Putting binning in the bin: strong evidence for a continuous relationship between galaxy starburstiness and AGN power.
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ABSTRACT

Studies investigating the relationship between star formation rate (SFR) and AGN power often rely on averaging techniques – such as stacking – to incorporate information from non-detections. However, averages, and especially means, can be strongly affected by outliers and can therefore give a misleading indication of the “typical” case. Recently, a number of studies have taken a step further by binning their sample in terms of AGN power, and investigating how the SFR distribution differs between these bins. These bin thresholds are often weakly motivated, and binning implicitly assumes that sources within the same bin have similar (or even identical) properties. In this paper, we investigate whether the main sequence-normalised SFR (i.e., starburstiness, $R_{MS}$) distribution changes continuously as a function of AGN power, using a hierarchical Bayesian model that completely removes the need to bin. In doing so, we find strong evidence that the $R_{MS}$ distribution changes with AGN power, such that higher X-ray luminosity AGNs have a tighter physical connection to the star forming process than lower luminosity AGNs.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The proportion of galaxies that show evidence of Active Galactic Nuclei (i.e., AGN) ranges from a few percent to a few tens of percent, depending on galaxy mass (e.g., Kauffmann et al. 2003; Best et al. 2005; Mullaney et al. 2012; Kaviraj et al. 2019). What this implies is that an individual supermassive black hole (SMBH) spends most of cosmic time in a dormant state during which it accretes at such a low rate as to make it unidentifiable as an AGN (e.g. Heckman et al. 2004). What is clear from their high masses, however, is that all SMBHs irrespective of their current accretion rate must have undergone periods of rapid growth at earlier times (e.g. Soltan 1982). Since BH growth is not a constant, it raises the question of what external factors cause a SMBH to transition from a dormant state to an active state (and vice versa). Or, more succinctly, what galaxy properties, if any, dictate AGN power?

Recent observations of the inner few (tens of) parsecs of galaxies hosting AGNs have revealed evidence of bars and spiral structures that may be funnelling material toward the central SMBH (e.g. Shlosman et al. 1989; Storchi-Bergmann et al. 2007; Audibert et al. 2019; Shimizu et al. 2019). While such studies are important for revealing how gas and dust are transferred from the host galaxy, they do not address the question of what “macroscopic” galaxy properties help to trigger black hole growth. This is important because, since the energy released by AGNs is thought to impact on galaxy scales, it is crucial that we understand what large-scale galaxy properties make them susceptible to triggering SMBH growth.

A key means of investigating what galaxy-scale factors govern SMBH growth rates is by quantifying the properties of AGN-hosting galaxies and attempting to identify correlations between these host properties and AGN power. How-
ever, this is hampered by the fact that, compared to most
galactic processes (e.g., star-forming events, mergers),
AGNs are extremely variable and short-lived. As demonstra-
ted by Hickox et al. (2014), this stochastic duty cycle
tends to dilute the underlying connections between AGN
power and other galactic properties, such that plots of mean
galaxy star formation rate (SFR) vs. AGN power, for exam-
ple, show a flat (i.e., independent) relationship (e.g. Harri-
on et al. 2012; Rosario et al. 2012; Mullaney et al. 2012;
Stanley et al. 2015, 2017; Suh et al. 2017; Ramasawmy
et al. 2019). Recently, some studies have instead investi-
gated the distribution of star forming properties (as op-
posed to simple means) in bins of AGN power (e.g. Scholtz
et al. 2018; Bernhard et al. 2019). Specifically, Scholtz et al.
(2018) compared the distribution of specific SFR in two
X-ray luminosity \( (L_X) \) bins, but did not find any signifi-
cant evidence of a difference between the two bins \((43 < \log_{10}(L_X/\text{ergs s}^{-1}) < 44 \text{ and } 44 < \log_{10}(L_X/\text{ergs s}^{-1}) < 45)\).
Bernhard et al. (2019, B19 from hereon in) compared the
distribution of main sequence-normalised SFRs (i.e., \( R_{\text{MS}} = \text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}} \), where \( \text{SFR}_{\text{MS}} \) is the SFR that galaxy would
have if it was on the star-forming main sequence, us-
ing the prescription of Schreiber et al. (2015)) in bins of low
\( L_X \) (i.e., \( 42.53 < \log_{10}(L_X/\text{ergs s}^{-1}) < 43.3 \)) and high \( L_X \) (i.e.,
\( 43.3 < \log_{10}(L_X/\text{ergs s}^{-1}) < 45.09 \)), and only found “tentative”
evidence of a dependency.

So whilst the use of distributions has allowed us to in-
vestigate the star-forming properties of AGNs in more detail
than using simple averages, no study has demonstrated that
the distribution of star-forming properties is dependent on
\( L_X \).\(^1\) Of course, this may be because no intrinsic connection
exists. It could, however, be due to an often unaddressed limi-
tation in the analysis: the use of arbitrarily-constructed bins of
\( L_X \). Beyond being somewhat arbitrary, weakly-motivated
and possibly impacting results (Lanzuisi et al. 2017), bin-
ing has several further limitations. One problem is how to
classify a source which, when considering errors, could fall
in two or more bins (i.e., if there was a bin boundary at
\( \log_{10}(L_X) \approx 44 \), can a source with \( \log_{10}(L_X) = 43.8 \pm 0.3 \) be
accurately classified?). Some studies discard these ambigu-
gous sources (e.g. Grimmett et al. 2019), whereas others use
only the measured value (e.g. Delvecchio et al. 2015; Aird
et al. 2018; Bernhard et al. 2019), which fails to fully
account for uncertainties. A second limitation is the implied
assumption that all sources in the same bin have identical
properties, yet sources just either side of the bin boundaries
are different. Both of these limitations constitute a loss of
information from the data in hand.

In this study, to investigate the implications of bin-
ing on our investigations of the relationship between star-
forming properties and AGN power, we analyse the \( R_{\text{MS}} \)
distribution as a continuous function of \( L_X \). To do this,
we have developed a comprehensive Bayesian hierarchical
model which has two substantial benefits over binning.
Firstly, it allows us to eliminate the possibility of binning-
dependent results. Secondly, the model allows us to accu-
rately account for all uncertainties (including, where nec-

\[\text{SFR} = \text{SFR}_{\text{MS}} \times \frac{1}{\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}} \]

\(^1\) Note, here we use “dependence” in the strict mathematical
sense, rather than suggesting that SFR physically depends
on AGN power.

