

Clustering Time Series and the Surprising Resilience of HMMs

Mark Kozdoba, Shie Mannor

Abstract

Suppose that we are given a time series where consecutive samples are believed to come from a probabilistic source, that the source changes from time to time and that the total number of sources is fixed. Our objective is to estimate the distributions of the sources. A standard approach to this problem is to model the data as a hidden Markov model (HMM). However, since the data often lacks the Markov or the stationarity properties of an HMM, one can ask whether this approach is still suitable or perhaps another approach is required. In this paper we show that a maximum likelihood HMM estimator can be used to approximate the source distributions in a much larger class of models than HMMs. Specifically, we propose a natural and fairly general non-stationary model of the data, where the only restriction is that the sources do not change too often. Our main result shows that for this model, a maximum-likelihood HMM estimator produces the correct second moment of the data, and the results can be extended to higher moments.

1 Introduction

Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ be a sequence of symbols over some alphabet \mathbb{X} , where each symbol is sampled from one of k sources, with distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k . Given the sequence x , consider the problem of inferring the distribution of the sources, and of the classification of the samples, in the sense of determining for each sample x_i which source produced it. A well known toy instance of this problem is the “dishonest casino”, where the sources are biased coins, see [Durbin et al., 1998]. A classical real world application is in speech recognition, see [Gales and Young, 2007]. In general, applications appear in virtually any field involving time series or sequential data. For instance, in financial times series [Rogers and Zhang, 2011], biological sequence analysis [Fridlyand et al., 2004],[Yoon, 2009],[Durbin et al., 1998], computer vision [Horst, 2002], and climate modelling [Hughes et al., 1999]. See also [San-Segundo et al., 2016],[Mannini and Sabatini, 2010], [Cho and Park, 2003], [Ge and Smyth, 2000] for a variety of other applications. Further, the above problem setting can also be viewed as a change-point detection problem, [Basseville and Nikiforov, 1993] (see also [Chib, 1998] for an HMM based framework), and in particular the applications in [Rogers and Zhang, 2011],[Fridlyand et al., 2004], [Kritzman et al., 2012], and [Mannini and Sabatini, 2010] are of this type.

When modelling the data $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, in order to be able to distinguish between the sources, one clearly needs some conditions on how the sources change as time progresses. Indeed, if the source is chosen independently at each time i , it is easy to see that the sources are indistinguishable and one effectively sees a single source with distribution equal to the empirical distribution of the data. A natural assumption on the underlying sequence of sources (also referred to as sequence of states) $s = (s_1, \dots, s_N)$ is that it forms a Markov chain, and the resulting model is a Hidden Markov Model (HMM). In particular this assumption is made in all of the above mentioned work.

With the HMM model, given a sequence of data x one can find a maximum likelihood HMM, and then, for instance, use the Viterbi sequence (the most likely state sequence s given the data) for classification. However, while the Markov chain assumption on the state sequence s is convenient, and there exists a variety of effective inference methods for the problem, the data source itself rarely satisfies the Markov condition on the sequence of the states. Consider for instance the financial time series applications, as considered in [Rogers and Zhang, 2011], [Ge and Smyth, 2000], [Kritzman et al., 2012]. The data is a time series of stock prices or commodity value indices, and the underlying hidden states reflect the general conditions of the market, such as bull or bear markets. If this data is modelled by an HMM, the model will imply that every day there is a certain probability that the market will enter a “bear” state, and that the expected time the system will spend in this state will be inversely proportional to this probability. Moreover, the model will imply that this probability does not change from day to day, due to stationarity of the Markov chain. Such properties clearly do not hold for real data as the stock markets are notoriously non-stationary. As another example, consider the task of monitoring human physical activity during a day (see, for instance, [Mannini and Sabatini, 2010]). Suppose that different states of the system correspond to different activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, running, driving, riding a bicycle. Assume that time steps are seconds, that at each time instance i , x_i corresponds to some set of features produced by the current activity, and that the activities can be distinguished based on the distribution of the features. In this situation, it clearly makes little sense to assign probabilities to transitions between, say, walking and climbing stairs states, since such probability will depend strongly on the environment, will change on different days and during the day, and in any case is likely to be too small to be meaningful. More generally, similar considerations apply in many problem instances where HMMs are used as a change-point detection tool.

In this paper we show that surprisingly, if one wants to learn the distributions of the sources, one can largely ignore the issue of modelling the environment, or modelling the transition mechanism between the states, under the assumption that the states do not change too often. Specifically, we define an Interval Model I of the data $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N, \dots)$ to be a finite or infinite sequence of consecutive intervals in \mathbb{N} , $I_1, I_2, \dots \subset \mathbb{N}$ with a mapping $\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that for any $i \in I_l$, x_i has distribution $\mu_{\tau(I_l)}$ and all x_i are independent. As mentioned above, in order to be able to differentiate between the sources, one must make *some* assumption on how the source to be sampled is chosen

at each time instance. The assumption that we make in this paper is that for every l , $|I_l| \geq m$ for some $m > 0$. This means that once the system enters a certain state, it stays at least m time units in that state. To the best of our knowledge, this assumption did not appear in the literature before. With this assumption, our main result, Theorem 3.4, states that if x is a sample from the Interval Model, then a maximum likelihood HMM estimator for the sequence x will produce an HMM with source distributions that approximate the distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k . In other words, we show that an HMM estimator learns the correct source distributions despite the fact that the sequence was not generated by an HMM. We refer to this phenomenon as the *resilience* of the HMM. Our result can be viewed as an extension of the classical HMM consistency results, [Baum and Petrie, 1966], [Petrie, 1969] as well as an extension of the more recent consistency under misspecification results, [Mevel and Finesso, 2004]. On the application side, our results provide a better theoretical understanding of the methods that are already widely used.

The Interval Model with the minimal m duration assumption is a fairly general model. Indeed, except for the minimal duration m for each state, we *make no other assumptions about the transitions* between the intervals. The transitions between different states *need not follow any deterministic or probabilistic pattern*, and in particular the process x *does not need to be stationary* and moreover, it *does not need to be ergodic*. The intervals themselves also can be of arbitrary lengths, provided it is larger than m . Therefore the Interval Model setting can be best described as partly stochastic and partly adversarial (see [Huang et al., 2011]). The values x_i are obtained by sampling from the sources, but the choice of changes of the sources can be arbitrary and hence adversarial. In addition, we do not require m to be known apriori but the precision of approximation of Theorem 3.4 will grow with m , with explicit bounds.

While in this paper we are concerned with estimating the source distributions, we note that once the sources are known, the problem of classifying the data according to the source is relatively easy. For instance one could use a sliding window over the data, $w_i = (x_i, \dots, x_{i+l})$, and for each i decide which source is the most likely to produce w_i . Note that if the sources are known, one can easily compute the length l of the window that is required to distinguish between the sources with high probability. Clearly, the more distinct the sources are, the smaller l is required. In cases where l is small compared to m , it is straightforward obtain guarantees on the accuracy of this method. We note that in contrast, the standard HMM decoding approach, the Viterbi sequence, does not in general have any guarantees and for the non-stationary Interval Model type data can be significantly inaccurate.

We now proceed to discuss our results in more detail. Consider a sample $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ generated from an Interval Model I as discussed above. We describe the behaviour of a maximum likelihood HMM estimator on such a sequence in two stages. First, we show that with high probability, there exists an HMM H_0 which assigns a high likelihood to the sequence x . Specifically, we

show that there is an HMM that assigns log-likelihood

$$L(H_0, x) = \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{H_0}(x) \geq -\frac{\log(2k \cdot m)}{m} - \sum_{j \leq k} w_j H(\mu_j) \quad (1)$$

to x , where w_j is the proportion of indices $i \leq N$ sampled from μ_j and $H(\mu_j)$ are the entropies of the sources. As detailed in the proofs, the term $-\sum_{i \leq k} w_i H(\mu_i)$ is the normalized log-likelihood that the model I itself assigns to a typical sample x , and it represents the true likelihood of the data. Therefore $L(H_0, x)$ is a sum of a true likelihood, and an error term which decreases with increasing m . The log-likelihood (1) is achieved on an HMM that has emission distributions μ_i identical to those of I , and the probability of a state change in this HMM is of order $\frac{1}{m}$.

