

On the Stability of General Bayesian Inference

Jack Jewson¹, Jim Q. Smith^{2, 4}, and Chris Holmes^{3, 4}

¹*Monash University, Melbourne, Australia*

²*University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL*

³*University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3LB*

⁴*Alan Turing Institute, London, NW1 2DB*

jack.jewson@monash.edu, j.q.smith@warwick.ac.uk, chris.holmes@stats.ox.ac.uk

April 2024

Abstract

We study the stability of posterior predictive inferences to the specification of the likelihood model and perturbations of the data generating process. In modern big data analyses, useful broad structural judgements may be elicited from the decision-maker but a level of interpolation is required to arrive at a likelihood model. As a result, an often computationally convenient canonical form is used in place of the decision-maker's true beliefs. Equally, in practice, observational datasets often contain unforeseen heterogeneities and recording errors and therefore do not necessarily correspond to how the process was idealised by the decision-maker. Acknowledging such imprecisions, a faithful Bayesian analysis should ideally be stable across reasonable equivalence classes of such inputs. We are able to guarantee that traditional Bayesian updating provides stability across only a very strict class of likelihood models and data generating processes, requiring the decision-maker to elicit their beliefs and understand how the data was generated with an unreasonable degree of accuracy. On the other hand, a generalised Bayesian alternative using the β -divergence loss function is shown to be stable across practical and interpretable neighbourhoods, providing assurances that posterior inferences are not overly dependent on accidentally introduced spurious specifications or data collection errors. We illustrate this in linear regression, binary classification, and mixture modelling examples, showing that stable updating does not compromise the ability to learn about the data generating process. These stability results provide a compelling justification for using generalised Bayes to facilitate inference under simplified canonical models.

Keywords: Stability; Generalised Bayes; β -divergence; Total Variation; Generalised linear models

1 Introduction

Bayesian inferences are driven by the posterior distribution

$$\pi(\theta|y) = \frac{\pi(\theta)f(y;\theta)}{\int \pi(\theta)f(y;\theta)d\theta}. \quad (1)$$

which provides the provision to update parameter prior $\pi(\theta)$ using observed data $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ assumed to have been generated according to likelihood $f(\cdot; \theta)$. The quality of such posterior inference depends on the specification of the prior, likelihood, and collection of the data. In controlled experimental environments where time is available to carefully consider such specifications, a posterior calculated in this way might be credible. However, modern applications often involve high-dimensional observational data and are undertaken without the supervision of a trained statistician. In such scenarios, it is natural to question the quality of the specification of $\pi(\theta)$ and $f(\cdot; \theta)$ and the collection of y and therefore wonder to what extent posterior inference through (1) can be trusted. Much work has previously investigated the stability of (1) to the specification of the prior $\pi(\theta)$, therefore our focus here will be on the likelihood $f(\cdot; \theta)$ and data y .

The likelihood model captures the decision maker’s (DM’s) beliefs regarding the generation of data y . However, accurately formulating expert judgements as probability densities is difficult. Even for a well-trained expert, so doing requires many more probability specifications to be made at a much higher precision than is possible within the time constraints of a typical problem (Goldstein, 1990). This is not to say that an elicited model is useless. It is certainly possible to reliably elicit important broad structural information from domain experts. However, the resulting “*functional*” model $f(\cdot; \theta)$ generally involves some form of interpolating approximation of the DM’s “*true*” beliefs. So doing so is not unreasonable. However, a consequence of such expediency is that the DM does not fully believe all the judgements expressed through their model $f(\cdot; \theta)$. A typical example of the above is when applied practitioners deploy computationally convenient canonical models, for which there are software and illustrative examples available, to their domain specific problems. While the broad structure of such models may be suitable across domains, it is the practitioner’s familiarity with its form, its software implementation, or the platform on which it was published that often motivates its use for inference, rather than a careful consideration of how it captures beliefs about the new environment.

Similarly, the data were not necessarily collected exactly how the DM imagined when specifying their model. There may be unforeseen heterogeneities, outliers, or recording errors. Alternatively, the DM may be deploying someone else’s carefully elicited model to an analogous but not necessarily

exchangeable scenario.

Given the inevitable lack of specificity in f and how the data y were generated, a faithful Bayesian analysis should be able to demonstrate that it is not overly dependent on their exact specification. Such stability would allow DMs to continue using familiar models in the knowledge that their arbitrary selection is not driving critical posterior inferences. This paper shows that the requirement for such stability necessitates the consideration of an updating rule different from (1).

Consider, for example, a situation where the DM’s *true* beliefs for data y corresponds to a Student’s- t distribution $t_5(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ with 5 degrees of freedom. The top left of Figure 1 shows that the ubiquitous Gaussian likelihood, $\mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ captures many of the same judgements. The two likelihoods appear almost indistinguishable for all values of their shared μ and σ^2 . Therefore, given finite time and introspection the DM may reasonably settle on the Gaussian likelihood as a suitable *functioning* approximation of their beliefs. However, the bottom left of Figure 1 shows that when updating according to (1) using the Gaussian model in place of the Student’s- t results in very different posterior inferences. Equally, (1) is not stable to perturbations of the data either, as under the Gaussian model a small proportion of outliers moves the posterior inferences away from the uncontaminated part of the data generating process (DGP). See Section 6.1 for full details of this example.

We demonstrate that the instability observed in Figure 1 results from the fact that implicitly (1) learns about the parameter of the model minimising the Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD) between the data generating process (DGP) and the model, and, as a result, that stability can only be expected when the DM is sure of the tails of their model specification and the data. The DM is highly unlikely to be sure of this a priori and therefore, under traditional Bayesian updating, it is left up to the DM to perform some *post hoc* sensitivity analysis to examine the impact their chosen model and particular features of the data had on the inference (see Box, 1980; Berger et al., 1994, and references within). However, such analyses are usually unsystematic and limited to the investigation of a small number of alternative judgements, models, or data points.

An alternative, motivated by the M -open world assumption that the model is misspecified for the DGP (Bernardo and Smith, 2001), is to use general Bayes (Bissiri et al., 2016) to update beliefs about model parameters minimising a divergence different from the KLD (Jewson et al., 2018). A particularly convenient alternative is the β -divergence (β D) which has previously been motivated as providing inference that is robust to outliers (Basu et al., 1998; Ghosh and Basu, 2016) and desirable from a decision-making point of view (Jewson et al., 2018). In this paper, we extend the motivation




Figure 1: **Top:** Probability density function (PDF) and log-probability density function of a Gaussian $f_{\sigma_{adj}^2}(y; \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma_{adj}^2 \sigma^2)$ and a Student's-t $h_\nu(y; \eta) = t_\nu(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ random variable, with $\mu = 0$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, $\nu = 5$ and $\sigma_{adj}^2 = 1.16$. **Bottom:** The resulting posterior predictive distributions using traditional and β D-Bayes updating with $\beta = 1.22$ on $n = 1000$ observations from an ϵ contamination model $g(y) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$.

for using β D-Bayes further, showing that its posterior predictive inferences are provably stable across an interpretable neighbourhood of likelihood models and DGPs. Such results demonstrate that the β D-Bayes facilitates the safe use of approximate canonical model specification for modern inference problems.

While inferences should desirably be stable to small perturbations of f and y , they should still be sensitive to the larger changes in order to extract useful inferences about the DGP. Importantly, the stability afforded to β D-Bayes inference does not compromise this. The β D-Bayes has the appealing property that if the model is correctly specified for the DGP, then the data generating parameter will be learned. There exists a growing literature that advocates using the β D for applied analyses (e.g.

Knoblauch et al., 2018, 2022; Girardi et al., 2020; Sugawara, 2020). This is further demonstrated in our experiments. For example, Figure 1 shows that as well as producing similar inference for the Gaussian and Student’s- t likelihood models, the β D-Bayes inferences both capture the modal part of the observed data. Further, inferences must also not be overly dependent on the selection of hyperparameter, β , of the β D. We discuss methods to select β and demonstrate reasonable insensitivity to its selection.

Results regarding the stability of (1) have largely focused on the parameter prior. Gustafson and Wasserman (1995) proved that the total variation divergence (TVD) between two posteriors resulting from *functioning* and *true* priors in linear and geometric ϵ -contamination neighbourhoods divergences as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ at a rate exponential in the dimension of the parameter space. However, Smith and Rigat (2012) showed that the TVD between two posteriors converges to 0 provided the two priors under consideration are close as measured by the local De Robertis distance. Our first results provide analogies to these for the specification of the likelihood model. Gilboa and Schmeidler (1989); Whittle and Whittle (1990); Hansen and Sargent (2001a,b); Watson and Holmes (2016) consider the stability of optimal decision making and consider minimax decision across neighbourhoods of the posterior. However, they do not consider what perturbations of the inputs of (1) would leave a DM in such a neighbourhood *a posteriori*. Most similar to our work is Miller and Dunson (2018), which considers Bayesian updating conditioning on data arriving within a KLD ball of the observed data and results concerning ‘global bias-robustness’ to contaminating observations, for example of the kernel-Stein discrepancy posteriors of Matsubara et al. (2021). We consider stability to an interpretable neighbourhood of the data which as a special case contains the globally bias-robust contamination.

Bayes linear methods (Goldstein, 1999), which concern only the sub-collection of probabilities and expectations the DM considers themselves to be able to specify (Goldstein et al., 2006), is an alternative to (1) designed to be stable to interpolating approximations. We prefer, however, to adopt the general Bayesian paradigm in this analysis. Firstly, the general Bayesian paradigm includes traditional Bayesian updating as a special case and produces familiar posterior and predictive distributions. Secondly, linear Bayes requires the elicitation of expectations and variances of unbounded quantities which are themselves unstable to small perturbations (see discussion on Goldstein and Wooff, 1994). Lastly, rather than trying to approximate their beliefs by a single model, the DM could consider several interpolating approximations and let the data guide any decision they themselves have not able to make using methods such as penalised likelihood approaches (e.g. Akaike, 1973; Schwarz

et al., 1978), Bayes’ factors (Kass and Raftery, 1995) or Bayesian model averaging (Hoeting et al., 1999). In particular, Williamson and Goldstein (2015) propose methods for combining posterior beliefs across an equivalence class of analyses. However, such methods can be computationally burdensome to compute across even a finite class of models (e.g. Rossell et al., 2021) and can reasonably only consider a handful of models that might fit with the DM’s beliefs, all of which contain some level of interpolating approximation.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 presents our inference paradigm, introducing general Bayesian updating (Bissiri et al., 2016), robustified inference with the β D, and defining how we will investigate posterior predictive stability. Section 3 presents our theoretical contributions surrounding the stability of Bayesian analyses to the choice of the likelihood function and Section 4 presents our results on the stability of inference to perturbations of the DGP. Proofs of all of our results are deferred to the supplementary material. Section 5 discusses methods to set the β hyperparameter and Section 6 illustrates the stability of the β D-Bayes inference in continuous and binary regression examples from biostatistics and a mixture modelling astrophysics example, where stability is shown not to compromise the model’s ability to learn about the DGP. Code to reproduce all of the examples in this paper can be found at <https://github.com/jejewson/stabilityGBI>.

2 A paradigm for inference and stability

2.1 General Bayesian Inference

Under the assumption that the model used for inference $f(y; \theta)$ does not exactly capture the DM’s beliefs, we find it appealing to adopt the general Bayesian perspective of inference. Bissiri et al. (2016) showed that the posterior update

$$\pi^\ell(\theta|y) = \frac{\pi(\theta) \exp(-w \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta, y_i))}{\int \pi(\theta) \exp(-w \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta, y_i)) d\theta}. \quad (2)$$

provides a coherent means to update prior beliefs after observing data $y \sim g(\cdot)$ about parameter $\theta_g^\ell := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \int \ell(\theta, z) g(z) dz$ without requiring that θ index a model for the data generating density $g(\cdot)$.

The parameter $w > 0$ in (2) calibrates the loss with the prior to accounts for the fact that unlike the likelihood in (1), $\exp(-\ell(\theta, y_i))$ is no longer constrained to integrate to 1. Lyddon et al. (2018) set w to match the asymptotic information in the general Bayesian posterior to that of a sample from

the ‘loss-likelihood bootstrap’, while [Giummolè et al. \(2019\)](#), building on the work of [Ribatet et al. \(2012\)](#), directly calibrate the curvature of the posterior to match that of the frequentist loss minimiser. A general Bernstein von-Mises Theorem for generalised posterior (2) was proven in [Miller \(2021\)](#).

We focus on a subset of loss functions, known as proper scoring rules ([Gneiting and Raftery, 2007](#)), that depend upon the DM’s likelihood model, allowing them to use this to encode their beliefs about the DGP. A scoring rule is proper if it is minimised in expectation at the density that generated the data. It therefore provides a means by which the DM can learn about the DGP. Under the log-score, $\ell(\theta, y) = -\log f(y; \theta)$ (2) collapses to (1). The parameter θ_g^ℓ associated with the log-score is the minimiser of the KLD between the distribution of the sample and the model ([Berk et al., 1966](#)). We therefore call updating using (1) KLD-Bayes. However, it is well known that minimising the log-score puts large importance on correctly capturing the tails of the data ([Bernardo and Smith, 2001](#)) and can have negative consequences for posterior decision making ([Jewson et al., 2018](#)). This is demonstrated in the bottom left of Figure 1.

2.2 β D-Bayes

An alternative proper scoring rule is the β -divergence loss ([Basu et al., 1998](#)), also known as the Tsallis Score (see e.g. [Dawid et al., 2016](#))

$$\ell^{(\beta)}(y, f(\cdot; \theta)) = -\frac{1}{\beta-1} f(y; \theta)^{\beta-1} + \frac{1}{\beta} \int f(z; \theta)^\beta dz, \quad (3)$$

so called as $\arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim g} [\ell^{(\beta)}(y, f(\cdot; \theta))] = \arg \min_{\theta} D_B^{(\beta)}(g || f(\cdot; \theta))$ where $D_B^{(\beta)}(g || f)$ is the β -divergence defined in Section A.1. We refer to updating using (2) and loss (3) as β D-Bayes. This was first used by [Ghosh and Basu \(2016\)](#) to produce a robustified Bayesian posterior (β D-Bayes) and has since been deployed for a variety of examples (e.g. [Knoblauch et al., 2018, 2022](#); [Girardi et al., 2020](#); [Sugasawa, 2020](#)).

The implicit robustness to outliers exhibited by the β D-Bayes is illustrated in the bottom right of Figure 1, where, unlike the KLD-Bayes, the β D-Bayes continues to capture the distribution of the majority of observations under outlier contamination. [Jewson et al. \(2018\)](#) argued that updating in a manner that is automatically robust to outliers, removes the burden on the DM to specify their beliefs in a way that is robust to the possible existence of occasional outliers. The results of the coming sections provide a formal rationale for adopting this methodology to provide stability to the canonical model choice and departures from the DGP.

While Bayesian inference has been proposed minimising several alternative divergences including the Hellinger divergence, α -divergence, and the TVD (e.g. [Hooker and Vidyashankar, 2014](#); [Jewson et al., 2018](#); [Knoblauch and Vomfell, 2020](#)) such methods require a non-parametric density estimate, prohibiting their use for high-dimensional problems with continuous data. We restrict our attention to local methods not requiring such an estimate and in particular to the β D and KLD. The γ -divergence ([Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008](#)) has also been shown to produce robust inference without requiring a non-parametric density estimate ([Hung et al., 2018](#); [Knoblauch et al., 2022](#)) and in general behaves very similarly, see Section B.1. There also exists scoring rules that tailor inference towards improved predictive performance ([Loaiza-Maya et al., 2021](#)). However, our focus here is on stably learning about the DGP in order to facilitate general decision-making without a specific prediction goal in mind.

2.3 Posterior Predictive Stability

We investigate the stability of general Bayesian posterior predictive distributions

$$m_f^D(y_{new}|y) = \int f(y_{new}; \theta) \pi^D(\theta|y) d\theta. \quad (4)$$

for exchangeable observation $y_{new} \in \mathcal{Y}$ to the specification of the model f , and the DGP g . As a result, we focus on the stability of the posterior distribution for observables $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ to perturbations of the prior for observables, f , and generating distributions for these observables g .

From a decision-making perspective, the posterior predictive is often integrated over to calculate expected utilities, and therefore stable posterior predictive distributions correspond to stable decision-making. Predictive stability is also a more reasonable requirement than say posterior stability. The parameter posteriors for two distinct models/DGPs will generally converge in different places (e.g. [Smith, 2007](#)). However, divergent parameter posteriors do not necessarily imply divergent posterior predictives, as we show. Further, focusing on observables allows us to consider interesting cases of neighbouring models with nested parameter spaces (see Section 6.3).

3 Stability to the specification of the likelihood function

In this section, we investigate the stability of inference to the choice likelihood model for a given DGP.