\(^2\) Multiple dependent data sources can easily be adopted in to
the framework, but for this study we choose only to model \( L_X \)
as a demonstration of the technique.
maximise the accuracy according to the testing presented in Ciesla et al. (2015). Next, we use the prescription of Schreiber et al. (2015), together with each galaxy’s redshift and mass, to predict the SFR that it would have if it were on the star-forming main sequence (i.e., SFR$_{\text{MS}}$). Finally, we calculate the starburstiness, $R_{\text{MS}}$, of each galaxy in our sample via $R_{\text{MS}} = \frac{\text{SFR}}{\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}}$. The $R_{\text{MS}}$ value of a galaxy aims to provide an indication of the star-forming properties of a galaxy after taking into account the mass and redshift dependence of the SFR of the dominant population of so-called main sequence galaxies (e.g. Brinchmann et al. 2004; Noeske et al. 2007; Elbaz et al. 2007; Magdis et al. 2010; Schreiber et al. 2015). While we appreciate that the precise nature of the mass and redshift of the main sequence is still the matter of some debate (e.g. Speagle et al. 2014; Ilbert et al. 2015; Whitaker et al. 2015; Popesso et al. 2019), the main aim of this study is to demonstrate a new analysis technique, so we choose to use the definition of Schreiber et al. (2015) to remain consistent with B19. This again ensures that any differences in results are a direct consequence of the analysis technique, as oppose to differences in the sample.

3 THE CONTINUOUS MODEL, MODEL SELECTION AND MCMC ALGORITHM

In this section we describe how we model the $R_{\text{MS}}$ data, in such a way to remove the need for binning, which enables us to investigate whether (and, if so, how) the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution changes as a continuous function of $L_X$. In subsection 3.1, we introduce the log-normal distribution we use to model the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and explain why we must use a “hierarchical” Bayesian approach to allow this to vary continuously with $L_X$. Next, in subsection 3.2 we describe our Bayesian priors and how these provide a mechanism to include all uncertainties on each individual $L_X$ value. Finally, in subsection 3.3, we introduce our bespoke MCMC sampler that explores the posterior parameter space in a way that allows us to test whether the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution depends on $L_X$.

3.1 $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and likelihood function

In order to test the continuous relationship between the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$ we assume a functional parametric form for the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution. In this work, we choose to model the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution as a log-normal distribution (i.e., that log$_{10}(R_{\text{MS}})$ is normally distributed). A log-normal distribution is primarily chosen to remain consistent with B19. Although recent studies have found the scatter around the main sequence to be well modelled by a log-normal distribution (Rodighiero et al. 2011; Sargent et al. 2012; Mullaney et al. 2015) there is a “bump” in the high-$R_{\text{MS}}$ end of the distribution caused by starburst galaxies. Therefore we stress that this study is working under the assumption that the deviation from the main sequence of star formation is log-normally distributed, at least for AGNs. In future studies, this model could be made more flexible to account for an additional second component, but the primary motivation of this work is to test the ability of the method to remove the need for binning and therefore we choose a log-normal $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution to remain consistent with B19.

As we choose to use a Bayesian approach, we wish to derive the posterior distribution, which is proportional to the product of the data-driven likelihood function (assuming a log-normal $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution) and the prior distributions. We are then interested in sampling parameter values from this posterior distribution. The prior distributions are essential for including the uncertainty on $L_X$ and are fully explained in Section 3.2. The remainder of this section, therefore, describes how we derive the likelihood function.

The likelihood function is given by the product of the probability density functions (PDFs) of all the detected $R_{\text{MS}}$ values, and the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of all undetected sources. The PDF of a given detected $R_{\text{MS}}$ value with parameters $\mu$ (representing the mode) and $\sigma$ (representing the width), is given by

$$f(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}) | \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}) - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).$$

(1)

For upper limits (i.e., non-detected $R_{\text{MS}}$ values, which ultimately comes from an upper limit on the infrared flux) the PDF is replaced by the CDF. The CDF is the integral of the PDF and can therefore be written as,

$$F(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}) | \mu, \sigma) = \int_{-\infty}^{R_{\text{MS}}} f(X | \mu, \sigma) dX = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \text{erf} \left( \frac{\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}) - \mu}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) \right].$$

(2)

where $f(X | \mu, \sigma)$ is given by Equation 1.

In other words, for a given galaxy, $F(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}))$ is close to 1 if most of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution with given $\mu$ and $\sigma$ values lies below the value of the upper limit. By contrast, $F(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}))$ is close to 0 if most of the distribution lies above the upper limit, meaning those $\mu$ and $\sigma$ values are incompatible with that limit.

By combining both our $m$ detections, $R_{\text{MS},1}, ..., R_{\text{MS},m}$, and $n - m$ non-detections, $R_{\text{MS},m+1}, ..., R_{\text{MS},n}$, the likelihood function is given by the product of the PDFs (for the detections) and the CDFs (for the upper limits),

$$L(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}) | \mu, \sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} f(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS},i}) | \mu, \sigma) \prod_{i=m+1}^{n} F(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS},i})) | \mu, \sigma).$$

(3)

If we were going to assume no dependence of $R_{\text{MS}}$ on $L_X$, and no uncertainty on $L_X$, then at this stage we could simply find the best-fitting values for $\mu$ and $\sigma$, as has been used previously in “Bayesian”-style studies that use bins. Such studies derive the likelihood function in different bins, use parameter-maximisation techniques to find the best fitting value for $\mu$ and $\sigma$ within each bin, and then compare how parameters change between different bins (e.g. Mullaney et al. 2015; Scholtz et al. 2018; Bernhard et al. 2019). However, in order to analyse the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution as a continuous function of $L_X$, we must use a hierarchical model, since this allows the parameters that control the shape of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution (i.e., $\mu$, $\sigma$) to vary as a function of $L_X$. As the true rela-
The rescaling of the $L_X$ values ensures that the hyperparameters are not orders of magnitude different, which could lead to problems in the analysis. By introducing these functional relationships, we have essentially related the mode and width of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution to the $L_X$ values. Additionally, we have changed the parameters of interest from $\mu$ and $\sigma$ to the parameters given by $\theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3\}$ (hereafter, our hyperparameters); this is what makes the approach “hierarchical”. Note that we specify an exponential form for the functional relationship between $\sigma_i$ and $L_{X,i}$ as $\sigma_i$ cannot be negative. The focus of this analysis is to now find the posterior distributions for $\theta$. By considering these posteriors, the functional relationships allow us to test whether the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution is dependent upon $L_X$. For example if $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$, the functional relationships are no longer a function of $L_X$ and therefore imply that the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distributions are independent of $L_X$. Additionally, relating the mode and width of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution to the $L_X$ values has completely removed the need to bin the data in $L_X$. The question of independence now becomes how likely is $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$, given the data observed. More details of which are contained in Section 3.2.2.

