$$p_\mu = \int_{q_{\mu, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu | \mu) dq_\mu$$

Large sample approximation:

$$p_\mu = 1 - \Phi(\sqrt{q_\mu})$$

To find upper limit at $\text{CL} = 1-\alpha$, set $p_\mu = \alpha$ and solve for μ .

Monte Carlo test of asymptotic formulae

Consider again $n \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu s + b)$, $m \sim \text{Poisson}(\tau b)$


Use q_μ to find p -value of hypothesized μ values.

E.g. $f(q_1|1)$ for p -value of $\mu = 1$.

Typically interested in 95% CL, i.e.,
 p -value threshold = 0.05, i.e.,
 $q_1 = 2.69$ or $Z_1 = \sqrt{q_1} = 1.64$.

Median[$q_1 | 0$] gives “exclusion sensitivity”.

Here asymptotic formulae good
 for $s = 6$, $b = 9$.




How to read the green and yellow limit plots

For every value of m_H , find the upper limit on μ .

Also for each m_H , determine the distribution of upper limits μ_{up} one would obtain under the hypothesis of $\mu = 0$.

The dashed curve is the median μ_{up} , and the green (yellow) bands give the $\pm 1\sigma$ (2σ) regions of this distribution.



Sensitivity for Poisson counting experiment

Count a number of events $n \sim \text{Poisson}(s+b)$, where

s = expected number of events from signal,

b = expected number of background events.

To test for discovery of signal compute p -value of $s = 0$ hypothesis,

$$p = P(n \geq n_{\text{obs}}|b) = \sum_{n=n_{\text{obs}}}^{\infty} \frac{b^n}{n!} e^{-b} = 1 - F_{\chi^2}(2b; 2n_{\text{obs}})$$

Usually convert to equivalent significance: $Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p)$
where Φ is the standard Gaussian cumulative distribution, e.g.,
 $Z > 5$ (a 5 sigma effect) means $p < 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$.

To characterize sensitivity to discovery, give expected (mean or median) Z under assumption of a given s .

$s/\sqrt{b}$ for expected discovery significance

For large $s + b$, $n \rightarrow x \sim \text{Gaussian}(\mu, \sigma)$, $\mu = s + b$, $\sigma = \sqrt{s + b}$.

For observed value x_{obs} , p -value of $s = 0$ is $\text{Prob}(x > x_{\text{obs}} \mid s = 0), :$

$$p_0 = 1 - \Phi \left(\frac{x_{\text{obs}} - b}{\sqrt{b}} \right)$$

Significance for rejecting $s = 0$ is therefore

$$Z_0 = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p_0) = \frac{x_{\text{obs}} - b}{\sqrt{b}}$$

Expected (median) significance assuming signal rate s is

$$\text{median}[Z_0 | s + b] = \frac{s}{\sqrt{b}}$$

Better approximation for significance

Poisson likelihood for parameter s is

$$L(s) = \frac{(s+b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s+b)}$$

For now
no nuisance
params.

To test for discovery use profile likelihood ratio:

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(0) & \hat{s} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \hat{s} < 0. \end{cases} \quad \lambda(s) = \frac{L(s, \hat{\hat{\theta}}(s))}{L(\hat{s}, \hat{\theta})}$$


So the likelihood ratio statistic for testing $s = 0$ is

$$q_0 = -2 \ln \frac{L(0)}{L(\hat{s})} = 2 \left(n \ln \frac{n}{b} + b - n \right) \quad \text{for } n > b, \quad 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

Approximate Poisson significance (continued)

For sufficiently large $s + b$, (use Wilks' theorem),

$$Z = \sqrt{2 \left(n \ln \frac{n}{b} + b - n \right)} \quad \text{for } n > b \text{ and } Z = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$


To find $\text{median}[Z|s]$, let $n \rightarrow s + b$ (i.e., the Asimov data set):

$$Z_A = \sqrt{2 \left((s + b) \ln \left(1 + \frac{s}{b} \right) - s \right)}$$

This reduces to $s/\sqrt{b}$ for $s \ll b$.

$n \sim \text{Poisson}(s+b)$, median significance,
assuming s , of the hypothesis $s = 0$

CCGV, EPJC 71 (2011) 1554, arXiv:1007.1727



“Exact” values from MC,
jumps due to discrete data.

Asimov $\sqrt{q_{0,A}}$ good approx.
for broad range of s, b .

$s/\sqrt{b}$ only good for $s \ll b$.