In view of this, the main difficulty resolved in this paper, and the main technical contribution, consists in showing that if a fixed HMM H has emission distributions that significantly differ from μ_1, \dots, μ_k , then the log-likelihood it assigns to x is lower than (1). We remark that due to the hidden states, the likelihood function of an HMM is a complicated quantity which is usually controlled implicitly, see the discussion in [Douc et al., 2011]. On the other hand, in this paper we show that by appropriate use of type theories (for both the model I and for a Markov chain) we can give explicit bounds on the likelihood for finite N . While type theory is a well known information theoretic tool, the particular combination of arguments that allows us to control the likelihood of an HMM is new.

To use type theory we will introduce the second moments of the model I and the HMM. Roughly speaking, for each $a, b \in \mathbb{X}$ and a random vector X , the second moment $M_X(a, b)$ is the probability that $x_i = a$ and $x_{i+1} = b$ averaged over all i . The second moment captures a basic temporal structure of the process. The main technical result of the paper, Theorem 3.3, shows that if the second moment of an HMM H , denoted M_H , differs from the moment for the model I , M_I , then for most samples x from I , the likelihood $L(H, x)$ will be low. Combined with additional arguments, this will imply that the maximum likelihood HMM will have the correct second moment.

It is now natural to ask how much information does the second moment H contain about the emission distributions ν_i of H ? In particular, is it true that if $M_I = M_H$ then the model I and H have the same set of emission distributions? In general, the answer to this question is negative. Elegant counterexamples can be found in [Chang, 1996] (see also [Anandkumar et al., 2012]). However, it is also well known and easy to see that the column space of the second moment matrices is spanned by the emission distributions. We will see that a similar statement holds for our definitions of moments, which somewhat differ from the classical ones. Therefore, if M_I and M_H are known, we can reconstruct the k -dimensional subspaces $\text{span}\{\mu_j\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{X}|}$ and $\text{span}\{\nu_j\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{X}|}$ spanned by emissions of I and H respectively. Note that in order to specify a measure on $|\mathbb{X}|$ points one needs $|\mathbb{X}| - 1$ parameters, but if one knows that the measure belongs to a given k -dimensional subspace, then only $k - 1$ parameters are required.

Since k is typically much smaller than $|\mathcal{X}|$, this means that the second moment contains most of the information about the emissions (consider the case $k = 2$ and $|\mathcal{X}| = 100$ for the sake of illustration).

Finally, we note that our approach can be extended to moments higher than two. Indeed, the main combinatorial tool used in this paper is type theory for second moments of Markov chains as developed in [Csiszár et al., 1987], where higher moments analog is also presented. However, all the ideas necessary for such an extension are present already in the second moment case and in this paper we restrict our attention only to the second moments.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we review the literature. Section 3 contains the definitions and the statements of the results, as well as a sketch of our main technical argument. We conclude by a discussion in Section 4. For clarity of presentation, the full proofs are deferred to Section 5.

2 Related Work

As noted in the Introduction, real data often does not behave as a sequence generated by an HMM. Some aspects of this problem may be addressed via the notion of Hidden *semi*-Markov Models (HSMMs, see the survey [Yu, 2010]). HSMM is an extension of an HMM which was developed in recent years to overcome a particular issue of state duration. In a Markov process, and hence in an HMM, the time the system stays in a given state is always a geometric, memoryless random variable, with an expectation that may depend on the state. In a semi-Markov model, the duration of a stay in a given state is allowed to be an arbitrary random variable depending on the current state. While HSMMs were shown to be more suitable than the HMMs in a large variety of cases, this comes at a cost. Since one can not realistically model arbitrary duration times, one can either resort to parametric families of distributions that might be better suited to a particular application than the geometric variable, or one may consider arbitrarily distributed but bounded duration times. The first option requires expert knowledge of the application domain, while the second introduces a huge space of parameters and is still limited in what it can model (due to boundedness). See [Yu, 2010] for a detailed account of the advantages and the issues with HSMMs.

The approach of this paper provides a different perspective on the issue of duration times. Indeed, while an HSMM provides a more general model of transitions between the states of the system than HMM, we show that if we want to estimate the source distributions, then under Interval Model assumptions we *do not need* to model the transitions between the states at all, and the simple HMM estimator suffices. This has run time and sample complexity advantages, but more importantly – we are guaranteed an approximation to the true sources without the need to guess and to model the transitions between the states.

It is worth emphasizing that in some situations modelling the transitions is important. For instance, in speech recognition certain phonemes are much more

likely to occur after certain other phonemes, and this transition information is important for the applications. However, in other situations, such as the financial time series and human activity series described in the Introduction, it is unlikely that there exists any stationary probabilistic model of the transitions. Hence it is important to know that an estimation procedure works for any, possibly non-stationary or non-probabilistic transition mechanism, as expressed by the Interval Model and guaranteed by our results.

A problem setup somewhat similar to the Interval Model was recently investigated in [Khaleghi and Ryabko, 2014], in the context of change point detection methods. Similarly to the Interval Model, in the model of [Khaleghi and Ryabko, 2014] the data is composed from intervals, and each interval is generated by one of k sources. Moreover, the sources there can be arbitrary stationary processes, which is significantly more general than the independent processes which we consider in this paper. However, the results of [Khaleghi and Ryabko, 2014] hold only in the asymptotic regime where the number of intervals is fixed and the number of samples N goes to infinity. This means that the length of each individual interval is required to go to infinity with N . This makes the problem simpler, since in this regime one can essentially learn the source from a single interval. In contrast, in the Interval Model we require the intervals to be of minimal length m , but we do not require the lengths to go to infinity with N , and our approximation results hold for any fixed $m \geq 2$. This regime requires the estimator to combine the information from *all* the intervals in the sample to estimate the sources, and our approach uses methods completely different from those of [Khaleghi and Ryabko, 2014].

We now turn to a discussion of the literature related to the more technical aspects of this paper. The classical consistency result for HMMs, [Baum and Petrie, 1966], [Petrie, 1969], states that if $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an infinite sequence generated by an HMM H , and H_n is a sequence of maximum likelihood estimators for the growing sequences $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$, then H_n converges to H with probability 1 (over x). A key technical component of these results is an extension of the Shannon-McMillan-Breiman Theorem. This extension deals with the asymptotic behaviour of the likelihood assigned by a given HMM to a sequence generated by a different HMM. The original results were formulated and proved for finite state HMMs with a finite value alphabet \mathbb{X} , and with additional light restrictions on H . More recently, several results have appeared which extend the consistency theorem to HMMs with more general state and value spaces, and investigate the conditions under which such extensions are possible. See for instance [Le Gland and Mevel, 2000], [Douc et al., 2011].

Our result can also be viewed as an extension of the consistency theorem, but in a different direction. We consider only finite state HMMs and finite value spaces \mathbb{X} , but we do not assume that x is generated by an HMM. The study of such questions, known as *misspecification* results, started only recently. The results in [Mével and Finesso, 2004] characterize the behaviour of a maximum likelihood estimator for HMMs when x is generated by general ergodic processes satisfying some mixing-type conditions. In particular it is shown that the sequence H_n of maximum likelihood estimators converges to an HMM H

such that the limiting Kullback-Leibler divergence between H and the process generating x is minimal (see [Mével and Finesso, 2004], Section IV). However, neither the result nor its proof supply any information about what the minimizing H actually is, and are therefore of a limited practical value. We note, however, that such a limitation is in fact unavoidable, due to the generality of the setup. If all we know about x is that it is generated by a general ergodic process, it is unlikely that anything concrete can be said about H . On the other hand, in this paper we assume a specific structure of the process x , namely that it is generated by an interval model, and we show that in this case, the source distributions of H approximate those of I . Therefore, our result can also be viewed as a statement about the properties of the minimizer H for the case when x is generated by I .

In all of the above mentioned work on consistency and misspecification, the assumption of ergodicity of the process generating x plays a crucial role and the underlying proof methods rely heavily on this assumption. It is therefore interesting to note that in this work we do not require the Interval Model to be ergodic. The details on the relation between the Interval Model and ergodicity are given in Section 5.1. Here we mention that in contrast to the existing methods, our approach *provides inequalities that are valid for finite N* rather than asymptotic results, which allows us to avoid the global ergodicity assumption and to work in the more general adversarial setting.

Moments of the data play an important role in our approach. In recent years, moments of the data have been used for parameter estimation in various mixture models. For instance, in [Arora et al., 2012], [Arora et al., 2013], it was shown that for several types of mixture models, the underlying distributions μ_j can be inferred from the second moment of the data under an “anchor words” assumption on μ_j s. In [Anandkumar et al., 2012] it was shown that for a sufficiently large number of samples and under lighter assumptions on μ_j , the third moment of the data can be used to reconstruct μ_j for a variety of mixtures, including the HMM. Note that the use of moments in this paper is different. Our estimator is the classical maximum likelihood estimator rather than an estimator based on moments. We use moments only as a tool to show that properties of the estimator approximate the properties of the true model.