We consider that the DM is conducting inference using the functional likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta); \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_f}\}$ in place of their true beliefs $\{h(\cdot; \eta); \eta \in \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_h}\}$ for data $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. We assume that f is an approximation of h in the sense that it captures some of the main aspects of h that the DM has been able to

faithfully specify, but interpolates between those in some arbitrary and convenient manner in a way that the DM does not necessarily believe. In this setting, a faithful posterior belief update should not diverge if f or h is used for inference. That is to say that posterior belief updating should be *stable* to the arbitrary interpolation of belief judgements used for defining a likelihood model. In this section we investigate sufficient conditions for how f can approximate h that would ensure such stability. For clarity of argument, we proceed under the assumption that the priors $\pi^D(\theta)$ and $\pi^D(\eta)$ are fixed. All technical conditions are stated in Section A.3.

3.1 The stability of the KLD-Bayes

Figure 1 demonstrated that there are examples of models and data where two models that appear very similar to the naked eye (top left), can result in substantially different KLD-Bayes posterior predictive inference (bottom left). As a result, we first examine how f must approximate h in order to guarantee stable traditional Bayesian updating (KLD-Bayes). In particular, Lemma 1 investigates how stable the posterior predictive approximation of the DGP g as measured by the KLD, is to changes in the likelihood model. Condition A.1, stated in Section A.3, requires that the posterior density on parameter values η and θ such that mapping the parameters θ of f , onto the space of parameters \mathcal{A} for model h , using the function I_f leaves $h(\cdot|I_f(\theta))$ KLD closer to g than $h(\cdot|\eta)$ vanishes exponentially fast and vice verse.

Lemma 1 (The stability in the posterior predictive approximation of the DGP of KLD-Bayes inference). For any two likelihood models $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_f}\}$ and $\{h(\cdot; \eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$, and y , $\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta)$ and $\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta)$ satisfying Condition A.1 for $D = \text{KLD}$, we have that

$$|\text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y))| \leq C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y) + \frac{1}{c} + T(f, h, y),$$

where $c := \min\{c_1, c_2\}$, $I_f : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ and $I_h : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Theta$ are defined in Condition A.1 and

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y) &:= \max \left\{ \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y) d\theta - \text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y) d\eta - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) \right\}. \\ T(f, h, y) &:= \max \left\{ \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{f(\cdot; \theta)}{h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))} d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y) d\theta, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{h(\cdot; \eta)}{f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))} d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y) d\eta \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

As a result, sufficient conditions for KLD-Bayes to provide a stable approximation of the DGP g when using model f in place of model h are that terms $C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y)$, $\frac{1}{c}$, and $T(f, h, y)$ are small. The term $C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y)$ is the maximal difference between the KLD of the model from g in expectation under the posterior and the KLD of the posterior predictive from g under either model f or h . This is driven by how concentrated the KLD-Bayes posteriors are. Similarly, the term c is the minimal rate associated with Condition A.1. This is driven by how quickly the posteriors concentrate around their KLD minimising parameters. We use Lemma 1 to examine what f must correctly capture about h in order that inference with both achieves similar approximations of the DGP. We therefore investigate some properties of $T(f, h, y)$. Without loss of generality assume that the second term in (5) is the largest. Then, $T(f, h, y)$ being small requires that

$$|\log(h(\cdot; \eta)) - \log(f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))| \quad (6)$$

is small in regions where $g(\cdot)$ and $\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)$ have density. Without knowledge of g , this requires that (6) be small everywhere for all η .

Lemma 1 establishes that if a DM can ensure that (6) is small everywhere then they can use the approximate model f in place of their true beliefs h and be safe in the knowledge that their KLD-Bayes posterior inferences cannot be driven by some arbitrary part of the approximate model. However, this requires the DM to be confident in the accuracy of the probability statements made by f on the log scale. Logarithms act to inflate the magnitude of small numbers thus ensuring that $|\log(h(\cdot; \eta)) - \log(f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))|$ is small requires that f and h are increasingly similar as their values decrease. This requires the DM to be more and more confident of the accuracy of the probability statements made by f further and further into the tails, something that is known to already be very difficult for low dimensional problems (Winkler and Murphy, 1968; O’Hagan et al., 2006), and becomes increasingly difficult as the dimension of the observation space increases. Tail probabilities definitionally correspond to surprising events and are thus harder to specify accurately. We therefore conclude that this is not a reasonable requirement to ask of any DM.

While Lemma 1 does not indicate the tightness of this bound, the example presented in Figure 1 demonstrates the importance of $T(f, h, y)$ being small for stable inference. Figure 1 (top right) shows that while the Gaussian and Student’s- t may appear similar when viewed on the natural scale the difference in their log probabilities is large in their tails. Figure 1, therefore provides an example of two likelihood models where (6) is not small everywhere and a DGP where the two models result in substantially different posterior beliefs (bottom left).

3.2 An interpretable neighbourhood of likelihood models

Motivated by the results of Section 3.1, we consider in what manner a DM might reasonably be able to accurately approximate their beliefs. Firstly, the total variation metric is defined as

$$\text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; \eta)) := \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} |f(Y; \theta) - h(Y; \eta)| = \frac{1}{2} \int |f(y; \theta) - h(y; \eta)| dy. \quad (7)$$

Then, functioning likelihood models f for data $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is considered ‘ ϵ -close’ to true belief distribution h if Definition 1 is satisfied.

Definition 1 (TVD neighbourhood of likelihood models). Likelihood models $f(\cdot; \theta)$ and $h(\cdot; \eta)$ for observable $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ are in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ of size ϵ if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \theta \in \Theta, \exists \eta \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; \eta)) &\leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \\ \forall \eta \in \mathcal{A}, \exists \theta \in \Theta \text{ s.t. } \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; \eta)) &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Being in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ entails the existence of functions $I_f : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ and $I_h : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Theta$ such that for all θ , $\text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))$ is small and for all η , $\text{TVD}(h(\cdot; \eta), f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))$ is also small. This means that there must exist mappings between the two parameter spaces such that for any parameter θ of f , mapping θ to η via I_f leaves $h(\cdot; \eta)$ TVD-close to $f(\cdot, \theta)$. Note that the symmetry of Definition 1 allows Θ and \mathcal{A} to have different dimensions.

The motivation for using the TVD in Definition 1 is three-fold. Firstly, and foremost, the TVD is interpretable. For two likelihoods to be close in terms of TVD requires that the greatest difference in any of the probability statements made by the two likelihoods be small on the natural scale - where elicitation of probabilities and sample distributions usually takes place - and not the log scale. In a practical sense, two densities that appear ‘close’ to the naked eye will be close according to TVD, while this heuristic will not be sufficient for close log probability. As a result, we believe that specifying a model that is TVD close to their exact beliefs is a feasible and reasonable requirement of a DM.

Further, the TVD is natural in the context of Bayesian decision-making. Two densities that are close in terms of TVD will produce similar estimates of bounded expected utility, and thus lead to similar decisions. This has previously been discussed by Smith (2010) and Jewson et al. (2018). Therefore, a model that is TVD close to the DM’s true beliefs will perform similarly from a decision-making perspective a priori. Lastly, the TVD neighbourhood contains ϵ -contamination models which

are popular models for investigating prior stability (Gustafson and Wasserman, 1995) and outliers (e.g. Aitkin and Wilson, 1980).

While Pinsker’s inequality (Pinkser, 1964) shows that (6) being small everywhere is a sufficient condition for Definition 1, it is not necessary to have close log probabilities to have close absolute probabilities. This is for example evidenced by Figure 1 where the TVD between the two densities is less than 0.05. Therefore, Definition 1 imposes a less strict requirement on the DM. Section A.6 demonstrates this by presenting an example where a shrinking TVD neighbourhood corresponds to an expanding KLD neighbourhood.

3.3 The stability of the β D-Bayes

In this section, we demonstrate that Definition 1 is a sufficient condition for stable updating under β D-Bayes. In addition to Condition A.1, the results in this section require Condition A.2, stated in Section A.3. This requires the boundedness over the space of data y of the essential supremum of DGP $g(\cdot)$ and models $f(\cdot; \theta)$ and $h(\cdot; \eta)$ for all values of their parameters θ and η . We need this condition to bound the β D and relate it to the TVD. In discrete models, this bound is always 1 and in continuous models such as Gaussian or Student’s- t likelihood a bound can be achieved by lower bounding their scale. Theorem 1 provides an analogous result to Lemma 1 but shows that Definition 1 is sufficient for posterior predictive stability.

Theorem 1 (The stability in the posterior predictive approximation of two models to the DGP of β D-Bayes inference). Assume $1 < \beta \leq 2$ and that the two likelihood models $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and $\{h(\cdot; \eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are such that $f, h \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Then provided Condition A.1 for $D = D_B^{(\beta)}$ is satisfied for y , $\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta)$ and $\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta)$ and there exists $M < \infty$ such that Condition A.2 holds, then

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c} + C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y),$$

where $c = \min\{c_1, c_2\}$ are defined in Condition A.1 and

$$C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y) := \max \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)), \right. \\ \left. \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \right\}.$$

Additionally, Theorem 2 proves that as well as providing similar approximations to the DGP, the β D between the β D-Bayes posterior predictive distributions themselves can also be bounded.

Theorem 2 (Stability of the posterior predictive distributions of two models under the β D-Bayes inference). Assume $1 < \beta \leq 2$ and that the two likelihood models $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and $\{h(\cdot; \eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are such that $f, h \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Then provided Condition A.1 for $D = D_B^{(\beta)}$ is satisfied for y , $\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta)$ and $\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta)$ and there exists $M < \infty$ such that Condition A.2 holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y) || m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_1} + 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g, f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\ D_B^{(\beta)}(m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y) || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_2} + 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g, h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are defined in Condition A.1 .

Theorem 1 is directly analogous to Lemma 1 with terms $C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y)$ and c having the same interpretation. Corollaries A.1 and A.2 invoke the generalised Bayesian Bernstein von-Mises theorem (Miller, 2021) applied to the β D (Theorem A.1) to show that under very general regularity conditions $c \rightarrow \infty$ and $C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, Theorem 1 establishes that Definition 1 is sufficient for the β D-Bayes posterior predictive distributions under two models to produce similar approximations of DGP g . This allows a DM to proceed using a model that well approximates their beliefs, as measured by the TVD, and know that the imprecision of their beliefs specification cannot lead to substantially different posterior predictive beliefs.

Note that Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 are not directly comparable results. Lemma 1 upper bounds the difference in the KLD approximation of the DGP whereas Theorem 1 bounds the difference in β D approximation of the DGP. The two bounds themselves are therefore not directly comparable only the conditions leading to these bounds. The sufficient conditions for KLD-Bayes to be stable are impractical to satisfy, while the β D-Bayes is provably stable under reasonable conditions that might in practice be plausible to believe. We also do not expect Theorem 1 (and 2) to be tight, however they are not vacuous. Lemma A.8 demonstrates that under Condition A.2, the β D between any two densities is bounded by $\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1}$ and therefore provided $\frac{(3\beta-2)}{\beta}\epsilon < 1$, our results provide a tighter upper bound than a trivial bound on the divergence.

Theorem 2 demonstrates that β D-Bayes updating not only provides a stable approximation of the DGP (as in Theorem 1) but also that the β D between posterior predictives under two TVD close models can be bounded above. This result is slightly weaker than Theorem 1 because it requires the TVD between the model and the DGP to be small in expectation under the posterior. A strength of Theorem 1 is that it holds independent of how well either of the models approximates the DGP. Lastly,

note that the choice of β away from 1 - the case corresponding to the KLD- is necessary for Theorems 1 and 2 to be practically useful as the bounds in all tend to infinity as $\beta \rightarrow 1$.

4 Stability to the data generating process

In this section, we investigate the stability of inference to perturbations of the DGP, the mechanism with which the data was generated. Consider that the DM is conducting inference using likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta); \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_f}\}$ that was faithfully elicited to capture beliefs about idealised DGP $g_1(\cdot)$. Whether this corresponds to their true beliefs or an approximation is not relevant to the argument below. Now suppose that, for unforeseen reasons, the data were actually generated according to $g_2(\cdot)$, a perturbation of $g_1(\cdot)$. A useful property to demonstrate would be that if, in some appropriate sense, such perturbations were small inferences from what was actually observed g_2 would be similar to those where g_1 had been assumed. Therefore, we investigate sufficient conditions for how $g_2(\cdot)$ can differ from $g_1(\cdot)$ and this stability be achieved. Throughout we consider data sets $y_1 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_1}) \sim g_1$ and $y_2 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}) \sim g_2$. Although not necessary to our argument we assume for simplicity that $n_1 = n_2$. All regularity conditions for these results to hold and their proofs are given in Section A.3.

4.1 The stability of the KLD-Bayes

Figure 1 considered a case where the data were generated from $g_2(y) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$ while the Gaussian model was an accurate representation of $g_1(y) = \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$. Although the DGP was the same for 90% of the observations, KLD-Bayes posterior inference under g_2 differs considerable from what one obtains when fitting f to g_1 - see Figure B.2. Figure 1, therefore, demonstrates that there are examples of models and data where two largely similar DGPs result in substantially different posterior predictive inferences from the same model. As a result, we first investigate how g_2 can differ from g_1 in order to guarantee stable traditional Bayesian updating (KLD-Bayes) for f . Lemma 2 investigates how stable the posterior predictive approximation to the DGP as measured by the KLD is to changes in the DGP. Condition A.3, stated in Section A.3, is analogous to Condition A.1. This requires that the posterior density on regions of $\theta_1|g_1$ and $\theta_2|g_2$ that leaves $f(\cdot; \theta_1)$ KLD closer to g_2 than $f(\cdot; \theta_2)$ or $f(\cdot; \theta_2)$ KLD closer to g_1 than $f(\cdot; \theta_1)$ vanishes exponentially fast.

Lemma 2 (The stability in the posterior predictive approximation of two DGPs under the same model for KLD-Bayes inference). For likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and data sets $y_1 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_1}) \sim g_1$

and $y_2 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}) \sim g_2$ for $n_1, n_2 > 0$, if Condition A.3 holds for $D = \text{KLD}$, y_1 , y_2 and $\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta)$, then

$$|\text{KLD}(g_1 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y_1)) - \text{KLD}(g_2 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y_2))| \leq C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_1, y_2) + \frac{1}{c} + T_1(g_1, g_2) + T_2(f, y_1, y_2),$$

where $c := \min\{c_{S^{(1)}}, c_{S^{(2)}}\}$ are defined in Condition A.3 and

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(g_1, g_2) &:= \left| \int g_2 \log g_2 - g_1 \log g_1 d\mu \right| \\ T_2(f, y_1, y_2) &:= \max \left\{ \int \int (g_1 - g_2) \log f(\cdot; \theta_1) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1 | y_1) d\theta_1, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \int (g_2 - g_1) \log f(\cdot; \theta_2) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2 | y_2) d\theta_2 \right\} \\ C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_1, y_2) &:= \max \left\{ \int \text{KLD}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1 | y_1) d\theta_1 - \text{KLD}(g_1 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y_1)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \text{KLD}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2 | y_2) d\theta_2 - \text{KLD}(g_2 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y_2)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

So KLD-Bayes can certainly be ensured to provide stable approximation to the DGP when using model f to update beliefs on data from g_2 rather than g_1 are that terms $C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_1, y_2)$, $\frac{1}{c}$, $T_1(g_1, g_2)$ and $T_2(f, y_1, y_2)$ are small. The term $C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_1, y_2)$ is the difference between the KLD of f from g_j in expectation under the posterior and the KLD of the posterior predictive of f from g_j maximised over $j = 1, 2$. This is driven by how concentrated the posteriors are. Similarly, the term c is the minimal rate associated with Condition A.3 and is driven by how quickly the posteriors concentrate around their KLD minimising parameters. We are interested in how g_2 must be close to g_1 for this bound to be small and therefore we focus on terms $T_1(g_1, g_2)$ and $T_2(f, y_1, y_2)$. Small $T_1(g_1, g_2)$ requires g_1 and g_2 to have similar Shannon entropy, a measure of the inherent randomness in the data, which seems a reasonable condition. However, as $f(y; \theta) \rightarrow 0$, $|\log f(y; \theta)| \rightarrow \infty$ therefore small $T_2(f, y_1, y_2)$ requires that $|g_1(y) - g_2(y)|$ gets smaller as $f(y; \theta)$ gets smaller for $\theta \sim \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta | y)$. That is to say that, $T_2(f, y_1, y_2)$ being small requires g_1 and g_2 to be increasingly close in their tails.

Such a requirement greatly reduces the generalisability of statistical modelling. The tails of the DGP correspond to rare observations and therefore the KLD-Bayes only generalises across DGPs with similar rare observations. Encountering such situations is not only unlikely in practice, but difficult for any DM to consider following our discussion in Section 3. This, for example, prohibits outlier ϵ -contamination models where the DGP for $(1 - \epsilon)\%$ of the data is the same across g_1 and g_2 , but g_2

is contaminated with $\epsilon\%$ of outliers, as seen in Figure 1 and B.2. Such an example also provides an indication that although Lemma 2 is only an upper bound that is not necessarily tight, the absence of small $T_2(f, y_1, y_2)$ results in substantially different KLD-Bayes posterior predictive inferences.

