

BIC note — Calculating and interpreting BIC

Description
Also see

Remarks and examples

Methods and formulas

References

Description

This entry discusses a statistical issue that arises when using the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) to compare models.

Stata calculates BIC, assuming $N = e(N)$ —we will explain—but sometimes it would be better if a different N were used. Commands that calculate BIC have an `n()` option, allowing you to specify the N to be used.

In summary,

1. If you are comparing results estimated by the same estimation command, using the default BIC calculation is probably fine. There is an issue, but most researchers would ignore it.
2. If you are comparing results estimated by different estimation commands, you need to be on your guard.
 - a. If the different estimation commands share the same definitions of observations, independence, and the like, you are back in case 1.
 - b. If they differ in these regards, you need to think about the value of N that should be used. For example, `logit` and `xtlogit` differ in that the former assumes independent observations and the latter, independent panels.
 - c. If estimation commands differ in the events being used over which the likelihood function is calculated, the information criteria may not be comparable at all. We say information *criteria* because this would apply equally to the Akaike information criterion (AIC), as well as to BIC. For instance, `streg` and `stcox` produce such incomparable results. The events used by `streg` are the actual survival times, whereas the events used by `stcox` are failures within risk pools, conditional on the times at which failures occurred.

Remarks and examples

stata.com

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

Background

The problem of determining N

The problem of conformable likelihoods

The first problem does not arise with AIC; the second problem does

Calculating BIC correctly

Background

The AIC and the BIC are two popular measures for comparing maximum likelihood models. AIC and BIC are defined as

$$\text{AIC} = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}) + 2 \times k$$

$$\text{BIC} = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}) + \ln(N) \times k$$

where

$$k = \text{number of parameters estimated}$$

$$N = \text{number of observations}$$

We are going to discuss AIC along with BIC because AIC has some of the problems that BIC has, but not all.

AIC and BIC can be viewed as measures that combine fit and complexity. Fit is measured negatively by $-2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood})$; the larger the value, the worse the fit. Complexity is measured positively, either by $2 \times k$ (AIC) or $\ln(N) \times k$ (BIC).

Given two models fit on the same data, the model with the smaller value of the information criterion is considered to be better.

There is substantial literature on these measures: see [Akaike \(1974\)](#); [Raftery \(1995\)](#); [Sakamoto, Ishiguro, and Kitagawa \(1986\)](#); and [Schwarz \(1978\)](#).

When Stata calculates the above measures, it uses the rank of $\mathbf{e(V)}$ for k and it uses $\mathbf{e(N)}$ for N . $\mathbf{e(V)}$ and $\mathbf{e(N)}$ are Stata notation for results stored by the estimation command. $\mathbf{e(V)}$ is the variance–covariance matrix of the estimated parameters, and $\mathbf{e(N)}$ is the number of observations in the dataset used in calculating the result.

The problem of determining N

The difference between AIC and BIC is that AIC uses the constant 2 to weight k , whereas BIC uses $\ln(N)$.

Determining what value of N should be used is problematic. Despite appearances, the definition “ N is the number of observations” is not easy to make operational. N does not appear in the likelihood function itself, N is not the output of a standard statistical formula, and what is an observation is often subjective.

▷ Example 1

Often what is meant by N is obvious. Consider a simple logit model. What is meant by N is the number of observations that are statistically independent and that corresponds to M , the number of observations in the dataset used in the calculation. We will write $N = M$.

But now assume that the same dataset has a grouping variable and the data are thought to be clustered within group. To keep the problem simple, let’s pretend that there are G groups and m observations within group, so that $M = G \times m$. Because you are worried about intragroup correlation, you fit your model with `xtlogit`, grouping on the grouping variable. Now you wish to calculate BIC. What is the N that should be used? $N = M$ or $N = G$?

That is a deep question. If the observations really are independent, then you should use $N = M$. If the observations within group are not just correlated but are duplicates of one another, and they had to be so, then you should use $M = G$. Between those two extremes, you should probably use a number between N and G , but determining what that number should be from measured correlations is difficult. Using $N = M$ is conservative in that, if anything, it overweights complexity. Conservativeness, however, is subjective, too: using $N = G$ could be considered more conservative in that fewer constraints are being placed on the data.

When the estimated correlation is high, our reaction would be that using $N = G$ is probably more reasonable. Our first reaction, however, would be that using BIC to compare models is probably a misuse of the measure.

Stata uses $N = M$. An informal survey of web-based literature suggests that $N = M$ is the popular choice.

