

Exact Bayesian inference for diffusion-driven Cox processes

F. B. Gonçalves^a, K. G. Łatuszyński^b, G. O. Roberts^b

^a Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil

^b University of Warwick, UK

Abstract

In this paper, we present a novel methodology to perform Bayesian inference for Cox processes in which the intensity function is driven by a diffusion process. The novelty lies in the fact that no discretization error is involved, despite the non-tractability of both the likelihood function and the transition density of the diffusion. The methodology is based on an MCMC algorithm and its exactness is built on retrospective sampling techniques. The efficiency of the methodology is investigated in some simulated examples and its applicability is illustrated in some real data analyzes.

Key Words: Poisson process, retrospective sampling, infinite dimensionality, MCMC.

1 Introduction

Cox processes (Cox, 1955) have been extensively used in a variety of areas to model point process phenomena. Examples can be found in finance - to model credit risk (Chib et al., 2006; Cariboni and Schoutens, 2009), survival analysis (Roberts and Sangalli, 2010), internet traffic (Iversen et al., 2000), insurance (Dassios and Jang, 2003) and Biology (Legg and Chitre, 2012). A Cox process (also sometimes termed doubly stochastic Poisson process) is a Poisson process in which the intensity function (IF) - also known as rate, evolves stochastically.

We will consider an approach for unidimensional processes which models the evolution of the IF by means of a diffusion process. We call the resulting process a *diffusion-driven Cox process* (DDCP). A diffusion process is a continuous time (univariate) Markov process which is defined as the solution of a stochastic differential equation (SDE) of the type:

$$dY_s = a(Y_s; \theta)ds + \sigma(Y_s; \theta)dW_s, \quad Y_0 \sim f_0^*, \quad (1)$$

¹Address: Av. Antônio Carlos, 6627 - DEST, ICEx, UFMG - 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. E-mail: fbgoncalves@est.ufmg.br

where W_s is a Brownian motion and $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are assumed to satisfy the regularity conditions (locally Lipschitz, with a linear growth bound) to guarantee a unique weak solution (see Kloeden and Platen, 1995, Chapter 4). Somewhat more general diffusion processes (eg time inhomogeneous and multivariate) can be dealt with within the framework we provide. For an accessible introduction to SDEs, see Øksendal (1998).

Suppose $N := \{N_s; s \in [0, T]\}$ is an one-dimensional inhomogeneous Poisson process (PP), with intensity function $\lambda := \{\lambda_s; s \in [0, T]\}$, observed in a time interval $[0, T]$. In this paper, we consider DDCPs of the type:

$$N \sim PP(\lambda_s), \quad s \in [0, T]; \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda_s = g(X_s, \theta); \quad (3)$$

$$dX_s = \alpha(X_s; \theta)ds + dW_s; \quad (4)$$

$$X_0 \sim f_0(\cdot; \theta). \quad (5)$$

The IF of the Poisson process N is a function g of a diffusion process $X := \{X_s; s \in [0, T]\}$, where $g(\cdot, \theta) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is non-negative and non-explosive. Also, f_0 is the density function of X_0 . The diffusion drift α is presumed to satisfy the regularity conditions (locally Lipschitz, with a linear growth bound) that guarantee the existence of a weakly unique, global solution of the SDE. θ is a set of unknown parameters. One may choose different parameterizations of the model by manipulating the dependency of g and X on θ . The parameterization should be chosen taking into account the interpretation of the model and its impact on the inference methodology - to be discussed further in Section 5.1. Finally, note that we are not restricted to unit diffusion coefficient diffusions. As long as the coefficient σ in (1) is continuously differentiable, we can rewrite a chosen intensity function $h(Y)$ as $g(X)$, where $g = h \circ \eta^{-1}$ and $\eta(y, \theta) = \int_{y^*}^y \frac{1}{\sigma(u; \theta)} du$, the Lamperti transform of Y , for some y^* in the state space of Y .

As is common in computational Bayesian methodologies involving intractable likelihoods, carrying out inference under the model in (2)-(5) is closely linked to being able to simulate from the model, which is itself a particularly challenging problem. As a result of this, existing approaches to this problem (see, for example, Chib et al., 2006; Cariboni and Schoutens, 2009; Lechnerová et al., 2008) have resorted to discrete time approximations, often leading to significant (and typically difficult to quantify) bias as well as substantial computational overhead.

The aim of this paper is to propose a methodology that is free of discretization error to perform simulation and inference for DDCPs as in (2)-(5). We term the methodology as exact in the sense of Monte Carlo error and MCMC convergence are the only sources of approximation. The proposed methodology consists of an MCMC algorithm to sample from the posterior distribution of the unknown components in the model, i.e., parameters and IF. Although the IF is infinite-dimensional, the proposed MCMC is actually based on a finite (albeit varying) dimensional Markov chain. This is due to the retrospective sampling approach adopted, in which the Markov chain contains the

unknown parameters of the model and a random finite-dimensional representation of the IF. This representation is such that the algorithm is tractable and the posterior distribution of the remainder of the IF can be easily recovered from the finite-dimensional representation. This approach is based on previous work on exact inference for diffusions (see Beskos et al., 2006). Further conditions on functions α and g are required but still consider a wide and flexible range of models. In this context, two particular forms for function g are highlighted, given their good modeling and inference properties. Extensions to consider a different data scheme and to more general models are also discussed. The latter is based on recent work on exact inference for jump-diffusions (see Gonçalves et al., 2017) that relies on an infinite-dimensional Barker’s MCMC via Bernoulli factories. Finally, the proposed methodology is investigated in simulated examples and its application is explored with real datasets. In particular, we illustrate the flexibility of the DDCPs when compared to more commonly used Cox process models by considering a diffusion X with a Cauchy invariant distribution.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the proposed MCMC algorithm to perform exact Bayesian inference for DDCPs. Simulated and real examples are presented in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Finally, Section 5 discusses some further topics including model parameterization, prediction, inference for a different data scheme and extensions of the proposed methodology.

2 Bayesian inference for DDCPs

Consider the DDCP model in (2)-(5) and suppose that N is observed in $[0, T]$. Define $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$ as the n observed events from N in $[0, T]$, i.e., the data set based on which inference is to be performed. Our aim is to perform Bayesian inference about the intensity function λ and the parameter vector θ indexing the model. The full Bayesian model is completely specified by setting a prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$.

The posterior distribution of the unknown quantities of the model (X and θ) is infinite-dimensional and has an intractable density, which makes it unfeasible to devise a straightforward MCMC algorithm to sample from this distribution. We resort to results related to the exact simulation of diffusions (see Sermaidis et al., 2012) to introduce auxiliary variables that allow us to devise a tractable finite-dimensional MCMC algorithm. Those variables define a finite-dimensional representation of the diffusion which can be sampled exactly from its full conditional distribution and such that, conditional on this representation, the parameters indexing the model are independent of the infinite-dimensional remainder of the diffusion and have a tractable full conditional density. Finally, this approach also allows for exact sampling from the posterior distribution of the infinite-dimensional remainder of the diffusion.

The proposed methodology can be applied to a wide class of models, \mathcal{P} , for which function α (the drift of the diffusion X) is differentiable and (setting $A(u; \theta) = \int_0^u \alpha(y; \theta) dy$ and defining f_N as the Lebesgue density of the standard normal distribution and \mathcal{X} as the state space of the diffusion X):

- (a) $\left(g + \frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2}\right)(u)$ is uniformly bounded below for all $u \in \mathcal{X}$;
- (b) $f_N((u - \mu)/t) \exp\{-A(u)\} f_0(u)$ and $f_N((u - \mu)/t) \exp\{A(u)\}$ are integrable in $u \in \mathcal{X}$, for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$;
- (c) $g(u)$ is bounded by $\exp(bu + c)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{X}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

In order to devise a valid and efficient MCMC algorithm to sample from the target posterior distribution, we introduce a random partition $\tau := (0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_m < \tau_{m+1} = T)$ of the time interval $[0, T]$, with $\Delta_i = \tau_i - \tau_{i-1}$. We define n_i to be the number of events from N falling in $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$ and let $(s_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,n_i})$ be those events, with $\Delta_{ij} = s_{i,j} - s_{i,j-1}$, for $j = 1, \dots, n_i + 1$, $s_{i,0} = \tau_{i-1}$ and $s_{i,n_i+1} = \tau_i$. This means that the j -th observed event from N in $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$ is called $s_{i,j}$. Figure 1 illustrates the notation adopted for the observed events and for the random partition τ in the interval $[0, T]$.




Figure 1: An illustration of the notation defined for the time points of interest.

We now define, for a fixed value of the partition τ , a set of finite-dimensional random variables that, together with θ , constitute the coordinates of the Markov chain in the proposed MCMC algorithm. We start by defining $X_\tau = (X_0, X_{\tau_1}, \dots, X_{\tau_m}, X_T)$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, m + 1$, $\tilde{X}_i = (X_{s_{i,1}}, \dots, X_{s_{i,n_i}})$. For each bridge $(s_{i,j-1}, X_{s_{i,j-1}}; s_{i,j}, X_{s_{i,j}})$ we consider a finite-dimensional measurable function $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ of this bridge that defines local upper and lower bounds for X in $[s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}]$. Details about the simulation of $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ and how to obtain the aforementioned local bounds are provided in Appendix F.