4.2 A plausible neighbourhood of data generating process perturbations

The results of Section 4.1 motivated us to consider what perturbations of the DGP should we reasonably expect our posterior inferences to be stable to. Data generating processes g_1 and g_2 for data $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ are considered ‘ ϵ -close’ if Definition 2 is satisfied.

Definition 2 (TVD Neighbourhood of data generating processes). Data generating processes g_1 and g_2 for observable $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ are in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ of size ϵ if $\text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) \leq \epsilon$

Following (7), g_2 is a small perturbation of g_1 according to Definition 2 if the probability statements made by either differ by a maximum of ϵ . This gives equal weight to modal or tail discrepancies rather than overly focusing on having the same tails. As a result, the data generating distribution for two populations will be close if distributions of the majority of the observations are close, rather than the distributions for a few of the observations.

Further, Definition 2 contains ϵ -contamination neighbourhoods as considered by Matsubara et al. (2021) and demands that the data sets were generated under mechanisms that were absolutely close on the natural scale, rather than the log-score considered in the KLD neighbourhoods on Miller and Dunson (2018).

4.3 The stability of the βD

We now demonstrate that Definition 2 is a sufficient condition on g_1 and g_2 to bound the consequences of generalising βD -Bayes inference for f from g_1 to g_2 . In addition to Condition A.3, the results in this section require Condition A.4 which is analogous to Condition A.2 and requires the bounding of the essential supremum over the space y of DGPs $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ and model $f(y; \theta)$ for all θ . Theorem 3 is an analogous result to Lemma 2 showing that Definition 2 is sufficient for posterior predictive stability

Theorem 3 (The stability in the posterior predictive approximation of two DGPs under the same model of βD -Bayes inference). Assume $1 < \beta \leq 2$, likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and that the two data sets $y_1 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_1}) \sim g_1$ and $y_2 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}) \sim g_2$ for $n_1, n_2 > 0$ are such that

$\{g_1, g_2\} \in \mathcal{G}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$. Then provided that Condition A.3 holds for $D = D_B^{(\beta)}$, y_1 , y_2 and $\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta)$ and there exists $M < \infty$ such Condition A.4 holds, then

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2))| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c} + C^{(\beta)}(f, y_1, y_2),$$

where $c := \min\{c_{\mathcal{S}(1)}, c_{\mathcal{S}(2)}\}$ are defined in Condition A.4 and

$$C^{(\beta)}(f, y_1, y_2) := \max \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)), \right. \\ \left. \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2)) \right\}$$

Additionally, Theorem 4 proves that as well as providing similar approximations to the DGPs, the β D between the β D-Bayes posterior predictive distributions themselves can also be bounded.

Theorem 4 (The stability of the posterior predictive distribution under two DGPs of the β D-Bayes inference). Assume $1 < \beta \leq 2$, likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and that the two data sets $y_1 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_1}) \sim g_1$ and $y_2 := (y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}) \sim g_2$ for $n_1, n_2 > 0$ are such that $\{g_1, g_2\} \in \mathcal{G}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$. Then provided there exists $M < \infty$ such that Condition A.3 hold, Condition A.4 holds for $D = D_B^{(\beta)}$, y_1 , y_2 and $\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta)$, then

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2)) \leq 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_{\mathcal{S}(1)}} + 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g_1, f(\cdot; \theta_1))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1. \\ D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)) \leq 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_{\mathcal{S}(2)}} + 2\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g_2, f(\cdot; \theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2.$$

where $c_{\mathcal{S}(1)}$ and $c_{\mathcal{S}(2)}$ are defined in Condition A.4.

Theorems 3 and 4 are the analogous result to Theorems 1 and 2 respectively with terms $C^{(\beta)}(f, y_1, y_2)$ and c having the same interpretation. The value M is still easy to bound here and Corollaries A.1 and A.2 demonstrate that $C^{(\beta)}(f, y_1, y_2) \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{1}{c} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, Theorem's 3 and 4 establish that β D-Bayes inferences will be similar for any two DGPs satisfying Definition 2. This allows a DM to use their model and know that small unforeseen perturbations of the DGP will not drive substantially different posterior inference or alternatively use a default model or software from the literature and know that as long as their application area is similar, the model's generalisation will not overly affect posterior inferences.

Once again, we do not invoke a comparison of the bounds from Lemma 2 and Theorem 3, as they are bounding different quantities. Instead, we consider the strength of the sufficient conditions

required for boundedness. KLD-Bayes requires strict conditions for the DGPs that are difficult for the DM to know would be satisfied, while the β D-Bayes is stable across reasonable generalisation of a DGP.

5 Setting β

To implement β D-Bayes inference it is obviously necessary to choose an appropriate value of β . We briefly review below a variety of methods that have been proposed to do this and comment on how these relate to the results of this paper. We then demonstrate that inference is not that sensitive to this choice provided that β is not chosen too close to one.

5.1 Data Driven Methods

One approach is to try to learn a value for β that is ‘optimal’ in some sense for the DM’s functioning likelihood model and the particular observed data at hand. Once the DM has decided upon model $f(\cdot; \theta)$, the value β regulates the trade-off between robustness and efficiency (e.g. [Basu et al., 1998](#)). Minimising the KLD ($\beta = 1$) provides the most efficient inference but is very sensitive to outliers. Increasing β away from 1 gains robustness to outliers at a cost to efficiency. [Warwick and Jones \(2005\)](#); [Ghosh and Basu \(2015\)](#); [Basak et al. \(2021\)](#) seek to optimise the robustness-efficiency trade-off by estimating β to minimise the mean squared error (MSE) of estimated model parameters, [Toma and Broniatowski \(2011\)](#); [Kang and Lee \(2014\)](#) minimise the maximum perturbation of the parameter estimates resulting from replacing one observation by the population estimated mean, and [Yonekura and Sugawara \(2023\)](#) build on the work of [Jewson and Rossell \(2022\)](#) to estimate β minimising the Fisher’s divergence to the DGP. The intuition behind these methods is that values estimated close to $\beta = 1$ indicate the model f is pretty well specified for the data at hand, while larger values indicate increasing large levels of possible model misspecification. We use the method of [Yonekura and Sugawara \(2023\)](#) to learn the value of β in the example in Section 6.1.

The results of this paper provide a DM who has used one of the above methods to set a value for β an indication of how sensitive their posterior inferences could be to the specification of their model and the data. For example, a DM learning a larger value for β knows that the term $\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{(\beta-1)}\epsilon$ will be small for any value of ϵ and that even large departures from their model or data would result in similar inferences. This suggests they will only be able to learn slowly about the DGP. On the other hand,

a DM estimating a very small β knows that their posterior inference may be very dependent on the precise model class they have chosen.

5.2 User Specified

Other works have advocated for the subjective specification for the value of β (e.g. [Jewson et al., 2018](#)) and the results in this paper help to facilitate this by interpreting β in terms of the level of stability it brings. The results of this paper demonstrate that β controls the amount that imprecision in the specification of the model or data can be magnified into the posterior, allowing for the interpretation of β as a meta prior for the DM’s confidence in their elicited model or data collection. The less confident they are, the greater β will need to be to prevent non-negligible *a posteriori* divergence. Eliciting β as such requires the DM to reflect on the value of ϵ associated with their beliefs or the quality of the data. For the neighbourhoods of Definition 1, this can be obtained by considering for a given set of parameters what the largest possible error in any of the probability statements could be, or for Definition 2 by considering the minimal proportion of a population that they believe is consistent with the DGP.

A default implementation, however, would be to set β such that $\frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} = U$ ensuring that the posterior predictive imprecision as measured by Theorem 1 is only $U > 1$ times the level of prior imprecision ϵ . We demonstrate such an approach for the example in Section 6.2 for $U = 2$. Importantly, a DM could not hope to set β to provide maximal stability. Maximum stability, i.e. minimising the right-hand side of the bounds in Theorems 1 and 3 would set $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and result in the posterior under any model and data collapsing to the prior, providing absolutely stable inference but not learning anything from the data. For minimally efficient learning to take place, posterior beliefs should not be closer, in the worst case, than the models were a priori.

5.3 Sensitivity

Finally, β D-Bayes inference appears not to be overly sensitive to the exact value of β . Figure 2 demonstrates that for the example introduced in Section 1, inference for the Gaussian and Student’s- t models is almost identical for values of $\beta \geq 1.2$. Section B.1 provides further demonstration of this.




Figure 2: Posterior predictive distributions using β D-Bayes updating on $n = 1000$ observations from an ϵ -contamination model $g(y) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$ for different values of β .

6 Experiments

6.1 Gaussian and Student's- t likelihood

We revisit the Gaussian and Student's- t example briefly introduced in Section 1. The likelihood models considered here are

$$f_{\sigma_{adj}^2}(y; \theta) := \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma^2 \times \sigma_{adj}^2) \text{ and } h_\nu(y; \eta) := \text{Student's-}t_\nu(y; \mu, \sigma^2). \quad (8)$$

Hyperparameters, $\nu = 5$ and $\sigma_{adj}^2 = 1.16$ are fixed to match the quartiles of the two distributions for all μ and σ^2 . These were inspired by O'Hagan (2012), who argued that for absolutely continuous probability distributions, it is only reasonable to ask an expert to make a judgement about the median and the quartiles of a distribution along with maybe a few specially selected features. This is justified as adequate as any two distributions with similar percentiles will look very similar, see for example Figure 1. However, Section 3.1 suggests that greater precision is required to ensure the stability of Bayes' rule updating. On the other hand, the likelihoods in (8) are contained in $\mathcal{N}_{0.043}^{\text{TVD}}$. We generated $n = 1000$ observations from the ϵ -contamination model $g(x) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$ contained within the $\mathcal{G}_{0.1}^{\text{TVD}}$ neighbourhood of $\mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$. We then conducted Bayesian updating under the Gaussian and Student's- t likelihood using both Bayes' rule and the β D-Bayes under shared priors $\pi(\mu, \sigma^2) = \mathcal{N}(\mu; \mu_0, v_0 \sigma^2) \mathcal{IG}(\sigma^2; a_0, b_0)$, with hyperparameters $(a_0 = 0.01, b_0 =$




Figure 3: Influence functions for parameter μ and σ^2 of the Gaussian and Student’s- t likelihood models under the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes with $\beta = 1.22$.

0.01, $\mu_0 = 0, v_0 = 10$). We used the method of Yonekura and Sugasawa (2023) to set $\beta = 1.22$ when using the Gaussian distribution and use the same value for the Student’s- t . Figure 1 and Figure B.1, which plots the parameter posterior distributions for both models under both updating mechanisms, clearly demonstrate the stability of the β D-Bayes across these two models and the lack of stability of traditional Bayesian updating. Not only is the β D inference more stable across $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$, the β D predictive better captures the majority of the DGP than either of the KLD-Bayes predictives. The capturing of the $\mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$ mode further illustrates the β D-Bayes’ stability across neighbourhoods of the DGP.

Figure 3 plots influence functions (West, 1984) for the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes under the Gaussian and Student’s- t model. Influence functions are the gradient of the loss function evaluated at parameter estimates as a function of the observations and show the impact that observation had on the analysis. Under the β D-Bayes, the influence functions of the Gaussian and Student’s- t likelihoods are closer for almost every y , illustrating the stability to the model, and additionally, the influence functions for both models under the β D-Bayes vary less with y , illustrating stability to the DGP.

6.1.1 DLD data

We consider an RNA-sequencing data set from Yuan et al. (2016) measuring gene expression for $n = 192$ patients with different types of cancer. Rossell and Rubio (2018) studied the impact of 57 predictors on the expression of DLD, a gene that can perform several functions such as metabolism regulation. To illustrate our results, we selected the 15 variables with the 5 highest loadings in the

first 3 principal components, and fitted regression models using the neighbouring models in (8) for the residuals. Section B.1 lists the selected variables. Once again, we used the method of Yonekura and Sugawara (2023) to set $\beta = 1.34$ when using the Gaussian distribution, and use the same value for the Student's- t .

Figure 4 demonstrates that β D-Bayes produces more stable estimates of the fitted residuals (top-left), the estimated density of the residuals (top-right), parameter estimates (bottom-left), and posterior predictive density for the observed data (bottom-right) than the traditional Bayesian inference. Rossell and Rubio (2018) found evidence that this data is heavy-tailed, further demonstrated in Figure B.5, which caused the KLD-Bayes to estimate very different densities under the Gaussian and Student's- t model, while the β D-Bayes is stable to this feature of the data. Figure B.4 shows the fit of the models to the posterior mean estimates of the standardised residuals, showing that as well as being stable, the β D-Bayes produces good estimation around the mode of the DLD data under both models. Section B.1 considers a further regression example showing that even when one of the models under consideration is 'well-specified' for the data, the β D-Bayes inference continues to perform adequately.

6.2 Binary Classification

Binary classification models predict $y \in \{0, 1\}$ from p -dimensional regressors X . The canonical model in such a setting is logistic regression where

$$P_{LR}(y = 1|X, \theta) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-X\theta)}, \quad P_{LR}(y = 0|X, \theta) = 1 - P_{LR}(Y = 1|X, \theta),$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the regression parameters. Alternative, less ubiquitous models include probit regression, which uses an alternative GLM link function depending on the standard Gaussian CDF $\Phi(\cdot)$, 'heavier tailed' t -logistic regression (Ding and Vishwanathan, 2010; Ding et al., 2013) and a mixture type model that explicitly models the chance of mislabelling of the observed classes.

$$P_{PR}(y = 1|X, \eta) = \Phi(w_{PR}X\theta), \quad P_{tLR}(y = 1|X, \eta) = \exp_t((0.5w_{tLR}X\theta - G_t(w_{tLR}X\theta)))$$

$$P_{ML}(y = 1|X, \eta) = (1 - \nu_1)P_{LR}(y = 1|X, \theta) + \nu_0(1 - P_{LR}(y = 1|X, \theta))$$

where $0 < t < 2$, $0 < \nu_0, \nu_1 < 1$, 'exp_t' is the so-called t -exponential and G_t ensures that $P_{tLR}(y = 1|X, \eta)$ is normalised, both are defined in Section B.3. Setting $t > 1$ results in heavier-tailed probabilities than the logistic model. For the probit and t -logistic models parameters θ are scalar multiples $w_{PR}, w_{tLR} \in \mathbb{R}$ of the logistic regression parameters $\theta \mapsto w\theta$. These are calculated in order to minimise the *a priori* TVD between the models and the logistic regression baseline according to $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ (see




Figure 4: Posterior mean estimates of standardised residuals (**top left**), posterior predictive residual distributions (**top-right**), absolute difference in posterior mean parameter estimates (**bottom left**) and difference in posterior predictive densities of the observations (**bottom right**) under the Gaussian and Student's- t model of KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes ($\beta = 1.34$) for the DLD data.

Section B.3). We upper bound ν_0 and ν_1 by 0.05 making $\epsilon = 0.05$ for these models. Figure 5 plots $P(y = 1|X, \theta)$ as a function of $X\theta$ for all four models (left) and the TVD between each alternative model and the logistic regression (right), demonstrating that all four produce very similar binary probabilities.

6.2.1 Colon Cancer Dataset

To investigate the stability of posterior predictive inferences across the logistic, probit, t -logistic, and mislabelled binary regression models we consider the colon cancer dataset of Alon et al. (1999). The dataset contains the expression levels of 2000 genes from 40 tumours and 22 normal tissues and there is purportedly evidence that certain tissue samples may have been cross-contaminated (Tibshirani and




Figure 5: **Left:** $P(y = 1|X, \theta)$ for logistic, probit, t -logistic and mislabelled models. **Right:** TVD between the logistic regression canonical model and the probit, t -logistic and mislabelled models. The θ parameters of the probit and t -logistic models are scalar multiplied in a fashion that minimise the TVD to the logistic regression

Manning, 2013). Rather than consider the full 2000 genes we first run a frequentist LASSO procedure, estimating the hyperparameter via cross-validation, and focus our modelling only on the nine genes selected by this procedure. We understand that such post-model selection biases parameter estimates, but the stability of the predictive inference is our focus here. We set $\beta = 2$ so that $U := \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} = 2$ with $M = 1$ as was proposed in Section 5.2.

Figure 6 compares the *a posteriori* TVD distance between the posterior predictive distributions for each observation with the *a priori* TVD distance between each of the models (top) and the difference between the posterior mean regression parameter estimates of the two models (bottom) under the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes. The stability of the β D-Bayes is once again demonstrated here. For almost every observation and every pair of models, the posterior predictive inference is as stable as it was *a priori*, while the KLD-Bayes inference is more often divergent. For the t -logistic and mislabelled models the predictive stability of the β D-Bayes also provides greater stability in the posterior mean parameter estimates.