There is another reason, not so good, to choose $N = M$. It makes across-model comparisons more likely to be valid when performed without thinking about the issue. Say that you wish to compare the `logit` and `xtlogit` results. Thus you need to calculate

$$\text{BIC}_p = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}_p) + \ln(N_p) \times k$$

$$\text{BIC}_x = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}_x) + \ln(N_x) \times k$$

Whatever N you use, you must use the same N in both formulas. Stata's choice of $N = M$ at least meets that test.

◀

▶ Example 2

In the above example, using $N = M$ is reasonable. Now let's look at when using $N = M$ is wrong, even if popular.

Consider a model fit by `stcox`. Using $N = M$ is certainly wrong if for no other reason than M is not even a well-defined number. The same data can be represented by different datasets with different numbers of observations. For example, in one dataset, there might be 1 observation per subject. In another, the same subjects could have two records each, the first recording the first half of the time at risk and the second recording the remaining part. All statistics calculated by Stata on either dataset would be the same, but M would be different.

Deciding on the right definition, however, is difficult. Viewed one way, N in the Cox regression case should be the number of risk pools, R , because the Cox regression calculation is made on the basis of the independent risk pools. Viewed another way, N should be the number of subjects, N_{subj} , because, even though the likelihood function is based on risk pools, the parameters estimated are at the subject level.

You can decide which argument you prefer.

For parametric survival models, in single-record data, $N = M$ is unambiguously correct. For multirecord data, there is an argument for $N = M$ and for $N = N_{\text{subj}}$.

◀

The problem of conformable likelihoods

The problem of conformable likelihoods does not concern N . Researchers sometimes use information criteria such as BIC and AIC to make comparisons across models. For that to be valid, the likelihoods must be conformable; that is, the likelihoods must all measure the same thing.

It is common to think of the likelihood function as the $\Pr(\text{data} \mid \text{parameters})$, but in fact, the likelihood is

$$\Pr(\text{particular events in the data} \mid \text{parameters})$$

You must ensure that the events are the same.

For instance, they are not the same in the semiparametric Cox regression and the various parametric survival models. In Cox regression, the events are, at each failure time, that the subjects observed to fail in fact failed, given that failures occurred at those times. In the parametric models, the events are that each subject failed exactly when the subject was observed to fail.

The formula for AIC and BIC is

$$\text{measure} = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}) + \text{complexity}$$

When you are comparing models, if the likelihoods are measuring different events, even if the models obtain estimates of the same parameters, differences in the information measures are irrelevant.

The first problem does not arise with AIC; the second problem does

Regardless of model, the problem of defining N never arises with AIC because N is not used in the AIC calculation. AIC uses a constant 2 to weight complexity as measured by k , rather than $\ln(N)$.

For both AIC and BIC, however, the likelihood functions must be conformable; that is, they must be measuring the same event.

Calculating BIC correctly

When using BIC to compare results, and especially when using BIC to compare results from different models, you should think carefully about how N should be defined. Then specify that number by using the `n()` option:

```
. estimates stats full sub, n(74)
Akaike's information criterion and Bayesian information criterion
```

Model	Obs	ll(null)	ll(model)	df	AIC	BIC
full	74	-45.03321	-20.59083	4	49.18167	58.39793
sub	74	-45.03321	-27.17516	3	60.35031	67.26251

Note: N=74 used in calculating BIC.

Both `estimates stats` and `estat ic` allow the `n()` option; see [\[R\] estimates stats](#) and [\[R\] estat ic](#).

Methods and formulas

AIC and BIC are defined as

$$\text{AIC} = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}) + 2 \times k$$

$$\text{BIC} = -2 \times \ln(\text{likelihood}) + \ln(N) \times k$$

where k is the model degrees of freedom calculated as the rank of variance–covariance matrix of the parameters $e(V)$ and N is the number of observations used in estimation or, more precisely, the number of independent terms in the likelihood. Operationally, N is defined as $e(N)$ unless the `n()` option is specified.

References

- Akaike, H. 1974. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 19: 716–723.
- Raftery, A. E. 1995. Bayesian model selection in social research. In Vol. 25 of *Sociological Methodology*, ed. P. V. Marsden, 111–163. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sakamoto, Y., M. Ishiguro, and G. Kitagawa. 1986. *Akaike Information Criterion Statistics*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Schwarz, G. 1978. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics* 6: 461–464.

Also see

- [R] [estat ic](#) — Display information criteria
- [R] [estimates stats](#) — Model-selection statistics