

Bayesian One- Way Repeated Measurements Model as a Mixed Model

Ameera Jaber Mohaisen and Khawla Abdul Razzaq Swadi
 Mathematics Department College of Education for Pure Science AL-Basrah University-Iraq
 E-mail: Khawla.swade@gmail.com

Abstract

In the Bayesian approach to inference, all unknown quantities contained in a probability model for the observed data are treated as random variables. Specifically, the fixed but unknown parameters are viewed as random variables under the Bayesian approach. In this paper, Bayesian approach is employed to making inferences on the one- way repeated measurements model as mixed model , and we prove some theorems about posterior.

Keywords: Mixed models, One- way repeated measurements model , Bayesian inference, Prior density, Posterior density.

1.Introduction

Mixed models are an extension of regression models that allow for the incorporation of random effects. A more contemporary application of mixed models is the analysis of longitudinal data, clustered data repeated measurements and spatially correlated data. Often random effects are used to describe the correlation structure in this type of this data. [4],[9],[10],[12].

Repeated measurements is a term used to describe data in which the response variable for each experimental units is observed on multiple occasions and possible under different experimental conditions . Repeated measures data is a common form of multivariate data, and linear models with correlated error which are widely used in modeling repeated measures data. Repeated measures is a common data structure with multiple measurements on a single unit repeated over time. Multivariate linear models with correlated errors have been accepted as one of the primary modeling methods for repeated measures data. We can represent repeated measurements model as a mixed model[1],[2],[4],[10],[12] .

In the Bayesian approach to inference, all unknown quantities contained in a probability model for the observed data are treated as random variables. Specifically, the fixed but unknown parameters are viewed as random variables under the Bayesian approach. Bayesian techniques based on Markov chain Monte Carlo provide what we believe to be the most satisfactory approach to fitting complex models as well as the direction that model is most likely to take in the future [3],[5],[6],[7],[8],[9],[11],[13],[14] .

In this paper, a simple Bayesian approach is employed to the linear one- way repeated measurements model to make inferences on the resulting mixed model coefficients. We investigate the posterior density and identify the analytic form of the Bayes factor. To illustrate the effectiveness of the our methodology. We have choosing the data set which A study was conducted at date palm research center laboratories, university of Basra, during 2007-2008 season

2. One- Way Repeated Measurements Model

Consider the model

$$y_{ijk} = \mu + \tau_j + \delta_{i(j)} + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk} + e_{ijk} \quad (1)$$

Where

$i=1, \dots, n$ is an index for experimental unit within group j ,

$j=1, \dots, q$ is an index for levels of the between-units factor (Group) ,

$k=1, \dots, p$ is an index for levels of the within-units factor (Time) ,

y_{ijk} is the response measurement at time k for unit i within group j ,

μ is the overall mean ,

τ_j is the added effect for treatment group j ,

$\delta_{i(j)}$ is the random effect for due to experimental unit i within treatment group j ,

γ_k is the added effect for time k ,

$(\tau\gamma)_{jk}$ is the added effect for the group $j \times$ time k interaction ,

e_{ijk} is the random error on time k for unit i within group j ,

For the parameterization to be of full rank, we imposed the following set of conditions

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \tau_j = 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^p \gamma_k = 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^q (\tau\gamma)_{jk} = 0 \quad \text{for each } k=1, \dots, p$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^p (\tau\gamma)_{jk} = 0 \quad \text{for each } j=1, \dots, q$$

And we assumed that the e_{ijk} and $\delta_{i(j)}$ are independent with

$$e_{ijk} \sim i.i.d. N(0, \sigma_e^2), \quad \delta_{ij} \sim i.i.d. N(0, \sigma_\delta^2).$$