6.3 Mixture Modeling

An advantage of considering the stability of the distributions for observables rather than parameters is that it allows ‘neighbouring’ models to have different dimensions to their parameter space. For




Figure 6: Colon Cancer Data. **Top:** TVD between the posterior predictive estimated probabilities for each observation of the probit (**left**), t -logistic (**centre**) and mislabelled (**right**) models and the canonical logistic regression under the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes ($\beta = 2$). The dotted line represented the *a priori* TVD distance between the models. **Bottom:** Absolute differences between posterior mean parameter estimates and those of the logistic regression.

example, consider initial model $f(\cdot; \theta)$ and then ‘neighbouring’ model

$$h(\cdot; \eta) = (1 - \omega) \times f(\cdot; \theta) + \omega \times h'(\cdot; \kappa),$$

for $\eta = \{\theta, \kappa, \omega\}$. Here, $h(\cdot; \eta)$ is a mixture model combining the likelihood model $f(\cdot; \theta)$, which could itself already be a mixture model, and some other density $h'(\cdot; \kappa)$ with additional parameters κ . For all $\theta \in \Theta$ and any $\kappa \in K$ we have that $\text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; \{\theta, \kappa, \omega\})) < \omega$ and therefore a TVD neighbourhood can be defined by upper bounding ω .

6.3.1 Shapley Galaxy Dataset

We examine the Shapley galaxy dataset of [Drinkwater et al. \(2004\)](#), recording the velocities of 4215 galaxies in the Shapley supercluster, a large concentration of gravitationally-interacting galaxies; see [Figure 7](#). The clustering tendency of galaxies continues to be a subject of interest in astronomy. [Miller and Dunson \(2018\)](#) investigate this data using Gaussian mixture models and use their coarsened posterior to select the number of mixture components, finding considerable instability in the number of estimated components K under different specifications of the coarsening parameter. See [Cai et al. \(2021\)](#) for further issues with estimating the number of components in mixture models.

We estimate Gaussian mixture models of the form

$$f(y; \theta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \omega_k \mathcal{N}(y; \mu_k, \sigma_k),$$

under the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes, considering number of components $K \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and using the normal-inverse Wishart priors of [Fúquene et al. \(2019\)](#) (full details available in [Section B.2](#)). β D-Bayes inference for such one-dimensional mixture models is easy to implement using adaptive quadrature to approximate the necessary integral term $\frac{1}{\beta} \int h(z; \eta)^\beta dz$. We do not formally place any constraint on the estimation of ω_k , however, any model that estimates a component with small ω_k can be seen as a neighbour of a model with one fewer component.

[Figure 7](#) shows the posterior predictive approximation to the histogram of the data of the Gaussian mixture models under the KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes and [Table 1](#) records the TVD between the posterior predictive distribution of recursively adding components to the model. The β D-Bayes inference for $\beta = 1.25$ and 1.5 is more stable to the addition of an extra component. In particular, for $K \geq 3$ the β D-Bayes inference stably estimates the biggest components of the data centered approximately at 5,000 and 15,000 km/s , while the KLD-Bayes produces very different inference for these modes depending on the number of clusters selected.

7 Discussion

This paper investigated the posterior predictive stability of traditional Bayesian updating and a generalised Bayesian alternative minimising the β D. In practice, the model used for inference is usually a convenient and canonical interpolation of the broad belief statements made by the DM and the observed data was not necessarily collected in the manner the DM imagined. We proved that β D-Bayes




Figure 7: Shapley Galaxy Data: Histograms of the data, in units of 1,000 km/s, excluding a small amount of data extending in a tail up to 80,000 km/s, and posterior predictive distributions of the fitted Gaussian mixture models with $K = 2 - 6$ components under the KLD-Bayes (**top**), $\beta\mathbf{D}$ -Bayes with $\beta = 1.25$ (**middle**) and $\beta\mathbf{D}$ -Bayes with $\beta = 1.5$ (**bottom**).

Table 1: Total variation distances between posterior predictive distributions for different number of mixture components K under the KLD-Bayes and β D for $\beta = 1.25$ and 1.5.

Method	$K = 2$ vs 3	$K = 3$ vs 4	$K = 4$ vs 5	$K = 5$ vs 6
KLD	0.27	0.12	0.13	0.08
β D ($\beta = 1.25$)	0.26	0.06	0.06	0.05
β D ($\beta = 1.5$)	0.22	0.04	0.07	0.02

inference is provably stable across a class of likelihood models and data generating processes whose probability statements are absolutely close, a TVD neighbourhood, by establishing bounds on how far their predictive inferences can diverge. On the other hand, our results require the DM to be sure about the tail properties of their beliefs and the DGP to guarantee stability for standard Bayesian inference.

The results of this paper simplify the process of belief elicitation for the β D-Bayes, bounding the *a posteriori* consequences for a given level of *a priori* inaccuracy, leaving the DM free to use the best guess approximation of their beliefs that they are most comfortable with, rather than switch to a less familiar model with better outlier rejection properties (O’Hagan, 1979). Such stability is achieved through a minimal amount of extra work compared with traditional Bayes’ rule inference, and it provides a similarly recognisable output. We hope such results help to justify the increased use of the β D to make robust inferences in statistics and machine learning applications.

A key issue motivating the departure from standard Bayesian methods here is a lack of concordance between the likelihood model and the data. Such an issue can be attributed to either a failure of the modeller to think carefully enough about the DGP, or errors in data collection. However, we treat these results separately to exemplify two different manifestations of the instability of Bayes’ rule.

The main limitation of our work is that we do not consider a universal measure of posterior predictive stability. Lemmas 1 and 2 use the KLD divergence to the DGP and Theorems 1 and 3 use the β D. It could of course be reasonably argued that the TVD should be used directly. However, the TVD is notoriously difficult to compute directly for large problems and is complicated by the intractability of the KLD and β D-Bayes posterior distributions. So instead, we focused on comparing the strength of the sufficient conditions required by each method for some measure of stability and used examples to indicate that these translate into meaningful differences.

The feasibility of β D-Bayes is dependent on the model likelihood being available in closed form –

although robust general Bayesian method exists to deal with cases when it is not (Matsubara et al., 2021) – and the integral term in (3) being either available in closed form or fast to approximate accurately. These conditions are met by many standard models including exponential family and Student’s- t models. When they are not then there are various method available to make such calculations. For example, quadrature can be used for low-dimensional data. This integral is over the data not parameters and is therefore invariant to the parametrisation of the model. Further, one contribution of this paper is to show that the β D-Bayes allows a DM to use a canonical model, where this integral would be available, in place of their true beliefs and know that any only approximately probabilistic specifications this might make will not have had an undue influence on their inference.

Future work could explore the applicability of such results in multivariate settings where belief specification and data collection are harder, and further investigate our KLD-Bayes results. While we argued when you could guarantee the stability of such methods, identifying for which statements KLD-Bayes is not stable would provide important and useful results to facilitate more focused belief elicitation.

To continue to facilitate the deployment of β D-Bayes methods in practice, more work is required to study and build upon existing methods to select β , particularly in high dimensions. While it is clear that considerable gains can be made over standard methods in certain scenarios, an adversarial analysis of the β D performance compared with its KLD-Bayes analogue would further motivate its wider applications. Other, interesting theoretical developments could seek to extend the posterior predictive stability to the stability of marginal posterior distributions in the case where there is an interpretable parameter of interest that is shared across models.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Danny Williamson, Christian Robert, and Sebastian Vollmer for their insightful discussions on the topics in this paper. We would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers, the Associated Editor and the Editor for their help in improving this paper. JJ was partially funded by the Ayudas Fundación BBVA a Equipos de Investigación Científica 2017, the Government of Spain’s Plan Nacional PGC2018-101643-B-I00, and a Juan de la Cierva Formación fellowship FJC2020-046348-I. CH was supported by the EPSRC Bayes4Health programme grant and both CH and JQS were supported by the Alan Turing Institute, UK.

References

- Aitkin, M. and Wilson, G. T. (1980), ‘Mixture models, outliers, and the EM algorithm’, *Technometrics* **22**(3), 325–331.
- Akaike, H. (1973), Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle, in ‘Second International Symposium on Information Theory’, p. 267–281.
- Alon, U., Barkai, N., Notterman, D. A., Gish, K., Ybarra, S., Mack, D. and Levine, A. J. (1999), ‘Broad patterns of gene expression revealed by clustering analysis of tumor and normal colon tissues probed by oligonucleotide arrays’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **96**(12), 6745–6750.
- Basak, S., Basu, A. and Jones, M. (2021), ‘On the ‘optimal’ density power divergence tuning parameter’, *Journal of Applied Statistics* **48**(3), 536–556.
- Basu, A., Harris, I. R., Hjort, N. L. and Jones, M. (1998), ‘Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence’, *Biometrika* **85**(3), 549–559.
- Berger, J. O., Moreno, E., Pericchi, L. R., Bayarri, M. J., Bernardo, J. M., Cano, J. A., De la Horra, J., Martín, J., Ríos-Insúa, D., Betrò, B. et al. (1994), ‘An overview of robust bayesian analysis’, *Test* **3**(1), 5–124.
- Berk, R. H. et al. (1966), ‘Limiting behavior of posterior distributions when the model is incorrect’, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **37**(1), 51–58.
- Bernardo, J. M. and Smith, A. F. (2001), *Bayesian theory*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Bissiri, P., Holmes, C. and Walker, S. G. (2016), ‘A general framework for updating belief distributions’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* .
- Box, G. E. (1980), ‘Sampling and bayes’ inference in scientific modelling and robustness’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)* pp. 383–430.
- Bregman, L. M. (1967), ‘The relaxation method of finding the common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming’, *USSR computational mathematics and mathematical physics* **7**(3), 200–217.
- Cai, D., Campbell, T. and Broderick, T. (2021), Finite mixture models do not reliably learn the number of components, in ‘International Conference on Machine Learning’, PMLR, pp. 1158–1169.
- Calon, A., Espinet, E., Palomo-Ponce, S., Tauriello, D. V., Iglesias, M., Céspedes, M. V., Sevillano,

- M., Nadal, C., Jung, P., Zhang, X. H.-F. et al. (2012), ‘Dependency of colorectal cancer on a TGF- β -driven program in stromal cells for metastasis initiation’, *Cancer cell* **22**(5), 571–584.
- Chernozhukov, V. and Hong, H. (2003), ‘An mcmc approach to classical estimation’, *Journal of Econometrics* **115**(2), 293–346.
- Cichocki, A. and Amari, S.-i. (2010), ‘Families of alpha-beta-and gamma-divergences: Flexible and robust measures of similarities’, *Entropy* **12**(6), 1532–1568.
- Dawid, A. P., Musio, M. and Ventura, L. (2016), ‘Minimum scoring rule inference’, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **43**(1), 123–138.
- Devroye, L., Mehrabian, A. and Reddad, T. (2018), ‘The total variation distance between high-dimensional gaussians with the same mean’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08693*.
- Dimitrakakis, C., Nelson, B., Zhang, Z., Mitrokotsa, A. and Rubinstein, B. I. (2017), ‘Differential privacy for bayesian inference through posterior sampling’, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18**(1), 343–381.
- Ding, N. and Vishwanathan, S. (2010), ‘t-logistic regression’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **23**.
- Ding, N., Vishwanathan, S., Warmuth, M. and Denchev, V. S. (2013), ‘T-logistic regression for binary and multiclass classification’, *Technical Report* pp. 1–55.
URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/ssnding/>
- Drinkwater, M. J., Parker, Q. A., Proust, D., Slezak, E. and Quintana, H. (2004), ‘The large scale distribution of galaxies in the shapley supercluster’, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia* **21**(1), 89–96.
- Durrieu, J.-L., Thiran, J.-P. and Kelly, F. (2012), Lower and upper bounds for approximation of the kullback-leibler divergence between gaussian mixture models, in ‘2012 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)’, Ieee, pp. 4833–4836.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2010), ‘Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent’, *Journal of Statistical Software* **33**(1), 1–22.
URL: <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v33/i01/>
- Fujisawa, H. and Eguchi, S. (2008), ‘Robust parameter estimation with a small bias against heavy contamination’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **99**(9), 2053–2081.

- Fúquene, J., Steel, M. and Rossell, D. (2019), ‘On choosing mixture components via non-local priors’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **81**(5), 809–837.
- Ghosh, A. and Basu, A. (2015), ‘Robust estimation for non-homogeneous data and the selection of the optimal tuning parameter: the density power divergence approach’, *Journal of Applied Statistics* **42**(9), 2056–2072.
- Ghosh, A. and Basu, A. (2016), ‘Robust bayes estimation using the density power divergence’, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **68**(2), 413–437.
- Gilboa, I. and Schmeidler, D. (1989), ‘Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior’, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **18**(2), 141–153.
- Girardi, P., Greco, L., Mameli, V., Musio, M., Racugno, W., Ruli, E. and Ventura, L. (2020), ‘Robust inference for non-linear regression models from the tsallis score: Application to coronavirus disease 2019 contagion in italy’, *Stat* **9**(1), e309.
- Giummolè, F., Mameli, V., Ruli, E. and Ventura, L. (2019), ‘Objective bayesian inference with proper scoring rules’, *Test* **28**(3), 728–755.
- Gneiting, T. and Raftery, A. E. (2007), ‘Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102**(477), 359–378.
- Goldstein, M. (1990), ‘Influence and belief adjustment’, *Influence Diagrams, Belief Nets and Decision Analysis* pp. 143–174.
- Goldstein, M. (1999), ‘Bayes linear analysis’, *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online* .
- Goldstein, M. and Wooff, D. A. (1994), ‘Robustness measures for bayes linear analyses’, *Journal of statistical planning and inference* **40**(2-3), 261–277.
- Goldstein, M. et al. (2006), ‘Subjective bayesian analysis: principles and practice’, *Bayesian Analysis* **1**(3), 403–420.
- Gustafson, P. and Wasserman, L. (1995), ‘Local sensitivity diagnostics for bayesian inference’, *The Annals of Statistics* **23**(6), 2153–2167.
- Hansen, L. P. and Sargent, T. J. (2001a), ‘Acknowledging misspecification in macroeconomic theory’, *Review of Economic Dynamics* **4**(3), 519–535.
- Hansen, L. and Sargent, T. J. (2001b), ‘Robust control and model uncertainty’, *American Economic Review* **91**(2), 60–66.

- Hoeting, J. A., Madigan, D., Raftery, A. E. and Volinsky, C. T. (1999), ‘Bayesian model averaging: a tutorial’, *Statistical science* pp. 382–401.
- Hooker, G. and Vidyashankar, A. N. (2014), ‘Bayesian model robustness via disparities’, *Test* **23**(3), 556–584.
- Hung, H., Jou, Z.-Y. and Huang, S.-Y. (2018), ‘Robust mislabel logistic regression without modeling mislabel probabilities’, *Biometrics* **74**(1), 145–154.
- Jewson, J. E., Ghalebikesabi, S. and Holmes, C. C. (2024), ‘Differentially private statistical inference through β -divergence one posterior sampling’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36**.
- Jewson, J. and Rossell, D. (2021), ‘General bayesian loss function selection and the use of improper models’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01214* .
- Jewson, J. and Rossell, D. (2022), ‘General bayesian loss function selection and the use of improper models’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* .
- Jewson, J., Smith, J. and Holmes, C. (2018), ‘Principles of Bayesian inference using general divergence criteria’, *Entropy* **20**(6), 442.
- Kang, J. and Lee, S. (2014), ‘Minimum density power divergence estimator for poisson autoregressive models’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **80**, 44–56.
- Kass, R. E. and Raftery, A. E. (1995), ‘Bayes factors’, *Journal of the american statistical association* **90**(430), 773–795.
- Knoblauch, J., Jewson, J. and Damoulas, T. (2018), Doubly robust Bayesian inference for non-stationary streaming data using β -divergences, in ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)’, pp. 64–75.
- Knoblauch, J., Jewson, J. and Damoulas, T. (2022), ‘An optimization-centric view on bayes’ rule: Reviewing and generalizing variational inference’, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **23**(132), 1–109.
URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/19-1047.html>
- Knoblauch, J. and Vomfell, L. (2020), ‘Robust bayesian inference for discrete outcomes with the total variation distance’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13456* .

- Kullback, S. and Leibler, R. A. (1951), ‘On information and sufficiency’, *The annals of mathematical statistics* **22**(1), 79–86.
- Loaiza-Maya, R., Martin, G. M. and Frazier, D. T. (2021), ‘Focused bayesian prediction’, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **36**(5), 517–543.
- Lyddon, S., Holmes, C. and Walker, S. (2018), ‘General bayesian updating and the loss-likelihood bootstrap’, *Biometrika* .
- Matsubara, T., Knoblauch, J., Briol, F.-X., Oates, C. et al. (2021), ‘Robust generalised Bayesian inference for intractable likelihoods’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07359* .
- Mihoko, M. and Eguchi, S. (2002), ‘Robust blind source separation by beta divergence’, *Neural computation* **14**(8), 1859–1886.
- Miller, J. W. (2021), ‘Asymptotic normality, concentration, and coverage of generalized posteriors’, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22**(1), 7598–7650.
- Miller, J. W. and Dunson, D. B. (2018), ‘Robust bayesian inference via coarsening’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* pp. 1–13.
- Norkin, V. (1986), ‘Stochastic lipschitz functions’, *Cybernetics* **22**(2), 226–233.
- O’Hagan, A. (1979), ‘On outlier rejection phenomena in bayes inference’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* pp. 358–367.
- O’Hagan, A. (2012), ‘Probabilistic uncertainty specification: Overview, elaboration techniques and their application to a mechanistic model of carbon flux’, *Environmental Modelling & Software* **36**, 35–48.
- O’Hagan, A., Buck, C. E., Daneshkhah, A., Eiser, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., Jenkinson, D. J., Oakley, J. E. and Rakow, T. (2006), *Uncertain judgements: eliciting experts’ probabilities*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Pinkser, M. (1964), ‘Information and information stability of random variables and processes’.
- Ribatet, M., Cooley, D. and Davison, A. C. (2012), ‘Bayesian inference from composite likelihoods, with an application to spatial extremes’, *Statistica Sinica* pp. 813–845.
- Rossell, D., Abril, O. and Bhattacharya, A. (2021), ‘Approximate laplace approximations for scalable model selection’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **83**(4), 853–879.