As a result of adapting the mode and width of the distribution so that binning is not required, the likelihood function changes slightly and is now given by,

$$L(\theta, L_X | R_{\text{MS}}) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} f(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS},i}) | \theta, L_{X,i})$$

$$\prod_{i=m+1}^{n} F(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS},i}) | \theta, L_{X,i}).$$

(5)

### 3.2 Prior and posterior distributions

#### 3.2.1 Prior distribution on $L_X$

We have now expressed the parameters as functions of the independent data (in this case, $L_X$) and the hyperparameters, $\theta$. The next step we must now consider is how to fully account for uncertainties on $L_X$. In our hierarchical model, we are able to treat the $L_X$ values as parameters, and can therefore place informative Bayesian priors on their values. The prior distribution on each $L_{X,i}$ can be constrained by the measured value $L_{X,i,\text{meas}}$ and uncertainty $\xi_i$ and modelled as a log-normal (here, we are assuming that our errors are symmetric in log space). This means that the prior distribution on a specific $\log_{10}(L_{X,i})$ is given by,

$$f(\log_{10}(L_{X,i}) | \log_{10}(L_{X,i,\text{meas}}), \xi_i) =$$

$$\left(2\pi \xi_i^2 \right)^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{(\log_{10}(L_{X,i}) - \log_{10}(L_{X,i,\text{meas}}))^2}{2\xi_i^2} \right).$$

(6)

where $\xi_i$ is derived by converting the percentage error on the flux measurement presented in Marchesi et al. (2016). This can be thought of as the probability density of observing the true $L_X$ given we have observed a measurement, $L_{X,i,\text{meas}}$ and error $\xi_i$. It should be noted that in this study we are working with only detected X-ray luminosities to remain consistent with B19 and we assume all uncertainties are modelled with a log-normal. One could, however, replace this prior distribution with any probability distribution.

At this stage, we have specified our likelihood function (Equation 5) and our priors on $L_X$. The final terms we must consider are the prior distributions on the hyperparameters, which we discuss in the next subsection.

#### 3.2.2 Prior distribution on hyperparameters

Because our primary scientific aim is to determine whether the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution changes with $L_X$, we are most interested in the (posterior) probability that the hyperparameters $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ are equal to 0 or whether they are non-zero (i.e., there is a dependence on $L_X$). We therefore choose the prior distributions of these hyperparameters to be a “spike and slab distribution”. This type of prior allows us to join two distributions; one defined in discrete space (the spike) and one in continuous space (the slab). This is necessary so that we can ensure that there is a defined prior probability that $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 = 0$ (i.e., there is a prior probability of independence between $R_{\text{MS}}$ and $L_X$), as opposed to a just a probability density. If we have a defined prior probability then we can calculate a posterior probability, again as opposed to just to a probability density.  

Our spike and slab prior distributions take the form,

$$f(\theta_1 | \omega) = (1 - \omega)N(\theta_1; 0, 1^2) + \omega \delta_{\theta_1=0}.$$  

$$f(\theta_2 | \omega) = (1 - \omega)N(\theta_2; 0, 1^2) + \omega \delta_{\theta_2=0}.$$  

(7)

where $\omega$ is the prior probability that $\theta_1, \theta_2 = 0$ and $\delta_{\theta_i=0}$ is the delta function. For our analysis, we choose $\omega = 0.5$ so that our prior probability favours neither the case of independence, $p(\theta_1 = 0) = p(\theta_2 = 0) = 0.5$, nor the case of dependence $p(\theta_1 = 0) = p(\theta_2 = 0) = 0.5$. As we are not interested in the posterior probabilities that $\theta_0, \theta_2 = 0$, the prior distributions on these parameters are Gaussian distributions with mean 0 and standard deviation 1.

3 A probability density is a “relative” likelihood as opposed to an absolute one. For a distribution over a continuous space, the absolute probability of any one particular occurrence is 0, whilst the probability density can be non-zero. For a distribution over a discrete space, the probability mass function (the discrete equivalent of the density) is an absolute probability.
This means that by using spike and slab prior distributions we have constructed four potential models:

- Model 1: $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 0$, no dependence on $L_X$ at all
- Model 2: $\theta_1 \neq 0, \theta_3 = 0$, mode depends on $L_X$, width does not
- Model 3: $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_3 \neq 0$, width depends on $L_X$, mode does not
- Model 4: $\theta_1 \neq 0, \theta_3 \neq 0$, both mode and width depend on $L_X$.

Note that as we have chosen $\omega = 0.5$ our prior distributions give no preferential weight to any of the model scenarios (according to the prior; they all have a probability of 0.25). Having now derived the likelihood function and all needed prior distributions we can construct the final posterior distribution,

$$f(\theta, \log_{10}(L_X)|\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}}), \log_{10}(L_{X,\text{meas}})) =$$

$$L(\log_{10}(R_{\text{MS}})|\theta, \log_{10}(L_X)) \times f(\log_{10}(L_X)|\log_{10}(L_{X,\text{meas}}), \xi) \times f(\theta|\omega)$$

(8)

### 3.3 MCMC algorithm and model switching

As our posterior distributions cannot be done analytically, we have written a purpose-built MCMC sampler in order to sample from the posterior distributions of each given hyperparameter (i.e., $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$). However, in addition to sampling from the posterior distributions to find the most likely hyperparameter values, we also use our sampler to determine the posterior probability of each of our four models (i.e., for model comparison). The posterior probability of the models can be calculated analytically, however even advanced sampling methods (e.g. Nested Sampling, see Buchner et al. 2014) struggle to accurately calculate them due to the high dimensionality of our parameter space (i.e., up to 545 dimensions as a result of including the $L_X$ values as parameters). Instead, we use “model switching” to compute the posterior model probabilities. In this subsection, we summarise our MCMC sampler, including the model switching component; a full description is however, given in Appendix A.

For the most part, our MCMC sampler adopts a standard Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm (Metropolis et al. 1953; Hastings 1970) to explore the parameter space. On each iteration, the MH algorithm proposes a new set of parameter values, which are then accepted or rejected. For efficiency, we propose new values for two parameters at a time, and accept them based on their “acceptance ratio” (see Equation 9). Our parameter vector is given by $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \log_{10}(L_{X,1}),...\log_{10}(L_{X,1}))$ and therefore we sample $\theta_0, \theta_1$ together, $\theta_2, \theta_3$ together. This is important as the value of $\theta_0$ is dependent on the value of $\theta_1$; similarly, the value of $\theta_2$ is dependent on $\theta_3$. Proposing the dependent hyperparameters together allows us to take into account the dependency and therefore propose more sensible values.