Finally, we make essential use of type theory for Markov chains. The results we use were obtained in [Csiszár et al., 1987], where second order and higher order type theory is developed.

3 Definitions and Results

In Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 we introduce the notions necessary to state the results. Section 3.4 contains the statements and outlines of the proofs.

3.1 Preliminaries

For a finite set S , denote by Δ_S the set of all probability measures on S . For any two probability distributions $\mu, \nu \in \Delta_{\mathbb{X}}$, define the entropy and the Kullback-Leibler divergence by

$$H(\mu) = - \sum_{a \in \mathbb{X}} \mu(a) \log \mu(a) \quad (2)$$

and

$$D(\nu|\mu) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{X}} \nu(a) \log \frac{\nu(a)}{\mu(a)}. \quad (3)$$

The total variation distance between $\mu, \nu \in \Delta_{\mathbb{X}}$ is given by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \sum_{s \in S} |\mu(s) - \nu(s)|. \quad (4)$$

3.2 Models

An Interval Model is a tuple $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$, where I_l is a sequence of consecutive intervals, $I_l = [b_l, e_l] \subset \mathbb{N}$, such that $b_1 = 1$, and $b_{l+1} = e_l + 1$ for all l , μ_i are probability measures on a fixed finite ground set \mathbb{X} , $\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ is an assignment of distributions to intervals, and $m > 0$ is such that $|I_l| \geq m$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that a sequence of random variables with values in \mathbb{X} , $X = X_1, X_2, \dots$, is distributed according to interval model I , denoted $X \sim I$, if X_i are independent and for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in I_l$, X_i has distribution $\mu_{\tau(l)}$.

For any finite N , let the weights $\{w_j\}$ be the proportions of each of the states μ_j in the data. Specifically, define

$$K_j(N) = \{i \leq N \mid i \in I_l \text{ and } \tau(l) = j\} \quad (5)$$

to be the set of indices $i \leq N$ such that $X_i \sim \mu_j$ and set

$$w_j = w_j(N) = \frac{1}{N} |K_j(N)|. \quad (6)$$

Note that w_i depends on N . For brevity of the notation this dependence is always assumed but not explicitly written.

Throughout the paper we assume for convenience that $m > 2$.

For each time $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\kappa(i)$ to be the index of the distribution of X_i , meaning $\kappa(i) = \tau(l)$ where l is such that $i \in I_l$.

A Hidden Markov Model, HMM, is a tuple $H = H(S, \{\nu_i\}_1^k, \{p_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k)$ where $S = \{1, \dots, k\}$ is a state space, ν_i are corresponding emission probabilities, and $p_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1} = j | S_t = i)$ for the Markov chain S_1, S_2, S_3, \dots of the states.

For a sequence $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$, the log-likelihood of x under the HMM H with initial distribution π is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
L(x, H, \pi) &= \\
&= \frac{1}{N+1} \log \left(\sum_{s=s_1, \dots, s_{N+1}} \pi(s_1) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^N p_{s_i, s_{i+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{N+1} \nu_{s_i}(x_i) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the sum is over all possible paths of length $N+1$ of the underlying Markov chain.

3.3 Moments

For a sequence $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$, the second moment is a probability distribution $M(x) \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}$, defined by

$$M(x)(a, b) = \frac{1}{N} |\{i \leq N \mid x_i = a \wedge x_{i+1} = b\}| \tag{8}$$

for all $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$. The second moment describes the frequencies of observing each pair of symbols a, b consecutively. For a random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{N+1})$, the second moment is the expectation of moments over all realizations of X ,

$$M_X = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X} M(x). \tag{9}$$

For instance, if X_i are independent and have the same distribution μ , then $M_X(a, b) = \mu(a) \cdot \mu(b)$.

To obtain an expression for the second moments for interval model I , define for fixed N

$$c_{rl} = |\{i < N+1 \mid \kappa(i) = r \wedge \kappa(i+1) = l\}|. \tag{10}$$

c_{rl} counts the transitions from state r to state l in the model, up to time $N+1$. Then, if $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{N+1}) \sim I$, we have

$$M_X(a, b) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r, l \leq k} c_{rl} \mu_r(a) \cdot \mu_l(b). \tag{11}$$

Next, to state our technical result, Theorem 3.3, we will require a definition of a *generalized second moment* of an HMM. To motivate this definition, let us first write (11) in a slightly different form. Denote for every $r, l \leq k$, $u_{rl} = \frac{c_{rl}}{N}$ and set $u_r = \sum_{l \leq k} u_{rl}$. Then one can write (11) as

$$\begin{aligned}
M_X(a, b) &= \\
&= (u_1 \mu_1(a), \dots, u_k \mu_k(a)) \begin{pmatrix} \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & u_{ij} & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1(b) \\ \vdots \\ \mu_k(b) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Equivalently, we have

$$M_X(a, b) = \phi_a \cdot U \cdot \chi_b, \tag{13}$$

where $\phi_a = (u_1\mu_1(a), \dots, u_k\mu_k(a))^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\chi_b = (\mu_1(b), \dots, \mu_k(b)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and U is the $k \times k$ matrix $U = (u_{ij})$.

Now, given an HMM $H = H(S, \{\nu_i\}_1^k, \{p_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k)$, and a set of arbitrary vectors $\phi = \{\phi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we define the *generalized second moment* of H as a matrix $M_{\phi, H} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ given by

$$M_{\phi, H}(a, b) = \phi_a \cdot p \cdot \chi_b, \quad (14)$$

where analogously to (13) we have $\chi_b = (\mu_1(b), \dots, \mu_k(b)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, but ϕ_a are arbitrary. The reasons for requiring this definition will become apparent during the proof of Theorem 3.3.

We call a set of vectors $\phi = \{\phi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{X}}$ as above *proper* if all the entries of all ϕ_a are non-negative, and

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{j \leq k} \phi_a(j) = 1. \quad (15)$$

If ϕ is a proper system, define a probability measure d_ϕ on \mathcal{X} by

$$d_\phi(a) = \sum_{j \leq k} \phi_a(j). \quad (16)$$

We conclude this section by stating the connection between column spaces of M_X , $M_{\phi, H}$, and spaces spanned by $\{\mu_j\}_{j \leq k}$ and $\{\nu_j\}_{j \leq k}$ respectively. Note that for any matrix M , the column space of M coincides with the image of M , $Im(M)$ as an operator $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$.

Lemma 3.1. 1. *If $X \sim I$ for an interval model I . Then $Im(M_X) \subset span\{\mu_j\}_{j \leq k}$.*

2. *For an HMM H and an arbitrary set $\{\phi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{X}}$, $Im(M_{\phi, H}) \subset span\{\nu_j\}_{j \leq k}$.*

The proof is given in Section 5.2.

Finally, for any $M \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}$, define the left and right marginalizations, $\bar{M}, \bar{\bar{M}} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ by

$$\bar{M}(a) = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} M(a, b), \quad \bar{\bar{M}}(a) = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} M(b, a). \quad (17)$$

3.4 Results

As discussed in the Introduction, the first part of argument consists in showing that there is an HMM H that assigns high likelihood to most of the samples from I . This is formalized in the following Lemma.

Given an Interval Model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$, for any $N > 0$ we define

$$N_{min} = \min_{j \leq k} w_j \cdot N, \quad (18)$$

with w_j as defined in (6).

Lemma 3.2. For any set of probability distributions $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^k$, there exists a function $\varepsilon : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(N) \rightarrow 0$ and such that the following holds:

For any Interval Model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$, there is an HMM H and an initial distribution π , such that for every $N > 0$, if $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \sim I$ then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon(N_{min})$,

$$L(X, H, \pi) \geq -\frac{\log 2km}{m} - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) - \varepsilon(N_{min}). \quad (19)$$

The proof is given in Section 5.3. We take a moment to discuss the particular dependence on N exhibited in the above Lemma. The fact that the error term $\varepsilon(N_{min})$ in (19) depends on N_{min} rather than N means that in order for $\varepsilon(N_{min})$ to be small, the interval $[1, \dots, N]$ needs to contain a sufficient number of samples from every one of the distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k . As will be evident from the proof, this assumption is necessary to obtain (19). On the other hand, the function ε is completely determined by the distributions $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^k$. In other words, in order to control the error in (19) for a model I , we only need to know its distributions, and in particular ε does not depend on the particular interval structure of the model.