Sum of squares due to groups, subjects(group), time, group*time and residuals are then defined respectively as follows:

$$SS_G = np \sum_{j=1}^q (\bar{y}_{.j} - \bar{y}_{...})^2, \quad SS_{U(G)} = p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q (\bar{y}_{ij.} - \bar{y}_{.j})^2$$

$$SS_{time} = nq \sum_{k=1}^p (\bar{y}_{..k} - \bar{y}_{...})^2, \quad SS_{G \times time} = n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (\bar{y}_{.jk} - \bar{y}_{.j} - \bar{y}_{..k} + \bar{y}_{...})^2$$

$$SS_E = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - \bar{y}_{ij.} - \bar{y}_{.jk} + \bar{y}_{.j})^2$$

Where

$$\bar{y}_{...} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p y_{ijk}}{nqp} \quad \text{is the overall mean.}$$

$$\bar{y}_{.j.} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p y_{ijk}}{np} \quad \text{is the mean for group } j.$$

$$\bar{y}_{ij.} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^p y_{ijk}}{p} \quad \text{is the mean for the } i^{th} \text{ subject in group } j.$$

$$\bar{y}_{..k} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q y_{ijk}}{nq} \quad \text{is the mean for time } k.$$

$$\bar{y}_{.jk} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_{ijk}}{n} \quad \text{is the mean for group } j \text{ at time } k.$$

Table(1): ANOVA table for one-way Repeated measures model

Source of variation	d.f	SS	MS	E(MS)
Group	$q - 1$	SS_G	$\frac{SS_G}{q - 1}$	$\frac{np}{(q - 1)} \sum_{j=1}^q \tau_j^2 + p\sigma_\delta^2 + \sigma_e^2$
Unit (Group)	$q(n - 1)$	$SS_{U(G)}$	$\frac{SS_{U(G)}}{q(n - 1)}$	$p\sigma_\delta^2 + \sigma_e^2$
Time	$p - 1$	SS_{time}	$\frac{SS_{time}}{p - 1}$	$\frac{nq}{(p - 1)} \sum_{k=1}^p \gamma_k^2 + \sigma_e^2$
Group*Time	$(q - 1)(p - 1)$	$SS_{G \times time}$	$\frac{SS_{G \times time}}{(q - 1)(p - 1)}$	$\frac{n}{(p - 1)(q - 1)} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (\tau\gamma)_{jk}^2 + \sigma_e^2$
Residual	$q(p - 1)(n - 1)$	SS_E	$\frac{SS_E}{q(p - 1)(n - 1)}$	σ_e^2

The model (1) is rewritten as follows

$$Y = X\beta + Zb + \epsilon \quad (2)$$

Where

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_{111} \\ y_{112} \\ \vdots \\ y_{nqp} \end{bmatrix}_{nqp \times 1}, \quad \beta = \begin{bmatrix} \mu \\ \tau \\ \gamma \\ (\tau\gamma) \end{bmatrix}_{(qp+q+p+1) \times 1}, \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{p \times 1} & \cdots & 0_{p \times 1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{p \times 1} & \cdots & 1_{p \times 1} \end{pmatrix}_{nqp \times nq},$$

$$b = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{1(1)} \\ \delta_{1(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{n(q)} \end{bmatrix}_{nq \times 1}, \quad \epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} e_{111} \\ e_{112} \\ \vdots \\ e_{nqp} \end{bmatrix}_{nqp \times 1},$$

and design matrix X is an $(nqp * (qp + q + p + 1))$ matrix.

$$\text{We assume that } H_0: Y = X\beta + \epsilon \text{ versus } H_1: Y = X\beta + Zb + \epsilon \quad (3)$$

As for the prior of β , and ϵ under H_1 , we assume β and b are independent and

$$\beta \sim N(0, \Sigma_0), \quad \Sigma_0 = \sigma_\beta^2 I_{1+q+p+qp}, \quad b \sim N(0, \Sigma_1), \quad \Sigma_1 = \sigma_b^2 I_{nq} \quad (4)$$

Also we assume that

$$\sigma_b^2 \sim \text{Invers Gamma}(\alpha_b, \beta_b), \quad \sigma_\epsilon^2 \sim \text{Invers Gamma}(\alpha_\epsilon, \beta_\epsilon) \quad (5)$$

