Approximate Bayesian Computation for the Stellar Initial Mass Function

Jessi Cisewski Department of Statistics Yale University

SCMA6

Collaborators: Grant Weller (Savvysherpa), Chad Schafer (Carnegie Mellon), David Hogg (NYU)

Background: ABC

The posterior for θ given observed data x_{obs} :

$$\pi(\theta \mid x_{\text{obs}}) = \frac{f(x_{\text{obs}} \mid \theta)\pi(\theta)}{\int f(x_{\text{obs}} \mid \theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta} = \frac{f(x_{\text{obs}} \mid \theta)\pi(\theta)}{f(x_{\text{obs}})}$$

Approximate Bayesian Computation

- "Likelihood-free" approach to approximating $\pi(\theta \mid x_{obs})$ ($f(x_{obs} \mid \theta)$ not specified)
- Proceeds via simulation of the forward process

Why would we not know $f(x_{obs} \mid \theta)$?

- Strong dependency in data
- Observational limitations



ABC for Astronomy

- cosmoabc: Likelihood-free inference via Population Monte Carlo Approximate Bayesian Computation (Ishida et al., 2015)
- Approximate Bayesian Computation for Forward Modeling in Cosmology (Akeret et al., 2015)
- Likelihood-Free Cosmological Inference with Type Ia Supernovae: Approximate Bayesian Computation for a Complete Treatment of Uncertainty (Weyant et al., 2013)
- Likelihood free inference in cosmology: potential for the estimation of luminosity functions (Schafer and Freeman, 2012)
- Approximate Bayesian Computation for Astronomical Model Analysis: A case study in galaxy demographics and morphological transformation at high redshift (Cameron and Pettitt, 2012)

Stellar Initial Mass Function: the distribution of star masses after a star formation event within a specified volume of space

 $\textbf{Molecular cloud} \rightarrow \textbf{Protostars} \rightarrow \textbf{Stars}$







- Properties of the cluster formation could include, for example, core growth by accretion, interaction due to turbulent environment (Bate, 2012)
- Observation effects include aging, completeness, measurement error

For the observed data x_{obs} and prior $\pi(\theta)$:



*Introduced in Pritchard et al. (1999) (population genetics)

Step 3: Accept θ_{prop} if $x_{obs} = x_{prop}$

- Waiting for proposals such that x_{obs} = x_{prop} would be computationally prohibitive
- Instead, accept proposals with Δ(x_{obs}, x_{prop}) ≤ ε for some distance Δ and some tolerance threshold ε

An accepted $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a draw from the posterior if

 $P(ext{Accept } heta_{ ext{prop}} \mid heta_{ ext{prop}} = heta) \propto f(x_{ ext{obs}} \mid heta)$ (the likelihood)

Toy Example: Assume that x_{obs} is Gaussian N(θ ,1). Suppose $x_{obs} = 1$, $\epsilon = 0.1$.



(left) Propose $\theta_{prop} = 0$; acceptance region for x_{prop} in red rectangle

(right) Consider all possible θ and calculate acceptance probability Illustration from Chad Schafer

$$x_{\rm obs} = 1$$
, $\theta = 0$, $\epsilon = 0.4$.



 $x_{
m obs} = 1, \epsilon = 1
ightarrow$



ABC Background

Comparing x_{prop} with x_{obs} is not feasible.

Comparing x_{prop} with x_{obs} is not feasible.

When x is high-dimensional, will have to make ϵ too large in order to keep acceptance probability reasonable.

Instead, reduce the dimension by comparing summaries, $S(x_{\rm prop})$ and $S(x_{\rm obs})$.

Gaussian illustration

- Data x_{obs} consists of 25 iid draws from Normal $(\mu, 1)$
- Summary statistics $S(x) = \bar{x}$
- Distance function $\Delta(S(x_{prop}), S(x_{obs})) = |\bar{x}_{prop} \bar{x}_{obs}|$
- Tolerance $\epsilon = 0.50$ and 0.10
- Prior $\pi(\mu) = \text{Normal}(0,10)$

Gaussian illustration: posteriors for μ



• How to pick a tolerance, ϵ ?

Instead of starting the ABC algorithm over with a smaller tolerance (ϵ), decrease the tolerance and use the already sampled particle system as a proposal distribution *rather* than drawing from the prior distribution.