We are now ready to state the main result of this paper. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ be generated by an Interval Model I . For an HMM H define

$$D = D(H) = \inf_{\phi \in P} \|M_X - M_{\phi, H}\|_{TV} - \frac{3}{m}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$P = \left\{ \phi \mid \phi \text{ is proper and } \|d_\phi - \bar{M}_X\|_{TV} \leq \frac{3}{m} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

In other words, D measures how well M_X can be approximated by a generalized moment $M_{\phi, H}$ where ϕ can be any proper system with d_ϕ close to the marginal \bar{M}_X . To gain some intuition into this quantity, consider the case where D is small, and M_X has the maximal rank, k . Then, standard matrix perturbation theory results imply that $Im(M_X)$ is close to $Im(M_{\phi, H})$ and hence $span\{\mu_j\}_{j \leq k}$ is close to $span\{\nu_j\}_{j \leq k}$ by Lemma 3.1. Note also that the set P in (21) is non-empty. Indeed, the proper system ϕ defined in (13) satisfies $d_\phi = \bar{M}_X$.

We assume throughout the paper that $D \geq 0$, which amounts to considering only the cases where $M_{\phi, H}$ at least somewhat differs from M_X .

Theorem 3.3. There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any set of probability distributions $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^k$, there exists functions ε and r such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(N) \rightarrow 0$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} r(N) \rightarrow c$ and the following holds:

For any Interval Model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$, and HMM $H = H(S, \{\nu_i\}_1^k, \{p_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k)$, if $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ is a sample from I then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_{N_{min}}$ over X , for every initial distribution π ,

$$L(x, H, \pi) \leq -D^2 - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) + \varepsilon(N_{min}), \quad (22)$$

where D is as defined in (20).

The proof is given in Section 5.4. Here we briefly describe the main idea of the proof. Fix an Interval Model I , an HMM H , and $N > 0$. Define a neighbourhood $U \subset \Delta_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}}$ of M_X by

$$U = \left\{ M \in \Delta_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}} \mid \|M - M_X\|_{TV} \leq \frac{3}{m} \right\}, \quad (23)$$

and denote by O the set of all sequences $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ such that $M(x) \in U$. Roughly speaking, the proof of (22) can be seen as a combination of two different uses of type theory. First, the type theory of Markov chains can be used to show that if an HMM H satisfies (20), then the likelihood assigned to the set O by H is at most 2^{-ND^2} ,

$$\mathbb{P}_H(O) = \sum_{x \in O} 2^{NL(x, H, \pi)} \leq 2^{-ND^2}. \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, type theory for independent sequences together with additional concentration results can be used to show that O contains a subset $X^l \subset O$ of size at least $2^{N \cdot (\sum_j w_j H(\mu_j))}$ such that all $x \in X^l$ are equiprobable with respect to X and X^l is of nearly full measure, $\mathbb{P}_X(X^l) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Combing these two statements, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{|X^l|} \sum_{x \in X^l} \mathbb{P}_H(x) \leq \frac{1}{|X^l|} \mathbb{P}_H(O) \leq 2^{-N(D^2 + \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j))}. \quad (25)$$

Note that (25) is in fact an averaged version of (22). The corresponding high probability formulation can be easily obtained via Markov's inequality.

Finally, we state our main result about the behaviour of the maximum likelihood HMM estimator on samples of model I . For $\delta > 0$, let \mathcal{H}_δ be the set of HMMs for which transition and emission probabilities are bounded below by δ ,

$$\mathcal{H}_\delta = \left\{ H(S, \{\nu_i\}_1^k, \{p_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k) \right\} \quad (26)$$

where ν_i and p_{ij} satisfy

$$\nu_i(x) \geq \delta \quad \forall i \leq k, x \in \mathbb{X} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{ij} \geq \delta \quad \forall i, j \leq k. \quad (27)$$

In what follows we assume that the HMM guaranteed by Lemma 3.2 is in \mathcal{H}_δ . This is equivalent to the following:

$$\delta \leq \frac{1}{m} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta \leq \mu_j(x) \quad \forall j \leq k, x \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (28)$$

Theorem 3.4. *Fix the distributions $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^k$ and $m > 0$. For any δ satisfying (28) there is a constant $c > 0$, a function r such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} r(N) \rightarrow c$ and a sequence ε_N with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ such that the following holds: Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ be a sample from Interval Model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$.*

Let H be a maximum likelihood estimator in \mathcal{H}_δ for the sequence X . Then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_{N_{min}}$ over X ,

$$D(H) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log 3km}{m}}. \quad (29)$$

Corollary 3.5. Let $X = (X_N)_{N=1}^\infty$ be an infinite sample from an infinite Interval Model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$. Let H_N be a sequence of maximum likelihood estimators for the sequences (X_1, \dots, X_N) . Then with probability 1,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} D(H_N) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log 3km}{m}}. \quad (30)$$

We now make a few remarks about the proof. The proof of Theorem 3.4 is obtained by an application of Theorem 3.3 to an appropriate (multiplicative) ε -net inside the set \mathcal{H}_δ and by the union bound. For this approach to work the log-likelihood needs to be a Lipschitz function of the HMM H . This is guaranteed by the assumption $H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$, with the Lipschitz constant depending on δ . This assumption is common in the literature and is used for similar purposes, although it is usually used somewhat differently. Moreover, this assumption can be easily removed if we let $N \rightarrow \infty$ in the Theorem statement, as formalized in Corollary 3.5. Note that in contrast to existing consistency results, since we do not assume ergodicity of I , the sequence H_N in the statement of Corollary 3.5 does not necessarily converge to a limit. Nevertheless, inequality (30) holds. Another remark concerns the magnitude of N required for (29) to hold with high probability. While the size of ε -net in \mathcal{H}_δ is exponential in k and $|\mathcal{X}|$, the probability of error in Theorem 3.3 is essentially exponentially small in N . Therefore for the union bound to hold, it suffices for N to be polynomial in k and $|\mathcal{X}|$. The complete proof is given in Section 5.5.

4 Discussion

In this work we considered time series generated by a finite state system, with an assumption that the states are somewhat *persistent*, in the sense that the system stays at a state at least m time units before the state changes. The advantage of such an assumption is that for a variety of systems it may be fairly realistic, and that it is minimal in the sense that we do not attempt to model the transition mechanism of the system between different states. Indeed, we show that for *any* such mechanism, the distributions of the sources can still be approximated. An apparent paradox of this result is that we show that the approximation can be done using an HMM estimator, and HMM estimator *does* assume a particular transition mechanism between the states. The resolution of this paradox, and the reason that the approach works, is that when the states have the persistence property, the transition mechanism provably has little influence on certain statistics (the likelihood and the moments, for this paper) of the system.

From a purely technical perspective, one possible extension of this work would be to relax the assumption that the system should spend at least m time units at each state. It should be enough for a system to satisfy this assumption most of the time rather than strictly every time it enters a new state. We believe such an extension can be proved using the approach developed in this paper. Another possible extension is to replace the discrete emission distributions used in this paper by some continuous class, such as the Gaussians.

From a more general perspective, we believe that the idea of replacing fully generative models by more adversarial settings may be extended to other estimation problems. Consider for instance topic modelling, where topics are distributions and documents are samples from mixtures of topics. By far the most popular generative model used to learn topics is the Latent Dirichlet Allocation, (LDA, [Blei et al., 2003]). LDA proposes a particular mechanism by which the documents are generated from the topics. LDA often performs extremely well in practice, despite the fact that real documents are clearly not generated by the LDA mechanism. This indicates that, analogously to our HMM results, there might exist some persistence properties of the topics which would guarantee that the topics are recovered by maximum likelihood LDA despite the fact that the documents were not generated by LDA. Identification of such persistence properties could contribute, for instance, to model independent (or less model-dependent) definitions of topics.

5 Proofs

5.1 Interval Model and Ergodicity

In this section we discuss the relation between the Interval Model and ergodicity. For the purposes of this discussion, a process $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N, \dots)$ is ergodic if there exists a distribution μ on \mathbb{X} such that for every $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X_i) = \int f(x) d\mu(x) \quad (31)$$

with probability 1 over X . Ergodicity means that space integrals with respect to μ can be recovered by a time average over a single trajectory of the process. If the process X is generated by an interval model, then for every N we can write

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X_i) = \sum_{j \leq k} w_j \frac{1}{|K_j|} \sum_{i \in K_j} f(X_i), \quad (32)$$

with the sets K_j as defined in (5). Since X_i with $i \in K_j$ are independent, if $|K_j| \rightarrow \infty$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{|K_j|} \sum_{i \in K_j} f(X_i) \rightarrow \int f(x) d\mu_j(x) \quad (33)$$

by the law of large numbers. Therefore (32) converges if and only if for each $j \leq k$, $w_j(N)$ converges to some limiting value \hat{w}_j with $N \rightarrow \infty$, in which case the limiting measure is $\mu = \sum_{j \leq k} \hat{w}_j \mu_j$. This situation demonstrates well the general line of reasoning used in this paper. We will assume that $|K_j|$ is large enough for integrals with respect to each component to converge (this corresponds to large N_{min} in the statements of the results), as in (33), but we will *not* require the more global condition that the weights $w_j(N)$ converge.