3. Posterior calculations

We have

$$Y|\theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2 \sim N(C\theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp}), \quad (6)$$

where $C = [X \ Z]$ and $\theta = [\beta \ b]^T$

Then the likelihood function $L(Y|\theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2)$ can be expressed as

$$L(Y|\theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2) \propto |\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp}|^{-1/2} \exp \left\{ \frac{-1}{2} (Y - C\theta)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp})^{-1} (Y - C\theta) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Then the joint posterior density to coefficients θ and the error variances σ_ϵ^2 and σ_b^2 given by

the expression

$$\pi_1(\theta|Y, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2) \propto L(Y|\theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2)\pi_0(\theta), \quad (8)$$

$$\rightarrow \pi_1(\theta|Y, \sigma_\epsilon^2, \sigma_b^2) \propto \exp\left\{\frac{-1}{2}(Y - C\theta)^T(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp})^{-1}(Y - C\theta)\right\}\pi_0(\theta), \quad (9)$$

and

$$\pi_1(\sigma_\epsilon^2|Y, \theta, \sigma_b^2) \propto |\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp}|^{-1/2} \exp\left\{\frac{-1}{2}(Y - C\theta)^T(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp})^{-1}(Y - C\theta)\right\}\pi_0(\sigma_\epsilon^2), \quad (10)$$

$$\pi_1(\sigma_b^2|Y, \theta, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \propto |\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{nqp}|^{-1/2} \exp\left\{\frac{-1}{2}(Y - C\theta)^T(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n)^{-1}(Y - C\theta)\right\}\pi_0(\sigma_b^2). \quad (11)$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\theta|Y, \sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \sim N(A_1 Y, A_2) \quad (12)$$

Where

$$A_1 = \{\Sigma D\}\{\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + [\Sigma D C^T C]\}^{-1} C^T \quad (13)$$

$$A_2 = \Sigma D - \Sigma^2 D C^T \{\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + [\Sigma D C^T C]\}^{-1} \{C D\}. \quad (14)$$

Where

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_\beta^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_b^2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } D = \begin{bmatrix} I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{nq} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ then } \Sigma D = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_\beta^2 I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_b^2 I_{nq} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } N=1+q+p+qp+nq.$$

Now we employ spectral decomposition to obtain $DC^T C = P \Lambda P^T$, [4] where

$\Lambda = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_N)$ is the matrix of eigenvalues and P is the orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + [\Sigma D C^T C] &= \sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + P \Sigma \Lambda P^T = P(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + \Sigma \Lambda)P^T = P\sigma_\epsilon^2(I_N + \frac{\Sigma}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \Lambda)P^T \\ &= \sigma_\epsilon^2 P(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda)P^T \end{aligned}$$

Where $v = \sigma_b^2/\sigma_\epsilon^2$ and $u = \sigma_\beta^2/\sigma_\epsilon^2$. Then, the conditional density of Y given σ_ϵ^2, u and v can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} m(Y|\sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{nqp/2}} \frac{1}{\det\left[I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right]^{1/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} Y^T P \left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right)^{-1} P^T Y\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{nqp/2}} \frac{1}{[\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+u d_i)]^{1/2} [\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+v d_i)]^{1/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} (\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+u d_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+v d_i})\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Where $s = (s_1, \dots, s_N)^T = B^T Y$. We choose the prior on $\sigma_\epsilon^2, v = \sigma_b^2/\sigma_\epsilon^2$ and $u = \sigma_\beta^2/\sigma_\epsilon^2$, qualitatively similar to the used in [3]. Specifically, we take $\pi_1(\sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v)$ to be proportional to the product of an inverse gamma density $\{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}/\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)\} \exp(-\beta_\epsilon/\sigma_\epsilon^2)(\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\alpha_\epsilon+1)}$ for σ_ϵ^2 and the gamma density for u and the density of a $F(b, a)$ distribution for v (for suitable choice of $\beta_\epsilon, \alpha_\epsilon, b$ and a). The posterior density of u, v given Y, the posterior mean and covariance matrix of θ as in the following theorems.