Now, for each $i = 1, \dots, m + 1$ we define, for all $j = 1, \dots, n_i + 1$, an auxiliary bidimensional homogeneous Poisson process $\Xi_{i,j}$ with rate $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ on $[s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}] \times [0, 1]$. The rate $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ is a function of g , α and $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ and is precisely defined in Appendix F. For each pair (i, j) we define $\Psi_{i,j} = (\psi_{i,1}, \dots, \psi_{i,\kappa_{i,j}})$ and $\Upsilon_{i,j} = (v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,\kappa_{i,j}})$ as the respective horizontal and vertical coordinates of the events from $\Xi_{i,j}$.

Finally, for each pair (i, j) we define $\dot{X}_{i,j} = (X_{\psi_{i,1}}, \dots, X_{\psi_{i,\kappa_{i,j}}})$, i.e., $\dot{X}_{i,j}$ is the diffusion X at the times defined by the horizontal coordinates of the Poisson process $\Xi_{i,j}$. We set $\dot{X} := \{\dot{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{m+1}$, $\mathcal{L}_i := \{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i+1}$ and $\mathcal{L} := \{\mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^{m+1}$, $\dot{X}_i := \{\dot{X}_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i+1}$ and $\dot{X} := \{\dot{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{m+1}$, $\Xi_i := \{\Xi_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i+1}$ and $\Xi := \{\Xi_i\}_{i=1}^{m+1}$.

Consider the function

$$\phi(u; \theta) = \left(g + \frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2}\right)(u; \theta) \quad (6)$$

and let, for all pair (i, j) , $\phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)$ and $\phi_{i,j,u}(\theta)$ be local lower and upper bounds, respectively, for $\phi(X_s; \theta)$, for $s \in [s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}]$. These bounds depend on g , α and on the local bounds for X , which are obtained from \mathcal{L} (see Appendix F). The posterior density to be targeted by the proposed MCMC algorithm is proportional to the joint density given in Theorem 1 below.

Theorem 1. *For a fixed value of the partition τ , the joint density of $(N, \mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta)$ w.r.t. a θ -free dominating measure is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(N, \mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta) &= \kappa(X_\tau, \tilde{X}) \pi(\theta) f_0(X_0; \theta) \exp \{A(X_T; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta)\} \quad (7) \\ &\times \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j} (1 - \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta)) \right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta) \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \left[r_{i,j}(\theta)^{\kappa_{i,j}} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_{i,j}} \mathbb{I} \left[\frac{\phi(X_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} < v_{i,j,k} \right] \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa(X_\tau, \tilde{X})$ is a function of X_τ and \tilde{X} that does not depend on θ (see the proof of the Theorem for details).

Proof. See Appendix B.

2.1 The MCMC algorithm

In order to sample from the posterior distribution of (X, θ) , we first devise an MCMC algorithm that converges to the posterior distribution of $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta, \tau)$ and then use following corollary of Theorem 1 to sample from the posterior remainder of X , given an MCMC sample from the posterior of $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta, \tau)$.

Corollary 1. *The conditional law of X given $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta, \tau, N)$ is independent of N and is given by the joint law of the Brownian bridges between the values $(X_\tau, \tilde{X}, \dot{X})$, conditional on \mathcal{L} .*

Proof. See proof of Theorem 1 in Appendix B.

The MCMC algorithm to sample from the posterior of $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta)$ is a Gibbs sampling that alternates between sampling $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_0, X_T)$ and θ from their respective full conditional distributions - both with density proportional to (7). Note, however, that X_τ is not updated in this sampling scheme. Therefore, to have a valid algorithm to sample from the posterior distribution of (X, θ) , we add an extra step to each iteration of the Gibbs sampling to update the random partition τ . This guarantees the irreducibility of the Markov chain and its convergence to the posterior distribution of $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_\tau, \theta, \tau)$.

Due to the Markov property of diffusions and Poisson processes, $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi)$ is conditionally independent, given (X_τ, N, θ) , among the intervals defined by the partition τ . For each interval (τ_{i-1}, τ_i) , for $i = 2, \dots, m$, $(\mathcal{L}_i, \tilde{X}_i, \dot{X}_i, \Xi_i)$ is sampled via

rejection sampling with proposal distribution given by a biased Brownian bridge. The term biased refers to the fact that the proposal distribution differs from the distribution under a Brownian bridge $BB(\tau_{i-1}, X_{\tau_{i-1}}; \tau_i, X_{\tau_i})$ measure only in the distribution of \tilde{X}_i . Defining $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}$ and $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}$ as the Lebesgue density of \tilde{X}_i under the proposal distribution and under the aforementioned BB measure, respectively, we have that

$$\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(\tilde{X}_i; \theta) = \frac{1}{c_i(\theta)} \pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(\tilde{X}_i) \times \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta), \quad (8)$$

where $c_i(\theta)$ is a normalising constant. Details on how to simulate from the density in (41) are provided in Appendix E. The acceptance indicator of the proposal is given by:

$$I_i = \mathbb{I} \left[\exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j} (\phi_{i,j,l}(\theta) - m(\theta)) \right) < u \right] \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_{i,j}} \mathbb{I} \left[\frac{\phi(\dot{X}_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} < v_{i,j,k} \right], \quad (9)$$

where $u \sim U(0, 1)$ and $m(\theta) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}} \{\phi(u; \theta)\}$. The validity of this algorithm is established by Propositions 1, 3 and 4 in Appendix A.

The algorithms to sample $(\mathcal{L}_i, \tilde{X}_i, \dot{X}_i, \Xi_i)$ for $i = 1$ and $i = m + 1$ are slightly different from the algorithm above. Basically, the proposals also include the simulation of X_0 and X_T , respectively, from the densities

$$\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_0^*}(X_0; \theta) \propto f_N((X_0 - X_{\tau_1})/\sqrt{\tau_1}) \exp\{-A(X_0; \theta)\} f_0(X_0; \theta), \quad (10)$$

$$\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_T^*}(X_T; \theta) \propto f_N((X_T - X_{\tau_m})/\sqrt{(T - \tau_m)}) \exp\{A(X_T; \theta)\}. \quad (11)$$

The remainder of the proposal and the acceptance indicator are the same as in the algorithm for the other intervals. Simulation from (10) and (11) may have to be performed indirectly, for example, via rejection sampling. The flexibility to choose f_0 is useful to assure the integrability of (10). The validity of this algorithm is established by Propositions 2 and 4 and an adaptation to Proposition 3, all in Appendix A.

Theorem 1, in particular the fact that the dominating measure in (7) does not depend on θ , implies that the full conditional density of θ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure is proportional to (7). This sampling step is further improved by integrating the $v_{i,j,k}$ variables out to get

$$\pi(\theta|\cdot) = \pi(\theta) f_0(X_0; \theta) \exp \left\{ A(X_T; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j} \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta) \right\} \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta) \right] \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} r_{i,j}(\theta)^{\kappa_{i,j}} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_{i,j}} \left(1 - \frac{\phi(X_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} \right) \right]. \quad (12)$$

A Metropolis-Hastings step will typically be required to sample from this distribution.

Finally, an appealing proposal on how to update the partition τ is presented in Appendix G.

2.2 Efficiency of the algorithm

Note that we are free to choose how to update the partition τ in the Gibbs sampler. However, this choice has a great impact on the efficiency of the algorithm. In one direction, the smaller the number of subintervals is, the lower is the autocorrelation of the chain, leading to faster convergence. On the other hand, the acceptance probability of the rejection sampling algorithm that samples $(\mathcal{L}_i, \tilde{X}_i, \dot{X}_i, \Xi_i)$ decreases (exponentially) as the length of the time interval increases. A reasonable empirical strategy is to choose the minimum number of subintervals for which the computational cost is tolerable. Naturally, this depends heavily on functions α and g .

The computational cost to update $(\mathcal{L}_i, \tilde{X}_i, \dot{X}_i, \Xi_i)$ may substantially vary among the different sub-intervals defined by the partition τ . This is related to the variation of function ϕ which, in turn, is related to the information in the data. Typically, time intervals with a higher concentration of observed events will lead to higher variations in the IF and, therefore, higher variations in function ϕ , resulting in a small acceptance probability. This behavior is usually easy to be identified in each example. A reasonable strategy to mitigate the problem is to adopt a partition τ with different sized intervals. As long as this is predefined for the MCMC, the algorithm is still valid. In particular, one may fix the number of intervals in a sequence that should have the same size until a different size is considered.

