

# Highest Posterior Model Computation and Variable Selection via the Simulated Annealing – Supplementary Material

---

## 1. MATHEMATICAL RESULT

Below are the conditions which are the basis of the convergence of the SA-HPM method.

**Condition 1.** *The probability of moving to  $j$  th model from  $i$  th model in  $p$  steps is positive, that is,  $q_{ij}^{(p)} > 0$ .*

**Condition 2.**  $q_{ii} > 0$ .

**Condition 3.**  $Q$  is irreducible.

[?] showed that if the above conditions are met, then the simulated annealing method converges. Hence, the SA-HPM algorithm in Figure 1 in the paper, converges. The following lemmas together with the following proposition establish that the conditions are satisfied for our proposed SA-HPM algorithm.

**Proposition 1.** *The model space  $\mathcal{M}$  is finite.*

**Lemma 1.** *In the SA-HPM algorithm, the probability of moving to  $j$  th model from  $i$  th model in  $p$  steps is positive, that is,  $q_{ij}^{(p)} > 0$ .*

**Lemma 2.** *In the SA-HPM algorithm  $q_{ii} > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose at time  $t$  the  $i$  th model gets selected. Since the  $i$  th model itself belongs to the neighborhood of  $i$  th

model according to our neighborhood region selection, we have,

$$q_{ii} = \frac{\text{posterior probability of } i\text{th model}}{\text{sum of posterior probabilities of neighbors of } i\text{ th model}} \\ = \frac{P(\mathcal{M}_i)P(y|\mathcal{M}_i)}{\sum_{\gamma \in \text{nbr}(i)} P(\mathcal{M}_\gamma)P(y|\mathcal{M}_\gamma)},$$

By definition prior probability of any model is strictly greater than 0 and posterior probabilities are never 0 in practice for any given proper prior. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *In the SA-HPM algorithm, the transition matrix  $Q$  is irreducible.*

*Proof.* We note that, each model has its own binary representation using  $\gamma$ . Given two binary sequences, they are neighbors within a finite number of transformations of the coordinates which is given by either  $0 \rightarrow 1$  or  $1 \rightarrow 0$ . Hence,  $\Pr(\mathcal{M}_j|\mathcal{M}_i) > 0$  for all  $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$ , trivially completing the proof.  $\square$

---

\* Arnab Kumar Maity. Pfizer, Inc., USA

Sanjib Basu. University of Illinois at Chicago, USA