If we were only considering one model, and simply wished to sample the posterior distributions, then we would simply iterate the above process. However, in our case we wish to compare the relative probability of four different models. As mentioned above, we do this using a technique known as “model switching”, which we describe next. For the purposes of this explanation, we will assume that the current state of the MCMC algorithm is such that it is in Model 1 (i.e., $\theta_1 = \theta_3 = 0$; however, for simplicity we will ignore $\theta_3$ for the rest of this explanation). We then propose, with probability 0.5, that the new value of $\theta_1$ remains at zero. If it does, we remain within Model 1 and the MH algorithm progresses as usual.

If, however, the new value of $\theta_1$ is chosen to be non-zero, then this implies that the MCMC algorithm has proposed a switch to a different model (in this case, Model 2). If this happens, we cannot retain the value for $\theta_0$, since the value of $\theta_0$ in Model 1 is likely very different to the value of $\theta_0$ in Model 2, as we are now including the $\theta_1$ parameter. This means that, when we propose a model switch, we cannot simply keep $\theta_0$ as before, as it is unlikely to be in a region of high posterior probability. Therefore, we need to propose “reasonable” values for both $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$, given that we have proposed Model 2. \(^4\) Given the two new proposed values (i.e., $\theta'' = (\theta_0'', \theta_1'')$), the acceptance probability, $\alpha$ is given by,

$$\alpha = \min \left( \frac{\pi(\theta'')q(\theta', \theta'')}{\pi(\theta')q(\theta', \theta'')} \right),$$

(9)

where $\pi(\theta)$ is the full conditional of $\theta$ and $q(\theta, \theta'')$ is the proposal density (i.e., the probability density of proposing $\theta''$ given the current $\theta$). Usually, the proposal density is a symmetric function (e.g. a Gaussian), so $q(\theta, \theta'') = q(\theta'', \theta)$ and the two $q$ values cancel in Equation. 9. However, as we explain in Appendix A, this is not the case when we propose a switch between models (Gottardo & Raftery 2008). We also explain in Appendix A how we calculate the values for $q(\theta, \theta'')$ and $q(\theta', \theta'')$. The final stage is the same whether we have proposed a model switch or not: we accept the proposed values with probability equal to the acceptance ratio, otherwise we re-accept the current values (as is standard in an MH algorithm).

The above process is replicated for $\theta_2$ and $\theta_3$ (in this case, a change from $\theta_2 = 0$ to $\theta_2 \neq 0$, or vice versa, represents a switch between models) and then the sampler works through the rest of the parameter vector. Note that the process is more straightforward for the $L_X$ values as the proposal distribution is centered on the current value and no switching is required, so our process reverts to the standard MH sampler.

One iteration through the full parameter vector corresponds to a single step and we run five chains in parallel for 25,000 steps.\(^5\) Each chain has the first 5000 steps removed as a burn-in, then the remaining steps from each chain are combined to form the final sample of 100,000 posterior draws for each parameter. The posterior probability of each of the four models presented in Section 3.2.2 is then straightforward to calculate from the combined chain: all we need to do is calculate the fraction of accepted samples from each model in the combined chain.

---

\(^4\) How we obtain a “reasonable” values is explained in full in Appendix A.

\(^5\) The choice of five chains for 25,000 steps is arbitrary, but these values ensured that the combined chain contained a sufficiently high number of samples from the posterior.
4 RESULTS

Given that we now have 100,000 independent draws from the posterior distribution from each parameter, we can begin to investigate the relationship between the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$. Recall that we modelled the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution as a log-normal distribution and set a relationship between the mode and width, and the $L_X$ values as outlined in Equation 4. We proposed values such that our sample was forced to consider $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 = 0$ respectively, effectively allowing for the MCMC sampler to switch between models of dependence or independence. In this Section, we present the posterior distributions of the hyperparameters and the posterior model probabilities.

4.1 Posterior distributions

4.1.1 Posterior model probabilities

As a result of implementing model switching in the MCMC algorithm we can easily calculate the posterior model probabilities by considering the fraction of samples of each chain within each model. The posterior model probabilities alongside the Bayes Factor comparison to the independent Model 1 are given in Table 1. The Bayes Factor, which can be accurately used to compare two models (Kass & Raftery 1995), is given as the ratio of the posterior model probability of the more complex model to the posterior model probability more simple one. Naturally, the Bayes Factor includes a “penalty” for the number of parameters used. In our case, as a result of including $L_X$ values as a parameters our models have vastly different numbers of parameters. Model 1, which ignores $L_X$ values only has 2, whereas Models 2, 3 and 4 have 544, 544 and 545 respectively. This can help explain the very small posterior probabilities of Models 2 and 3, where the chain either prefers the simple Model 1, or for the sake of 1 extra parameter Model 4, which comprehensively outperforms them. The Bayes Factor comparing Model 4 to Model 1 gives us a value of 14.56, which can be seen as “strong” evidence in favour of Model 4 (Kass & Raftery 1995). Using this model comparison model technique, the posterior model probability is not equal to the probability that the model is true, as the sum of all posterior model probabilities in the analysis must be equal to 1. It is therefore important to consider the Bayes Factor approach for comparing the models, rather than using the posterior model probabilities as they are.

4.1.2 Hyperparameters

In Figure 1 we present the posterior distributions for the hyperparameters as computed by the MCMC algorithm outlined in Section 3.3. The off-diagonal plots show the joint posterior distributions. As described in Section 4.1.1, we have strong evidence that a model of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution with a dependence on $L_X$ is preferred to the independent model. The rest of this paper therefore, works with the assumption that Model 4 is the most suitable model.

We present summary statistics for the posterior distributions of the hyperparameters in Table 2. The coefficients of $L_X$ in the functional relationships (see Equation 4) are given by $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$, which from Table 2 and Figure 1 are positive and negative respectively. This implies that as $L_X$ increases, the mode and width of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution increase and decrease respectively. The relationship between the mode and width of the log-normal $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$ can be seen in Figure 2, where the posterior distributions of the hyperparameters have been sampled 1000 times and combined with $L_X$ to provide samples of $\mu$ and $\sigma$.

4.2 $R_{\text{MS}}$ as a function of $L_X$

In this paper, we have used a hierarchical Bayesian framework to remove the need for binning and stacking when modelling the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution of galaxies hosting AGN of different $L_X$. In doing so, and in contrast to B19, we find strong evidence that there is relationship between the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$ (i.e., AGN power) as oppose to just tentative evidence.