Particle system: (1) retained sampled values, (2) importance weights

Beaumont et al. (2009); Moral et al. (2011); Bonassi and West (2004)

Gaussian illustration: sequential posteriors



Tolerance sequence, $\epsilon_{1:10}$: 1.00 0.75 0.53 0.38 0.27 0.19 0.15 0.11 0.08 0.06

We propose an ABC algorithm for inference on the stellar IMF

Examples of IMF models

- Power-law: Salpeter (1955)
 - Used a power law with lpha= 2.35
- Broken power-law: Kroupa (2001)

$$\Phi(M) \propto M^{-\alpha_i}, M_{1i} \leq M \leq M_{2i}$$

- $\begin{array}{ll} \alpha_1 = 0.3 & \mbox{for } 0.01 \leq M/M^*_{Sun} \leq 0.08 \ \mbox{[Sub-stellar]} \\ \alpha_2 = 1.3 & \mbox{for } 0.08 \leq M/M_{Sun} \leq 0.50 \\ \alpha_3 = 2.3 & \mbox{for } 0.50 \leq M/M_{Sun} \leq M_{max} \end{array}$
- Log-Normal model: Chabrier (2003)

$$\xi(\log m) = \frac{dn}{d\log m} = 0.158 \times \exp\left(-\frac{(\log m - \log 0.08)^2}{2(0.69)^2}\right)$$

*1 $M_{Sun} = 1$ Solar Mass (the mass of our Sun)

ABC for the stellar initial mass function

• We propose an ABC algorithm with a new data-generating model

- Can account for various observational limitations and uncertainties
- Goal is to capture information about the cluster formation process
- Use ideas of preferential attachment ["Rich get richer" (Yule, 1925; Simon, 1955)]

Applications: wealth distribution, evolution of citation networks, number of internet page links

Often considered underlying mechanism for data exhibiting power-law behavior (D'Souza et al., 2007)

Proposed Model Generation Process

- Fix cloud mass that forms stars: M_{ecl}
- 2 $m_t \sim Exponential(\lambda)$ enters the system of stars, t = 1, 2, ...
- **③** The mass quantity m_t does one of the following:
 - Starts a new star
 - Joins an existing star
- **9** Process is complete when the total mass reaches M_{ecl}



Proposed Model Form



 $\alpha = {\rm probability}~{\rm of}~{\rm entering}~{\rm mass}$ forming a new star

 $\gamma =$ growth component ($\gamma = 1$ is linear growth)

The generating process is complete when the total mass of formed stars reaches M_{ecl} . The possible ranges of parameters are $\lambda > 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, and $\gamma > 0$.

Selecting summary statistics

- Use simplified model: broken power-law, assume independent draws
- Account for the following observation effects:
 - $\bullet \ \mathsf{Aging} \longrightarrow \mathsf{more} \ \mathsf{massive} \ \mathsf{stars} \ \mathsf{die} \ \mathsf{faster}$
 - Completeness function:

$$P(\text{observing star} \mid m) = \begin{cases} 0, & m < C_{\min} \\ \frac{m - C_{\min}}{C_{\max} - C_{\min}}, & m \in [C_{\min}, C_{\max}] \\ 1, & m > C_{\max} \end{cases}$$

Measurement error

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}(\alpha \mid m_{1:n_{obs}}, n_{tot}) &= \\ & \left(\mathcal{P}(M > T_{age}) + \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{M_{max}^{1 - \alpha} - M_{min}^{1 - \alpha}} \right) \int_{C_{min}}^{C_{max}} M^{-\alpha} \times \left(1 - \frac{M - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}} \right) dM \right)^{n_{tot} - n_{obs}} \\ & \times \prod_{i=1}^{n_{obs}} \left\{ \int_{2}^{T_{age}} (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} m_i^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (\log(m_i) - \log(M))^2} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{M_{max}^{1 - \alpha} - M_{min}^{1 - \alpha}} \right) M^{-\alpha} \\ & \times \left(I\{M > C_{max}\} + \left(\frac{M - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}} \right) I\{C_{min} \le M \le C_{max}\} \right) dM \bigg\} \end{split}$$



Sample size = 1000 stars, $[C_{\min}, C_{\max}] = [2, 4]$, $\sigma = 0.25$

Summary statistics

We want to account for the following with our summary statistics and distance functions:

Shape of the observed Mass Function

$$\rho_1(m_{prop}, m_{obs}) = \left[\int \left\{\hat{f}_{\log m_{prop}}(x) - \hat{f}_{\log m_{obs}}(x)\right\}^2 dx\right]^{1/2}$$

2 Number of stars observed

$$ho_2(m_{prop},m_{obs})=|1-n_{prop}/n_{obs}|$$

 m_{prop} = masses of the stars simulated from the forward model m_{obs} = masses of observed stars n_{prop} = number of stars simulated from the forward model n_{obs} = number of observed stars