- Rossell, D. and Rubio, F. J. (2018), ‘Tractable bayesian variable selection: beyond normality’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**(524), 1742–1758.
- Rossell, D. and Telesca, D. (2017), ‘Nonlocal priors for high-dimensional estimation’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112**(517), 254–265.
- Schwarz, G. et al. (1978), ‘Estimating the dimension of a model’, *The Annals of Statistics* **6**(2), 461–464.
- Smith, J. (2007), ‘Local robustness of bayesian parametric inference and observed likelihoods’.
- Smith, J. Q. (2010), *Bayesian decision analysis: principles and practice*, Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, J. and Rigat, F. (2012), ‘Isoseparation and robustness in finite parameter bayesian inference’, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **64**, 495–519.
- Sugasawa, S. (2020), ‘Robust empirical bayes small area estimation with density power divergence’, *Biometrika* **107**(2), 467–480.
- Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2013), ‘Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances’, *Journal of statistical planning and inference* **143**(8), 1249–1272.
- Tenenbaum, D. (2016), ‘Kegrest: Client-side rest access to kegg’, *R package version* **1**(1).
- Tibshirani, J. and Manning, C. D. (2013), ‘Robust logistic regression using shift parameters (long version)’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.4987*.
- Toma, A. and Broniatowski, M. (2011), ‘Dual divergence estimators and tests: robustness results’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **102**(1), 20–36.
- Warwick, J. and Jones, M. (2005), ‘Choosing a robustness tuning parameter’, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **75**(7), 581–588.
- Watson, J. and Holmes, C. (2016), ‘Approximate models and robust decisions’, *Statistical Science* **31**(4), 465–489.
- West, M. (1984), ‘Outlier models and prior distributions in bayesian linear regression’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* pp. 431–439.
- Whittle, P. and Whittle, P. R. (1990), *Risk-sensitive optimal control*, Vol. 20, Wiley New York.
- Williamson, D. and Goldstein, M. (2015), ‘Posterior belief assessment: Extracting meaningful subjective judgements from bayesian analyses with complex statistical models’, *Bayesian Analysis* **10**(4), 877–908.

- Winkler, R. L. and Murphy, A. H. (1968), Evaluation of subjective precipitation probability forecasts, *in* ‘Proceedings of the first national conference on statistical meteorology’, American Meteorological Society Boston, pp. 148–157.
- Yonekura, S. and Sugawara, S. (2023), ‘Adaptation of the tuning parameter in general bayesian inference with robust divergence’, *Statistics and Computing* **33**(2), 39.
- Yuan, T., Huang, X., Woodcock, M., Du, M., Dittmar, R., Wang, Y., Tsai, S., Kohli, M., Boardman, L., Patel, T. et al. (2016), ‘Plasma extracellular rna profiles in healthy and cancer patients’, *Scientific reports* **6**(1), 1–11.

Section A contains additional information for our theoretical analysis, including definitions of the Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD) and β -divergence (β D), full definitions of notation and technical conditions and proofs of the results of Sections 3 and 4. Section B contains additional details of the experimental results of Section 6, including full specifications of the models and data used, as well as additional sensitivity analysis for β and a comparison with the γ -Divergence (γ D).

A Definitions, Conditions and Proofs

A.1 Divergence Definitions

Here we provide definitions of the KLD and β D.

Definition A.1 (The Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD) (Kullback and Leibler, 1951)). The KLD between probability densities $g(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\text{KLD}(g||f) = \int g \log \frac{g}{f} d\mu.$$

Definition A.2 (The β -divergence (β D) (Basu et al., 1998; Mihoko and Eguchi, 2002)). The β D is defined as

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) = \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int g^\beta d\mu + \frac{1}{\beta} \int f^\beta d\mu - \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int g f^{\beta-1} d\mu,$$

where $\beta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. The β D is Bregman-divergence (Bregman, 1967) with associated function $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} t^\beta$. When $\beta = 1$, $D_B^{(1)}(g(x)||f(x)) = \text{KLD}(g(x)||f(x))$.

The β D has often been referred to as the Density-Power Divergence in the statistics literature (Basu et al., 1998) where it is often parametrised as $\beta = \beta_{DPD} + 1$.

A.2 Notation

Now we define the paper's notation in full. The focus of the paper is on different densities for p -dimensional observations $y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$. Let g , g_1 and g_2 be potential data generating densities for y . Consider likelihood models for y

$$\{f(y; \theta) : y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^p, \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_f}\},$$

and where appropriate potential alternative likelihood model

$$\{h(y; \eta) : y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^p, \eta \in \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_h}\},$$

with functions $I_f : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ and $I_h : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Theta$ mapping between their parameter spaces. The parameter of model $f(\cdot; \theta)$ minimising divergence D to DGP g is defined as

$$\theta_g^D = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} D(g(\cdot), f(\cdot; \theta)) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \int \ell^D(y, f(\cdot; \theta)) dG(y).$$

The empirical loss minimiser from data $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \sim g$ is

$$\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^D = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell^D(y_i, f(\cdot; \theta))$$

The general Bayesian posterior learning about θ_g^D from $y \sim g$ given prior $\pi^D(\cdot)$ is

$$\pi^D(\theta|y) = \frac{\pi^D(\theta) \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell^D(x_i, f(\cdot; \theta)))}{\int \pi^D(\theta) \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell^D(x_i, f(\cdot; \theta))) d\theta}.$$

The posterior predictive for exchangeable observation $y_{new} \in \mathcal{Y}$ is

$$m_f^D(y_{new}|y) = \int f(y_{new}; \theta) \pi^D(\theta|y) d\theta.$$

Throughout this section, we will use the \cdot notation within divergence functions to indicate the variable that is being integrated over in the divergence, i.e. the divergence does not depend on a value for this variable. Further, define the expected and empirical Hessian matrices as

$$\begin{aligned} H_g^D(\theta) &:= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \mathbb{E}_y [\ell^D(y, f(\cdot; \theta))] \right)_{i,j} \\ \hat{H}_{g,n}^D(\theta) &:= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell^D(y_i, f(\cdot; \theta)) \right)_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

A.3 Technical Conditions

The results of Sections 3 and 4 require the following conditions.

A.3.1 Stability to the likelihood model

We require the following stochastic concentration condition of the general Bayesian posterior, which we argue below will hold given sufficient regularity of the observations and the prior specification. This condition was inspired by the Stochastic Lipschitz continuity assumption of [Norkin \(1986\)](#).

Condition A.1 (Stochastic Concentration of the posterior for f and h around g). For divergence $D(\cdot||\cdot)$ and likelihood models $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and $\{h(\cdot; \eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$, define the subsets of parameters

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)} &:= \{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } D(g||h(\cdot|\eta)) - D(g||h(\cdot|I_f(\theta))) \leq d\} \\ \mathcal{S}_d^{(2)} &:= \{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } D(g||f(\cdot|\theta)) - D(g||f(\cdot|I_h(\eta))) \leq d\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}, \mathcal{S}_d^{(2)} \subset \Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ and $I_f : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ and $I_h : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Theta$ are mappings between the Θ and \mathcal{A} . Then, for dataset $y \sim g(\cdot)$ with $n > 0$ and priors $\pi^D(\theta)$ and $\pi^D(\eta)$ there exists $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $d > 0$ the product posterior $\pi^D(\theta, \eta|y) = \pi^D(\theta|y)\pi^D(\eta|y)$ satisfies

$$\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}|y) \geq 1 - \exp(-c_1 d) \quad (10)$$

$$\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(2)}|y) \geq 1 - \exp(-c_2 d). \quad (11)$$

Condition A.1 ensures that n is large enough and $\pi^D(\theta)$ and $\pi^D(\eta)$ have sufficient prior density around θ_g^D and η_g^D for the posterior based on the likelihoods f and h to have concentrated around their optimal parameter such that the *a posteriori* probabilities that $h(y|I_f(\theta))$ is closer to g than $h(y|\eta)$ and $f(y|I_h(\eta))$ is closer to g than $f(y|\theta)$ according to divergence D vanish sufficiently quickly. This condition allows us to upper bound $\int D(g||h(\cdot|\eta))\pi^D(\eta|y)d\eta$ by $\int D(g||h(y|I_f(\theta)))\pi^D(\theta|y)d\theta$ (and equivalently $\int D(g||f(y|\theta))\pi^D(\theta|y)d\theta$ by $\int D(g||f(y|I_h(\eta)))\pi^D(\eta|y)d\eta$) and therefore compare $h(y|I_f(\theta))$ and $f(y|\theta)$ (and equivalently $f(y|I_h(\eta))$ and $h(y|\eta)$) across the values of their shared parameter θ (or η).

Miller (2021) proved a Bernstein von-Mises theorem for generalised Bayesian posteriors (see also Chernozhukov and Hong, 2003; Lyddon et al., 2018) which provides sufficient conditions under which they concentrate at their loss minimising parameter θ_g^D and η_g^D . Under these conditions, $\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}|y) \xrightarrow{P} 1$ and $\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(2)}|y) \xrightarrow{P} 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as $D(g, f(\cdot; \theta_g^D)) \leq D(g, f(\cdot; I_h(\eta_g^D)))$ and vice versa by definition. Theorem A.1, proves a special case of the result of Miller (2021) for the β D-Bayes and Corollary A.2 formalises how this convergence implies Condition A.1 holds.

Conditions A.1 (and A.3 below) are the only part of these theorems where the observed data appears. So the following theorems simply require that the Bayesian updating is being done conditional on a dataset satisfying Condition A.1 or A.3 where appropriate. Extensions could look at whether Condition A.1 and the following theorems hold in expectation under the data generating process (DGP), however, this may require additional assumptions to be made about the DGP that we wish to avoid.

Additionally, triangle-type inequalities relating the β D to the TVD will require the bounding of the value of the density functions according to Condition A.2.

Condition A.2 (Boundedness of g , f and h). For data generating process $g(\cdot)$ and likelihood models $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ and $\{h(\cdot; \eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$ there exists $0 < M < \infty$ such that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_y g(y) \leq M, \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_y f(y; \theta) \leq M \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_y h(y, \eta) \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Given base measure μ - assumed to be the Lebesgue measure for continuous random variables and the counting measures for discrete random variables - $\operatorname{ess\,sup}_y f(y) = M$ if the set defined by $f^{-1}(M, \infty)$ has measure 0, i.e. $\mu(f^{-1}(M, \infty)) = 0$. For discrete random variables it is always the case that $M \leq 1$ and M can be bounded for continuous random variables such as a Gaussian or Student's- t by lower bounding the model's scale parameter by some reasonable value.

A.3.2 Stability to the DGP

Conditions A.3 and A.4 are required for the results of Section 4 and are analogous to Conditions A.1 and A.2 introduced in the previous section.

Condition A.3 (Stochastic Concentration of the posterior for f around g_1 and g_2). For divergence $D(\cdot||\cdot)$ and likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$, define subsets of $\Theta \times \Theta$

$$\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)} := \{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta \text{ s.t. } D(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) - D(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \leq d\}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_d^{(2)} := \{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta \text{ s.t. } D(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - D(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \leq d\}.$$

Then, for datasets $y_{1:n_1} \sim g_1(\cdot)$ and $y'_{1:n_2} \sim g_2(\cdot)$ with $n_1, n_2 > 0$ and prior $\pi^D(\theta)$ there exists $c_{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}}, c_{\mathcal{S}^{(2)}} > 0$ such that for all $d > 0$ the product posterior $\pi^D(\theta_1, \theta_2 | y_1, y_2) = \pi^D(\theta_1 | y_1) \pi^D(\theta_2 | y_2)$ satisfies

$$\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)} | y_1, y_2) \geq 1 - \exp(-c_{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}} d), \tag{12}$$

$$\pi^D(\mathcal{S}_d^{(2)} | y_1, y_2) \geq 1 - \exp(-c_{\mathcal{S}^{(2)}} d). \tag{13}$$

Condition A.4 (Boundedness of g_1 , g_2 and f). For data generating processes $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ and likelihood model $\{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ there exists $0 < M < \infty$ such that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_y g_1(y) \leq M, \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_y g_2(y) \leq M, \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_y f(y; \theta) \leq M \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

While not necessary for any of our results, the Bernstein-von Mises theorem for generalised posteriors (Theorem 4; [Miller, 2021](#)) can be applied to the β D-Bayes and helps to interpret our results. Here, we state the required Condition [A.5](#) before later stating the result in Theorem [A.1](#).

Condition A.5 (Assumptions of Theorem 4 of [Miller \(2021\)](#) for the β D). Fix $\theta_g^{(\beta)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and let prior $\pi(\theta)$ is continuous at $\theta_g^{(\beta)}$ with $\pi(\theta_g^{(\beta)}) > 0$. Let $L_n^{(\beta)} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $L_n^{(\beta)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell^{(\beta)}(y_i, f(\cdot; \theta))$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume:

- (1) $L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}$ can be represented as

$$L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\theta) = L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)}) + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})^T \hat{H}_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)}) + r_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)} \rightarrow \theta_g^{(\beta)}$, with $\hat{H}_{g,n}^{(\beta)} \rightarrow H_g^{(\beta)}$ for positive definite $H_g^{(\beta)}$, and $r_{g,n}^{(\beta)} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has the following property: there exist $\epsilon_0, c_0 > 0$ such that for all n sufficiently large, for all $x \in B_{\epsilon_0}(0)$, we have $|r_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(x)| \leq c_0|x|^3$.

- (2) For any $\epsilon > 0$, $\liminf_n \inf_{\theta \in B_\epsilon(\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})^c} (L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\theta) - L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}(\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})) > 0$, where $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^D : |x - x_0| < r\}$

Condition [A.5](#) (1) requires that the β D loss can be approximated by a quadratic form and (2) requires that as n grows the β D loss is uniquely minimised at $\hat{\theta}_n^{\ell^{(\beta)}}$. [Miller \(2021\)](#) sought general conditions and did not condition on $L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}$ being differentiable. The β D loss applied to standard probability models is generally differentiable and in this case Condition [A.5](#) (1) is immediately provided by Taylor's Theorem providing the 3rd order partial derivatives of $L_{g,n}^{(\beta)}$ are continuous in $B_{\epsilon_0}(\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})$ and bounded.

A.4 Proofs: Stability to the Model

Before we prove Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Lemma 1 we first introduce some useful Lemmas that simplify their proofs.

A.4.1 Useful Lemmas for proving Theorems 1 and 2

Lemma A.1 establishes a convenient representation for the TVD.

Lemma A.1 (A simplification of the TVD). The following relationship holds for the TVD between two densities f and h .

$$\text{TVD}(f, h) = \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy = \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy.$$

where $A^+ := \{y : h(y) > f(y)\}$ and $A^- := \{y : f(y) > h(y)\}$.

Proof. Firstly, by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TVD}(f, h) &= \frac{1}{2} \int |h(y) - f(y)| dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider $L_{f,h} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $L_{f,h}(y) := \min(f(y), h(y))$ as the lower of the two probability densities for every y . Given that both f and h are probability densities and thus integrate to 1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy &= 1 - \int L_{f,h}(y) dy \\ \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy &= 1 - \int L_{f,h}(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The two right-hand sides are identical and therefore the two left-hand sides must be equal. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TVD}(f, h) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy \\ &= \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\ &= \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy, \end{aligned}$$

proving the result. □

Lemma A.2 establishes a triangle-type inequality relating the β D and the TVD. Triangle-type inequalities fit naturally with Section 3's requirements for stability. If two models are close, then they ought to provide similar approximations to a third distribution, the DGP. The β D does not strictly satisfy the triangle inequality. However, we can prove the following results connecting the TVD and the β D in a triangle-type inequality. The result relies on $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$, which places the β D in between

the KLD at $\beta = 1$ and the L_2 -distance $D_B^{(2)}(g||f) = \frac{1}{2} \int (f - g)^2$. We are yet to come across scenarios where setting β outside this range is appropriate from a practical viewpoint (see e.g. [Jewson et al., 2018](#); [Knoblauch et al., 2018](#)).