In Figure 3 we show how the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution, when modelted as a log-normal distribution, changes as a function of $L_X$ in the range $42.53 \leq \log_{10}(L_X/\text{ergs s}^{-1}) \leq 45.09$. As $L_X$ increases, the mode of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution increases, whilst the width decreases. This is also shown in Figure 1, as $\theta_1$ takes positive values (i.e., $\mu$ increases with increasing $L_X$) and $\theta_2$ takes negative values (i.e., $\sigma$ decreases with increasing $L_X$). These results, albeit with more evidence, are still consistent with the tentative findings of B19, which showed that more luminous X-ray AGNs have $R_{\text{MS}}$ distributions closer to those of main sequence galaxies compared to lower $L_X$. 

![Figure 1](image-url). The posterior distributions for each of the hyperparameters $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2$ and $\theta_3$ are shown on the diagonal plots. This corresponds to the values that maximise the posterior distribution and therefore give us the best fitting values for each parameter, under our log-normal model assumption and the functional relationships we chose. The bimodality is an indication of the model switching between the $L_X$-independent and $L_X$-dependent case for both $\mu$ and $\sigma$. The bivariate correlation plots shown as contours and points on the off diagonals.
Table 1. The posterior model probabilities given for each model. These are calculated by considering the amount of time the MCMC chain spent in each of the models. Also shown is the Bayes Factor, which is used to judge, out of two models, the model considered to be the most likely.

| Model | Value of $\mu$            | Value of $\sigma$ | Posterior probability | Bayes Factor vs. Model 1 |
|-------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1     | $\theta_0$                | $e^{\theta_2}$    | 0.06317               | -                        |
| 2     | $\theta_0 + \theta_1 \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right)$ | $e^{\theta_2}$    | 0.01327               | 0.21                     |
| 3     | $\theta_0$                | $e^{\theta_2 + \theta_3 \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right)}$ | 0.0035                | 0.055                    |
| 4     | $\theta_0 + \theta_1 \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right)$ | $e^{\theta_2 + \theta_3 \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right)}$ | 0.92006               | 14.56                    |

AGNs. This is also consistent with the findings of Schulze et al. (2019), who noticed no difference in the SFR distribution of 20 $z \sim 2$ quasars and the SFR distribution of main sequence galaxies.

With our new analysis showing stronger evidence of a dependence of $R_{\text{MS}}$ on $L_X$, it is natural to ask whether this is consistent with the observed flat relationship between SFR and $L_X$ reported by some other studies (e.g. Rosario et al. 2012; Stanley et al. 2015). We are able to explore this issue by generating synthetic SFRs using our $L_X$-dependent $R_{\text{MS}}$ model, together with the measured $L_X$, redshifts, and stellar masses of our sample. To do this we:

(i) randomly generate a sample from the joint posterior distribution of the hyperparameters, $\theta_0^*, \theta_1^*, \theta_2^*, \theta_3^*$. This involves taking a random point from each of the off-diagonal plots in Figure 1 (and therefore respecting any correlations between parameters);

(ii) for each of the 541 sources in our sample we use their detected $L_X$ values, alongside the aforementioned randomly sampled hyperparameters, to calculate the mode and width of the predicted $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution. Recall, we reuse the functional relationships we chose earlier so that we have a pre-
Table 2. Posterior mean and standard deviations for the hyper-parameters for Model 4.

| Parameter | Mode | Standard Deviation |
|-----------|------|--------------------|
| $\theta_0$ | -1.158 | 0.127 |
| $\theta_1$ | 0.267 | 0.036 |
| $\theta_2$ | 0.559 | 0.160 |
| $\theta_3$ | -0.4 | 0.050 |

The predicted mode, $\mu_{\text{pred}}$, and predicted width, $\sigma_{\text{pred}}$:

$$
\mu_{\text{pred}} = \theta_0^* + \theta_1^* \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right) \quad \text{and} 
$$

$$
\sigma_{\text{pred}} = e^{\theta_2^* + \theta_3^* \log_{10} \left( \frac{L_X}{10^{40}} \right)}.
$$

(iii) we then sample an $R_{\text{MS}}$ value from the log-normal distribution with the parameters $\mu_{\text{pred}}$ and $\sigma_{\text{pred}}$;

(iv) we then repeat steps 1-3 10,000 times so that we have, for each source in our sample, a set of 10,000 predicted $R_{\text{MS}}$ values constrained by our hyperparameter posterior distributions and the assumption of our functional relationships;

(v) we next multiply each of the sampled $R_{\text{MS}}$ values by the corresponding main sequence SFR, calculated by using the stellar masses, redshifts and the prescription from Schreiber et al. (2015). This leaves us with a sample of 10,000 predicted SFRs for each source calculated using our functional relationships and posterior distributions.

Figure 4 shows the relationship between SFR and $L_X$ as predicted by our $L_X$-dependent $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution. The grey contours represent the distribution of the predicted SFRs at each value of $L_X$ (i.e., as predicted by our model). The red stars show the mean of our predicted SFR in bins of $L_X$, using a bin width of 0.25 dex (with error bars indicating the 3σ standard error). Over-plotted are the observed mean SFRs (calculated using survival analysis), also in bins of $L_X$, from Stanek et al. (2015). The yellow circles represent the SFRs of the 148 AGNs in our sample with measured fluxes, while the yellow triangles represent the upper-limits on SFRs for the remaining 293 AGNs. Despite our analysis providing strong evidence of a relationship between the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$, the projected relationship between the average predicted SFRs and $L_X$ is comparable to the observed flat relationship of Stanek et al. (2015) (i.e., while the means are offset, they are well within the range of scatter given by the observed measurements), emphasising the need for caution when using linear means and bins. While the incorporation of mass and redshift information to convert our predicted $R_{\text{MS}}$ values to SFR may contribute to some of the flattening, it is plausible that averaging over a log-normal distribution within a particular $L_X$ bin could significantly flattened the relationship (e.g. Hickox et al. 2014).

This further demonstrates that even if a strong underlying relationship between star-forming properties and AGN power exists, it is extremely difficult to extract using average (or even individually-measured) SFRs in bins of $L_X$.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Limitations of our approach

Before discussing the implications of our results, in this Section we aim to highlight limitations of our approach and discuss areas for potential improvement. Initially, as we reuse the same dataset as B19, we have adopted the same set of initial assumptions as that paper. Namely, the assumption about the parametric form of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and the validity of the Schreiber et al. (2015) main sequence. However by removing the need for binning, we have relaxed the unstated assumption about sources in the same bins having similar properties. The remainder of this Section, therefore aims to highlight additional limitations and assumptions with our methodology, as well as those of B19.