Theorem1: the posterior density of u, v given Y is:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(u, v|Y) &\propto \frac{v^{(b/2)-1} u^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{Cu}{\beta_\epsilon}\right\}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+u d_i)\right)^{-1/2} \left(\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+v d_i)\right)^{-1/2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+u d_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+v d_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(u, v|Y) &= \int m(Y|\sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v) f(u, \alpha_\epsilon, \beta_\epsilon) f(v, b, a) f(\sigma_\epsilon^2, \alpha_\epsilon, \beta_\epsilon) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &= \int \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{nqp/2}} (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \frac{c}{\beta_\epsilon \Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \left(\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon}\right)^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\alpha_\epsilon+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) d\sigma_\epsilon^2\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Where $c = \sigma_\beta^2$

$$\begin{aligned}&= (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \frac{(cu)^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}}\right\}}{(\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon))^2} \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right\} (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{(cu)^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}}\right\}}{(\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon))^2} (2)^{(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} \\ &\quad \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad \left(\frac{2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right)^{(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &\propto \frac{v^{(b/2)-1} u^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}}\right\}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right\} \left(\frac{2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right)^{[(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+4)/2]-1} \\ &\quad \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &\propto \frac{v^{(b/2)-1} u^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}}\right\}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} \Gamma((n+2\alpha_\epsilon+4)/2) (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2} \\ &\therefore \pi_1(u, v|Y) \propto \frac{v^{(b/2)-1} u^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{cu}{\beta_\epsilon} \frac{b^{b/2} a^{a/2}}{B(b, a)} \frac{v^{(b/2)-1}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}}\right\}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2}\end{aligned}$$

Theorem2: The posterior mean and covariance matrix of θ are:

$$E(\theta/Y) = DPE\left\{\left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} uI_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & vI_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right)^{-1} / Y\right\} C^T s \quad (17)$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} var(\theta|Y) = & \frac{1}{nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2} E \left[\frac{\left(2\beta_\epsilon + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+u d_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+v d_i} \right) \right)}{Y} \right] D - \frac{1}{nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2} D C^T P E \left[\left(2\beta_\epsilon + \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+u d_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+v d_i} \right) \right) \left[I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right]^{-1} / Y \right] P^T C D + \\ & E[R(u, v) R(u, v)^T / Y], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\text{Where } R(u, v) = D P \left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right)^{-1} C^T S$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{From (11): } E(\theta|Y) &= A_1 Y \\ &= \{ \Sigma D \} \{ \sigma_\epsilon^2 I_N + [\Sigma D C^T C] \}^{-1} C^T Y \\ &= \Sigma D \left\{ \sigma_\epsilon^2 P \left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right) P^T \right\}^{-1} C^T Y \\ &= \frac{\Sigma}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} D P^{T-1} \left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right)^{-1} P^{-1} C^T Y \end{aligned}$$

$\because P$ is the orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors, then $P^{-1} = P^T$ and $P^{T-1} = P$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E(\theta|Y) &= D P \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right)^{-1} P^T C^T Y \\ &= D P E \left(\left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right)^{-1} \middle| y \right) C^T S \end{aligned}$$

Where the expectation $E \left(\left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} u I_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & v I_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \right)^{-1} \middle| y \right)$ is taken with respect to $\pi_1(u, v|Y)$ (see theorem 1 above). And by same way can prove the variance of θ given Y .

4. Model checking and Bayes factors

We would like to choose between a Bayesian mixed repeated measurements model and its fixed counterpart by the criterion of the Bayes factor for two hypotheses :

$$H_0 : Y = X\beta + \epsilon \text{ versus } H_1 : Y = X\beta + Zb + \epsilon. \quad (19)$$

We compute the Bayes factor, B_{01} , of H_0 relative to H_1 for testing problem (19) as following

$$B_{01}(Y) = \frac{m(Y|H_0)}{m(Y|H_1)} \quad (20)$$

where $m(Y|H_i)$ is the predictive density of Y under model $H_i, i = 0, 1$.