Lemma A.2 (A triangle inequality relating the β D and the TVD). For densities f , h and g with the property that there exists $M < \infty$ satisfying Condition [A.2](#) and $1 < \beta \leq 2$ we have that

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f)| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(h, f).$$

Proof. By the definition of the β D, we can rearrange

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \left(\int \left[\frac{1}{\beta} h(y)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta} f(y)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1} g(y) h(y)^{\beta-1} + \frac{1}{\beta-1} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \right] dy \right) \\ &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} \int (h(y)^\beta - f(y)^\beta) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int g(y) (f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1}) dy \right) \end{aligned}$$

As in Lemma [A.1](#), define $A^+ := \{y : h(y) > f(y)\}$ and $A^- := \{y : f(y) > h(y)\}$. Now by the monotonicity of the function y^β and $y^{\beta-1}$ when $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A^-} h(y)^\beta - f(y)^\beta dy &< 0 \\ \int_{A^+} g(y) (f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1}) dy &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

therefore removing these two terms provides an upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int (h(y)^\beta - f(y)^\beta) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int g(y) (f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1}) dy \\ &\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} (h(y)^\beta - f(y)^\beta) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) (f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1}) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Next, adding and subtracting $\frac{1}{\beta}h(y)f(y)^{\beta-1}$ provides

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) \\
& \leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} \left(h(y)^\beta - f(y)^\beta \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) \left(f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy. \\
& = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} \left(h(y)^\beta - h(y)f(y)^{\beta-1} + h(y)f(y)^{\beta-1} - f(y)^\beta \right) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) \left(f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy. \\
& = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y) \left(h(y)^{\beta-1} - f(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) \left(f(y)^{\beta-1} - h(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy. \\
& = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{f(y)^{\beta-1}}{h(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \left(1 - \frac{h(y)^{\beta-1}}{f(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now on A^+ $h(y) > f(y)$ and so $\left(\frac{f(y)}{h(y)} \right)^{\beta-1} > \frac{f(y)}{h(y)}$ for $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$ so

$$\left(1 - \frac{f(y)^{\beta-1}}{h(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{f(y)}{h(y)} \right)$$

with the exact same logic holding in reverse on A^- . We can use this to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) & \leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{f(y)^{\beta-1}}{h(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \left(1 - \frac{h(y)^{\beta-1}}{f(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy \\
& \leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{f(y)}{h(y)} \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \left(1 - \frac{h(y)}{f(y)} \right) dy \\
& = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-2} (f(y) - h(y)) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the fact that we defined $\max \{\text{ess sup } f, \text{ess sup } h, \text{ess sup } g\} \leq M < \infty$ and Lemma A.1 to

leave

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} h(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-2} (f(y) - h(y)) dy \\
&\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta} \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta} \int_{A^+} (h(y) - f(y)) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} (f(y) - h(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta} \text{TVD}(h, f) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(h, f) \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(h, f).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.3 proves the convexity of the $D_B^{(\beta)}(g, f)$ in both g and f

Lemma A.3 (The convexity of the β D). The β D between two densities $g(y)$ and $f(y)$ is convex in both densities for $1 < \beta \leq 2$, when fixing the other. That is to say that for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(\lambda g_1 + (1-\lambda)g_2, f) &\leq \lambda D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1, f) + (1-\lambda) D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2, f) \text{ for all } f \\
D_B^{(\beta)}(g, \lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda)f_2) &\leq \lambda D_B^{(\beta)}(g, f_1) + (1-\lambda) D_B^{(\beta)}(g, f_2) \text{ for all } g
\end{aligned}$$

for $1 < \beta \leq 2$.

Proof. First, we fix f and look at convexity in the function g . let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. The function x^p for $x \geq 0$ and $p > 1$ is convex and thus satisfies

$$(\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2)^p \leq \lambda x_1^p + (1-\lambda)x_2^p$$

therefore we have that provided $D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) < \infty$ and $D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
&D_B^{(\beta)}(\lambda g_1 + (1-\lambda)g_2||f) \\
&= \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} (\lambda g_1 + (1-\lambda)g_2)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta} f^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1} (\lambda g_1 + (1-\lambda)g_2) f^{\beta-1} d\mu \\
&\leq \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} (\lambda g_1^\beta + (1-\lambda)g_2^\beta) + \frac{1}{\beta} f^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1} (\lambda g_1 + (1-\lambda)g_2) f^{\beta-1} d\mu \\
&= \lambda D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) + (1-\lambda) D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we fix g and look at the convexity in f . Similarly to above we know that when $x \geq 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq 2$ that $\frac{1}{p}x^p$ and $-\frac{1}{p-1}x^{p-1}$ are both convex in y . We therefore have that provided $D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f_1) < \infty$ and $D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f_2) < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & D_B^{(\beta)}(g||\lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda)f_2) \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}g^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}(\lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda)f_2)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}g(\lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda)f_2)^{\beta-1} d\mu \\ &\leq \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}g^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}(\lambda f_1^\beta + (1-\lambda)f_2^\beta) - \frac{1}{\beta-1}g(\lambda f_1^{\beta-1} + (1-\lambda)f_2^{\beta-1}) d\mu \\ &= \lambda D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f_1) + (1-\lambda)D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.4 introduces a useful the “three-point property” (Cichocki and Amari, 2010) associated with the β D

Lemma A.4 (Three-point property of the β D). The following relationship for the β D holds for densities g , f and h

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(f||h) = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + R(g||f||h)$$

where

$$R(g||f||h) = \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int (g-f) (h^{\beta-1} - f^{\beta-1}) d\mu \quad (14)$$

Proof. Following the definition of the β D (A.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + D_B^{(\beta)}(f||h) \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}g^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}f^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}gf^{\beta-1} d\mu + \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}f^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}h^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}fh^{\beta-1} d\mu \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}g^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}h^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta-1}f^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}gf^{\beta-1} - \frac{1}{\beta-1}fh^{\beta-1} d\mu \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}g^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta}h^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}gh^{\beta-1} + \frac{1}{\beta-1}gh^{\beta-1} + \frac{1}{\beta-1}ff^{\beta-1} - \frac{1}{\beta-1}gf^{\beta-1} d\mu \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\beta-1}fh^{\beta-1} d\mu \\ &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int (g-f) (h^{\beta-1} - f^{\beta-1}) d\mu \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.5 provides a useful bound for the interpretation of the remainder term from Lemma A.4.

Lemma A.5 (A bound on $R(g||f||h)$ from Lemma A.4). For densities f , h and g with the property that there exists $M < \infty$ satisfying Condition A.2 and $1 < \beta \leq 2$, the remainder term from Lemma A.4 can be bounded as

$$R(g||f||h) \leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g, f)$$

Proof. Define $A_f^+ := \{y : g(y) \geq f(y)\}$ and $A_f^- := \{y : g(y) \leq f(y)\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} R(g||f||h) &= \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int (g-f) (h^{\beta-1} - f^{\beta-1}) d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int h^{\beta-1} (g-f) d\mu + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int f^{\beta-1} (f-g) d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} h^{\beta-1} (g-f) d\mu + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} f^{\beta-1} (f-g) d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} (g-f) d\mu + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int_{A^-} (f-g) d\mu \\ &\leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g, f) \end{aligned}$$

by Condition A.2 and Lemma A.1. □

Lemma A.6 shows that the β D can be bounded above by the TVD, which is useful when interpreting the bound in Theorem 1.

Lemma A.6. For densities f , h and g with the property that there exists $M < \infty$ satisfying Condition A.2 and $1 < \beta \leq 2$ we have that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) \leq \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \right) \text{TVD}(g, f).$$

Proof. Firstly, define $A^- = \{y : g(y) < f(y)\}$ and $A^+ = \{y : g(y) \geq f(y)\}$ and note on A_+ that $(f(y) - g(y)) < 0$ and on A_- that $g(y) < f(y) \Rightarrow g^{\beta-1}(y) < f^{\beta-1}(y)$ for $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$. The β D can, then, be

rearranged as

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta} \int f(y)^{\beta-1} (f(y) - g(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int (g(y)^{\beta-1} - f(y)^{\beta-1}) g(y) dy \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{A_-} f(y)^{\beta-1} (f(y) - g(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A_+} (g(y)^{\beta-1} - f(y)^{\beta-1}) g(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f \leq M$ by Condition A.2 and using Lemma A.1 we can write

$$\int_{A_-} f(y)^{\beta-1} (f(y) - g(y)) dy \leq M^{\beta-1} \int_{A_-} (f(y) - g(y)) dy = M^{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(f, g).$$

Further, on A_+ we have that $g(y) > f(y)$ which implies that $\frac{f(y)}{g(y)} < 1$ and that when $1 < \beta < 2$, $\frac{f(y)}{g(y)}^{\beta-1} > \frac{f(y)}{g(y)}$ so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{A_+} (g(y)^{\beta-1} - f(y)^{\beta-1}) g(y) dy = \int_{A_+} g(y)^{\beta-1} \left(1 - \left(\frac{f(y)}{g(y)} \right)^{\beta-1} \right) g(y) dy \\
& \leq \int_{A_+} g(y)^{\beta-1} \left(1 - \frac{f(y)}{g(y)} \right) g(y) dy \\
& = \int_{A_+} g(y)^{\beta-1} (g(y) - f(y)) dy \\
& \leq M^{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(f, g),
\end{aligned}$$

since $g \leq M$ by Condition A.2. Combining the two bounds leaves

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta} \text{TVD}(f, g) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(f, g),$$

which proves the theorem. \square

The implications of Lemma A.6 are as follows. Provided $\left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \right)$ does not get too small, we can be confident that any value of θ such that $f(\cdot; \theta)$ is close to the data generating density g in terms of TVD, will receive high posterior mass under an update targeting the βD .

Lastly, Lemma A.7 provides a convenient result for the deployment of Conditions A.1 (and A.3 below). This result was inspired by part of the proof of Theorem 7 of Dimitrakakis et al. (2017) (p27).

Lemma A.7 (Stochastic Concentration (Norkin, 1986; Dimitrakakis et al., 2017)). If random variable $\omega \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ is distributed according to π and there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $t > t_0$

$$F_\omega(t) = \pi(\{\omega \leq t\}) \geq 1 - \exp(-c(t - t_0)), \tag{15}$$

then

$$\int \omega \pi(\omega) d\omega \leq t_0 + \frac{1}{c}$$

Proof. We can write the expectation of ω in terms of its cumulative distribution function (CDF) as

$$\begin{aligned} \int \omega \pi(\omega) d\omega &= \int_0^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt - \int_{-\infty}^0 F_\omega(t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt \\ &= \int_0^{t_0} (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt + \int_{t_0}^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{t_0} 1 dt + \int_{t_0}^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt \\ &= t_0 + \int_{t_0}^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then, invoking (15) leaves

$$\begin{aligned} \int \omega \pi(\omega) d\omega &\leq t_0 + \int_{t_0}^\infty (1 - F_\omega(t)) dt \\ &\leq t_0 + \int_{t_0}^\infty \exp(-c(t - t_0)) dt \\ &\leq t_0 + \int_0^\infty \exp(-ct) dt \\ &= t_0 + \frac{1}{c} \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Lemma A.8 shows that the β D between any two distributions satisfying Condition A.2 is bounded and that its integrand is also bounded.

Lemma A.8. For densities f , h and g with the property that there exists $M < \infty$ satisfying Condition A.2 and $1 < \beta$ we have that the β D is bounded from above as

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) \leq \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \right).$$

Further, its integrand is bounded in absolute value

$$\left| \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} g(y)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta} f(y)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1} g(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \right| \leq \frac{2M^\beta}{\beta-1}.$$

Proof. To prove that the β D is bounded we use Condition A.2 to show

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) &= \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int g(y)^\beta dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int f(y)^\beta dy - \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int g(y)f(y)^{\beta-1} dy \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int g(y)^\beta dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int f(y)^\beta dy \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int M^{\beta-1} g(y) dy + \frac{1}{\beta} \int M^{\beta-1} f(y) dy \\
&\leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\beta-1)} + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta} \\
&= \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{(\beta-1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Further, bounded its integrand is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} g(y)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta} f(y)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1} g(y)f(y)^{\beta-1} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} g(y)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta} f(y)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta-1} g(y)f(y)^{\beta-1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} M^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta} M^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta-1} M^\beta \\
&\leq \frac{2M^\beta}{\beta-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem A.1 establishes the concentration of the β D-Bayes posterior around the β D minimising parameter $\theta_g^{(\beta)}$ and posterior asymptotic normality. This result directly follows from Theorem 4 of Miller (2021) and this result for the β D previously appeared in Jewson et al. (2024).

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 4 of Miller (2021) for the β D). Assume Condition A.5. Define $\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta) := \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$ and let $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim g$. Then

- (i) The β D posterior concentrates on $\theta_g^{(\beta)}$

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)})} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta) d\theta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0 \tag{16}$$

where $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : |x - x_0| < r\}$

- (ii) The β D posterior is asymptotically Gaussian

$$\int \left| \tilde{\pi}_n^{(\beta)}(\phi) - \mathcal{N}_p\left(\phi; 0, (H_g^{(\beta)})^{-1}\right) \right| d\phi \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \tag{17}$$

where $\tilde{\pi}_n^{(\beta)}$ denotes the density of $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)})$ when $\tilde{\theta} \sim \pi_n^{(\beta)}$, $\mathcal{N}_p(x; \mu, \Sigma)$ denotes the p -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean vector μ and covariance matrix Σ

Proof. The result is proved as a direct application of Theorem 4 of [Miller \(2021\)](#) with $f_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell^{(\beta)}(D_i, f(\cdot; \theta))$ being the β D-loss function. \square

Theorem [A.1](#) shows that the β D posterior concentrates on $\theta_g^{(\beta)}$ and converges to a Gaussian distribution centred around the β D minimising parameter $\hat{\theta}_{g,n}^{(\beta)}$ in total variation distance.

Corollary A.1 (Posterior Predictive Convergence I). Assume Conditions [A.2](#) and [A.5](#). Define $\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) := \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$, $m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\tilde{y}|y) := m_f^{(\beta)}(\tilde{y}|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim g$. Then

$$C^{(\beta)}(f, y) := \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (18)$$

Proof. Firstly, under Condition [A.5](#), Theorem [A.1](#) proves that

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)})} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad (19)$$

where $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : |x - x_0| < r\}$. This is the same as saying that $\theta \xrightarrow{P} \theta_g^{(\beta)}$ for $\theta \sim \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)$.

We now investigate both terms in $C^{(\beta)}(f, y)$ and show that both of their limits are $D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta_g^{(\beta)}))$ and therefore the limit of their difference is 0. Under Condition [A.2](#), Lemma [A.8](#) shows that $\psi^{(1)}(\theta) := D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))$ is bounded and continuous function of θ and therefore as convergence in probability implies convergence in distribution we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi^{(1)}(\theta)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[\psi^{(1)}(\theta_g^{(\beta)})] = \psi^{(1)}(\theta_g^{(\beta)}) \quad (20)$$

$$\Rightarrow \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \longrightarrow D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta_g^{(\beta)})) \quad (21)$$

Secondly, under [A.2](#) $\psi_{\tilde{y}}^{(2)}(\theta) := f(\tilde{y}; \theta)$ is also a continuous and bounded function of θ for all \tilde{y} and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_{\tilde{y}}^{(2)}(\theta)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[\psi_{\tilde{y}}^{(2)}(\theta_g^{(\beta)})] = \psi_{\tilde{y}}^{(2)}(\theta_g^{(\beta)}) \quad (22)$$

$$\Rightarrow m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\tilde{y}|y) := \int f(\tilde{y}; \theta) \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \longrightarrow f(\tilde{y}; \theta_g^{(\beta)}) \quad (23)$$

This proves that $m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $f(\cdot; \theta_g^{(\beta)})$ pointwise. Under Condition A.2 the integrand of the β D is bounded (Lemma A.8) and therefore Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem provides that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \longrightarrow D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta_g^{(\beta)})). \quad (24)$$

Therefore, both $\int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta$ and $D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_{f,n}^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))$ converge as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta_g^{(\beta)}))$ which by Slutsky's Theorem proves that $C^{(\beta)}(f, y) \rightarrow 0$.

□

Corollary A.2 (Posterior Predictive Convergence II). Assume Conditions A.5.

- 1) Define $\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) := \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$, $\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) := \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim g$. Then for all $d \geq 0$

$$\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\mathcal{S}_d^{(j)}|y) \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $\mathcal{S}_d^{(j)}$ defined in Condition A.1 for the β D.

- 2) Define $\pi_{n_1}^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y) := \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{n_1}\})$, $\pi_{n_2}^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y') := \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y' = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_{n_2}\})$ with $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim g_1$ and $\{y'_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim g_2$. Then for all $d \geq 0$

$$\pi_{n_1, n_2}^{(\beta)}(\mathcal{S}_d^{(j)}|y) \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \text{as } \min(n_1, n_2) \rightarrow \infty$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $\mathcal{S}_d^{(j)}$ defined in Condition A.3 for the β D.