Extending $s/\sqrt{b}$ to case where b uncertain

The intuitive explanation of $s/\sqrt{b}$ is that it compares the signal, s , to the standard deviation of n assuming no signal, $\sqrt{b}$.

Now suppose the value of b is uncertain, characterized by a standard deviation σ_b .

A reasonable guess is to replace $\sqrt{b}$ by the quadratic sum of $\sqrt{b}$ and σ_b , i.e.,

$$\text{med}[Z|s] = \frac{s}{\sqrt{b + \sigma_b^2}}$$

This has been used to optimize some analyses e.g. where σ_b cannot be neglected.

Profile likelihood with b uncertain

This is the well studied “on/off” problem: Cranmer 2005; Cousins, Linnemann, and Tucker 2008; Li and Ma 1983,...

Measure two Poisson distributed values:

$n \sim \text{Poisson}(s+b)$ (primary or “search” measurement)

$m \sim \text{Poisson}(\tau b)$ (control measurement, τ known)

The likelihood function is

$$L(s, b) = \frac{(s+b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s+b)} \frac{(\tau b)^m}{m!} e^{-\tau b}$$

Use this to construct profile likelihood ratio (b is nuisance parameter):

$$\lambda(0) = \frac{L(0, \hat{\hat{b}}(0))}{L(\hat{s}, \hat{b})}$$

Ingredients for profile likelihood ratio

To construct profile likelihood ratio from this need estimators:

$$\hat{s} = n - m/\tau ,$$

$$\hat{b} = m/\tau ,$$

$$\hat{\hat{b}}(s) = \frac{n + m - (1 + \tau)s + \sqrt{(n + m - (1 + \tau)s)^2 + 4(1 + \tau)sm}}{2(1 + \tau)} .$$

and in particular to test for discovery ($s = 0$),

$$\hat{\hat{b}}(0) = \frac{n + m}{1 + \tau}$$

Asymptotic significance

Use profile likelihood ratio for q_0 , and then from this get discovery significance using asymptotic approximation (Wilks' theorem):

$$Z = \sqrt{q_0};$$
$$= \left[-2 \left(n \ln \left[\frac{n+m}{(1+\tau)n} \right] + m \ln \left[\frac{\tau(n+m)}{(1+\tau)m} \right] \right) \right]^{1/2}$$

for $n > \hat{b}$ and $Z = 0$ otherwise.

Essentially same as in:

Robert D. Cousins, James T. Linnemann and Jordan Tucker, NIM A 595 (2008) 480–501; arXiv:physics/0702156.

Tipei Li and Yuqian Ma, Astrophysical Journal 272 (1983) 317–324.

Asimov approximation for median significance

To get median discovery significance, replace n , m by their expectation values assuming background-plus-signal model:

$$n \rightarrow s + b$$

$$m \rightarrow \tau b$$

$$Z_A = \left[-2 \left((s + b) \ln \left[\frac{s + (1 + \tau)b}{(1 + \tau)(s + b)} \right] + \tau b \ln \left[1 + \frac{s}{(1 + \tau)b} \right] \right) \right]^{1/2}$$

Or use the variance of $\hat{b} = m/\tau$, $V[\hat{b}] \equiv \sigma_b^2 = \frac{b}{\tau}$, to eliminate τ :

$$Z_A = \left[2 \left((s + b) \ln \left[\frac{(s + b)(b + \sigma_b^2)}{b^2 + (s + b)\sigma_b^2} \right] - \frac{b^2}{\sigma_b^2} \ln \left[1 + \frac{\sigma_b^2 s}{b(b + \sigma_b^2)} \right] \right) \right]^{1/2}$$


Limiting cases

Expanding the Asimov formula in powers of s/b and σ_b^2/b ($= 1/\tau$) gives

$$Z_A = \frac{s}{\sqrt{b + \sigma_b^2}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(s/b) + \mathcal{O}(\sigma_b^2/b) \right)$$

So the “intuitive” formula can be justified as a limiting case of the significance from the profile likelihood ratio test evaluated with the Asimov data set.

Testing the formulae: $s = 5$



Using sensitivity to optimize a cut




Figure 1: (a) The expected significance as a function of the cut value x_{cut} ; (b) the distributions of signal and background with the optimal cut value indicated.