5.2 Preliminaries

In what follows it will be convenient to use the tensor notation for operators – for any two vectors $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{X}}$, $v \otimes w$ is a rank 1 linear operator $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{X}}$, which acts by $(v \otimes w)(u) = \langle u, v \rangle \cdot w$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{X}}$. In particular, for $a, b \in \mathbb{X}$ we have $\langle (v \otimes w)\delta_a, \delta_b \rangle = v(a) \cdot w(b)$.

For instance, if $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{N+1})$ all X_i are independent with distribution μ then

$$M_X = \mu \otimes \mu. \quad (34)$$

If $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{N+1}) \sim I$ is a sample from the interval model, we can write 11 equivalently as

$$M_X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r, l \leq k} c_{rl} \mu_r \otimes \mu_l. \quad (35)$$

An important property of the interval model is that the number of transitions between *different* states in the model is small. We formalize it in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *For an interval model I and $N > 0$, for every $r, l \leq k$, let c_{rl} be the state transition counts, as defined in (10). Then*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{r \neq l} c_{rl} \leq \frac{1}{m}. \quad (36)$$

Proof. Indeed, since interval length is at least m , the set $\{1, \dots, N+1\}$ contains at most $\lceil (N+1)/m \rceil$ different intervals and hence at most $\lceil (N+1)/m \rceil - 1$ transitions. \square

It follows from (36) that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r \neq l} c_{rl} \mu_r \otimes \mu_l \right\|_{TV} = \left\| M_X - \sum_{i \leq k} w_i \mu_i \otimes \mu_i \right\|_{TV} \leq \frac{1}{m}. \quad (37)$$

We refer to the expression

$$M_{X, pure} = \sum_{i \leq k} w_i \mu_i \otimes \mu_i \quad (38)$$

as a *pure* moment and to the expression

$$M_{X,mixed} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r \neq l} c_{rl} \mu_r \otimes \mu_l \quad (39)$$

as a *mixed* moment. The pure moment captures the contribution to the moment inside each interval, while the mixed moment captures the contribution from transitions between the intervals.

Finally, we prove Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The statement for M_X follows directly from (11). To show the statement for $M_{\phi,H}$, for any $\phi_a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $i \leq k$ let $\phi_a(i)$ be the i -th coordinate of ϕ_a . For every $i \leq k$, define $\hat{\phi}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ by $\hat{\phi}_i(a) = \phi_a(i)$. Then by the definition, (14),

$$M_{H,\pi}(a, b) = \sum_{i \leq k} \sum_{j \leq k} p_{ij} \phi_a(i) \nu_j(b), \quad (40)$$

and hence

$$M_{H,\pi} = \sum_{i,j \leq k} p_{ij} \hat{\phi}_i \otimes \nu_j. \quad (41)$$

Since the image of $\hat{\phi}_i \otimes \nu_j$ is spanned by ν_j , it follows that $Im(M_{H,\pi}) \subset span\{\nu_j\}_{j=1}^k$. \square

5.3 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Consider an HMM H with k states, $S = \{1, \dots, k\}$, with emission probabilities equal to those of the model I , μ_i , and some transition matrix, p_{ij} . In order to show the lower bound on L , it suffices to consider a single path of the HMM. Let $s = s_1, \dots, s_N$ be a sequence of states of H that follows precisely the sequence of states in I , so that $s_i = \kappa(i)$. Let the initial distribution π be a delta measure concentrated on the first state of I , $\kappa(1)$. Recall that the likelihood $L(x, H, \pi) = \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{H,\pi}(x)$ is given by a sum (7). The contribution of a single path s in this sum is

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j \leq k} c_{ij} \log p_{ij} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_i \log \mu_j(x_i^j). \quad (42)$$

where c_{ij} are the transition counts of the model I , as in (10), and x_i^j are the entries of X , rearranged so that for all i , x_i^j are entries sampled from μ_j . Consider the second term first,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_i \log \mu_j(x_i^j) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{c_{jj}}{N} \frac{1}{c_{jj}} \sum_i \log \mu_j(x_i^j). \quad (43)$$

Clearly, by the law of large numbers, $\frac{1}{c_{jj}} \sum_i \log \mu_j(x_i^j) \rightarrow -H(\mu_j)$ with $|c_{jj}| \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, the first term in (42),

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,k \leq k} c_{ij} \log p_{ij} \quad (44)$$

controls the underlying Markov chain probability of the path s . Since the total number of transitions between different states in the model is small, see (36), this probability is large when p_{ii} are close to 1. In particular, by choosing $p_{ii} = 1 - \frac{1}{m}$ and $p_{ij} = \frac{1}{(k-1)m}$ for all i and $j \neq i$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,k \leq k} c_{ij} \log p_{ij} = \quad (45)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \leq k} c_{ii} \log(1 - \frac{1}{m}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} c_{ij} \log \frac{1}{(k-1)m} \geq \quad (46)$$

$$-\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m^2} - \frac{1}{m} \log(k-1)m \geq \quad (47)$$

$$-\frac{\log 2km}{m} \quad (48)$$

where in line (47) we have used (36) and the fact that

$$\log(1 - \frac{1}{m}) \geq -\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m^2} \quad (49)$$

for $m \geq 2$. □

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ be distributed according to an interval model I . We first show that the empirical second moment of a sample x is close to its expected second moment, M_X .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ be distributed according to the interval model $I = I(\{I_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^k, \tau, m)$. Denote*

$$\tilde{w} = \min_{i \leq k} w_i. \quad (50)$$

Then for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_X \left(\|M(x) - M_X\|_{TV} \geq \varepsilon + \frac{2}{m} \right) \leq 2^{-c_1 \tilde{w} N \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|x|^4} - \frac{c_2 \log k}{\tilde{w} N} \right)}, \quad (51)$$

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are absolute constants.

Before we proceed with the proof, note the particular form of the error, $\varepsilon + \frac{2}{m}$, in (51). As we show in what follows, the pure component of M_X , (38), can be approximated by the pure component of $M(x)$ to arbitrary precision, giving rise to the ε term in the error. However, the mixed component of M_X will not necessarily be approximated well by the mixed part of $M(x)$, but has a small norm, (37) and gives rise to the $\frac{1}{m}$ term in the error. To see why the mixed moment of M_X might not be well approximated by the mixed part of $M(x)$, recall that we do not place any assumptions on the transitions between different states in the interval model. In particular, for $r \neq l$, c_{rl} need not be large and consequently there may not be enough samples to recover $\mu_r \otimes \mu_l$.

Proof Of Lemma 5.2. We first consider samples from each state j separately and show that they approximate $\mu_j \otimes \mu_j$ well. This can be achieved by standard methods if the samples are independent. We therefore divide the indices into independent pairs. Let

$$A_j = \{i < N + 1 \mid \kappa(i) = j \text{ and } \kappa(i + 1) = j\} \quad (52)$$

be the set of indices i such that $X_i \sim \mu_j$ and set

$$B = \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus (\cup_{j \leq k} A_j) \quad (53)$$

to be the set of indices where the transitions between intervals occur. Divide A_j into a set of odd pairs and even pairs as follows:

$$A_j^1 = \{(i, i + 1) \mid i \in A_j, i \text{ is odd}\}, \quad (54)$$

$$A_j^2 = \{(i, i + 1) \mid i \in A_j, i \text{ is even}\}. \quad (55)$$

For instance, if $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) \subset A_j$, then $(1, 2), (3, 4), (5, 6)$ are odd pairs, and $(2, 3), (4, 5)$ are even. Then the pairs in each A_j^t are mutually independent. Hence they can be considered i.i.d samples from the measure $\mu_j \times \mu_j$. To estimate how well independent empirical samples of $\mu_j \times \mu_j$ approximate $\mu_j \times \mu_j$, we use the Dvoretzky Kiefer Wolfowitz inequality, [Dvoretzky et al., 1956], which bounds the sup distance between the empirical and true distribution. Specifically, if μ is a probability distribution on a set S and Y_1, \dots, Y_N are independent samples from μ , it follows from the Dvoretzky Kiefer Wolfowitz inequality that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in S} \left| \mu(s) - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \leq N} \delta_{Y_i} \right) (s) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp(-2N\varepsilon^2) \quad (56)$$

for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$. We apply this with $S = \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$, $\mu = \mu_j \times \mu_j$ and $Y_i = (X_i, X_{i+1})$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{X}$, $j \leq k$ and $t \in \{1, 2\}$, let

$$R_{j,t}(a, b) = \mu_j(a)\mu_j(b) - \frac{1}{|A_j^t|} \sum_{(i, i+1) \in A_j^t} \delta(X_i = a) \cdot \delta(X_{i+1} = b) \quad (57)$$

be the difference between the empirical and the true measures. Then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{a,b \in \mathbb{X}} |R_{j,t}(a,b)| \geq \varepsilon / |\mathbb{X}|^2 \right) \leq 2^{-c|A_j^t| \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\mathbb{X}|^4}}. \quad (58)$$

