HIGH CONFIDENCE IMPLIES HIGH CREDIBILITY AND VICE VERSA

Suppose we have a confidence set at level α , so that

$$P[\beta \in C(X) \mid \beta] \ge 1 - \alpha \tag{1}$$

for all parameter values β in the parameter space *S*. From a Bayesian perspective, if the space of possible *X* values is *U*, then in the joint probability space $S \times U$, the prior pdf $\pi(\beta)$ on β lets us use the coverage probabilities $P[\beta \in C(X) | \beta]$ to form the probability of the set $Q \in S \times U$ defined as $Q = \{\beta, X | \beta \in C(X)\}$. Then it is clear that

$$P[Q] = \int P[Q \mid \beta] \pi(\beta) \, d\beta \ge 1 - \alpha.$$
⁽²⁾

This follows because the integral above is just a weighted average of coverage probabilities, all of which equal or exceed $1 - \alpha$. Let q(X) be the marginal density for X, which is just

$$\int \pi(\beta) p(X \mid \beta) \, d\beta \,. \tag{3}$$

Then another way to write the unconditional P[Q] is

$$P[Q] = \int P[Q \mid X]q(X) \, dX \,. \tag{4}$$

 $P[Q \mid X]$ is just the Bayesian posterior probability on Q, and the expression above can be read as saying that the unconditional probability of Q is an average over X of credibility levels (posterior probabilities) for C(X).

Let $R \subset U$ be the set of X values for which $P[Q \mid X] < 1 - \varepsilon$ and let $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ be P[R]. Then we can put an upper bound on P[Q] via

$$1 - \alpha \le P[Q] \le (1 - \varepsilon)\gamma(\varepsilon) + 1 - \gamma(\varepsilon).$$
(5)

Rearranging terms and subtracting 1 from both sides, we get

$$-\alpha \le -\varepsilon\gamma(\varepsilon) \tag{6}$$

$$\therefore \alpha \ge \varepsilon \gamma(\varepsilon) \,. \tag{7}$$

The $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ function is obviously decreasing in ε , and $\gamma(1) = 0$, $\gamma(0) = 1$. Therefore if it is continuous, there is an ε such that $\gamma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$. At such a value of ε , (7) implies

 $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\alpha}$.

Putting this result into words, if we have a confidence set with coverage probability everywhere at least $1 - \alpha$, then except on a set of *X* values with prior probability $\sqrt{\alpha}$, the posterior probability that β is in C(X) will be at least $1 - \sqrt{\alpha}$.

Date: October 8, 2020.

^{©2020} by Christopher A. Sims. ©2020. This document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/

If there is a discontinuity, the argument has to get pickier, without changing the result or the basic intuition. In this case there might be no ε with $\varepsilon = \gamma(\varepsilon)$, but if not, because of the monotonicity, there does have to be a value of ε with

$$\gamma^{+} = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \gamma(\varepsilon - \delta) \ge \varepsilon \ge \gamma^{-} = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \gamma(\varepsilon + \delta) \,.$$

But then $\gamma^+ \varepsilon \leq \alpha$, so $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\alpha}$. Since by assumption ε is strictly less than γ^+ and strictly greater than γ^- , we know that there is an $\varepsilon^+ > \varepsilon$ that still satisfies $\varepsilon < \sqrt{\alpha}$, for which $\gamma(\varepsilon^+) < \varepsilon < \sqrt{\alpha}$. This lets us conclude that for an $\varepsilon < \sqrt{\alpha}$, except on a set of X values with prior probability less than ε , the posterior probability that β is in C(X) will be at least $1 - \varepsilon$.

Note that the confidence set you start with has α level many times smaller than the levels of ε and γ you can guarantee. E.g., with coverage probability of the confidence set at .01, you can only guarantee $\varepsilon = \gamma = .10$. To get $\varepsilon = \gamma = .01$, you would need to have a confidence set with $\alpha = .0001$.

As you should be able to see, this same argument can be run in reverse. If for every *X* we construct a set *C*(*X*) that has posterior probability P[C(X) | X] greater than or equal to $1 - \alpha$, then the probability γ of the set of β values for which the coverage probability $P[C(X) | \beta] < 1 - \varepsilon$ must satisfy $\alpha > \varepsilon \gamma$. This is the same formula as before, but now of course the interpretation of ε and γ are different.