

## What sort of inferences to report?

Pros and cons

On  $\beta$  directly, so are infering the relationship between X and Z E.g. text ex., with Y=DEG, X=(CHILD, PDEG, CHILD×PDEG). Interesting that  $\hat{\beta}_1 < 0$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_3 > 0$ .

Or could try to relate more directly to the (X, Y) relationship...

## Alternatively, can bypass g

A priori

$$p(z,\beta) = \left\{\prod_{i=1}^n p(z_i|\beta)\right\} p(\beta)$$

Equate observing  $y = y_{1:n}$  with partial knowledge of  $z = z_{1:n}$ , expressed as  $z \in R(y)$ , i.e., (z, y) relationship must be monotone. So a posteriori

$$p(z,\beta|z\in R(y)) = \left\{\prod_{i=1}^n p(z_i|\beta)\right\}p(\beta)I\{z\in R(y)\}$$

Ammenable full conditionals again

<ロ> 4個> 4目> 4目> 目 のQの

## These ideas extend from regression to multivariate analysis

- Rank likelihood method frees one from choosing a prior on g
- Rank likelihood method simplifies Gibbs sampling (no update to g)
- Rank likelihood method only leads to inference on (X, Z) relationship, can't extend to (X, Y) relationship.

Text ex: virtually the same inferences on  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$  from either approach

 $Y_{i,j}$  is the *i*-th observation on the *j*-th variable.

 $Z_{i,j}$  is the corresponding latent variable with standard normal distribution.

 $Z_{i,1:p} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_p(0, \Psi)$ 

$$Y_{i,j} = g_j(Z_{i,j})$$

Again the rank likelihood method allows inference about  $\Psi$  without explicit modelling of  $g_j(), j = 1, ..., p$ .

So can infer dependence amongst the p variables whilst ignorning the scale on which each variable lives...