Since $\|R_{j,t}\|_{TV} \leq |\mathbb{X}|^2 \sup_{a,b} |R_{j,t}(a,b)|$, we obtain the total variation bound

$$\mathbb{P} (\|R_{j,t}\|_{TV} \geq \varepsilon) \leq 2^{-c|A_j^t| \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\mathbb{X}|^4}}. \quad (59)$$

Since $|A_j^t| \approx \frac{1}{2} w_j N$, the union bound over all j, t implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{j,t} \|R_{j,t}\|_{TV} \geq \varepsilon \right) &\leq 2k \cdot 2^{-c\bar{w}N \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\mathbb{X}|^4}} \\ &\leq 2^{-c\bar{w}N \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\mathbb{X}|^4} - \frac{c_1 \log k}{\bar{w}N} \right)} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

for an appropriate absolute constant $c_1 > 0$. Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} M(x)(a,b) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \leq k} \sum_{t \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{i \in A_j^t} \delta_{x_i}(a) \delta_{x_{i+1}}(b) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in B} \delta_{x_i}(a) \delta_{x_{i+1}}(b) \\ &= \\ &\quad \sum_{j \leq k} \sum_{t \in \{1,2\}} \frac{|A_j^t|}{N} \frac{1}{|A_j^t|} \sum_{i \in A_j^t} \delta_{x_i}(a) \delta_{x_{i+1}}(b) \\ &\quad + \frac{|B|}{N} \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{i \in B} \delta_{x_i}(a) \delta_{x_{i+1}}(b). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} M(x) - M_X &= \\ &\quad \sum_{j \leq k} \sum_{t \in \{1,2\}} \frac{|A_j^t|}{N} R_{j,t} \\ &\quad - M_{X,mixed} + \frac{|B|}{N} \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{i \in B} \delta_{x_i}(a). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

By (36) and (37), the total variation norm of the last two terms is bounded by $\frac{1}{m}$ each. The first term is a convex combination, and therefore the claim of the lemma follows from (60). \square

We proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.3. Define a set

$$U = \left\{ M \in \Delta_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}} \mid \|M - M_X\|_{TV} \leq \frac{3}{m} \right\}. \quad (63)$$

Lemma 5.2 (with $\varepsilon = 1/m$) states that $M(x) \in U$ with high probability over I .

Next, fix an HMM H and let $M_H = M_{\phi, H}$ be the generalized second moment attaining the infimum in (20),

$$D = \|M_X - M_H\|_{TV} = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}} \|M_X - M_{\phi, H}\|_{TV} - 3/m. \quad (64)$$

Let

$$O = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1}) \mid M(x) \in U\} \quad (65)$$

be the set of all data sequences x with $M(x) \in U$. Using the type theory for second moments of Markov chains, we will show that

$$\mathbb{P}_{H, \pi}(O) \leq 2^{-ND^2}, \quad (66)$$

for every initial distribution π , where D is given by (64). Equivalently, under H , probability of observing a sequence x with $M(x) \in U$ is at most 2^{-ND^2} . We first prove Theorem 3.3 assuming (66), and then prove (66).

The inequality (66) bounds the likelihood under H of *all* x such that $M(x) \in U_\varepsilon$. To prove Theorem 3.3, we need to bound the likelihood $L(x, H, \pi)$ of *individual* sequence x produced by I . Let

$$H(X) = \frac{1}{N} H(X_1, \dots, X_N) = \sum_{i \leq k} w_i H(\mu_i) \quad (67)$$

be the entropy of a sample $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ from I .

The following lemma describes the type theory for samples from model I . Recall that \tilde{w} was defined in (50) and has the property that in a sample $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ from I every source appears at least $\tilde{w}N$ times.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \sim I$. Then there exist a subset $G \subset \mathbb{X}^N$ of sequences such that*

1. *For every $x^l = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in G$,*

$$\left| -\frac{1}{N} \log P_X(x^l) - H(X) \right| \leq \varepsilon_N, \quad (68)$$

- 2.

$$\sum_{x^l \in G} P_X(x^l) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_N, \quad (69)$$

where $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ with $\tilde{w}N \rightarrow \infty$.

This Lemma is a version of an Asymptotic Equipartition Property (AEP) for independent variables (see [Cover and Thomas, 2006]). Statements (68) and (69) follow from a weak law of large numbers. The details of the proof are identical to the standard AEP and are omitted.

Note that on one hand sequences x^l are a set of almost full probability by (69), and on the other hand, by Lemma 5.2, $\mathbb{P}_X(M(x) \in U)$ is also close to 1. Denote

$$X^l = G \cap O. \quad (70)$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_X(X^l) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_N, \quad (71)$$

perhaps with a slightly different ε_N . In addition, similarly to the standard AEP, we can obtain cardinality estimates on $|X^l|$. Indeed, combining (71) and (68) we get

$$2^{N(H(X)+\varepsilon_N)} \geq |X^l| \geq 2^{N(H(X)-\varepsilon_N)}. \quad (72)$$

Next, using (66) we can write

$$\sum_{x^l \in X^l} \mathbb{P}_H(x^l) \leq \mathbb{P}_H(O) \leq 2^{-ND^2}, \quad (73)$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{|X^l|} \sum_l \mathbb{P}_H(x^l) \leq 2^{-N(D^2 + \frac{1}{N} \log |X^l|)}. \quad (74)$$

Using (72) we therefore obtain

$$\frac{1}{|X^l|} \sum_l \mathbb{P}_H(x^l) \leq 2^{-N(D^2 + \sum_{i \leq k} w_i H(\mu_i) - \varepsilon_N)}. \quad (75)$$

Note that (75) is essentially the statement of Theorem 3.3 on average over x^l . By applying Markov inequality to this average we get that the proportion of $x \in X_l$ which satisfy

$$L(x, H) \geq -D^2/2 - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) - \varepsilon_N \quad (76)$$

is at most $2^{-N \frac{D^2}{2}}$. Formally,

$$\frac{|\{x \in X^l \mid x \text{ satisfies (76)}\}|}{|X^l|} \leq 2^{-N \frac{D^2}{2}}. \quad (77)$$

Using (68) and (72) again, this estimate implies a probability estimate over X ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_X \left(L(x, H) \geq -D^2/2 - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) + \varepsilon_N \right) \\ & \leq 2^{-N \left(\frac{D^2}{2} - 2\varepsilon_N \right)} + \varepsilon_N, \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

therefore concluding the proof of Theorem 3.3.

It remains to prove the bound (66). We begin with a standard construction for transforming an HMM into a Markov chain in a special form. This converts

the problem of bounding the likelihood of data under an HMM to a problem of bounding a likelihood of a certain set of paths in the chain. Given an HMM $H = H(S, \{\nu_i\}_1^k, \{p_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k)$, construct a Markov chain $H' = (S', p')$ with state space $S' = S \times \mathbb{X}$, and transition probabilities

$$p'_{(i,a),(j,b)} = p_{ij}\nu_j(b). \quad (79)$$

For a state $(i, a) \in S'$, we refer to a as the data component of the state. Clearly, by observing a random walk of H' and looking only at the data component, we get a distribution over the data that is identical to that of the HMM. Note that for a single data vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$, there are exactly k^{N+1} paths of the chain H' yielding the data x .