Firstly, the analysis is computationally expensive. This is mostly due to the large number of sampled parameters. In this case, there are four hyperparameters ($\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_4$) plus, as described in Section 3.2, 541 $L_X$ parameters with a well-defined (i.e., using the measured value and its uncertainties) prior distribution. The parameters are sampled pairwise throughout the MCMC algorithm, which reduces the time, but the algorithm is still computationally expensive. Despite having a large number of parameters, overparameterisation is not a concern since the priors tightly constrain the $L_X$ values.

Secondly, in this work, we have imposed simple relationships between the mode and width ($\mu, \sigma$, respectively) of the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and $L_X$. Whilst this relationship could be made more flexible, the aim of this paper was to test the framework and to determine if there is any dependence on $L_X$. We therefore chose simple relationships to assess whether we could rule-out the independent case. In future studies, more flexible forms of the functional relationships could be tested and model comparison methods used to determine whether any other functional forms provide a better representation of the data. It would also be interesting to investigate whether assuming alternative models for the redshift and mass evolution of the Main Sequence (e.g. Speagle et al. 2014; Ilbert et al. 2015; Whitaker et al. 2015; Popesso et al. 2019) effects our results.

Thirdly, posterior model probabilities can be dependent upon the choice of prior distribution chosen for individual parameters. As the marginal likelihood is the integral of the likelihood function over all the prior space (effectively a weighted average of the likelihood function), an analysis of this sort must make sure that the prior distributions are reflective of current up to date knowledge. Our prior distributions are influenced by the work of B19. By the construction of the marginal likelihood, however, overly vague prior distributions can excessively “penalise” more complex models. Likewise, prior distributions that are too constrained can favour more complex models. Therefore, prior distributions should be carefully chosen and justified.

Finally, we stress again that we have worked under the assumption that $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution is log-normal. This is unlikely to be the case. Indeed, it is known that some AGNs reside in quiescent and starburst galaxies whose combined $R_{\text{MS}}$ values do not follow a log-normal distribution (e.g. the main sequence/starburst population is believed to follow a bi-modal log-normal distribution in $R_{\text{MS}}$). Having said that, our focus here is to assess whether, after eliminating the need for binning, our analysis (and comparing to the same dataset in B19), the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution could be $L_X$-dependent. It is not immediately clear why a truly $L_X$-independent $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution would be better modelled by a $L_X$-dependent log-normal, as opposed to a $L_X$-independent
The predicted relationship between SFR and $L_X$ using our functional relationships (see Equation 4) and hyperparameter posterior distributions. The contour region represents the predicted SFRs for a given $L_X$, calculated by folding back in the stellar masses and redshifts of our sources. Over-plotted is the linear mean SFR predicted in arbitrarily chosen bins of $L_X$ (red stars) and the results from Stanley et al. (2015) for the redshift range $0.8 < z < 1.5$ (green diamonds). Despite being slightly offset from each other, the linear means predicted by the dependent model are broadly consistent with the flat relationship (i.e., they fall well within the range of scatter given by the observed means), highlighting the need to exercise caution with binning and averaging. For reference, the original data points from this analysis are also shown, with filled yellow circles representing detected sources and filled yellow triangles indicating those sources with only upper limits on their SFR.

Figure 4

5.2 Implications of our analysis

The aim of this paper was to introduce a Bayesian hierarchical framework that removes both the need to bin data (particularly in distribution-style analyses) and the need to use averaging techniques (or other summary statistics/parameters). To allow us to accurately demonstrate that any new results were driven by the methodology, we applied our hierarchical model on the same dataset as B19. The process involves assuming a distributional form for one variable (in this case the starburstiness of a galaxy) and setting a direct dependence between the parameters of this distribution and some independent variable (in this case, $L_X$). Uncertainties on the independent variable are also fully considered by treating them as a parameter and applying an informative prior, which is derived from the measured values and their uncertainties.

In this study, we have investigated the relationship between the $R_{MS}$ distribution of AGN hosts and $L_X$, and found strong evidence of a relationship between the two. Recently, a number of studies have approached this problem from the other direction; i.e., investigating how AGN power changes as a function of the star-forming properties of their hosts. For example, Chen et al. (2013) reported that, when binned in terms of SFR, the mean $L_X$ of star-forming galaxies increases with average SFR (see also Delvecchio et al. 2015, who also accounted for the effects of galaxy stellar mass). Further, Rodighiero et al. (2015) found that, when binned according to stellar mass, the mean $L_X$ of starburst galaxies is higher than that of main sequence galaxies which, in turn, is higher than that of quiescent galaxies. Both these
results imply that average AGN power is higher in more actively star-forming systems. More recently, Aird et al. (2019) and Grimmett et al. (2019) have shown that the distribution of specific L_X (i.e., L_X/M_*, a proxy for Eddington ratio, $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$) changes as a function of the star-forming activity of their hosts, with a higher fraction of starbursts hosting AGNs with $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} > 10\%$ than their main sequence counterparts. Together, these studies, plus the results presented here, strongly support the assertion that higher AGN powers are preferentially found in more actively star-forming systems.

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have introduced a hierarchical Bayesian framework to assess whether the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution of AGN-hosting galaxies changes as a continuous function of an X-ray luminosity ($L_X$). Our approach removes the need for both binning and averaging and also allows for full consideration of the uncertainties on the independent variable.

By modelling the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution as a log-normal, and proposing simple relationships between its parameters (i.e., mode and width) of that log-normal and X-ray luminosity, we found strong evidence that an $L_X$-dependent model is preferred over an $L_X$-independent one. By binning the same data, B19 reported the same overall trend, but without such strong evidence, thereby highlighting the importance of utilising all available information by removing the need for binning. By using the same dataset and pre-processing as B19, we ensured that any differences found in contrast to that paper are a direct result of the new analysis technique.