Finally

Two lectures only enough for a brief introduction to:

- Parameter estimation

- Hypothesis tests ($\rightarrow$ path to Machine Learning)

- Limits (confidence intervals/regions)

- Systematics (nuisance parameters)

- Experimental sensitivity

No time for many other interesting topics:

- Bayesian parameter estimation

Final thought: once the basic formalism is fixed, most of the work focuses on writing down the likelihood, e.g., $P(x|\theta)$, and including in it enough parameters to adequately describe the data (true for both Bayesian and frequentist approaches) so often best to invest most of your time with it.

Extra slides

Example: fitting a straight line

Data: (x_i, y_i, σ_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$.


Model: y_i independent and all follow $y_i \sim \text{Gauss}(\mu(x_i), \sigma_i)$

$$\mu(x; \theta_0, \theta_1) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 x,$$

assume x_i and σ_i known.

Goal: estimate θ_0

Here suppose we don't care about θ_1 (example of a “nuisance parameter”)



Maximum likelihood fit with Gaussian data

In this example, the y_i are assumed independent, so the likelihood function is a product of Gaussians:

$$L(\theta_0, \theta_1) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right],$$

Maximizing the likelihood is here equivalent to minimizing

$$\chi^2(\theta_0, \theta_1) = -2 \ln L(\theta_0, \theta_1) + \text{const} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

i.e., for Gaussian data, ML same as Method of Least Squares (LS)

θ_1 known a priori


$$L(\theta_0) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right] .$$

$$\chi^2(\theta_0) = -2 \ln L(\theta_0) + \text{const} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} .$$

For Gaussian y_i , ML same as LS

Minimize $\chi^2 \rightarrow$ estimator $\hat{\theta}_0$.

Come up one unit from $\chi^2_{\min}$
to find $\sigma_{\hat{\theta}_0}$.




ML (or LS) fit of θ_0 and θ_1

$$\chi^2(\theta_0, \theta_1) = -2 \ln L(\theta_0, \theta_1) + \text{const} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} .$$

Standard deviations from
tangent lines to contour

$$\chi^2 = \chi_{\min}^2 + 1 .$$

Correlation between
 $\hat{\theta}_0$, $\hat{\theta}_1$ causes errors
to increase.




If we have a measurement $t_1 \sim \text{Gauss}(\theta_1, \sigma_{t_1})$

$$L(\theta_0, \theta_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_t} e^{-(t_1 - \theta_1)^2 / 2\sigma_{t_1}^2} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right]$$

$$\chi^2(\theta_0, \theta_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \frac{(t_1 - \theta_1)^2}{\sigma_{t_1}^2}$$

The information on θ_1
improves accuracy of $\hat{\theta}_0$.



Reminder of Bayesian approach

In Bayesian statistics we can associate a probability with a hypothesis, e.g., a parameter value θ .

Interpret probability of θ as ‘degree of belief’ (subjective).

Need to start with ‘prior pdf’ $\pi(\theta)$, this reflects degree of belief about θ before doing the experiment.

Our experiment has data x , $\rightarrow$ likelihood $L(x|\theta)$.

Bayes’ theorem tells how our beliefs should be updated in light of the data x :

$$p(\theta|x) = \frac{L(x|\theta)\pi(\theta)}{\int L(x|\theta')\pi(\theta') d\theta'} \propto L(x|\theta)\pi(\theta)$$

Posterior pdf $p(\theta|x)$ contains all our knowledge about θ .

Bayesian approach: $y_i \sim \text{Gauss}(\mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1), \sigma_i)$

We need to associate prior probabilities with θ_0 and θ_1 , e.g.,

$$\pi(\theta_0, \theta_1) = \pi_0(\theta_0)\pi_1(\theta_1) \quad \leftarrow \text{suppose knowledge of } \theta_0 \text{ has no influence on knowledge of } \theta_1$$

$$\pi_0(\theta_0) = \text{const.} \quad \leftarrow \text{'non-informative', in any case much broader than } L(\theta_0)$$

$$\pi_1(\theta_1) = p(\theta_1|t_1) \propto p(t_1|\theta_1)\pi_{\text{Ur}}(\theta_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_t} e^{-(t_1-\theta_1)^2/2\sigma_t^2} \times \text{const.}$$

prior after t_1 ,
before $\mathbf{y}$

Ur = “primordial”
prior

Likelihood for control
measurement t_1

Bayesian example: $y_i \sim \text{Gauss}(\mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1), \sigma_i)$

Putting the ingredients into Bayes' theorem gives:

$$p(\theta_0, \theta_1 | \vec{y}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} e^{-(y_i - \mu(x_i; \theta_0, \theta_1))^2 / 2\sigma_i^2} \pi_0 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{t_1}} e^{-(\theta_1 - t_1)^2 / 2\sigma_{t_1}^2}$$

posterior $\propto$ likelihood $\times$ prior



Note here the likelihood only reflects the measurements $\mathbf{y}$.