Simulation Study with simpler model

- **1** Draw $n = 10^3$ stars
- 2 IMF slope $\alpha = 2.35$ with $M_{min} = 2$ and $M_{max} = 60$
- $N = 10^3$ particles
- T = 30 sequential time steps



Special cases of proposed forward model

- Yule-Simon model: m_t fixed, $\gamma = 1$, $\alpha = 0.30$
- Chinese restaurant process: m_t fixed, γ = 1, α = 0, modified π_t (prob of forming a new star)



Stellar, brown dwarf and multiple star properties from a radiation hydrodynamical simulation of star cluster formation

Matthew R. Bate^{1,2*}

¹School of Physics, University of Exeter, Stocker Road, Exeter EX4 4QL
²Monash Centre for Astrophysics, School of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Vic 3168, Australia

- Summary of 183 stars
- Size and color of points based on final mass



Bate (2012) simulation

- Growth of 183 stars
- Color of lines based on start time

bluer = formed earlier, redder = formed later



Bate (2012) simulation - ABC posteriors

• 2000 particles, 23 time steps, $M_{tot} = 88.68$



Summary

- ABC can be a useful tool when data are too complex to define a reasonable likelihood
- Selection of good summary statistics is crucial for ABC posterior to be meaningful
- A challenge in describing the Stellar Initial Mass Function is capturing the cluster formation mechanism
- We proposed a Preferential Attachment mechanism for the ABC forward model



THANK YOU!!!

Bibliography I

- Akeret, J., Refregier, A., Amara, A., Seehars, S., and Hasner, C. (2015), "Approximate Bayesian Computation for Forward Modeling in Cosmology," arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.07245.
- Bate, M. R. (2012), "Stellar, brown dwarf and multiple star properties from a radiation hydrodynamical simulation of star cluster formation," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 419, 3115–3146.
- Beaumont, M. A., Cornuet, J.-M., Marin, J.-M., and Robert, C. P. (2009), "Adaptive approximate Bayesian computation," *Biometrika*, 96, 983 – 990.
- Bonassi, F. V. and West, M. (2004), "Sequential Monte Carlo with Adaptive Weights for Approximate Bayesian Computation," *Bayesian Analysis*, 1, 1–19.
- Cameron, E. and Pettitt, A. N. (2012), "Approximate Bayesian Computation for Astronomical Model Analysis: A Case Study in Galaxy Demographics and Morphological Transformation at High Redshift," *Monthly Notices of* the Royal Astronomical Society, 425, 44–65.
- Chabrier, G. (2003), "The galactic disk mass function: Reconciliation of the hubble space telescope and nearby determinations," The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 586, L133.
- D'Souza, R. M., Borgs, C., Chayes, J. T., Berger, N., and Kleinberg, R. D. (2007), "Emergence of tempered preferential attachment from optimization," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 6112–6117.
- Ishida, E., Vitenti, S., Penna-Lima, M., Cisewski, J., de Souza, R., Trindade, A., Cameron, E., et al. (2015), "cosmoabc: Likelihood-free inference via Population Monte Carlo Approximate Bayesian Computation," arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.06129.
- Kroupa, P. (2001), "On the variation of the initial mass function," Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 322, 231–246.
- Moral, P. D., Doucet, A., and Jasra, A. (2011), "An adaptive sequential Monte Carlo method for approximate Bayesian computation," *Statistics and Computing*, 22, 1009–1020.
- Pritchard, J. K., Seielstad, M. T., and Perez-Lezaun, A. (1999), "Population Growth of Human Y Chromosomes: A study of Y Chromosome Microsatellites," *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 16, 1791 – 1798.

Salpeter, E. E. (1955), "The luminosity function and stellar evolution." The Astrophysical Journal, 121, 161.

- Schafer, C. M. and Freeman, P. E. (2012), Statistical Challenges in Modern Astronomy V, Springer, chap. 1, Lecture Notes in Statistics, pp. 3 – 19.
- Simon, H. A. (1955), "On a class of skew distribution functions," Biometrika, 425-440.
- Weyant, A., Schafer, C., and Wood-Vasey, W. M. (2013), "Likeihood-free cosmological inference with type la supernovae: approximate Bayesian computation for a complete treatment of uncertainty," *The Astrophysical Journal*, 764, 116.
- Yule, G. U. (1925), "A mathematical theory of evolution, based on the conclusions of Dr. JC Willis, FRS," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Containing Papers of a Biological Character, 21–87.