Despite finding a strong relationship between the $R_{\text{MS}}$ distribution and AGN power, when we convert our $L_X$-dependent distributions back into the mean SFR - $L_X$ plane, we find that the dependent model can reproduce results consistent with previously seen flat relationships (e.g. Stanley et al. 2015). This further highlights the difficulty in extracting underlying relationships between AGN power and host galaxy properties when averaging in bins of AGN power.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Aird J., Coil A. L., Georgakakis A., 2017, MNRAS, 465, 3390
Aird J., Coil A. L., Georgakakis A., 2018, MNRAS, 474, 1225
Aird J., Coil A. L., Georgakakis A., 2019, MNRAS, 484, 4360
Audibert A., et al., 2019, A&A, 632, A33
Bernhard E., Grimmnett L. P., Mullaney J. R., Daddi E., Tadhunter C., Jin S., 2019, MNRAS, 483, L52
Best P. N., Kauffmann G., Heckman T. M., Brinchmann J., Charlot S., Iveciž Z., White S. D. M., 2005, MNRAS, 362, 25
Boquien M., Burgarella D., Roelhy Y., Buat V., Ciesla L., Corre D., Inoue A. K., Salas H., 2019, A&A, 622, A103
Brinchmann J., Charlot S., White S. D. M., Tremonti C., Kauffmann G., Heckman T., Brinkmann J., 2004, MNRAS, 351, 1151
Buchner J., et al., 2014, A&A, 564, A125
Chabrier G., 2003, PASP, 115, 763
Chen C.-T. J., et al., 2013, ApJ, 773, 3
Ciesla L., et al., 2015, A&A, 576, A10
Civano F., et al., 2016, VizieR Online Data Catalog, 181
Dai Y. S., Wilkes B. J., Bergeron J., Kuraskiewicz J., Omont A., Atanas A., Teplitz H. I., 2018, MNRAS, 478, 4238
Delvecchio I., et al., 2015, MNRAS, 449, 373
Elbaz D., et al., 2007, A&A, 468, 33
Gottardo R., Raftery A. E., 2008, Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 17, 949
Grimmett L. P., Mullaney J. R., Jin S., Bernhard E., Daddi E., Walters K., 2019, MNRAS, 487, 4071
Harrison C. M., et al., 2012, ApJ, 760, L15
Hastings W. K., 1970, Biometrika, 57, 97
Heckman T. M., Kauffmann G., Brinchmann J., Charlot S., Tremonti C., White S. D. M., 2004, ApJ, 613, 109
Hickox R. C., Mullaney J. R., Alexander D. M., Chen C.-T. J., Civano F. M., Goulding A. D., Hainline K. N., 2014, ApJ, 782, 9
Ilbert O., et al., 2015, A&A, 579, A2
Jin S., et al., 2018, ApJ, 864, 56
Kass R. E., Raftery A. E., 1995, Journal of the American Statistical Association, 90, 773
Kauffmann G., et al., 2003, MNRAS, 346, 1055
Kaviraj S., Martin G., Silk J., 2019, MNRAS, 487, 4071
Lanzuisi G., et al., 2017, A&A, 602, A123
Larson D., et al., 2011, ApJS, 192, 16
Liu D., et al., 2018, ApJ, 853, 172
Magdis G. E., Rigopoulou D., Huang J.-S., Fazio G. G., 2010, MNRAS, 401, 1521
Marchesi S., et al., 2016, ApJ, 817, 34
Masoureaux M., Mounichas G., Georgantopoulos I., Ruiz A., Magdis G., Plionis M., 2018, A&A, 618, A31
Metropolis N., Rosenbluth A. W., Rosenbluth M. N., Teller A. H., Teller E., 1953, J. Chem. Phys., 21, 1087
Mullaney J. R., Alexander D. M., Goulding A. D., Hickox R. C., 2011, MNRAS, 414, 1082
Mullaney J. R., et al., 2015, MNRAS, 419, 95
Mullaney J. R., et al., 2015, MNRAS, 453, L83
Noeske K. G., et al., 2007, ApJ, 660, L47
Noll S., Burgarella D., Giovannoli E., Buat V., Marcillac D., Muñoz-Mateos J. C., 2009, A&A, 507, 1793
Popesso P., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 483, 3213
Ramasawmy J., Stevens J. J., Martin G., Geach J. E., 2019, MNRAS, 486, 4320
Rodighiero G., et al., 2011, ApJ, 739, L60
Rodighiero G., et al., 2015, ApJ, 800, L10
Rosario D. J., et al., 2012, A&A, 545, A45
Rosario D. J., et al., 2013, ApJ, 771, 63
Sargent M. T., Béthermin M., Daddi E., Elbaz D., 2012, ApJ, 747, L31
Scholtz J., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 475, 1288
In this appendix we describe, in detail, one full step of the MCMC sampler used to construct the posterior distributions presented in Section 4, which were then used to compare our various models. Interested readers should also refer to the study of Gottardo & Raftery (2008), from which our sampler is adapted.

A key component of our algorithm is that, when it proposes a switch between models, it proposes “reasonable” parameters within the proposed model. Otherwise, we run the risk of never switching models – not because the proposed model is necessarily worse, but because we always propose highly unlikely parameter values within that model. What we mean by “reasonable”, therefore, is likely parameter values within each proposed model. As such, we need to have some knowledge of the posterior probability distributions of each model before we can start proposing switches between models. One way of achieving this would be to force Model 1, for example, to converge, then force a switch to Model 2, allow that to converge, and so on. Once all models have converged, we would then allow our sampler to switch between models by proposing reasonable parameter values (i.e., those close to the posterior mode). In our case, however, as we only have four models, we instead run a separate standard MCMC sampler for each model (i.e., without model switching), which gives us an indication of the most suitable regions of the posterior parameter space for each model. Mathematically, these two approaches are exactly analogous.

With an estimate of the posterior parameter space for each model in-hand, we can propose reasonable regions of the parameter space when switching between models. In what follows, we describe how we switch between various models. For ease of explanation, we will only consider $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$, but same process is applied when sampling $\theta_2$ and $\theta_3$. Recalling that we step through the parameters in pairs, we sample $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$ at the same time. This leads to four possible cases, which are summarised in Table A1, and discussed in detail below.

**Case A:** Here, the sampler is currently in the state where $\theta_1 = 0$, and is proposing $\theta_1 \neq 0$ (i.e., it is in a $\mu$-independent model [Models 1 or 3]) and proposes to remain within a $\mu$-independent model. However, because we progress through the vector pairwise, the sampler must still propose a $\theta_0$ value. For this, we use a standard MH proposal – a value randomly selected from a Gaussian distribution centered on the current $\theta_0$ value. Based on pilot runs, we choose a value for the width of the Gaussian distribution that results in good mixing (i.e., the acceptance rate is between 20–40 per cent). In this case, the $q(\theta, \theta')$ value is the product of the likelihood of choosing $\theta_1' = 0$ (i.e., 0.5) and the proposed $\theta_0$ value (i.e., $\theta_0' = f(\theta_0' | \theta_0, \Sigma_1)$), where $f$ is the Gaussian density function. This product is symmetrical on switching between $\theta$ and $\theta'$, meaning $q(\theta, \theta') = q(\theta', \theta)$, so the $q$ terms cancel in Equation 9.