The number of time points m defining the partition τ will be typically large and, therefore, induce a high autocorrelation for the diffusion X . This will, in turn, lead to a high autocorrelation of the parameter vector θ . A simple strategy to alleviate this problem is to perform multiple updates of τ and $(\mathcal{L}, \tilde{X}, \dot{X}, \Xi, X_0, X_T)$ for each update of θ . Furthermore, Monte Carlo estimation should be performed using a thinned sample of X .

Some important parameterization issues related to the efficiency of the MCMC algorithm are discussed in Section 5.1.

3 Examples

We present some simulated examples to investigate the modeling and inference properties of the proposed methodology. We consider two examples for the link function g which have a considerable modeling and inference appeal. The first example is the exponential function, widely used through the well-known Log-Gaussian Cox process (Møller et al., 1998; Diggle, 2014). The second one is the standard normal cdf Φ , also used for Gaussian process-driven Cox processes (Gonçalves and Gamerman, 2018). Those functions feature the nice property of going from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R}^+ and $[0, 1]$, respectively. We combine those functions with the three diffusion models solving the

following SDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_s &= -\rho X ds + dW_s \quad (\text{Ornstein-Uhlenbeck - OU}); \\ dX_s &= -\rho X_s(\sigma^2 X_s^2 - \mu) ds + dW_s. \quad (\text{transformed double-well potential - DW}); \\ dX_s &= -\frac{X_s}{1+X_s^2} ds + dW_s \quad (\text{Cauchy}). \end{aligned}$$

The OU-process is a stationary Gauss-Markov process and the Cauchy process has a Cauchy invariant distribution which allows for longer-term excursions away from 0 than a Gaussian process. The transformed double-well process stochastically alternates visits between two regions located around a positive and a negative value. In Appendix D, we present some simulated trajectories and Monte Carlo estimates for some models that combine the two link functions above with the OU and the transformed double-well diffusions. The algorithm to simulate from the model is also presented there.

Now, we present three simulated examples, in which the first two aim at analyzing how well the IF function and model parameters are estimated and the third one explores model flexibility. In the first two, data is simulated in the interval $[0, 400]$ and the proposed MCMC algorithm is run to estimate the intensity function and parameters indexing the model. Given the low information that the data contains about the volatility parameter σ and the feasibility to fix it in a reasonable value (see discussion in Section 5.1), this parameter is fixed in its real value. The chains run for 51000 iterations with a burn-in of 11000, with the parameter vector being updated from iteration 1020 at every 5 iterations of the Gibbs sampler and performing (for the exp-OU example) 10 consecutive updates per time. A lag of 5 iterations is considered to obtain the posterior sample of the diffusion path. A noncentered parameterization (see Section 5.1) is adopted for the Poisson processes Ξ_{ij} in the cdf-DW example. These are all strategies to optimize the convergence speed of the Markov chain. All the estimated parameters in each model are jointly sampled via Metropolis-Hastings with a properly tuned Gaussian random walk proposal. The algorithms are implemented in Ox (Doornik, 2007) and run in a 3.50-GHz Intel i7 processor with 16GB RAM.

We fit the exp-OU - $g(X_s) = \exp(\mu + \sigma X_s)$, and the cdf-DW - $g(X_s) = \delta \Phi(\sigma X_s)$, models to one datasets generated from the respective true model. They have 499 and 645 events, respectively. We estimate parameters μ and ρ for the former and δ for the latter. The remaining parameters are fixed at their real value. Note that, if we do not fix some parameters in the cdf-DW model, we have an intrinsic identifiability issue. This is basically because an increase in the value of δ can be compensated by a change in the parameters of the DW diffusion to reduce the amplitude of its variation and vice-versa. Furthermore, the form of the g function may ravel the identification of the diffusion path as it goes away from 0 which, in turn, may compromise the joint identification of parameters μ and ρ . A reasonable solution is to fix the diffusion parameters according to the time scale of the problem - the example presented here can be used as a reference for the DW process.

We adopt $f_0(u) \propto \exp(-\rho\sigma^2 u^4/4)$ so that $\pi_{\mathbb{W}_0^*}(u) \propto f_N((u-\mu)/\sigma) \exp\{-A(u)\} f_0(u)$ is integrable for the cdf-DW example. Improper constant priors are adopted for all parameters and the results are presented in Figure 2 and Table 1.

Table 1: Posterior statistics of the estimated parameters for both simulated examples. Parameters without an estimate were fixed at their real values.

	δ			μ			ρ			σ
	real	mean	sd	real	mean	sd	real	mean	sd	real
exp-OU	-	-	-	0	0.134	0.142	0.05	0.097	0.031	0.2
cdf-DW	3	3.192	0.399	1	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.2




Figure 2: Real (black line) and estimated intensity function - posterior mean and point-wise 95% credibility interval, for the exp-OU (top) and cdf-DW (bottom) examples. The black circles on the bottom represent the data.

The general class of Cox process models proposed in this paper offers a significant contribution, in terms of model flexibility, when compared to the class of models found in the literature, in particular, log-Gaussian Cox processes. In order to illustrate this, we compare a heavy tailed DDCP - the exp-Cauchy model, to the exp-OU model, which is a type of log-Gaussian Cox process. The exp-Cauchy model considers the intensity function to be the exponential of the Cauchy diffusion - $g(X_s) = \rho \exp(\sigma X_s)$. We generate data from the exp-Cauchy model in $[0, 1000]$ for $\rho = 0.2$ and $\sigma = 0.4$. The dataset contains 353 points. We fit both the exp-Cauchy and the exp-OU models and predict two functionals of the intensity function in $[1000, 2000]$, $I_\lambda = E \left[\int_{1000}^{2000} \lambda_s ds \right]$ and $p_\lambda = E[p_4(\lambda_s)]$, where $p_4(\lambda_s)$ is the proportion of times the intensity function goes

above 4 at time points multiple of 0.1 in [1000, 2000]. We also compare the predicted IF with some replications of data in [1000, 2000]. That is done by computing MC estimates of:

$$E_f = E \left[\frac{1}{20} \sum_{i=1}^{20} f(|I_{\lambda,i} - N_i|) \right], \quad (13)$$

where $I_{\lambda,i}$ is the predictive integrated IF in $[1000 + 50(i - 1), 1000 + 50i]$ and N_i is the number of events in the same time interval from the simulated data. We consider two options for function f , $f_1(\Delta) = 2(F_{t,1}(\Delta^2/1000) - 0.5)$, where $F_{t,1}$ is the cdf of a student-t distribution with 1 d.f., and $f_2(\Delta) = \Delta/(I_{\lambda,i} + N_i)$, where $\Delta = |I_{\lambda,i} - N_i|$. These statistics are computed for 1000 replications of data in [1000, 2000] and we analyze the distribution of this sample.

Figure 3 shows the real and estimated IF under the two models. Figure 4 and Table 2 show the results for the predictive distribution. Although the estimation of the IF in the observed interval is similarly efficient under both models, their predictive power is substantially different. The model misspecification yields highly biased predictions.




Figure 3: Real (black line) and estimated intensity function - under the exp-OU (blue) and exp-Cauchy (red) models. The black circles represent the data.

Table 2: Comparison of predictive estimates under the exp-OU and exp-Cauchy models.

		I_λ										
		min	1%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	95%	99%	max
exp-OU		594.1	1548.3	2487.4	3153.2	4864.4	8666.7	17847.2	40055.6	74540.4	3.1×10^5	9.8×10^7
exp-Cauchy		2.7	276.5	425.7	552.9	1062.5	4333.1	72307.5	6.1×10^6	3.3×10^8	6.1×10^{13}	9.5×10^{38}
		p_λ										
		min	1%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	95%	99%	max
exp-OU		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
exp-Cauchy		0	0.0028	0.011	0.019	0.039	0.065	0.117	0.180	0.242	0.437	0.975




Figure 4: Distribution of the MC estimates E_{f_1} (left) and E_{f_2} (right) under the Exp-OU (blue) and Exp-Cauchy (red) models, for the 1000 data replications. The sample for f_1 presents values up to 1, but with negligible density above 0.15. The sample for f_1 has mean and s.d. 0.053 and 0.111 for the Cauchy model and 0.102 and 0.104 for the OU model. The sample for f_2 has mean and s.d. 0.600 and 0.086 for the Cauchy model and 0.850 and 0.034 for the OU model.

4 Applications

We apply the proposed methodology to three real datasets. The first one is the classic coal mine disaster data of Jarrett (1979), consisting of the dates of 191 coal mine explosions that killed ten or more men in Britain between March 15th, 1875 and March 22nd, 1962. We consider year as the time unit and the cdf-DW model as defined in Section 3. Parameter δ is estimated and we fix $\mu = 1$, $\rho = 0.1$ and $\sigma = 0.2$. The second dataset regards the S&P500 index from January 3rd, 2000 to December 31st, 2013 - 3521 days, with data consisting of the days in which a variation (w.r.t. the previous day) of more than 20 points occurred - 489 days in total (13,89%). The exp-OU model, as defined in Section 3, is considered with one time unit corresponding to ten days and for fixed $\sigma = 0.2$. Finally, the third dataset considers earthquake occurrences in Japan (rectangular region containing all the main islands from Kyushu to Hokkaido) from Jan 1st, 2014 to 29th Oct, 2018, with magnitude 4,5+ (1824 occurrences). The exp-Cauchy model, as defined in Section 3, is considered with day as the time unit. Parameters ρ and σ are constrained to be smaller than 1 to avoid computational cost problems. Results are presented in Figures 5 and 6 and Table 3.