Next, we use type theory for Markov chains to obtain deviation bounds on the empirical second moment of a random walk. Similarly to second moment of the data, for a Markov chain $H' = (S', p')$, and a path $s = s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N+1}$, where $s_i \in S'$, define the second moment $M(s) \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ by

$$M(s)(u, v) = \quad (80)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} |\{i \leq N \mid s_i = u \wedge s_{i+1} = v\}|, \quad (81)$$

for all $u, v \in S'$. For a subset $\Pi \subset \Delta_{S' \times S'}$, the second order type theory provides bounds of the form

$$\mathbb{P}_{H'}(M(s) \in \Pi) \leq 2^{-N \cdot D}, \quad (82)$$

where D is a suitably defined distance between the set Π and the transition matrix p' . Statement (82) is a Markov chain analog of Sanov's theorem for i.i.d sequences ([Sanov, 1957], [Cover and Thomas, 2006]). We use a second moment deviation inequality due to [Csiszár et al., 1987], stated as Lemma 5.5. Note that type theory provides estimates on moments of paths of the chain H' , which take values in $\Delta_{S' \times S'}$, while our assumptions are about moments of the data, $M(x) \in \Delta_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}}$. We now describe the connection between the two types of moments. Consider a Markov chain $H' = (S', p')$ corresponding to an HMM H . Define a linear map $T : \Delta_{S' \times S'} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}}$ by

$$T(M')(a, b) = \sum_{i,j \leq k} M'((i, a), (j, b)). \quad (83)$$

If M' is the second moment of a path of the chain, then $T(M')$ is the second moment of the data. The map T satisfies the following inequality, which is crucial for our analysis.

Lemma 5.4. *For any $M_1, M_2 \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$,*

$$D(T(M_1)|T(M_2)) \leq D(M_1|M_2). \quad (84)$$

Proof. This result is a consequence of the chain rule for relative entropies. To see this, represent an element $v = ((i, a), (j, b)) \in S' \times S'$ as a pair $v = (u, w)$ where

$u = (i, j)$ and $w = (a, b)$ are the state and data parts of v . Then $M \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ is a distribution over all (u, w) . Denote by $V = (U, W)$ the random vector with values in $S' \times S'$ and distribution M . Then, by definition, $T(M)$ is the marginal distribution of component W of V . By the chain rule for relative entropies ([Cover and Thomas, 2006], equation (2.67)),

$$\begin{aligned}
D(M_1, M_2) &= \\
D((U_1, W_1)|(U_2, W_2)) &= \\
D(W_1|W_2) &+ \\
\sum_{a,b \in \mathcal{X}} M_1(a, b) \cdot D([U_1|W_1 = (a, b)]|[U_2|W_2 = (a, b)]) & \\
\geq D(W_1|W_2) & \\
= D(T(M_1)|T(M_2)). &
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where the inequality in (85) is due to the non-negativity of relative entropy. \square

To state the deviation result, Lemma 5.5, we require some additional notation. For any measure $M \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$, define the left and right marginalizations $\bar{M}, \bar{\bar{M}} \in \Delta_{S'}$ by

$$\bar{M}(u) = \sum_{v \in S'} M(u, v), \quad \bar{\bar{M}}(u) = \sum_{v \in S'} M(v, u). \tag{86}$$

Moreover, given $M \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$, define the related transition matrix to be

$$M(v|u) = \frac{M(u, v)}{\bar{M}(u)}. \tag{87}$$

A measure $M \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ is called stationary, if $\bar{M} = \bar{\bar{M}}$. Such measure is a stationary measure of a random walk given by the transition matrix $M(v|u)$. We denote by $\Delta_{S' \times S'}^0$ the set of all stationary measures.

Finally, we introduce a quantity that will control the deviations of moments. Given a transition matrix $p' = p'_{uv}$ and a measure $M \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$, define

$$D(M|p') = \sum_{u,v \in S'} M(u, v) \log \frac{M(v|u)}{p'_{uv}} = \tag{88}$$

$$\sum_{u,v \in S'} M(u, v) \log \frac{M(u, v)}{M(u)p'_{uv}}. \tag{89}$$

The quantity $D(M|p')$ differs from the standard Kullback-Leibler divergence since p' is not a measure. However, as follows from (89), we can write $D(M|p') = D(M|z)$, where $D(t|z)$ is the standard KL divergence and $z \in \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ is defined by $z(u, v) = \bar{M}(u) \cdot p'_{uv}$.

For any closed set $\Pi \subset \Delta_{S' \times S'}$, denote $\Pi_0 = \Delta_{S' \times S'}^0 \cap \Pi$.

Lemma 5.5 ([Csiszár et al., 1987]). *Let $\Pi \subset \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ be a closed convex set. For any $D' > 0$ there is a sequence ε_N with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_N = 0$ such that for any Markov chain $C = (S', p')$ satisfying (90),*

$$D' = \min_{M \in \Pi_0} D(M|p'), \tag{90}$$

if $X = X_1, \dots, X_{N+1}$ is a random walk generated by C then

$$\mathbb{P}_C(M(X) \in \Pi) \leq 2^{-N(D' - \varepsilon_N)}. \quad (91)$$

Lemma 5.5 provides us with likelihood estimates that depend on the parameters of the unfolded Markov chain H' . To obtain the bound (66) for an HMM H we apply Lemma 5.5 to the Markov chain H' with the set $\Pi \subset \Delta_{S' \times S'}$ given by

$$\Pi = T^{-1}(U) = \{M' \mid T(M') \in U\}, \quad (92)$$

where U_ε was defined in (63).

Choose some $M' \in \Pi$ and denote $M = T(M')$. In what follows we show that if D is given by (64), then

$$D(T(M') \mid T(\bar{M}'p')) \geq 2D^2. \quad (93)$$

Note that by (84) this implies

$$D(M' \mid \bar{M}'p') \geq 2D^2, \quad (94)$$

and hence $D' \geq 2D^2$ in Lemma 5.5, therefore proving (66).

Next, to obtain (93), observe that by Pinsker's Inequality (see [Cover and Thomas, 2006]¹), it is sufficient to show that

$$\|T(M') - T(\bar{M}'p')\|_{TV} \geq D. \quad (95)$$

Recall that by definition $T(M') \in U$, and hence

$$\|T(M') - M_X\|_{TV} \leq \frac{3}{m}. \quad (96)$$

Thus to obtain (95) it is sufficient to show that

$$\|M_X - T(\bar{M}'p')\|_{TV} \geq D + \frac{3}{m}. \quad (97)$$

Let us now write the explicit expression for $T(\bar{M}'p')$.

$$T(\bar{M}'p')(a, b) = \sum_{i, j \leq k} \bar{M}'((i, a)) p'_{(i, a), (j, b)} = \quad (98)$$

$$\sum_{i, j \leq k} \bar{M}'((i, a)) p_{ij} \mu_j(b). \quad (99)$$

In addition, observe that by definition, with the notation $M = T(M')$,

$$\sum_{i \leq k} \bar{M}'((i, a)) = \quad (100)$$

$$\sum_{i \leq k} \sum_{j \leq k} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} M'((i, a), (j, b)) = \quad (101)$$

$$\sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} M(a, b) = \bar{M}(a). \quad (102)$$

¹Pinsker's Inequality: $2\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}^2 \leq D(\mu|\nu)$ for all measures μ, ν .

For every $a, b \in \mathbb{X}$, denote $\phi_a = (M'(1, a), \dots, M'(k, a)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $\chi_b = (\nu_1(b), \dots, \nu_k(b))$. Then we can rewrite (99) in the generalized second moment form (14) as

$$T(\bar{M}'p')(a, b) = \phi_a \cdot p \cdot \chi_b. \quad (103)$$

Moreover, since $M = T(M') \in U$, the marginals satisfy

$$\|\bar{M}_X - \bar{M}\|_{TV} \leq \|M_X - M\|_{TV} \leq \frac{3}{m}. \quad (104)$$

Therefore, by (102) and (104) the condition (20) for ϕ_a in the main Theorem holds.