**Case B:** In this case, the sampler is currently in the state where $\theta_1 = 0$, and is proposing $\theta_1 \neq 0$ (i.e., it is in a $\mu$-independent model [Models 1 or 3] and is proposing to switch to a $\mu$-dependent model [Models 2 or 4]). As a result of proposing a switch to a $\mu$-dependent model, we must propose values for both $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$. To do this, we use a bivariate Gaussian distribution centered on the “reasonable” values obtained using the process described above. Based on pilot runs, we choose a value for the widths of the bivariate Gaussian distribution that results in good mixing (i.e., the acceptance rate is between 20–40 per cent). In addition to the widths, the bivariate Gaussian distribution accounts for the correlation between $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$ by using the calculated covariance matrix. In this case, the $q(\theta, \theta')$ value is the product of the likelihood of choosing $\theta_1' \neq 0$ (i.e., 0.5) and proposed $\theta$ values (i.e., $\theta' = f_2(\theta_0' | \theta_0, \Sigma_1)$), where $f_2$ is the bivariate Gaussian density function, $\hat{\theta}_0, \hat{\theta}_1$ are the estimates of the posterior mode from the original chains and $\Sigma_1$ is the covariance matrix. This product is not symmetrical on switching between $\theta$ and $\theta'$, since the inverse process involves sampling from a univariate Gaussian. This means $q(\theta, \theta') \neq q(\theta', \theta)$, so they must be accounted for in the acceptance ratio.

**Case C:** Here, the sampler is currently in the state where $\theta_1 \neq 0$, and is proposing $\theta_1' = 0$ (i.e., it is in a $\mu$-dependent model [Models 2 or 4] and is proposing to switch to a $\mu$-independent model [Models 1 or 3]). As a result of proposing a switch to a $\mu$-independent model, we again must propose a “reasonable” value of $\theta_0$ within the proposed model. To do this, we use a distribution, centered on the “reasonable” values obtained using the process described above. Based on pilot runs, we choose a value for the width of the Gaussian distribution that results in good mixing (i.e., the acceptance rate is between 20–40 per cent). In this case, the $q(\theta, \theta')$ value is the product of the likelihood of choosing $\theta_1' = 0$ (i.e., 0.5) and the proposed $\theta_0$ value (i.e., $\theta_0' = f(\theta_0' | \theta_0, \Sigma_1)$), where $f$ is the Gaussian density function, $\hat{\theta}_0, \hat{\theta}_1$ are the estimates of the posterior mode from the original chains and $\Sigma_1$ is the covariance matrix. This product is not symmetrical on switching between $\theta$ and $\theta'$, since the inverse process involves sampling from a univariate Gaussian. This means $q(\theta, \theta') \neq q(\theta', \theta)$, so they must be accounted for in the acceptance ratio.

**Case D:** In this final case, the sampler is currently in the state where $\theta_1 \neq 0$, and is proposing $\theta_1' \neq 0$ (i.e., it is in a $\mu$-dependent model [Models 2 or 4] and is proposing to remain in a $\mu$-dependent model). As a result we need to propose values for both $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$. To do this, we use a bivariate
Table A1. Summary of the possible model switches for 1 proposal of the $\mu$-related hyperparameters, $\theta_0$ and $\theta_1$. There are four potential cases depending on whether the model is currently in a $\mu$-dependent or a $\mu$-independent state and whether we propose to move to a $\mu$-dependent or $\mu$-independent state. For the possible cases the value of the proposal density $q(\theta, \theta')$ and the inverse $q(\theta', \theta)$ are given.

The univariate Gaussian density is given by $f$ and the bivariate Gaussian density is given by $f_2$. The tuned proposal widths are given by $s_1$ and $s_2$, and the calculated covariance matrices by $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$. When a model switch is proposed, the “reasonable” values must be used to sample a proposed parameter value and these are given by $\hat{\theta}_0$ and $\hat{\theta}_1$.

| Case | Current $\theta_1$ | Proposed $\theta'_1$ | Model now | Model proposed | $q(\theta, \theta')$ | $q(\theta', \theta)$ |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| A    | $\theta_1 = 0$   | $\theta'_1 = 0$  | 1        | 3              | $0.5 \times f(\theta'_0 | \theta_0, s_1)$ | $0.5 \times f(\theta_0 | \theta'_0, s_1)$ |
| B    | $\theta_1 = 0$   | $\theta'_1 \neq 0$ | 1        | 4              | $0.5 \times f_2([\theta'}_0, \theta'_1 | [\theta_0, \hat{\theta}_1], \Sigma_1)$ | $0.5 \times f(\theta_0 | \theta'_0, s_2)$ |
| C    | $\theta_1 \neq 0$| $\theta'_1 = 0$  | 2        | 3              | $0.5 \times f(\theta_0 | \theta'_1, s_2)$ | $0.5 \times f_2([\theta_0, \theta_1 | [\theta'}_0, \hat{\theta}_1], \Sigma_1)$ |
| D    | $\theta_1 \neq 0$| $\theta'_1 \neq 0$| 2        | 4              | $0.5 \times f_2([\theta'}_0, \theta'_1 | [\theta_0, \theta_1], \Sigma_2)$ | $0.5 \times f_2([\theta_0, \theta_1 | [\theta'_0, \theta'_1], \Sigma_2)$ |

Gaussian distribution, centered on the current values. Based on pilot runs, we choose a value for the width of the Gaussian distribution that results in good mixing (i.e., the acceptance rate is between 20–40 per cent) and calculate the appropriate covariance matrix. In this case, the $q(\theta, \theta')$ value is the product of the likelihood of choosing $\theta'_{\mu} \neq 0$ (i.e., 0.5) and the proposed $\theta$ value (i.e., $\theta' = f_2([\theta'}_0, \theta'_1 | [\theta_0, \theta_1], \Sigma_1)$, where $f_2$ is the bivariate Gaussian density function, and $\Sigma_2$ is the covariance matrix). This product is symmetrical on switching between $\theta$ and $\theta'$, meaning $q(\theta, \theta') = q(\theta', \theta)$ and so the terms cancel.

This process is then repeated for the next pair of hyperparameters (i.e., $\theta_2$ and $\theta_3$) followed by one sampling through the $L_X$ values, the latter of which is done by using a standard MH algorithm.
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