Table 3: Posterior statistics of the estimated parameters for the three applications.

	δ		μ		ρ		σ	
	mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd
Coal mine (cdf-DW)	5.105	1.094	-	-	-	-	-	-
SP500 (exp-OU)	-	-	-0.517	0.866	0.013	0.0083	-	-
Japan_EQ (exp-Cauchy)	-	-	-	-	0.801	0.119	0.782	0.132




Figure 5: Estimated intensity function - posterior mean and pointwise 95% credibility interval, for the coal mine - cdf-DW (top), and SP500 - exp-OU (bottom), examples.

5 Further topics

5.1 A note on parameterization

The general DDCP model defined in (2)-(5) will sometimes admit different parameterizations. Typically, the parameterization of a model has a great impact on the efficiency (convergence properties) of the MCMC algorithm devised to perform inference. We define η_1 as the set of parameters indexing function g and η_2 as the set indexing functions α and f_0 .

We consider the parameterization issue when the same model may be defined with some parameter(s) being either in η_1 or η_2 , referred to as noncentered and centered parameterizations, respectively. This problem is deeply investigated in Papaspiliopoulos et al. (2007), in a general Gibbs sampling context, who argue that the noncentered parameterization performs better when X (the missing data), under the centered parameterization, is relatively (to the parameter(s) in question) weakly identified by the data. This implies that X , under the noncentered parameterization, and the parameter(s) in question are not highly correlated a posteriori, which contributes to the efficiency of




Figure 6: Estimated intensity function - posterior mean, for the Japan earthquake example. The plot on the bottom zooms in $[0, 10]$.

the Gibbs sampler.

In the context of DDCP, the diffusion X , under the centered parameterization, is strongly identified by the data, relative to the parameters indexing the diffusion, because the data is highly informative about the intensity function. For that reason, the centered parameterization should always be preferred (see Figure 8 in Appendix C).

It is also important to address the fact that the Poisson process data is, typically, not very informative about the parameters indexing the diffusion. This is basically due to the composition of the Poisson process variance given the IF and the diffusion variance given its parameters. The same phenomenon is observed, for example, for Gaussian process-driven Cox processes (see Gonçalves and Gamerman, 2018).

Finally, note that some parameters may eventually appear in both η_1 and η_2 . That is the case if the model is defined based on a diffusion Y with a diffusion coefficient depending on unknown parameters. Estimation of those parameters should be avoided and, given that the diffusion coefficient determines the instant variance of the diffusion, it is reasonable to assume that the data will contain even less information about those parameters when compared to parameters in the drift. For that reason, fixing the parameters in the diffusion coefficient, based on the scale of the problem, should be feasible and lead to good results. If, however, estimation of those parameter is

indispensable, the MCMC algorithm should be devised in terms of $Y = \eta^{-1}(X)$ (the inverse of the Lamperti transform) instead of X , so that the centered parameterization can be considered also for parameters in the diffusion coefficient. In practice, the new algorithm will only differ from that in Section 2 in terms of the full conditional distribution of θ . Defining $X_i(\theta) = \eta(Y_{\tau_i}; \theta)$ and $X_{i,j}(\theta) = \eta(Y_{s_{i,j}}; \theta)$, this distribution is given by

Theorem 2.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta|\cdot) &= \pi(\theta) f_0^*(Y_0; \theta) \exp \left\{ A(X_{m+1}(\theta); \theta) - A(X_0(\theta); \theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j} \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta) \right\} \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \pi_{\tilde{W}}(\tilde{X}_i(\theta); X_{i-1}(\theta), X_i(\theta)) \frac{1}{\Delta_i} f_{\mathcal{N}}((X_i(\theta) - X_{i-1}(\theta))/\Delta_i) \eta'(Y_{\tau_i}; \theta) \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \eta'(Y_{s_{i,j}}; \theta) \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{i,j}(\theta); \theta) \right] \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} r_{i,j}(\theta)^{\kappa_{i,j}} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_{i,j}} \left(1 - \frac{\phi(\varphi(\omega_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; X_{i,j-1}(\theta), X_{i,j}(\theta)); \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta))}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\omega_{\psi_{i,j,k}} = X_{\psi_{i,j,k}} - \left(1 - \frac{\psi_{i,j,k} - s_{i,j}}{s_{i,j} - s_{i,j-1}} \right) X_{i,j-1}(\theta_0) - \left(\frac{\psi_{i,j,k} - s_{i,j}}{s_{i,j} - s_{i,j-1}} \right) X_{i,j}(\theta_0),$$

θ_0 is the current value of θ in the chain used to simulate $X_{\psi_{i,j,k}}$ and

$$\varphi(\omega_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; X_{i,j-1}(\theta), X_{i,j}(\theta)) = \omega_{\psi_{i,j,k}} + \left(1 - \frac{\psi_{i,j,k} - s_{i,j}}{s_{i,j} - s_{i,j-1}} \right) X_{i,j-1}(\theta) + \left(\frac{\psi_{i,j,k} - s_{i,j}}{s_{i,j} - s_{i,j-1}} \right) X_{i,j}(\theta).$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

Another possible reparameterization regards the Poisson processes $\Xi_{i,j}$. Basically, some models may induce a high correlation between the parameters indexing the diffusion and the $\Xi_{i,j}$'s. Sermaidis et al. (2012) proposes a noncentered parameterization to reduce that dependence that, instead of simulating a Poisson process with rate $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ on $[0, t] \times [0, 1]$, simulates a Poisson process with rate 1 on $[0, t] \times [0, \infty)$. This strategy works because we only need to unveil the points for which the second coordinate falls below $r_{i,j}(\theta)$. This leads to the following full conditional distribution for θ :

Theorem 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{i,j}; \theta) \right] f_0(X_0; \theta) \pi(\theta) \\ &\exp \left\{ A(X_T; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j} \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta) \right\} \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \mathbb{I}(v_{i,j,k} < r_{i,j}(\theta)) \frac{\phi(X_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} \right) \right]. \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combines the proof of Theorem 1 and that of Theorem 3 from Sermaidis et al. (2012).

The practical computational difference between this algorithm and the original one is that, when proposing a move from θ to θ^* , one needs to simulate potential extra PP points if $r_{i,j}(\theta^*) > r_{i,j}(\theta)$ (see Sermaidis et al., 2012, Section 4.1). The double-well potential process is a typical example in which the noncentered parameterization leads to significant improvement (see Figure 7 in Appendix C).

5.2 Prediction

Prediction about future behavior is generally of interest when fitting unidimensional Cox processes. Under the Bayesian Paradigm, that is naturally achieved through the predictive distribution, i.e., the posterior distribution of some function of the process in some unobserved time interval.

It is straightforward to obtain a sample from the predictive distribution in an MCMC context, as it is considered in this paper. Suppose that we want to predict some function $h(N^*, X^*)$ of the Cox process and the diffusion X in some unobserved time interval, given the data N . The predictive distribution of $h(N^*, X^*)$ satisfies:

$$\pi(h(N^*, X^*)|N) = \int \pi(h(N^*, X^*)|X, \theta)\pi(X, \theta|N)dXd\theta. \quad (15)$$

This means that a sample from the predictive distribution $\pi(h(N^*, X^*)|N)$ can be obtained by simulating one observation from $\pi(h(N^*, X^*)|X^{(j)}, \theta^{(j)})$, for each $(X^{(j)}, \theta^{(j)})$ in the posterior sample output in the MCMC algorithm. Naturally, simulation from $\pi(h(N^*, X^*)|X, \theta)$ should be possible.

Consider for example $h(N^*, X^*) = N_{T+t^*} - N_T$, for some $t^* > 0$, i.e. the number of events in the interval of length t^* following the observed interval. Simulation from $\pi(h(N^*, X^*)|N)$ is performed as follows:

Simulation from the predictive distribution

1. initiate $j = 1$;
2. simulate $X^{*(j)} := \{X_t; T \leq t \leq T + t^*\}$, given $X_T^{(j)}$ and $\theta^{(j)}$, including \mathcal{L} ;
3. obtain an upper bound $\lambda^{*(j)}$ for λ_s in $[T, T + t^*]$ using \mathcal{L} ;
4. simulate a Poisson process with rate $\lambda^{*(j)}$ on $[0, t^*]$;
5. simulate $X^{*(j)}$ at the times of the $PP(\lambda^{*(j)})$;
6. keep each of the events t_i with probability $R(t_i) = \frac{g(X_{t_i}^{*(j)}, \theta^{(j)})}{\lambda^{*(j)}}$.
7. store $N_{T+t^*}^{(j)} - N_T$, make $j = j + 1$ and go to 2 until the whole MCMC sample is used.