We have

$$m(Y|H_0) = \int f(Y|\beta, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \pi_0(\sigma_\epsilon^2) d\sigma_\epsilon^2,$$

where under H_0 , $\pi_0(\sigma_\epsilon^2)$ induced by $\pi_0(\theta, \sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ is the only part needed, and

$$m(Y|H_1) = \int f(Y|\theta, \sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \pi_0(\theta, \sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2) d\theta d\sigma_b^2 d\sigma_\epsilon^2,$$

where $\pi_0(\sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ will be constant in θ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} m(Y|H_0) &= \int f(Y|\beta, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \pi_0(\sigma_\epsilon^2) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &= (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \int (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-nqp/2} \exp \left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \right) (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\alpha_\epsilon+1)} \exp \left(-\frac{(Y-X\beta)^2}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \right) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &= (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \int (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\frac{nqp}{2}+\alpha_\epsilon+1)} \exp \left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \right) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\ &= \\ (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \int (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\frac{nqp}{2}+\alpha_\epsilon+1)} (\beta_\epsilon + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)^{-\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} \left(\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - \right. \\
 & \left. (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2 \right)^{\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} \\
 & \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\
 & = (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \int \frac{(\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)^{\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)}}{(\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)}} \\
 & \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + \\
 & (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)^{-\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\
 & = (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \int \left(\frac{(\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \right)^{\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} \\
 & \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - (\mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + \\
 & (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)^{-\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \\
 & \therefore m(Y|H_0) = \\
 & (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \Gamma\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - \mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk}))^2)^{-\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right)} \\
 & (21)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(Y|H_1, \sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v) &= (2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1 + ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1 + vd_i))^{-1/2} \\
 \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i} \right)\right\}. \quad (22)
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 m(Y|H_1) &= \int m(Y|M_1, \sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v) \pi_0(\sigma_\epsilon^2, u, v) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 du dv \\
 &= \int \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} (\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-(\alpha_\epsilon+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) (2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-nqp/2} (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1 + ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1 + \\
 & vd_i))^{-1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i} \right)\right\} \pi_0(u, v) d\sigma_\epsilon^2 du dv \\
 &= \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1 + ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1 + vd_i))^{-1/2} \pi_0(u, v) \\
 & \left\{ \int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left(\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i} \right)\right\} d\sigma_\epsilon^2 \right\} du dv
 \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore$

$$\begin{aligned}
 m(Y|H_1) &= \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \Gamma(nqp/2 + \\
 & \alpha_\epsilon) \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1 + ud_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1 + vd_i))^{-1/2} \pi_0(u, v) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \\
 & \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i})^{-(nqp/2 + \alpha_\epsilon - 1)} du dv \quad (23)
 \end{aligned}$$

5.Example (The storage experiment)

In this section, we illustrate the effectiveness of the our methodology. We have choosing the data set which a study was conducted at date palm research center laboratories, university of Basra, during 2007-2008 season. The objective of the study is to improve storage ability of date palm fruits cv. Barhi at khalal stage. Fruits of both cultivars were soaked in calcium solution at (0,1,2)% concentration for 5 minutes and stored at $0C^{\circ}$, $3C^{\circ}$ and room temperature. the design of the experiment was done according to the model (1). Table (2) below show the results for the analysis of variance for model, from this table we can see that the calculated F-values is greater than the tabulated F-values at 0.05 level significant that is means there is significant effect for calcium chloride on storage capability for date palm fruits under different temperatures. The values of parameters $(\mu, \tau_j, \delta_{i(j)}, \gamma_k, (\tau\gamma)_{jk}, \sigma_{\delta}^2, \sigma_e^2)$ for the model (1) based on ANOVA table shown in table (3).

