

Under the truncated model, η is a $F \times \bar{K}$ matrix of regression coefficients, and u is a $\bar{K} \times D$ matrix satisfying $u_{:,d} \sim N(\eta^T \phi_d, I_{\bar{K}})$. Similarly, A is a $\bar{K} \times \bar{K}$ lower triangular matrix, and $v_{:,d} \sim N(Au_{:,d}, \lambda_v^{-1} I_{\bar{K}})$. The probabilities π_{kd} for the first \bar{K} topics are set as in eq. (2), with the final topic set so that a valid distribution is ensured: $\pi_{Kd} = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{K}-1} \pi_{kd} = \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{K}-1} \psi(-v_{kd})$.

3.1 Gibbs Updates for Topic Assignments, Correlation Parameters, and Hyperparameters

The precision parameter λ_f controls the variability of the feature weights associated with each topic. As in many regression models, the gamma prior is conjugate so that

$$\begin{aligned} p(\lambda_f | \eta, a_f, b_f) &\propto \text{Gam}(\lambda_f | a_f, b_f) \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} N(\eta_{fk} | \mu_f, \lambda_f^{-1}) \\ &\propto \text{Gam}\left(\lambda_f \mid \frac{1}{2}\bar{K} + a_f, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} (\eta_{fk} - \mu_f)^2 + b_f\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Similarly, the precision parameter λ_v has a gamma prior and posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\lambda_v | v, a_v, b_v) &\propto \text{Gam}(\lambda_v | a_v, b_v) \prod_{d=1}^D N(v_{:,d} | Au_{:,d}, L^{-1}) \\ &\propto \text{Gam}\left(\lambda_v \mid \frac{1}{2}\bar{K}D + a_v, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d=1}^D (v_{:,d} - Au_{:,d})^T (v_{:,d} - Au_{:,d}) + b_v\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Entries of the regression matrix A have a rescaled Gaussian prior $A_{k\ell} \sim N(0, (k\lambda_A)^{-1})$. With a gamma prior, the precision parameter λ_A nevertheless has the following gamma posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\lambda_A | A, a_A, b_A) &\propto \text{Gam}(\lambda_A | a_A, b_A) \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k N(A_{k\ell} | 0, (k\lambda_A)^{-1}) \\ &\propto \text{Gam}\left(\lambda_A \mid \frac{1}{2}\bar{K}(\bar{K}-1) + a_A, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k kA_{k\ell}^2 + b_A\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Conditioning on the feature regression weights η , the mean weight μ_f in our hierarchical prior for each feature f has a Gaussian posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mu_f | \eta) &\propto N(\mu_f | 0, \gamma_\mu) \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} N(\eta_{fk} | \mu_f, \lambda_f^{-1}) \\ &\propto N\left(\mu_f \mid \frac{\gamma_\mu}{\bar{K}\gamma_\mu + \lambda_f^{-1}} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{K}} \eta_{fk}, (\gamma_\mu^{-1} + \bar{K}\lambda_f)^{-1}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

To sample $\eta_{:,k}$, the linear function relating metadata to topic k , we condition on all documents u_k : as well as ϕ , μ , and Λ . Columns of η are conditionally independent, with Gaussian posteriors:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\eta_{:,k} | u, \phi, \mu, \Lambda) &\propto N(\eta_{:,k} | \mu, \Lambda^{-1}) N(u_{k,:}^T | \phi^T \eta_{:,k}, I_D) \\ &\propto N(\eta_{:,k} | (\Lambda + \phi\phi^T)^{-1} (\phi u_{k,:}^T + \Lambda\mu), (\Lambda + \phi\phi^T)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Similarly, the scores $u_{:,d}$ for each document are conditionally independent with Gaussian posteriors:

$$\begin{aligned} p(u_{:,d} | v_{:,d}, \eta, \phi_d, L) &\propto N(u_{:,d} | \eta^T \phi_d, I_{\bar{K}}) N(v_{:,d} | Au_{:,d}, L^{-1}) \\ &\propto N(u_{:,d} | (I_{\bar{K}} + A^T L A)^{-1} (A^T L v_{:,d} + \eta^T \phi_d), (I_{\bar{K}} + A^T L A)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

To resample A , we note that its rows are conditionally independent. The posterior of the k entries $A_{k,:}$ in row k depends on v_k : and $\hat{U}_k \triangleq u_{1:k,:}$, the first k entries of $u_{:,d}$ for each document d :

$$\begin{aligned} p(A_{k,:}^T | v_k, \hat{U}_k, \lambda_A, \lambda_v) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^k N(A_{kj} | 0, (k\lambda_A)^{-1}) N(v_k^T | \hat{U}_k^T A_{k,:}^T, \lambda_v^{-1} I_D) \\ &\propto N(A_{k,:}^T | (k\lambda_A \lambda_v^{-1} I_k + \hat{U}_k \hat{U}_k^T)^{-1} \hat{U}_k v_k^T, (k\lambda_A I_k + \lambda_v \hat{U}_k \hat{U}_k^T)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$