Steps 2 and 5 are performed via the EA algorithm (Beskos et al., 2008) that performs exactly simulation of a class of diffusion processes.

It is also feasible to devise unbiased Monte Carlo estimators for expectations of intractable functions h under the predictive distribution. For example, suppose that we want to estimate $I = E_{(X^*, \theta|N)} \left[\int_T^{T+t^*} g(X_s, \theta) ds \right]$. Unbiased estimation is achieved

by defining a r.v. U with uniform distribution in $(T, T + t^*)$ and noting that

$$I = t^* E_{(U, X_0, \theta | N)} [g(X_U, \theta)]. \quad (16)$$

This means that an unbiased estimator of I is given by:

$$\hat{I} = t^* \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_{U^{(j)}}^{(j)}, \theta^{(j)}), \quad (17)$$

which can be computed by simulating J iid samples of U and X_U (the latter from its predictive distribution).

5.3 Inference for a different data scheme

Suppose that instead of observing the complete Poisson process N , we only observe the number of points in a collection of intervals defining a partition of $[0, T]$. This is a common feature in real datasets in which data are aggregated in small time intervals (w.r.t. the total observed time interval), like daily counting data for processes observed over weeks/months.

Define $\Gamma := (0 = \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p = T)$ to be the $p+1$ time points defining the partition in which the aggregated data is observed and $\dot{n} := (\dot{n}_1, \dots, \dot{n}_p)$ to be the number of events in each of the intervals from the partition. Poisson process properties imply that the \dot{n}_j 's are all conditionally independent (given the intensity function) and

$$\dot{n}_j \sim \text{Poisson} \left(\int_{\gamma_{j-1}}^{\gamma_j} g(X_s; \theta) ds \right). \quad (18)$$

which leads to the following likelihood function:

$$L(X, \theta) \propto \exp \left\{ - \int_0^T g(X_s; \theta) ds \right\} \prod_{j=1}^p \left(\int_{\gamma_{j-1}}^{\gamma_j} g(X_s; \theta) ds \right)^{\dot{n}_j}. \quad (19)$$

Inference for this data scheme can be carried out for models in the \mathcal{P} class that, additionally, have a bounded intensity function conditional on the parameters, for example, the cdf-* models. Suppose that $M(\theta)$ is an upper bound for $g(u; \theta)$, $u \in \mathcal{X}$. We consider a Gibbs sampling algorithm analogous to the one proposed in Section 2. The partition τ of $[0, T]$ needs to be discretely distributed over Γ such that each interval (τ_{l-1}, τ_l) needs to contain at least two of the subintervals defined by Γ so that τ can be updated to assure irreducibility of the chain.

The diffusion bridges are sampled in each subinterval (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) via rejection sampling by proposing from a Brownian bridge and accepting with probability:

$$\alpha_1 = \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} \phi(X_s; \theta) - m(\theta) ds \right\} \prod_{j \in \tau_{i,i+1}} \left(\frac{\int_{\gamma_{j-1}}^{\gamma_j} g(X_s; \theta) ds}{(\gamma_j - \gamma_{j-1}) M(\theta)} \right)^{\dot{n}_j}, \quad (20)$$

for ϕ and $m(\theta)$ as previously defined and $\tau_{i,i+1}$ representing the set of observed intervals that define (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) . The acceptance probability in (20) is evaluated by simulating a Poisson process for the exponential term and by computing an unbiased (and a.s. in $(0, 1)$) estimator for the product term.

Define r_i and $\phi_{i,l}$ as in Appendix F, by making $n_i = 0$, and consider the indicator function

$$I_i = \mathbb{I}[\exp(-\Delta_i(\phi_{i,l}(\theta) - m(\theta))) < u] \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_i} \mathbb{I}\left[\frac{\phi(\dot{X}_{\psi_{i,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,l}(\theta)}{r_i(\theta)} < v_{i,k}\right], \quad (21)$$

where $u \sim U(0, 1)$.

Furthermore, an unbiased estimator of the product term in (20) is given by

$$\prod_{j \in \tau_{i,i+1}} \prod_{k=1}^{\dot{n}_j} \frac{g(X_{U_{j,k}}; \theta)}{M(\theta)}, \quad (22)$$

where $U_j = (U_{j,1}, \dots, U_{j,\dot{n}_j})$ and the $U_{j,k}$'s are i.i.d. $U(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j)$. Finally, the initial and ending intervals are sampled by proposing from a biased Brownian motion which biases the extreme points with terms $\exp\{-A(X_0; \theta)\}$ and $\exp\{A(X_T; \theta)\}$, respectively. A proposal bridge is then accepted if $I_i = 1$ and a simulated Bernoulli r.v. with success probability given by (22) returns 1.

The full conditional density of the parameter vector θ is derived analogously to Theorem 1 and is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta|\cdot) &\propto [M(\theta)]^{\sum_{j=1}^p \dot{n}_j} f_0(X_0; \theta) \pi(\theta) \\ &\exp\left\{A(X_T; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \Delta_i \phi_{i,u}(\theta)\right\} \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[(r_i(\theta))^{\kappa_i} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_i} \left(1 - \frac{\phi(\dot{X}_{\psi_{i,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,l}(\theta)}{r_i(\theta)}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

5.4 Extensions

The methodology proposed in this paper is restricted to the class \mathcal{P} defined in Section 2. Although this is a rich class, one may wonder whether the methodology could be extended to a wider class of models. In fact, we can combine the theory in this paper with ideas from Gonçalves et al. (2017) to devise an exact methodology for a wider class of models that only requires the drift α to be differentiable.

Gonçalves et al. (2017) devise a general MCMC algorithm to perform exact inference for discretely observed (jump-)diffusion processes. The algorithm consists of a Gibbs sampling that alternates between updating parameters and missing paths between observations. Each of those two blocks is updated via Barker's steps in which

the unknown acceptance probabilities are evaluated using a Bernoulli Factory (see Łatuszyński et al., 2011) called the Two-Coin algorithm. This could be adapted to DDCPs by adding the Poisson process likelihood (24) to the expression of the acceptance probability in each step of the Barker’s steps.

Finally, this extended methodology could also be applied to the data scheme described in Section 5.3 for any diffusion with differentiable drift α .

6 Conclusions

This paper proposes the first exact methodology to perform inference in a class of diffusion-driven Cox processes. The methodology is exact in the sense that no discretization-based approximation is used and MCMC error is the only source of inaccuracy. The proposed MCMC algorithm is a Gibbs Sampling that alternates between updating the diffusion path and the parameters indexing the model.

The exactness feature of the algorithm lies in the key fact that the global acceptance probability of the rejection sampling algorithm that samples from the full conditional distribution of the diffusion (bridges) has an intractable term which also appears in the joint density of the data and the diffusion at a finite collection of time points.

Several issues related to model flexibility and the efficiency of the proposed methodology are discussed and illustrated in simulated examples. Results show very good recovery of the intensity function and the Cauchy diffusion example illustrates the model flexibility when compared to the most popular models in the literature. Also, three real data examples are presented, concerning coal mine accidents, the SP500 index and earthquakes in Japan.

Further discussions are presented regarding model parameterization, prediction and inference for the case where the data is aggregated. The centered parameterization is argued and illustrated to have a better performance. Prediction is straightforwardly performed with an extra sampling step that uses the MCMC output to sample from the desired predictive distribution. Finally, an extension of the proposed methodology for a wider class of models is discussed with the use of an infinite-dimensional Barker’s MCMC algorithm.

References

- Beskos, A., O. Papaspiliopoulos, and G. O. Roberts (2006). Retrospective exact simulation of diffusion sample paths with applications. *Bernoulli* 12(6), 1077–1098.
- Beskos, A., O. Papaspiliopoulos, and G. O. Roberts (2008). A new factorisation of diffusion measure and sample path reconstruction. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability* 10(1), 85–104.
- Beskos, A., O. Papaspiliopoulos, G. O. Roberts, and P. Fearnhead (2006). Exact and computationally efficient likelihood-based inference for discretely observed diffusion

- processes (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 68(3), 333–382.
- Cariboni, J. and W. Schoutens (2009). Jumps in intensity models: investigating the performance of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes in credit risk modeling. *Metrika* 69, 173–198.
- Chib, S., M. K. Pitt, and N. Shephard (2006). Likelihood based inference for diffusion driven state space models. *Working paper*.
- Cox, D. R. (1955). Some statistical methods connected with series of events. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 17, 129–164.
- Dassios, A. and J. Jang (2003). Pricing of catastrophe reinsurance and derivatives using the cox process with shot noise intensity. *Finance and stochastics* 7, 73–95.
- Diggle, P. J. (2014). *Statistical Analysis of Spatial and Spatio-Temporal Point Patterns* (3rd ed.). London: Chapman & Hall.
- Doornik, J. A. (2007). *Object-Oriented Matrix Programming Using Ox* (3rd ed.). London: Timberlake Consultants Press and Oxford.
- Gonçalves, F. B. and D. Gamerman (2018). Exact Bayesian inference in spatiotemporal Cox processes driven by multivariate Gaussian processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society - Series B* 80(157-175).
- Gonçalves, F. B., G. O. Roberts, and K. G. Łatuszynski (2017). Exact Monte Carlo likelihood-based inference for jump-diffusion processes. [*arXiv:1707.00332*].
- Iversen, V. B., A. J. Glenstrup, and J. Rasmussen (2000). Internet dial-up traffic modelling. *Fifteenth Nordic Teletraffic Seminar*.
- Jarrett, R. G. (1979). A note on the intervals between coal-mining disasters. *Biometrika* 66, 191–193.
- Kloeden, P. and E. Platen (1995). *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*. New York: Springer.
- Łatuszyński, K., I. Kosmidis, O. Papaspiliopoulos, and G. Roberts (2011). Simulating events of unknown probabilities via reverse time martingales. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 38(4), 441–452.
- Lechnerová, R., K. Helisová, and V. Benesš (2008). Cox point processes driven by Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type processes. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability* 10, 315–335.
- Legg, M. W. and M. A. Chitre (2012). Clustering of snapping shrimp snaps on long time scales: a simulation study. *Proceedings of Acoustics*.