Table 2 : ANOVA table for one-way Repeated measures model

Source of variation	d.f	S.S	M.S	E(M.S)	F-Test
Group	2	2956.3	1478.15	41765.659	$F_c = \frac{MS_G}{MS_{U(G)}} = 13.448^*$ $F_t(2,6,0.05)=5.14$
Unit (Group)	6	659.5	109.917	10724.508	
Time	6	42468.7	7078.117	63745.491	$F_c = \frac{MS_T}{MS_E} = 166.787^*$ $F_t(6,21,0.05)=2.57$
Group*Time	12	22868.9	1905.742	5759.664	$F_c = \frac{MS_{G \times T}}{MS_E} = 44.906^*$ $F_t(12,21,0.05)=2.25$
Residual	21	891.2	42.4381	42.4381	
Total	47	69844.6			

Table(3) estimation values for parameters $(\mu, \tau_j, \delta_{i(j)}, \gamma_k, (\tau\gamma)_{jk}, \sigma_{\delta}^2, \sigma_e^2)$ by ANOVA table

$\hat{\mu}$	$\hat{\tau}_j$	$\hat{\delta}_{i(j)}$	$\hat{\gamma}_k$	$(\hat{\tau\gamma})_{jk}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{\delta}^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$
63.584	141.929	411.037	413.784	398.039	55.352	42.4381

We next applied our methodology (Bayesian method) to the storage experiment data. Figure(1) represent the posterior density of coefficients for the model (1). Figure (2) shows the number for iterations of the Gibbs sampler which used in this study, which was 10000 iterations for this data, while figure (3) shows density estimates based on 10000 iterations of σ_{δ}^2 and σ_e^2 . Table(4) presents the values of the parameters $(\mu, \tau_j, \delta_{i(j)}, \gamma_k, (\tau\gamma)_{jk}, \sigma_{\delta}^2, \sigma_e^2)$ based on Bayesian method. From table(3) and table(4), we can see that the values of parameters obtained in both ANOVA and Gibbs sampling are nearly alike and encouraging.


Table(4)estimation values for parameters $(\mu, \tau_j, \delta_{i(j)}, \gamma_k, (\tau\gamma)_{jk}, \sigma_{\delta}^2, \sigma_e^2)$ by Bayesian method

$\hat{\mu}$	$\hat{\tau}_j$	$\hat{\delta}_{i(j)}$	$\hat{\gamma}_k$	$(\hat{\tau\gamma})_{jk}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{\delta}^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$
63.55	145.3	435.8	381.5	381.2	50.814	43.403

The model checking approach based on Bayes factor which its value was

$$B_{01}(Y) = 2.0022 \times 10^{-8},$$

that is mean the Bayes factor favors H_1 with strong evidence for the storage experiment data.



**Figure (1) the posterior density of one-way repeated measurements model
 coefficients(μ , τ_j , $\delta_{i(j)}$, γ_k , $(\tau\gamma)_{jk}$)**

Figure (2) shows 10000 iterations of the sampler for the this data





Figure (3) shows density estimates based Gibbs on 10000 iterations of σ_e^2 and σ_δ^2



6. Conclusions

1. We show that the posterior density of u, v given Y in Bayesian one- way repeated measurements model is:

$$\pi_{22}(u, v|Y) \propto \frac{v^{(b/2)-1} u^{\alpha_\epsilon-1} \exp\left\{\frac{Cu}{\beta_\epsilon}\right\}}{(a+bv)^{-(a+b)/2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1+ud_i)\right)^{-1/2} \left(\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1+vd_i)\right)^{-1/2} \left(2\beta_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)^{-(nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2)/2}$$

2. The posterior mean of θ given Y in Bayesian one- way repeated measurements is:

$$E(\theta/Y) = DPE\left\{\left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} uI_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & vI_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right)^{-1} / Y\right\} C^T S$$

3. The posterior covariance matrix of θ given Y in Bayesian one- way repeated measurements is:

$$Var(\theta|Y) = \frac{1}{nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2} E\left[\frac{\left(2\beta_\epsilon + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right)}{Y}\right] D - \frac{1}{nqp+2\alpha_\epsilon+2} D C^T P E\left[\left(2\beta_\epsilon + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+ud_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} \frac{s_i^2}{1+vd_i}\right)\right)\right] \left[I_N + \begin{bmatrix} uI_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & vI_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right]^{-1} / Y\right] P^T C D + E[R(u, v)R(u, v)^T / Y],$$

$$\text{Where } R(u, v) = DP\left(I_N + \begin{bmatrix} uI_{1+q+p+qp} & 0 \\ 0 & vI_{nq} \end{bmatrix} \Lambda\right)^{-1} C^T S$$