The information from the control measurement t_1 has been put into the prior for θ_1 .

We would get the same result using the likelihood $P(\mathbf{y}, t | \theta_0, \theta_1)$ and the constant “Ur-prior” for θ_1 .

Marginalizing the posterior pdf

We then integrate (marginalize) $p(\theta_0, \theta_1 | \mathbf{y})$ to find $p(\theta_0 | \mathbf{y})$:

$$p(\theta_0 | \mathbf{y}) = \int p(\theta_0, \theta_1 | \mathbf{y}) d\theta_1$$

In this example we can do the integral (rare). We find

$$p(\theta_0 | \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{\theta_0}} e^{-(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_0)^2 / 2\sigma_{\theta_0}^2}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_0 = \text{same as MLE}$$

$$\sigma_{\theta_0} = \sigma_{\hat{\theta}_0} \quad (\text{same as for MLE})$$

For this example, numbers come out same as in frequentist approach, but interpretation different.

Marginalization with MCMC

Bayesian computations involve integrals like

$$p(\theta_0|x) = \int p(\theta_0, \theta_1|x) d\theta_1 .$$

often high dimensionality and impossible in closed form,
also impossible with ‘normal’ acceptance-rejection Monte Carlo.

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) has revolutionized
Bayesian computation.

MCMC (e.g., Metropolis-Hastings algorithm) generates
correlated sequence of random numbers:

cannot use for many applications, e.g., detector MC;
effective stat. error greater than if all values independent .

Basic idea: sample multidimensional θ but look only at
distribution of parameters of interest.

MCMC basics: Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

Goal: given an n -dimensional pdf $p(\theta)$ up to a proportionality constant, generate a sequence of points $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \dots$

- 1) Start at some point $\vec{\theta}_0$
- 2) Generate $\vec{\theta} \sim q(\vec{\theta}; \vec{\theta}_0)$
- 3) Form test ratio $\alpha = \min \left[1, \frac{p(\vec{\theta})q(\vec{\theta}_0; \vec{\theta})}{p(\vec{\theta}_0)q(\vec{\theta}; \vec{\theta}_0)} \right]$
- 4) Generate $u \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$
- 5) If $u \leq \alpha$, $\vec{\theta}_1 = \vec{\theta}$,  move to proposed point
else $\vec{\theta}_1 = \vec{\theta}_0$  old point repeated
- 6) Iterate

Proposal density $q(\theta; \theta_0)$
e.g. Gaussian centred
about θ_0

Metropolis-Hastings (continued)

This rule produces a *correlated* sequence of points (note how each new point depends on the previous one).

Still works if $p(\theta)$ is known only as a proportionality, which is usually what we have from Bayes' theorem: $p(\theta|\mathbf{x}) \propto p(\mathbf{x}|\theta)\pi(\theta)$.

The proposal density can be (almost) anything, but choose so as to minimize autocorrelation. Often take proposal density symmetric: $q(\theta; \theta_0) = q(\theta_0; \theta)$


Test ratio is (*Metropolis-Hastings*): $\alpha = \min \left[1, \frac{p(\vec{\theta})}{p(\vec{\theta}_0)} \right]$

I.e. if the proposed step is to a point of higher $p(\theta)$, take it; if not, only take the step with probability $p(\theta)/p(\theta_0)$.

If proposed step rejected, repeat the current point.

Example: posterior pdf from MCMC

Sample the posterior pdf from previous example with MCMC:



Normalized histogram of θ_0 gives its marginal posterior pdf:


$$p(\theta_0|\mathbf{y}) = \int p(\theta_0, \theta_1|\mathbf{y}) d\theta_1$$

Bayesian method with alternative priors

Suppose we don't have a previous measurement of θ_1 but rather, an “expert” says it should be positive and not too much greater than 0.1 or so, i.e., something like

$$\pi_1(\theta_1) = \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\theta_1/\tau}, \quad \theta_1 \geq 0, \quad \tau = 0.1.$$

From this we obtain (numerically) the posterior pdf for θ_0 :



This summarizes all knowledge about θ_0 .

Look also at result from variety of priors.