- Møller, J., A. R. Syversveen, and R. P. Waagepetersen (1998). Log Gaussian Cox processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 25, 451–482.
- Øksendal, B. K. (1998). *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Papaspiliopoulos, O., G. O. Roberts, and M. Sköld (2007). A general framework for the parametrization of hierarchical models. *Statistical Science* 22, 59–73.
- Roberts, G. and L. M. Sangalli (2010). Latent diffusion models for survival analysis. *Bernoulli* 16, 435–458.
- Sermaidis, G., O. Papaspiliopoulos, G. O. Roberts, A. Beskos, and P. Fearnhead (2012). Markov chain Monte Carlo for exact inference for diffusions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 40, 294–321.

Appendix A - Important results and definitions

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, be the probability measure of $(X_{(i)}|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, N, \theta, X^{-(i)})$, where $X^{(i)}$ is X in (τ_{i-1}, τ_i) and $X^{-(i)}$ is $X \setminus \{X^{(i)}, X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}\}$. Let also \mathbb{P}_1 be the probability measure of $(X_0, X^{(1)}|N, X_{\tau_1}, \theta, X^{-(1)})$, where $X^{(1)}$ is X in $(0, \tau_1)$, where $X^{-(1)}$ is X outside $[0, \tau_1]$. Finally, let \mathbb{P}_{m+1} be the probability measure of $(X_T, X^{(m+1)}|N, X_{\tau_m}, \theta, X^{-(m+1)})$, where $X^{(m+1)}$ is X in (τ_m, T) , where $X^{-(m+1)}$ is X outside $[\tau_m, T]$.

Now let $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}$ be the joint measure of the $m + 1$ independent Brownian bridges $BB(\tau_{i-1}, X_{\tau_{i-1}}; \tau_i, X_{\tau_i})$ (with measure denoted $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i$), for $i = 1, \dots, m + 1$, and $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ be the joint measure of the $m + 1$ independent biased Brownian bridges (with measure denoted $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*$) that differ from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i$ only in the distribution of \tilde{X}_i . Let also \mathbb{W}_1 be the measure of a Brownian motion in $[0, \tau_1]$ with initial distribution f_0 and \mathbb{W}_{m+1} be the measure of a Brownian motion in $(\tau_m, T]$.

Finally, let Ξ^+ be the product measure of $n + m + 1$ unit rate Poisson processes on $[s_{ij-1}, s_{ij}] \times [0, 1]$, $\forall i, j$, \mathbb{L} be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} be the measure of a unit rate Poisson process on $[0, T]$.

We set, for $i = 1, \dots, m + 1$,

$$L(X, \theta) \propto \exp \left\{ - \int_0^T g(X_s; \theta) ds \right\} \prod_{j=1}^n g(X_{t_j}; \theta), \quad (24)$$

$$L_i(X, \theta) \propto \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} g(X_s; \theta) ds \right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta), \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(X, \theta) = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^T \left(\frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2} \right) (X_s; \theta) ds \right\}, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_i(X, \theta) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2} \right) (X_s; \theta) ds \right\}. \quad (27)$$

$L(X, \theta)$ is the Poisson process likelihood, which is proportional to the RN derivative between the law of a $PP(g(X_s; \theta))$ and the law of a $PP(1)$. $\mathcal{G}_i(X, \theta)$ is proportional to the RN derivative between the law of a bridge of X in (τ_{i-1}, τ_i) and the law of a Brownian bridge in the same interval and with same initial and end values (see Beskos et al., 2006).

Proposition 1. For $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}) \propto L_i(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_i(X, \theta), \quad (28)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

Proposition 2.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{W}_1}(X_0, X^{(1)}) \propto L_1(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_1(X, \theta) \exp \{-A(X_0; \theta)\} \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{m+1}}{d\mathbb{W}_{m+1}}(X_T, X^{(m+1)}) \propto L_{m+1}(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_{m+1}(X, \theta) \exp \{A(X_T; \theta)\} \quad (30)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

Proposition 3. For $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(X^{(i)}) = \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}) \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}}{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}}(\tilde{X}_i) \propto L_i(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_i(X, \theta) \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta)}, \quad (31)$$

and, therefore, the acceptance probability of the proposed rejection sampling algorithm in section 2.1, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(-\int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} (\phi(X_s; \theta) - m(\theta)) ds\right) &= \exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j}(\phi_{i,j,l}(\theta) - m(\theta))\right) \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \exp\left(-\int_{s_{i,j-1}}^{s_{i,j}} (\phi(X_s; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)) ds\right), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Proof. The first result comes from Bayes Theorem, RN chain rule, Girsanov's Theorem and the fact that $\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(X^{(i)}) = \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}}{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}}(\tilde{X}_i)$. The second result comes from standard calculations to bound the RN derivative of $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ w.r.t. $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*$ by 1 and by summing and subtracting $\phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)$ inside the integral.

Consider function $\phi(\cdot; \theta)$ and $m(\theta)$ as defined in Section 2. Now let $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ be an upper bound for the function $\phi(X_s; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)$ in $[s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}]$ and $\Xi_{i,j}$ be a homogeneous Poisson process of intensity $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ on $[0, t] \times [0, 1]$. Now define N_b to be the number of points of $\Xi_{i,j}$ falling below the graph $\{(s, (\phi(X_s; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta))/r_{i,j}(\theta)); s \in [s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}]\}$.

Proposition 4.

$$P(N_b = 0 | X, \theta) = \exp\left\{-\int_{s_{i,j-1}}^{s_{i,j}} (\phi(X_s; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)) ds\right\}.$$

Proof. The result comes from standard properties of Poisson processes.

Proposition 4 implies that we only need to know the value of X_s at the times where there is an event from $\Xi_{i,j}$ to simulate a coin with probability given by $P(N_b = 0 | X, \theta)$. This is called the *Poisson coin algorithm*.

Lemma 1. The density of $(\tilde{X}_i, X_{(i)}, \mathcal{L}_i, \Xi_i)$ conditional on $(X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, N, \theta)$, for $i = 1, \dots, m+1$, with respect to the dominating measure $\mathbb{L}^{n_i} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i \otimes \Xi_i^+$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\pi(\tilde{X}_i, X_{(i)}, \mathcal{L}_i, \Xi_i | N, X_{\tau_i}, X_{\tau_{i+1}}) = \\ &= \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(\tilde{X}_i) \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j}(1 - r_{i,j}(\theta))\right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} r_{i,j}(\theta)^{\kappa_{i,j}} \exp\left\{-\sum_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \Delta_{i,j}(\phi_{i,j,l} - m)(\theta)\right\}}{a_i(X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}; \theta)} \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa_{i,j}} \mathbb{I}\left[\frac{\phi(X_{\psi_{i,j,k}}; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta)}{r_{i,j}(\theta)} < v_{i,j,k}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(\tilde{X}_i)$ is given by (41) for intervals with events from N , and is 1, otherwise. Also,

$$a(X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}; \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*} \left[\exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} (\phi(X_s; \theta) - m(\theta)) ds \right\} \right]. \quad (34)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

Appendix B - Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1

Bayes Theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}) &\propto \frac{dP}{d\mathbb{N}}(N|X, \theta) \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, \theta) \\ &\propto \frac{dP}{d\mathbb{N}}(N|X, \theta) \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}, X_{\tau_i}|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, \theta) \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X_{\tau_i}|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, \theta)}{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}} \propto L_i(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_i(X, \theta), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{G}_i is obtained from Girsanov's Theorem (see Beskos et al., 2006).