Proof. Part 1)

We prove the result for $j = 1$, with $j = 2$ following immediately by symmetry. Under Condition A.5, Theorem A.1 proves that

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)})} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 \text{ and } \int_{B_\varepsilon(\eta_g^{(\beta)})} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

where $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : |x - x_0| < r\}$. Therefore defining $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)}, \eta_g^{(\beta)}) := B_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)}) \cap B_\varepsilon(\eta_g^{(\beta)})$ we have that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(\theta_g^{(\beta)}, \eta_g^{(\beta)})} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)\pi_n^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta d\theta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

Now by definition

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot|\eta_g^{(\beta)})) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot|I_f(\theta_g^{(\beta)}))) \leq 0,$$

and under Condition A.5 for every $d > 0$ there exists a ε such that $\theta, \eta \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\theta_g^{(\beta)}, \eta_g^{(\beta)})$ implies that $\theta, \eta \in \mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}$ and therefore

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}} \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) \pi_n^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta d\theta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

Part 2)

We prove the result for $j = 1$, with $j = 2$ following immediately by symmetry. Under Condition A.5, Theorem A.1 proves that

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)})} \pi_{n_1}^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y) d\theta_1 \xrightarrow{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} 1 \text{ and } \int_{B_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)})} \pi_{n_2}^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y') d\theta_2 \xrightarrow{n_2 \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad (25)$$

where $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : |x - x_0| < r\}$. Therefore defining $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)}, \theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)}) := B_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)}) \cap B_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)})$ we have that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(\theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)}, \theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)})} \pi_{n_1}^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y) \pi_{n_2}^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y') d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

Now by definition

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot | \theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)})) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || h(\cdot | \theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)})) \leq 0,$$

and under Condition A.5, for every $d > 0$ there exists a ε such that $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\theta_{g_1}^{(\beta)}, \theta_{g_2}^{(\beta)})$ implies that $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}$ and therefore

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_d^{(1)}} \pi_{n_1}^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y) \pi_{n_2}^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y') d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \xrightarrow{\min(n_1, n_2) \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

□

A.4.2 Proof of Lemma 1

We are now able to investigate the stability in the posterior predictive approximation to the DGP of inference using the KLD-Bayes.

Proof. Firstly, the logarithm is a concave function and therefore the negative logarithm is a convex function which is sufficient to prove the convexity of KLD in its second argument. Further, by the definition of the KLD, we can see that

$$\text{KLD}(g || f) = \text{KLD}(g || h) + \int g \log \frac{h}{f} d\mu. \quad (26)$$

Now we can use the convexity of the KLD and Jensen's inequality, to show that

$$\text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) \leq \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta$$

Now adding and subtracting $\int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta$ provides

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta \\ &= \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta + \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &\quad - \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &= \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &\quad + \int \int \{\text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{\text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (11) of Condition A.1 applied to the KLD provides

$$\int \int \{\text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \leq \frac{1}{c_2}.$$

We can now use the triangular-type relationship of (26) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta + \frac{1}{c_2} \\ &= \int \left(\int g(\cdot) \log \frac{h(\cdot; \eta)}{f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))} d\mu + \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \right) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta + \frac{1}{c_2} \\ &= \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{h(\cdot; \eta)}{f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))} d\mu\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta + \int \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_2} + \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)). \end{aligned}$$

The same arguments of Lemma A.7 and (10) of Condition A.1 show

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta + \frac{1}{c_1} \\ &= \int \left(\int g(\cdot) \log \frac{f(\cdot; \theta)}{h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))} d\mu + \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \right) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta + \frac{1}{c_1} \\ &= \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{f(\cdot; \theta)}{h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))} d\mu\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta + \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y)d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_1} + \text{KLD}(g||m^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) - \text{KLD}(g||m^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results provides the following bound,

$$|\text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y))| \leq C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y) + \frac{1}{c} + T(f, h, y)$$

where $c := \min\{c_1, c_2\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T(f, h, y) &:= \max \left\{ \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{f(\cdot; \theta)}{h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))} d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y) d\theta, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \int g(\cdot) \log \frac{h(\cdot; \eta)}{f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))} d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y) d\eta \right\} \\ C^{\text{KLD}}(f, h, y) &:= \max \left\{ \int \text{KLD}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta|y) d\theta - \text{KLD}(g||m^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int \text{KLD}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\eta|y) d\eta - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

as required □

A.4.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 uses the convexity of the βD (Lemma A.3) and the triangular relationship between the βD and the TVD (Lemma A.2) to prove stability in the posterior predictive approximation to the DGP of inference using the βD .

Proof. Using the convexity of the βD (Lemma A.3) and Jensen's inequality,

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta$$

Adding and subtracting $\int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \\ &= \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \\ &\quad + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta - \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta \\ &= \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta \\ &\quad + \int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (11) of Condition A.1 applied to the β D provides

$$\int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta \leq \frac{1}{c_2}.$$

We then use the triangular-type relationship between the β D and the TVD (Lemma A.2) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta \\ &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; I_h(\eta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta + \frac{1}{c_2} \\ &\leq \int \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)), h(\cdot; \eta)) + D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \right) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta + \frac{1}{c_2} \\ &= \int \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; I_h(\eta)), h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta + \frac{1}{c_2} \\ &\quad + D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)). \end{aligned}$$

The same arguments this time using (10) of Condition A.1 can also be used to show that

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta \\ &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta + \frac{1}{c_1} \\ &\leq \int \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) + D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \right) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta + \frac{1}{c_1} \\ &= \int \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(f(\cdot; \theta), h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta + \frac{1}{c_1} \\ &\quad + D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results provides the following bound,

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \epsilon + \frac{1}{c} + C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y),$$

where $c = \max\{c_1, c_2\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(\beta)}(f, h, y) &:= \max \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||m^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

A.4.4 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2 uses the convexity of the β D (Lemma A.3), the triangular relationship between the β D and the TVD (Lemma A.2) and the three-point property the β D (Lemmas A.4 and A.5) to establish the posterior predictive stability to the likelihood model's specification provided by inference using the β D.

Proof. By the convexity of the β D for $1 < \beta \leq 2$ (Lemma A.3) we can apply Jensen's inequality to show that

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||h(\cdot;\eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &\leq \int \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(f(\cdot;\theta)||h(\cdot;\eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Now the three-point property associated with the β D (Lemma A.4) gives us that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(f||h) = D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f) + R(g||f||h)$$

where $R(g||f||h)$ is defined in (14). Using this here provides

$$\begin{aligned} &D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) \\ &\leq \int \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(f(\cdot;\theta)||h(\cdot;\eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &= \int \left\{ \int [D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot;\eta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot;\theta)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R(g||f(\cdot;\theta)||h(\cdot;\eta))] \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \\ &= \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot;\eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta - \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot;\theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\ &\quad + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot;\theta)||h(\cdot;\eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Now adding and subtracting $\int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta - \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta - \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta. \\
&= \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \\
&+ \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (10) of Condition A.1 applied to the β D provides

$$\int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; \eta)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta \leq \frac{1}{c_1}.$$

As a result

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) &\leq \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \frac{1}{c_1} + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

We can now apply the triangle type inequality from Lemma A.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) &\leq \int (D_B^{(\beta)}(g||h(\cdot; I_f(\theta))) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g||f(\cdot; \theta))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \frac{1}{c_1} + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta. \\
&\leq \int \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)), f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \frac{1}{c_1} + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Given the neighbourhood of likelihood models $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$ we can then write

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) &\leq \int \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(h(\cdot; I_f(\theta)), f(\cdot; \theta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta \\
&+ \frac{1}{c_1} + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta. \\
&\leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_1} + \int \int R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y)d\theta\pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y)d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Now from Lemma A.5 we have that $R(g||f(\cdot; \theta)||h(\cdot; \eta)) \leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g, f(\cdot; \theta))$ and as a result we can bound

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_1} + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g, f(\cdot; \theta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta|y) d\theta.$$

This provides the first part of the required result. We note that we could have instead considered $D_B^{(\beta)}(m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)))$, applied the corresponding version of the three-point property of Bregman divergences, with remainder $R(g||h||f) = \int (g-h) \left(\frac{1}{\beta-1} f^{\beta-1} - \frac{1}{\beta-1} h^{\beta-1} \right) d\mu$, used Lemma A.7 with (11) of A.1 and Lemma A.5, therefore we also have that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(m_h^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y))) \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}\epsilon + \frac{1}{c_2} + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g, h(\cdot; \eta)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\eta|y) d\eta.$$

providing the second part of the required result. \square

A.5 Proofs: Stability to the DGP

A.5.1 A useful Lemma for proving Theorems 3 and 4

In order to prove Theorems 3 and 4, Lemma A.9 provides a second triangle-type inequality for the β D and TVD in the case where one model is estimated under two DGPs.

Lemma A.9 (Another triangle inequality relating the β D and the TVD). For densities f , g_1 and g_2 with the property that there exists $M < \infty$ satisfying Condition A.4 and $1 < \beta \leq 2$ we have that

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f)| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2).$$

Proof. By the definition of the β D, we can rearrange

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \\ &\quad \left(\int \left(\frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} g_1(y)^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} g_2(y)^\beta + \frac{1}{\beta-1} g_2(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} - \frac{1}{\beta-1} g_1(y) f(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy \right) \\ &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \left(\frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int (g_1(y)^\beta - g_2(y)^\beta) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \right) \end{aligned}$$

As in Lemma A.1, define $A^+ := \{y : g_2(y) > g_1(y)\}$ and $A^- := \{y : g_1(y) > g_2(y)\}$. By the monotonicity of the function y^β when $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A^+} g_1(y)^\beta - g_2(y)^\beta dy &< 0 \\ \int_{A^-} f(x)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

therefore removing these two terms provides an upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \left(\frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int \left(g_1(y)^\beta - g_2(y)^\beta \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \right) \\
&\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} \left(g_1(y)^\beta - g_2(y)^\beta \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now adding and subtracting $g_1(y)g_2(y)^{\beta-1}$ provides

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) &\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} \left(g_1(y)^\beta - g_2(y)^\beta \right) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} \left(g_1(y)^\beta - g_1(y)g_2(y)^{\beta-1} + g_1(y)g_2(y)^{\beta-1} - g_2(y)^\beta \right) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y) \left(g_1(y)^{\beta-1} - g_2(y)^{\beta-1} \right) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{g_2(y)^{\beta-1}}{g_1(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, on A^- $g_1(x) > g_2(x)$ which implies that $\left(\frac{g_2(x)}{g_1(x)} \right)^{\beta-1} > \frac{g_2(x)}{g_1(x)}$ for $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$ and

$$\left(1 - \frac{g_2(x)^{\beta-1}}{g_1(x)^{\beta-1}} \right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{g_2(x)}{g_1(x)} \right).$$

We can use this to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) &\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{g_2(y)^{\beta-1}}{g_1(y)^{\beta-1}} \right) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y)^\beta \left(1 - \frac{g_2(y)}{g_1(y)} \right) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the fact that we defined $\max \{\text{ess sup } f, \text{ess sup } g_1, \text{ess sup } g_2\} \leq M < \infty$ and Lemma A.1 to leave

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1||f) &= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_1(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} g_2(y)^{\beta-1} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} f(y)^{\beta-1} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&\leq D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\beta-1)} \int_{A^-} (g_1(y) - g_2(y)) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int_{A^+} (g_2(y) - g_1(y)) dy \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) \\
&= D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f) + \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2),
\end{aligned}$$

providing the required result. \square

A.5.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Similarly to Lemma 1, we are now able to investigate the stability in the posterior predictive approximation to the DGP of inference using the KLD-Bayes.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 1 established the convexity of the KLD in its second argument. Further, by the definition of the KLD, we can see that

$$\text{KLD}(g_1||f) = \text{KLD}(g_2||f) + \int g_1 \log g_1 - g_2 \log g_2 d\mu + \int (g_2 - g_1) \log f d\mu. \quad (27)$$

Now we can use the convexity of the KLD and Jensen's inequality, to show that

$$\text{KLD}(g_1||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y_{1:n_1})) \leq \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1$$

Now adding and subtracting $\int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2$ provides

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{KLD}(g_1||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y_{1:n_1})) \leq \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\
&= \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 + \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&\quad - \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&= \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&\quad + \int \int \{\text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{\text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (13) of Condition A.3 applied to the KLD provides

$$\int \int \{\text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_1) d\theta_1 \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y_2) d\theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}}.$$

We can now use the triangular-type relationship of (27) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(g_1||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y_{1:n_1})) &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} \\ &= \int \left(\text{KLD}(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) + \int g_1 \log g_1 - g_2 \log g_2 d\mu + \int (g_2 - g_1) \log f(\cdot; \theta_2) d\mu \right) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} \\ &= \int \int (g_2 - g_1) \log f(\cdot; \theta_2) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 + \int \text{KLD}(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\ &\quad + \int g_1 \log g_1 - g_2 \log g_2 d\mu + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} + \text{KLD}(g_2||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y'_{1:n_2})) - \text{KLD}(g_2||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y'_{1:n_2})). \end{aligned}$$

The same arguments of Lemma A.7 and (12) of Condition A.3 show

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(g_2||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y'_{1:n_2})) &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2|y'_{1:n_2}) d\eta \\ &\leq \int \text{KLD}(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} \\ &= \int \left(\text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) + \int g_2 \log g_2 - g_1 \log g_1 d\mu + \int (g_1 - g_2) \log f(\cdot; \theta_1) d\mu \right) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} \\ &= \int \int (g_1 - g_2) \log f(\cdot; \theta_1) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 + \int \text{KLD}(g_1||f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1|y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\ &\quad + \int g_2 \log g_2 - g_1 \log g_1 d\mu + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} + \text{KLD}(g_1||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y_{1:n_1})) - \text{KLD}(g_1||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y_{1:n_1})). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results provides the following bound,

$$|\text{KLD}(g||m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y)) - \text{KLD}(g||m_h^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot|y))| \leq C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2}) + \frac{1}{c} + T_1(g_1, g_2) + T_2(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2})$$

where $c := \min\{c_{\mathcal{S}(1)}, c_{\mathcal{S}(2)}\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1(g_1, g_2) &:= \max \left\{ \int g_2 \log g_2 - g_1 \log g_1 d\mu, \int g_1 \log g_1 - g_2 \log g_2 d\mu \right\} \\
T_2(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2}) &:= \max \left\{ \int \int (g_1 - g_2) \log f(\cdot; \theta_1) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \int \int (g_2 - g_1) \log f(\cdot; \theta_2) d\mu \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \right\} \\
C^{\text{KLD}}(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2}) &:= \max \left\{ \int \text{KLD}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 - \text{KLD}(g_1 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \int \text{KLD}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{\text{KLD}}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 - \text{KLD}(g_2 || m_f^{\text{KLD}}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2})) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

A.5.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 uses the convexity of the β D (Lemma A.3) and the second triangular relationship between the β D and the TVD (Lemma A.9) to prove stability in the posterior predictive approximation to the DGP of inference using the β D.

Proof. Using the convexity of the β D (Lemma A.3) and Jensen's inequality,

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})) \leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1$$

Now, adding and subtracting $\int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2$ provides

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\
&= \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\
&\quad + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 - \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&= \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&\quad + \int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (13) of Condition A.3 applied to the β D provides

$$\int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_1) d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y_2) d\theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{c_{\mathcal{S}(2)}}.$$

We can now use the triangular-type relationship between the β D and the TVD (Lemma A.9) to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} \\
&\leq \int \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \right) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} \\
&= \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(2)}}} + D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2})) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2}))
\end{aligned}$$

and the same arguments applying Lemma A.7 and (12) of Condition A.3 show

$$\begin{aligned}
D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2})) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 \\
&\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} \\
&\leq \int \left(\frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \right) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} \\
&= \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{c_{S^{(1)}}} + D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1}))
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results provides the following bound,

$$|D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2}))| \leq \frac{M^{\beta-1}(\beta+2)}{\beta(\beta-1)} \epsilon' + \frac{1}{c} + C^{(\beta)}(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2}),$$

where $c := \min\{c_{S^{(1)}}, c_{S^{(2)}}\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
C^{(\beta)}(f, y_{1:n_1}, y'_{1:n_2}) &:= \max \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1 | y_{1:n_1}) d\theta_1 - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_1 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y_{1:n_1})), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \int D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2 | y'_{1:n_2}) d\theta_2 - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2 || m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot | y'_{1:n_2})) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

A.5.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Similarly to Theorem 2, we use the convexity of the β D (Lemma A.3) and the three-point property of the β D (Lemmas A.4 and A.5) to prove Theorem 3 which establishes the posterior predictive stability to perturbations of the DGP provided by inference using the β D.