5.5 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Set $D_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\log 3km}{m}}$. To obtain Theorem 3.4 it suffices to show that with high probability over X ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, H, \pi) &\leq -D_0^2 - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) + \varepsilon(N_{min}) \\ &= -\frac{\log 3km}{m} - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) + \varepsilon(N_{min}) \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

jointly for all HMMs $H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$ which satisfy

$$D(H) > \sqrt{\frac{\log 3km}{m}}. \quad (106)$$

Indeed, assume that (105) holds for all H which satisfy (106). Then, since by Lemma 3.2 we know that there exists an HMM $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$ such that

$$L(x, H_0, \pi) > -\frac{\log 3km}{m} - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) - \varepsilon(N_{min}), \quad (107)$$

it follows that the maximum likelihood estimator H must satisfy

$$D(H) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log 3km}{m}}. \quad (108)$$

Note that for a single fixed HMM H satisfying (106), the statement (105) holds by Theorem 3.3 with high probability. However, since we would like to have explicit exponential probability bounds, we work directly with estimate 77 in the proof of Theorem 3.3 rather than with the final statement of that theorem. Then, for a fixed H , the probability over X^l of x not satisfying (105) is at most $2^{-N \frac{D_0^2}{2}}$. The uniform statement for all $H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$ satisfying (106) can be obtained by approximation and union bound. We first define an appropriate metric on \mathcal{H}_δ . Consider the set \mathcal{H}_δ as a subset of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^F , where

$F = k^2 + k \cdot |\mathcal{X}|$ and we simply consider the parameters of an HMM as coordinates. For any $H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$ let $v(H) = (v_t(H))_{t=1}^F \in \mathbb{R}^F$ be the vector corresponding to H . In what follows we identify \mathcal{H}_δ with a subset of \mathbb{R}^F , $\{v(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta\} \subset \mathbb{R}^F$. By definition we have for every $H \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$,

$$v_t(H) \geq \delta \quad \forall t \leq F. \quad (109)$$

Define a map $R : \mathbb{R}^F \mapsto \mathbb{R}^F$ by

$$R(v) = (\log v_1, \dots, \log v_F) \quad (110)$$

and define a metric on \mathcal{H}_δ by

$$\begin{aligned} d_*(H_1, H_2) &= \|R(v(H_1)) - R(v(H_2))\|_\infty \\ &= \max_{t \leq F} \left| \log \frac{v_t(H_1)}{v_t(H_2)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

Next, for $\gamma > 0$ let Γ_γ be the minimal cardinality of a γ -net of \mathcal{H}_δ with respect to the metric d_* . Since \mathcal{H}_δ is bounded in \mathbb{R}^F , the map R is coordinate-wise at most $\frac{1}{\delta}$ -Lipschitz on \mathcal{H}_δ (by (109)), and d_* is an ℓ_∞ norm on the image of R , standard volumetric arguments imply that

$$\Gamma_\gamma \leq c \left(\frac{1}{\gamma \cdot \delta} \right)^F. \quad (112)$$

It is also easy to check that the normalized log-likelihood is 1-Lipschitz with respect to d_* :

$$|L(x, H_1, \pi) - L(x, H_2, \pi)| \leq d_*(H_1, H_2), \quad (113)$$

for every sequence x and distribution π .

Consider an $1/N$ -net in \mathcal{H}_δ . As noted above, for an individual HMM H satisfying (106), the statement (105) holds with probability at least $1 - 2^{-N \frac{D_0^2}{2}}$ over X^l . Therefore with probability at least

$$1 - 2^{-N \frac{D_0^2}{2}} \cdot 2^{F \log \frac{1}{N \cdot \delta}}, \quad (114)$$

we have

$$L(x, H, \pi) \leq -D_0^2 - \sum_j w_j H(\mu_j) + \varepsilon(N_{min}) + \frac{1}{N}. \quad (115)$$

It remains to observe that for any N such that

$$N \geq 2 \frac{F \log \frac{1}{N \cdot \delta}}{D_0^2}, \quad (116)$$

the probability in (114) is positive, and approaches 1 for larger N , thereby completing the proof. \square

References

- [Anandkumar et al., 2012] Anandkumar, A., Hsu, D., and Kakade, S. M. (2012). A method of moments for mixture models and hidden markov models. In *COLT 2012*.
- [Arora et al., 2013] Arora, S., Ge, R., Halpern, Y., Mimno, D. M., Moitra, A., Sontag, D., Wu, Y., and Zhu, M. (2013). A practical algorithm for topic modeling with provable guarantees. In *ICML 2013*.
- [Arora et al., 2012] Arora, S., Ge, R., and Moitra, A. (2012). Learning topic models – going beyond SVD. *FOCS '12*.
- [Basseville and Nikiforov, 1993] Basseville, M. and Nikiforov, I. V. (1993). *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Application*.
- [Baum and Petrie, 1966] Baum, L. E. and Petrie, T. (1966). Statistical inference for probabilistic functions of finite state markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 37(6).
- [Blei et al., 2003] Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y., and Jordan, M. I. (2003). Latent dirichlet allocation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*
- [Chang, 1996] Chang, J. T. (1996). Full reconstruction of markov models on evolutionary trees: Identifiability and consistency. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 137.
- [Chib, 1998] Chib, S. (1998). Estimation and comparison of multiple change-point models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 86(2).
- [Cho and Park, 2003] Cho, S.-B. and Park, H.-J. (2003). Efficient anomaly detection by modeling privilege flows using hidden markov model. *Computers and Security*, 22.
- [Cover and Thomas, 2006] Cover, T. M. and Thomas, J. A. (2006). *Elements of Information Theory*.
- [Csiszár et al., 1987] Csiszár, I., Cover, T. M., and Choi, B.-S. (1987). Conditional limit theorems under markov conditioning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 33(6).
- [Douc et al., 2011] Douc, R., Moulines, E., Olsson, J., and van Handel, R. (2011). Consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator for general hidden markov models. *Ann. Statist.*, 39.
- [Durbin et al., 1998] Durbin, R., Eddy, S., Krogh, A., and Mitchison, G. (1998). *Biological sequence analysis: probabilistic models of proteins and nucleic acids*.

- [Dvoretzky et al., 1956] Dvoretzky, A., Kiefer, J., and Wolfowitz, J. (1956). Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 27(3).
- [Fridlyand et al., 2004] Fridlyand, J., Snijders, A. M., Pinkel, D., Albertson, D. G., and Jain, A. N. (2004). Hidden markov models approach to the analysis of array cgh data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 90(1).
- [Gales and Young, 2007] Gales, M. and Young, S. (2007). The application of hidden markov models in speech recognition. *Found. Trends Signal Process.*, 1(3).
- [Ge and Smyth, 2000] Ge, X. and Smyth, P. (2000). Deformable markov model templates for time-series pattern matching. KDD '00.
- [Horst, 2002] Horst, B. (2002). *Hidden Markov Models: Applications in Computer Vision*.
- [Huang et al., 2011] Huang, L., Joseph, A. D., Nelson, B., Rubinstein, B. I., and Tygar, J. D. (2011). Adversarial machine learning. AISec '11.
- [Hughes et al., 1999] Hughes, J. P., Guttorp, P., and Charles, S. P. (1999). A non-homogeneous hidden markov model for precipitation occurrence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 48(1).
- [Khaleghi and Ryabko, 2014] Khaleghi, A. and Ryabko, D. (2014). Asymptotically consistent estimation of the number of change points in highly dependent time series. In *ICML*.
- [Kritzman et al., 2012] Kritzman, M., Page, S., and Turkington, D. (2012). Regime shifts: Implications for dynamic strategies. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 68.
- [Le Gland and Mevel, 2000] Le Gland, F. and Mevel, L. (2000). Exponential forgetting and geometric ergodicity in hidden markov models. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 13(1).
- [Mannini and Sabatini, 2010] Mannini, A. and Sabatini, A. M. (2010). Machine learning methods for classifying human physical activity from on-body accelerometers. *Sensors*, 10(2).
- [Mevel and Finesso, 2004] Mevel, L. and Finesso, L. (2004). Asymptotical statistics of misspecified hidden markov models. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, 49(7).
- [Petrie, 1969] Petrie, T. (1969). Probabilistic functions of finite state markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 40(1).
- [Rogers and Zhang, 2011] Rogers, L. C. G. and Zhang, L. (2011). An asset return model capturing stylized facts. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 5(2).

- [San-Segundo et al., 2016] San-Segundo, R., Lorenzo-Trueba, J., Martnez-Gonzlez, B., and Pardo, J. M. (2016). Segmenting human activities based on hmms using smartphone inertial sensors. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*.
- [Sanov, 1957] Sanov, I. (1957). On the probability of large deviations of random variables. *Mut. Sb., vol. 42, pp. 11-44, 1957 (in Russian). English translation in Sel. Trunsl. Math. Statist. Probab., vol. 1 , 1961.*
- [Yoon, 2009] Yoon, B.-J. (2009). Hidden markov models and their applications in biological sequence analysis. *Current Genomics*, 10(6).
- [Yu, 2010] Yu, S.-Z. (2010). Hidden semi-markov models. *Artificial Intelligence*, 174(2).