Proof of Proposition 2

From Bayes Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{W}_1}(X_0, X^{(1)}) &\propto \frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{N}}(N|X, \theta) \frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{W}_1}(X_0, X^{(1)}|X_{\tau_1}, \theta) \\ &\propto L_1(X, \theta) \frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{W}_1}(X^{(1)}, X_{\tau_1}|X_0, \theta) \frac{f_0}{f_\theta}(X_0; \theta) \\ &\propto L_1(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_1(X, \theta) \exp \{-A(X_0; \theta)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{m+1}}{d\mathbb{W}_{m+1}}(X_T, X^{(m+1)}) &\propto \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{m+1}}{d\mathbb{N}}(N|X, \theta) \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{m+1}}{d\mathbb{W}_{m+1}}(X_T, X^{(m+1)}|X_{\tau_m}, \theta) \\ &\propto L_{m+1}(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}_{m+1}(X, \theta) \exp \{-A(X_T; \theta)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_{m+1} are obtained from Girsanov's Theorem (see Beskos et al., 2006, Equation (4)).

Proof of Lemma 1

The result is proved by showing that the output from a rejection sampling algorithm that proposes $(\tilde{X}_i, X_{(i)}, \mathcal{L}_i)$ from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*$ and Ξ_i from its marginal law and has acceptance indicator given by (21) is an exact draw from $(\tilde{X}_i, X_{(i)}, \mathcal{L}_i, \Xi_i|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, N, \theta)$.

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ be the law of $(X^{(i)}|X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, N, \theta)$, then, equations (41) and (25) and Proposition 1 imply that

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(X^{(i)}) = \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(X^{(i)}) \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(\tilde{X}_i)}{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(\tilde{X}_i)} \propto \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} \phi(X_s; \theta) - m(\theta) ds \right\} \leq 1. \quad (35)$$

The proof is concluded by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} \phi(X_s; \theta) - m(\theta) ds \right\} = \\ & \prod_{j=1}^{n_i+1} \exp \left(- \Delta_{ij} (\phi_{i,j,l}(\theta) - m(\theta)) - \int_{s_{i,j-1}}^{s_{i,j}} \phi(X_s; \theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta) ds \right) = P(I_i = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(N, X, \Xi, \theta) \propto \\ & \prod_{i=0}^m \pi(\tilde{X}_i, X_{(i)}, \mathcal{L}_i, \Xi_i | X_{\tau_{i-1}}, X_{\tau_i}, N, \theta) \pi(X_\tau, N | X_0, \theta) \pi(X_0 | \theta) \pi(\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (36) is obtained from Lemma 1. To derive the second term we define \mathbb{P} and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ to be the probability measures of $(X_{-\tau}, X_\tau, N | X_0, \theta)$ and $(X_{-\tau} | X_\tau, N, X_0, \theta)$, respectively, where $X_{-\tau} := X \setminus X_\tau$. We also define $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ to be the joint measure of the $m+1$ biased Brownian bridges on $(\tau_{i-1}, X_{\tau_{i-1}}; \tau_i, X_{\tau_i})$, for $i = 1, \dots, m+1$, as defined in Appendix A.

We now obtain the joint density $\pi(X_\tau, N | X_0, \theta)$ w.r.t. the product measure $(\mathbb{N} \otimes \mathbb{L}^{m+1})$. We have that

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*}(X_{-\tau}) = \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}(X_{-\tau}) \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*}(X_{-\tau}), \quad (37)$$

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*}(X_{-\tau}) = \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}(\tilde{X})}{\frac{1}{c(\theta)} \pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}(\tilde{X}) \prod_{j=1}^n g(X_{t_j}; \theta)} = \frac{c(\theta)}{\prod_{j=1}^n g(X_{t_j}; \theta)}, \quad (38)$$

where $c(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} c_i(\theta)$.

Furthermore, Bayes theorem combined with Girsanov's Theorem gives

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\tilde{\mathbb{W}}}(X_{-\tau}) = L(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}(X, \theta) \exp \{ A(X_\tau; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta) \} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} f_{\mathcal{N}}((X_{\tau_i} - X_{\tau_{i-1}})/\Delta_i)/\sqrt{\Delta_i}}{\pi(X_\tau, N | X_0, \theta)}, \quad (39)$$

for L and \mathcal{G} as defined in (24) and (26), respectively.

We replace (39) and (38) in (37) and take expectation on both sides w.r.t. $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(X_\tau, N|X_0, \theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*} \left[L(X, \theta) \mathcal{G}(X, \theta) \exp \{A(X_T; \theta) - A(X_0; \theta)\} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n g(X_{t_j}; \theta)} \right] \\ &c(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} f_{\mathcal{N}}(X_{\tau_{i+1}}; X_{\tau_i}, \Delta_i). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We now replace (33) and (40) in (36) to get the result.

Proof of Theorem 2

This is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1, but replacing (X_τ, \tilde{X}) by (Y_τ, \tilde{Y}) and $X \setminus (X_\tau, \tilde{X})$ by $\omega \setminus (X_\tau, \tilde{X})$, where ω is the linear transformation φ^{-1} of the bridges among the (X_τ, \tilde{X}) values to make them start and end in 0. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(N, Y_\tau, \tilde{Y}, \mathcal{L}, \Xi, Y_0, \theta) &\propto \\ \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \pi(\tilde{Y}_i, \omega_i, \mathcal{L}_i, \Xi_i | Y_{\tau_{i-1}}, Y_{\tau_i}, N, \theta) &\pi(X_\tau(\theta), N | X_0(\theta), \theta) \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \eta'(Y_{\tau_i}; \theta) \pi(Y_0 | \theta) \pi(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (41) is obtained by adapting Lemma 1. Basically, by replacing $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(\tilde{X}_i)$ with $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(\tilde{X}_i(\theta); X_{\tau_{i-1}}(\theta), X_{\tau_i}(\theta)) \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \eta'(Y_{s_{i,j}}; \theta)$, and redefining ϕ_l , ϕ_u and $m(\theta)$ as shown in the theorem. Furthermore, the Brownian bridge measures in the dominating measure are replaced by the measure of standard Brownian bridges (starting and ending in 0).

Appendix C - MCMC plots




Figure 7: Autocorrelation plot of parameter δ for the cdf-DW example under the noncentered (left) and centered (right) parameterization of the Poisson processes Ξ_{ij} .




Figure 8: Autocorrelation plots of μ (left) and ρ (right) for the exp-OU example under the centered (top) and noncentered (bottom) parameterization.

Appendix D - Simulated examples

Simulation from a DDCP model is achieved by basically combining exact simulation of diffusions with the Poisson thinning technique that simulates an inhomogeneous Poisson process with intensity λ_s by thinning the events from a homogeneous Poisson process with intensity λ^* - an upper bound for λ_s , $\forall s$. Exact simulation of diffusions is performed via the EA algorithm proposed in Beskos et al. (2006) and Beskos et al. (2008). The EA algorithm samples from the exact law of a class of diffusion processes via retrospective rejection sampling. It proposes from (biased) Brownian motion in the case of unconditional diffusions and from Brownian bridge in the case of diffusion bridges. The algorithm is directly applied to unit diffusion coefficient processes which can always be obtained, if σ is differentiable, by applying the Lamperti transform.

The acceptance probability of EA has the form $\exp\left\{-\int_0^t \phi(X_s) ds\right\}$, where $\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2}\right)(x) - l$ and $l = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}} (\alpha^2 + \alpha')(u)/2$. The decision of whether or not to accept the proposal is taken through a Poisson process in such a way that the path of X only needs to be unveiled at a random finite collection of time points.

Suppose, without loss of generality, that function g is unbounded. The algorithm to simulate DDCPs is as follows:

Exact simulation of DDCPs

1. simulate X_0 from f_0 ;
2. simulate X in $(0, t]$ via EA and keep the lower and upper bounds for X obtained from \mathcal{L} ;
3. obtain an upper bound λ^* for λ_s in $[0, t]$ using the bounds for X ;
4. simulate a Poisson process with rate λ^* on $[0, t]$:
(t_1, \dots, t_{n^*});
5. simulate X at times (t_1, \dots, t_{n^*}) , from the respective BB conditional on \mathcal{L} ;
6. keep each of the n^* points with probability $R(t_i) = \frac{\lambda(t_i)}{\lambda^*}$.

Step 2 should be performed piecewise if t is big, in order to get a reasonable computational cost (see Beskos et al., 2006). In this case, each simulated interval provides an upper bound λ^* based on \mathcal{L} .

We simulate four Cox processes. For the OU-process $dX_s = \rho X_s ds + dW_s$, we consider $g(X_s) = \exp(\mu + \sigma X_s)$ (exp-OU), for $\mu = 0$, $\rho = 0.05$, $\sigma = 0.2$; and $g(X_s) = \delta \Phi(\sigma X_s)$ (cdf-OU), for $\rho = 0.05$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $\delta = 3$. For the (transformed) DW process $dX_s = -\rho X_s(\sigma^2 X_s^2 - \mu)ds + dW_s$, $g(X_s) = \exp(\delta + \sigma X_s)$ (exp-DW), for $\delta = 0$, $\mu = 1.5$, $\rho = 0.05$, $\sigma = 0.15$; and $g(X_s) = \delta \Phi(\sigma X_s)$ (cdf-DW), for $\mu = 0.5$, $\rho = 0.1$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $\delta = 3$.