4. Bayes factor in Bayesian one-way repeated measurements for testing the two models

$H_0 : Y = X\beta + \epsilon$ versus $H_1 : Y = X\beta + Zb + \epsilon$ is:

$$B_{01}(Y) = \frac{m(Y|H_0)}{m(Y|H_1)}$$

where $m(Y|H_i)$ is the predictive density of Y under model $H_i, i = 0, 1$. We have

$$m(Y|H_0) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{nqp}{2}} \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} \Gamma\left(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1\right) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^p (y_{ijk} - \mu + \tau_j + \gamma_k + (\tau\gamma)_{jk})^2)^{-(\frac{nqp}{2} + \alpha_\epsilon + 1)},$$

and $m(Y|H_1) = \frac{\beta_\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}}{\Gamma(\alpha_\epsilon)} (2\pi)^{-nqp/2} \Gamma(nqp/2 + \alpha_\epsilon) \int (\prod_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} (1 + u d_i))^{-1/2} (\prod_{i=2+q+p+qp}^{nq} (1 + v d_i))^{-1/2} \pi_0(u, v) (\beta_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1+q+p+qp} \frac{s_i^2}{1+u d_i} + \sum_{i=2+q+p+qp}^n \frac{s_i^2}{1+v d_i})^{-(nqp/2 + \alpha_\epsilon - 1)} du dv$.

5. There is significant effect for calcium chloride on storage capability for date palm fruits cv. Barhi under different temperatures.

6. The values of parameters obtained in both ANOVA and Bayesian method are nearly alike and encouraging.

7. The Bayes factor favors H_1 with strong evidence for the storage experiment data that is mean the correct model is mixed one-way repeated measurements model.

7. References

- [1] Al-Mouel, A.H.S., (2004). Multivariate Repeated Measures Models and Comparison of Estimators, Ph.D. Thesis, East China Normal University, China.
- [2] Al-Mouel, A.H.S., and Wang, J.L., (2004). One-Way Multivariate Repeated Measurements Analysis of Variance Model, Applied Mathematics a Journal of Chinese Universities, 19, 4, pp435-448.
- [3] Angers, J.-F. and Delampady, M. (2001). Bayesian nonparametric regression using wavelets. Sankhyā Ser. B 63, 287 - 308.
- [4] Arnold, Steven F. (1981). The theory of linear models and multivariate analysis. John Wiley and Sons, New York. Chichester. Brisbane. Toronto
- [5] Berger, J. O. (1985). Statistical decision theory and Bayesian analysis. Springer, New York.
- [6] DeRobertis, L. and Hartigan, J. A. (1981). Bayesian inference using intervals of measures. Ann. of Statistics. Vol. 9, No. 2, 235 - 244.
- [7] Ghosh, J.K., Delampady, M. and Samanta, T. (2006). Introduction to Bayesian Analysis: Theory and Methods. Springer, New York.
- [8] Gilks, W.R., Richardson, S. and Spiegelhalter, D.J., (1996). Markov Chain Monte Carlo in Practice, Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall.
- [9] Jon, W., (2013). Bayesian and frequentist regression methods, Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London.
- [10] Neter, J. and Wasserman, W., (1974). Applied linear statistical models, regression analysis of variance and experimental designs, Richard. D. IRWIN, INC.
- [11] Papoulis, A., (1997). Markoff Sequences in Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes, 2nd ed. New York. McGraw-Hill, pp. 528-535, 1984.
- [12] Vonesh, E.F. and Chinchilli, V.M., (1997). Linear and Nonlinear Models for the Analysis of Repeated Measurements, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
- [13] Walsh, B., (2002). Introduction to Bayesian Analysis, Lecture Notes for EEB 596z.
- [14] Walsh, B., (2004). Markov Chain Monte Carlo and Gibbs Sampling, Lecture Notes for EEB 581.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