Lemma A.5 is the important lemma for this proof rather than the triangle inequality

Proof. By the convexity of the β D for $1 < \beta \leq 2$ (Lemma A.3) we can apply Jensen's inequality to show that

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2))) &\leq \int D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &\leq \int \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now the three-point property associated with the β D (Lemma A.4) gives us that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(f_1||f_2) = D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f_2) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f_1) + R(g_2||f_1||f_2)$$

where $R(g||f||h)$ is defined in (14). Using this here provides

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2))) &\leq \int \left\{ \int D_B^{(\beta)}(f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &= \int \left\{ \int (D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_2)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \right\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &= \int \int (D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_2)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &\quad + \int \int R(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma A.7 to random variable $\{D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_2)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1))\} \in \mathbb{R}$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{A}$ which by using (12) of Condition A.3 applied to the β D provides

$$\int \int \{D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_2)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1))\} \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{c_{S(1)}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2))) &\leq \int \int (D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_2)) - D_B^{(\beta)}(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1))) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &\quad + \int \int R(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_{S(1)}} + \int \int R(g_2||f(\cdot;\theta_1)||f(\cdot;\theta_2))\pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1)d\theta_1 \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2)d\theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now from Lemma A.5 we have that $R(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_1)||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g_2, f(\cdot; \theta_1))$ which is itself not necessarily small. We can however apply the triangle inequality to the TVD and say that

$$\begin{aligned} R(g_2||f(\cdot; \theta_1)||f(\cdot; \theta_2)) &\leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \text{TVD}(g_2, f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} (\text{TVD}(g_1, g_2) + \text{TVD}(g_1, f(\cdot; \theta_1))) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} (\epsilon + \text{TVD}(g_1, f(\cdot; \theta_1))), \end{aligned}$$

given the neighbourhood of data generating processes defined by $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon^{\text{TVD}}$. As a result

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2))) \leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \epsilon + \frac{1}{c_{S(1)}} + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g_1, f(\cdot; \theta_1)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_1|y_1) d\theta_1.$$

We note that we could have instead considered $D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1)))$, applied the corresponding version of the three-point property of βD , used Lemma A.7, (13) of Condition A.3 applied to the βD and Lemma A.5 to also show that

$$D_B^{(\beta)}(m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_2)||m_f^{(\beta)}(\cdot|y_1))) \leq 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \epsilon + \frac{1}{c_{S(2)}} + 2 \frac{M^{\beta-1}}{\beta-1} \int \text{TVD}(g_2, f(\cdot; \theta_2)) \pi^{(\beta)}(\theta_2|y_2) d\theta_2.$$

Which proves the required result. \square

A.6 An Alternative Neighbourhood Definition

An alternative neighbourhood for likelihood models of Definition 1 and data generating processes of Definition 2 could be to replace the TVD with the KLD. We show here, using an example, that such a neighbourhood would be prohibitively strict to provide useful stability to a DM.

Consider $f(x; \theta) = f_1(x; \theta_1)$ and $h(x; \eta) = (1 - \epsilon)f_1(x; \theta_1) + \epsilon f_2(x; \theta_2)$. The TVD between f and h is less than ϵ independent of the form of f_1 and f_2 as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TVD}(h(x; \eta), f(x; \theta)) &= \frac{1}{2} \int |f_1(x; \theta_1) - (1 - \epsilon)f_1(x; \theta_1) - \epsilon f_2(x; \theta_2)| dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon) \int |f_1(x; \theta_1) - f_1(x; \theta_1)| dx + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \int |f_1(x; \theta_1) - f_2(x; \theta_2)| dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \int |f_1(x; \theta_1) - f_2(x; \theta_2)| dx \\ &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when $f_1 = \mathcal{N}(x; 0, 1)$ and $f_2 = \mathcal{N}(x; \mu_c, 1)$, the bounds of [Durrieu et al. \(2012\)](#) can be used to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KLD}(h(x; \eta) || f(x; \theta) &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \log \left\{ (1 - \epsilon) + \epsilon \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mu_c^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \epsilon \log \left\{ (1 - \epsilon) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} \mu_c^2 \right) + \epsilon \exp \left(\frac{1}{4} \mu_c^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \log(2/e) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore that $\text{KLD}(h(x; \eta) || f(x; \theta) = O(\sqrt{n})$ even when $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ if $\mu_c = O(\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, a very small contamination can lead to a large KLD distance but not a large TVD distance.

While we argue that the TVD is practical and interpretable, one limitation is that it is not available in closed form, even between standard families. However, recent work from [Devroye et al. \(2018\)](#) provides bounds on the TVD between two multivariate Gaussian distributions which may prove useful for interpreting the TVD in terms of distributions most users are familiar with. For example, in the 1-dimensional case, the result of [Devroye et al. \(2018\)](#) becomes

$$\frac{1}{100} \min \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{\eta}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \right\} \leq \text{TVD}(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2), \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 + \eta)) \leq 1.5 \min \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{\eta}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \right\}$$

and therefore a TVD bound of $\epsilon = 0.05$ can be shown to be equivalent to $\frac{\eta}{\sigma^2} \approx 0.18$ i.e. an approximately 20% increase in the variance of the Gaussian.

B Extended Experimental Results

This section contains additional details and results for the experiments of Section 6.

B.1 Gaussian and Student's- t likelihood

B.1.1 Posteriors

Figure [B.1](#) plots the posterior distribution of model parameters μ and σ^2 of the Gaussian and Student's- t models (8) discussed in Section 6.1.

The left-hand side of Figure [B.1](#) demonstrates what most statistical practitioners expect when comparing the performance of a Gaussian and a Student's- t under outlier contamination ([O'Hagan, 1979](#)). Under the Student's- t likelihood, the inference is much less affected by the outlying contamination than under the Gaussian likelihood. The parameter μ is shifted less towards the contaminant




Figure B.1: Parameter posterior distributions for μ and σ^2 under Bayes' rule updating (KLD-Bayes) (**left**) and βD -Bayes with $\beta = 1.22$ (**right**) under the likelihood functions $f(y; \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma_{adj}^2 \sigma^2)$ (**red**) and $h(y; \eta) = t_\nu(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ (**blue**) where $\nu = 5$ and $\sigma_{adj}^2 = 1.16$.

population and the parameter σ^2 is inflated much less. In short, very different inferences are produced using a Student's- t and a Gaussian under outlier contamination. Updating using the βD -Bayes presents a striking juxtaposition to this. The βD -Bayes produces almost identical posteriors for both μ and σ^2 under both models resulting in almost identical posterior predictive densities in Figure 1.

Estimating the TVD or the βD between the two predictive distributions is hampered by the fact that they are not available in closed form. However, the energy distance [Székely and Rizzo \(2013\)](#) provides a metric that can be easily estimated from samples of the predictive. The energy distance between the Gaussian and Student's- t predictive distributions under traditional Bayesian updating was 0.125, while under βD -Bayes updating the energy distance was 2.13×10^{-3} .




Figure B.2: **Left:** The multiplier $\frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}$ from Theorems 1 and 2 for different values of M and $1 < \beta < 2$. **Right:** The energy distance between the posterior predictives after fitting a Gaussian and a Student's- t model as in Figure 1 under the β D-Bayes for different β .

B.1.2 Sensitivity analysis

As was noted in Section 5, it is encouraging to note the stability of the β D-Bayes inference appears not to be overly sensitive to the exact value of β .

Complimenting Figure 2, the left-hand side of Figure B.2 plots $\frac{M^{\beta-1}(3\beta-2)}{\beta(\beta-1)}$, the multiplier of the TVD from Theorems 1 and 2, as a function of β for various M . We see that as β increases away from 1 this multiplier initially decreases rapidly, indicating a large increase in guaranteed stability by moving away from the KLD. However, after this point the multiplier plateaus, indicating that a similar amount of stability results from a range of values of β . The right-hand plot of Figure B.2 has a very similar shape. Here we plot the energy distance (Székely and Rizzo, 2013) between the posterior predictives of fitting a Gaussian likelihood model and Student's- t likelihood modes, used in Figure 1 for different values of β . Once again, we see that taking $\beta > 1$ results in a large increase in a posteriori stability but that after a point that stability achieved is fairly constant with β .

B.1.3 Comparison with the γ -divergence

Similarly to the β D, the γ -divergence (γ D) provides a loss function that does not require an estimator of the underlying density, and has been shown to have good robustness properties Hung et al. (2018); Knoblauch et al. (2022). Here, we show its stability performance appears comparable with the β D. Firstly the γ D is defined as follows.

Definition B.1 (The γ -divergence ($D_G^{(\gamma)}$) (Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008; Hung et al., 2018)). The γ D is defined as

$$D_G^{(\gamma)}(g||f) = \frac{1}{(\gamma-1)\gamma} \left\{ \left(\int g^\gamma d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} - \int \frac{f^{\gamma-1}}{(\int f^\gamma d\mu)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}} g d\mu \right\},$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

The corresponding loss function allowing generalised Bayesian inference for $\theta_g^{(\gamma)}$ is

$$\ell^{(\gamma)}(y, f(\cdot; \theta)) = -\frac{1}{\gamma-1} f(y; \theta)^{\gamma-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{1}{(\int f(z; \theta)^\gamma dz)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}}.$$

Similarly to the β D-loss in (3), the γ D-loss raises the likelihood to the power $\gamma - 1$ and ‘adjusts’ by the integral of the likelihood to the power γ , except for the γ D this ‘adjustment’ term is multiplicative rather than additive as it was in the β D. The integral term is independent of location parameters e.g. μ from the Gaussian and Student’s- t examples, and therefore inference for these will be very similar under the β D and γ D (Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008). Figure B.3 shows that in the example introduced in Section 6.1, inference for σ^2 is also very similar under the γ D and β D and as a result they estimate identical posterior predictives under both the Gaussian and Student’s- t models.

B.1.4 Stability to an ϵ contamination of the DGP

Following the discussion in Section 4.1, consider a DM with likelihood model $f(y; \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma_{adj}^2 \sigma^2)$ and DGPs $g_1(y) = \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$ and $g_2(y) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$. The top of Figure B.4 demonstrates that despite the absolute difference between the densities of the DGPs being small everywhere, if this is weighted by $\log f(y)$ where $f(y) = \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$ we see that the distance becomes large in tail areas of the DGP’s. The bottom of Figure B.4 demonstrates that the KLD-Bayes posterior predictive is substantially different when fitting model $f(y; \theta)$ to DGPs g_1 and g_2 while the β D-Bayes produces very similar posterior predictive distributions under data from either DGP.

B.1.5 DLD Data

For the DLD data discussed in Section 6.1, we provide additional Q-Q normal and histogram plots. These demonstrate the heavy-tailed nature of the DLD data and the reasonable fit of the standardised residuals produced by the β D-Bayes.




Figure B.3: Posterior predictive and parameter posterior distributions for (μ, σ^2) under $\gamma\mathbf{D}$ -Bayes with $\gamma = 1.22$ and likelihood functions $f(y; \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma_{adj}^2 \sigma^2)$ (**red**) and $h(y; \eta) = t_\nu(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ (**blue**) where $\nu = 5$ and $\sigma_{adj}^2 = 1.16$.




Figure B.4: **Top:** Absolute difference between DGP's $g_1(y) = \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1)$ and $g_2(y) = 0.9 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 0, 1) + 0.1 \times \mathcal{N}(y; 5, 3^2)$ (**left**) and the absolute difference weighted by $\log f(y)$ for $f(y) = \mathcal{N}(y, 0, 1)$. **Bottom:** Posterior predictive distributions for fitting model $f(y; \theta) = \mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma_{adj}^2 \sigma^2)$ to data from $g_1(y)$ (**left**) and $g_2(y)$ (**right**) under the KLD-Bayes (**red**) and β D-Bayes with $\beta = 1.22$ (**blue**).




Figure B.5: DLD data - Posterior mean distribution for standardised residuals under the Gaussian (**top**) and Student's- t model (**bottom**) of KLD-Bayes (**left**) and β D-Bayes with $\beta = 1.34$ (**right**).




Figure B.6: Q - Q normal plot of the fitted residuals according to the Gaussian model under the KLD-Bayes for the DLD data (**left**) and TGF- β data (**right**)

B.1.6 TGF- β data

We consider another regression example to illustrate the stability to the selection between a Gaussian and Student's- t example when using β D-Bayes updating.

The dataset from [Calon et al. \(2012\)](#) concerns gene expression data for $n = 262$ colon cancer patients. Previous work ([Rossell and Telesca, 2017](#); [Rossell and Rubio, 2018](#)) focused on selecting genes that affect the expression levels of TGF- β , a gene known to play an important role in colon cancer progression. Instead, we study the relation between TGF- β and the 7 genes (listed in Section [B.1.7](#)) that appear in the 'TGF- β 1 pathway' according to the *KEGGREST* package in *R* ([Tenenbaum, 2016](#)), so that $p = 8$ after including the intercept. We fitted regression models using the neighbouring models in (8) for the residuals. Once again, we used the method of [Yonekura and Sugawara \(2023\)](#) to set $\beta = 1.03$ when using the Gaussian distribution and use the same value for the Student's- t .

Figure [B.7](#) shows that both inference procedures are stable to the choice of the model here. The β D-Bayes appears to be marginally more stable in estimating the fitted residuals and predictive density (top-left and bottom-right), while the KLD-Bayes appears marginally more stable when estimating parameters (bottom-left). Figure [B.8](#) shows the fit of the models to the standardised residuals under posterior mean estimates. [Rossell and Rubio \(2018\)](#); [Jewson and Rossell \(2021\)](#) find considerable evidence that a Gaussian model is compatible with this data, further demonstrated in Figure [B.6](#).

B.1.7 Variable selection

When investigating the stability of the β D-Bayes inference to the Gaussian and Student's- t likelihoods we regressed the DLD and TGF- β gene expressions on a subset of the variables available in the full data sets. The procedures for which variables were selected as outlined in Sections 6.1 and [B.1.6](#). To ensure that our results are reproducible, below we indicate the selected covariates and the supplementary material contains code for these variable pre-screening steps.

DLD: For the DLD analysis, we selected the 15 genes with the 5 highest loadings in the first 3 principal components of the original 57 predictors. This procedure selected the following genes C15orf52, BRAT1, CYP26C1, SLC35B4, GRLF1, RXRA, RAB3GAP2, NOTCH2NL, SDC4, TTC22, PTCH2, ECH1, CSF2RA, TP53AIP1, and RRP1B.




Figure B.7: TGF- β data - Posterior mean estimates of standardised residuals (**top left**), posterior mean estimated residuals distribution (**top-right**), absolute difference in posterior mean parameter estimates (**bottom left**) and difference in posterior predictive densities of the observations (**bottom right**) under the Gaussian and Student's- t model of KLD-Bayes and β D-Bayes ($\beta = 1.03$) for the TGF- β data.




Figure B.8: TGF- β data - Posterior mean distribution for standardised residuals under the Gaussian (**top**) and Student's- t model (**bottom**) of KLD-Bayes (**left**) and β D-Bayes with $\beta = 1.03$ (**right**).

TGF- β : For the TGF- β analysis we focused on 7 of the 10172 genes available in the data set that appear in the ‘TGF- β 1 pathway’ according to the KEGGREST package in *R* ([Tenenbaum, 2016](#)). These were the VIT, PDE4B, ATP8B1, MAGEA11, PDE6C, PDE9A, and SEPTIN4 genes.

B.2 Binary Classification

We provide additional details of the binary classification experiments in Section 6.2.

B.2.1 t -logistic regression

Following [Ding and Vishwanathan \(2010\)](#); [Ding et al. \(2013\)](#), the t -exponential function used in the t -logistic regression is defined as

$$\exp_t(x) := \begin{cases} \exp(x) & \text{if } t = 1 \\ \max\{1 + (1 - t)x, 0\}^{1/(1-t)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and $G_t(X\theta)$ is defined as the solution of

$$\exp_t(0.5X\theta - G_t(X\theta)) + \exp_t(-0.5X\theta - G_t(X\theta)) = 1. \quad (28)$$

In general, there is no closed form for $G_t(X\theta)$ but Algorithm 1 of [Ding et al. \(2013\)](#) computes it efficiently.

B.2.2 Transformations of probit and t -logistic β 's

To minimise the *a priori* TVD between the probit and t -logistic alternative models and the logistic canonical model the β 's of the alternative model are scalar multiplied. For the probit model, the canonical parameters are multiplied by 0.5876364 and for the t -logistic the canonical parameters are multiplied by 1.331078.

B.2.3 Variables selected Colon Cancer data

To prepare the Colon Cancer data for our analysis we first took the natural logarithm of the gene expression levels to remove some of their skewness. We then used the *glmnet* package in *R* [Friedman et al. \(2010\)](#) to conduct LASSO variable selection using cross-validation to choose the hyperparameter. This process left us with the intercept and genes

`genes.249, genes.377, genes.493, genes.625, genes.1325, genes.1473,`
`genes.1582, genes.1671, genes.1772.`

B.3 Mixture Models

Here we provide full details of the models and priors considered in Section 6.3. We estimated Gaussian mixture models of the form

$$f(y; \omega, \mu, \sigma, K) = \sum_{k=1}^K \omega_k N(y; \mu_k, \sigma_k)$$

using Normal-Inverse-Gamma-Dirichlet priors

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K) &\sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K) \\ \sigma_k^2 &\sim \text{IG}\left(\frac{\nu_0}{2}, \frac{S_0}{2}\right), \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\ \mu_k | \sigma_k &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{\kappa} \sigma_k), \quad k = 1, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha_k = a$ $k = 1, \dots, K$, $\nu_0 = 5$, $S_0 = 0.2$ and $\kappa = 5.68$ following the recommendations of [Fúquene et al. \(2019\)](#). We elicited the parameter a to ensure that the marginal prior probability that any of the component weights was greater than 0.05 was 0.95.