Figure 9 shows one realization of each of the four processes, with $T = 400$. We also compute Monte Carlo estimates of the expectation of some functionals of the processes, which are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Monte Carlo estimates of the expectation of some functionals of the simulated processes. An i.i.d. sample of size 50k is used. N_T is the number of Poisson events, $t_{(10)}$ is the time of occurrence of the 10-th event.

		1%	25%	50%	75%	99%	mean	s.d.
exp-OU	N_T	294	415	477	549	773	487.34	102.74
	$t_{(10)}$	1.83	5.91	9.32	14.24	34.01	10.95	6.93
cdf-OU	N_T	410	543	599	656	792	599.58	82.90
	$t_{(10)}$	2.14	4.64	6.61	9.84	28.06	8.10	5.31
exp-DW	N_T	118	167	654	1171	1408	681.20	469.68
	$t_{(10)}$	3.70	7.08	9.40	13.30	38.12	11.43	6.89
cdf-DW	N_T	144	218	602	976	1084	601.20	349.69
	$t_{(10)}$	2.66	5.05	6.50	8.55	25.40	7.49	4.19




Figure 9: Realization of processes exp-OU (top-left), cdf-OU (top-right), exp-DW (bottom-left) and cdf-DW (bottom-right). Number of Poisson events are 499, 518, 714 and 645, respectively.

Appendix E - Sampling from a biased Brownian bridge

We present a collection of algorithms to sample from the density

$$\pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i^*}(\tilde{X}_i; \theta) = \frac{1}{c_i(\theta)} \pi_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_i}(\tilde{X}_i) \times \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} g(X_{s_{i,j}}; \theta). \quad (41)$$

Suppose that the (normal) distribution of \tilde{X} under a $BB(X_{\tau_1}, \tau_1, X_{\tau_2}, \tau_2)$ has mean vector μ and covariance matrix Σ . Now define μ_0 to be a L -dimensional vector with all entries equal to b , such that $g(u) \leq \exp(bu + c)$. Sampling from (41) can be performed via rejection sampling by proposing a value x from the distribution

$$\mathcal{N}(m, C), \quad C^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1}, \quad m = C(\Sigma^{-1}\mu + \mu_0), \quad (42)$$

and accepting with probability

$$\alpha = \prod_{l=1}^L \frac{g(x; \theta)}{\exp(bx + c)}.$$

If some additional conditions are satisfied though, more efficient algorithms can be used to simulate from (41). We present some examples below

- **Sampling from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ when $g(u; \theta) \propto \exp\{-au^2 + bu\}$, for $a \geq 0, b \in \mathbb{R}$.**

This implies that the density in (41) is a multivariate normal. Suppose first that $a > 0$, then the distribution of \tilde{X} under $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ is

$$\mathcal{N}(m, C), \quad C^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1} + \Sigma_0, \quad m = C(\Sigma^{-1}\mu + \mu_0), \quad (43)$$

where $\Sigma_0 = (2a)I_L$, for I_L being the L -dimensional identity matrix.

If $a = 0$, the distribution of \tilde{X} under $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ is given by (42).

- **Sampling from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ when $g(u; \theta) \propto \Phi\{au + b\}$, for $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.**

This implies that the distribution of \tilde{X} belongs to a general class of skew-normal distributions from which directly simulation is not feasible. Two options are available here. The first is a rejection sampling that proposes from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ and accepts with probability

$$\alpha = \prod_{l=1}^L \Phi(ax + b).$$

This algorithm has a global acceptance probability equals to $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{l=1}^L \Phi(ax + b)]$.

If the first algorithm is not efficient, simulation from (41) may be performed by considering an auxiliary embedded Gibbs sampling algorithm, as proposed by Gonçalves and Gamerman (2018). Define $W = aI_L$ and δ as the L -dimensional column vector with all entries equal to $-b$. Also define $\Gamma = I_L + W\Sigma W'$, $\Delta' = W\Sigma$ and $\gamma = W\mu$. Furthermore, let A be the lower diagonal matrix obtained from the Cholesky decomposition of Γ , i.e. $\Gamma = AA'$. Finally, define the region $B = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^L; Ax > -(\gamma + \delta)\}$ and the L -dimensional random vectors U_0^* , U_0 and U_1 . The following algorithm outputs an exact draw from (41).

1. Simulate $(U_0^*|U_0^* \in B)$, where $U_0^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_L)$;
2. obtain $U_0 = AU_0^*$;
3. simulate $(U_1|U_0) \sim \mathcal{N}(\Delta\Gamma^{-1}U_0, \Sigma - \Delta\Gamma^{-1}\Delta')$;
4. output $U_1 + \mu$.

The only non-trivial step from the algorithm above is Step 1, in which we need to simulate from a vector of uncorrelated standard Gaussian distribution truncated to be in a region defined by linear constraints. That is achievable by a Gibbs sampler that samples each coordinate at a time from its respective univariate truncated standard normal full conditional distribution. The algorithm is efficient since the linear constraints are defined by the lower diagonal matrix A , which allows us to initiate the algorithm already inside the truncated region B . Furthermore, the dimension L will typically be small, which makes the algorithm above sufficiently fast. More details about the simulation of this general class of skew normal distributions can be found in Gonçalves and Gamerman (2018).

- **Sampling from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ when $g(u; \theta)$ is bounded by $\exp\{-au^2 + bu + c\}$, $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}$, for $a > 0$, $(b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.**

We sample from (41) via rejection sampling by proposing a value x from (43) and accepting with probability

$$\alpha = \prod_{l=1}^L \frac{g(x; \theta)}{\exp(-ax^2 + bx + c)}.$$

- **Sampling from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^*$ when g is uniformly bounded above by $M \in \mathbb{R}$.**

We sample from (41) via rejection sampling by proposing a value x from a $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ and accepting with probability

$$\alpha = \prod_{l=1}^L \frac{g(x; \theta)}{M}.$$

If direct simulation from (41) is not possible and more than one of the rejection sampling algorithms above can be applied, we choose the one with the highest global acceptance probability, which may be computed analytically or empirically.

Appendix F - The layered Brownian bridge

Define $\phi(\cdot) = \left(g + \frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha'}{2}\right)(\cdot)$ and $m(\theta) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}} \{\phi(u; \theta)\}$. Bounds for the ϕ function are obtained from bounds on the Brownian bridge proposal which, in turn, are obtained through the *layered Brownian bridge* construction presented in Beskos et al. (2008). We ask the reader to resort to the original reference and Gonçalves et al. (2017) for details about the simulation of layers and of the process given layers. In fact, we perform the layer construction by simulating layers for standard (starting and ending in 0) Brownian bridges on the respective time lengths and making the corresponding linear transformation to recover the layers for the original bridges (for details, see Gonçalves et al., 2017, Appendices E and F). This strategy produces tighter bounds for the diffusion path which, in turn, reduces the computational cost. Also, the parameterization considered in Theorem 2 requires the simulation of standard bridges.

We define an upper bound $r_{i,j}(X)$ for function ϕ in $[s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j}]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta) &= \inf \{\phi(u; \theta); u \in B_{i,j}\}, \\ \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta) &= \sup \{\phi(u; \theta); u \in B_{i,j}\}, \\ r_{i,j}(\theta) &= \phi_{i,j,u}(\theta) - \phi_{i,j,l}(\theta); u \in B_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_{i,j} := [\underline{x}_{i,j} + \underline{L}_{i,j}, \bar{x}_{i,j} + \bar{L}_{i,j}], \quad j = 1, \dots, n_i + 1,$$

with $\underline{x}_{i,j} = \min\{X_{s_{i,j-1}}, X_{s_{i,j}}\}$, $\bar{x}_{i,j} = \max\{X_{s_{i,j-1}}, X_{s_{i,j}}\}$, $\underline{L}_{i,j}$ and $\bar{L}_{i,j}$ being lower and upper bounds for the independent standard BBs in $(s_{i,j-1}, s_{i,j})$.

Appendix G - Sampling the partition τ

The random partition τ is updated on every iteration of the Gibbs sampler by setting a time length ε and doing as follows:

- i) $\tau_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(0, \min\{\varepsilon, t_1\})$;
- ii) $\tau_2 = \tau_1 + \varepsilon$, if $t_1 > \varepsilon$ and $\tau_2 = \tau_1 + \mathcal{U}(0, \varepsilon)$, otherwise;
- iii) $\tau_j = \tau_1 + (l - 1)\varepsilon$, for $l = 3, \dots, m - 1$;
- iv) $\tau_m = \tau_{m-1} + \varepsilon$, if $\tau_m \in (t_n, T)$ and $t_m + \varepsilon > T$ for some m ; and $\tau_m = \mathcal{U}(t_n, T)$, otherwise.