

An Expectation-Maximization Algorithm for Continuous-time Hidden Markov Models

Qingcan Wang* and Weinan E†

Abstract

We propose a unified framework that extends the inference methods for classical hidden Markov models to continuous settings, where both the hidden states and observations occur in continuous time. Two different settings are analyzed: hidden jump process with a finite state space, and hidden diffusion process with a continuous state space. For each setting, we first estimate the hidden states given the observations and model parameters, showing that the posterior distribution of the hidden states can be described by differential equations in continuous time. We then consider the estimation of unknown model parameters, deriving the continuous-time formulas for the expectation-maximization algorithm. We also propose a Monte Carlo method based on the continuous formulation, sampling the posterior distribution of the hidden states and updating the parameter estimation.

1 Introduction

Hidden Markov models (HMM) are widely used for inferring the underlying dynamical process from observed data. The classical discrete-time hidden Markov model (DT-HMM) contains a pair of stochastic processes $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t = 0, \dots, T\}$. The hidden process $\{X_t\}$ is a Markov chain with transition probability $\Pr\{X_{t+1}|X_t; \theta\}$; the observations $\{Y_t\}$ are sampled independently at each time t based on the observation probability $\Pr\{Y_t|X_t; \theta\}$. Here θ denotes the model parameters. The following are two basic problems for HMM:

State estimation: given the observations $\{Y_t\}$ and the model parameters θ , calculate the posterior distribution of the hidden states $\Pr\{X_t|Y_0, \dots, Y_T; \theta\}$.

Parameter estimation: given the observations $\{Y_t\}$ with unknown model parameters θ , learn θ .

For DT-HMM, the most widely used approach to address both of the problems is the Baum-Welch algorithm [3, 4, 52]. It uses the forward-backward equations for state estimation, and the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm for parameter estimation (see Section 2).

A natural extension of the classical HMM is the continuous-time Hidden Markov models (CT-HMM), where both the hidden process $\{X_t\}$ and observations $\{Y_t\}$ occur in continuous time. Different settings of CT-HMM have been proposed in the literature, along with the corresponding algorithms. One setting that has been considered is to take the hidden $\{X_t\}$ as a jump process with finite state space. Along this line, [23] establishes some theoretical results for the case when the observations $\{Y_t\}$ are either a non-homogeneous jump process determined by $\{X_t\}$, or a Brownian motion with drift (see also [24, 61, 15, 22]). From a more practical perspective, different settings like the Markov-modulated Poisson process [18, 56], batch Markovian arrival process [7] and bivariate Markov process [47] have been considered (see Section 3.1

*Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics, Princeton University (qingcanw@princeton.edu).

†Department of Mathematics and Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics, Princeton University (weinan@math.princeton.edu).

for details). To estimate the parameters, the approach studied in [18, 31] is to discretize the time and solve it as DT-HMM. Another approach is to use the ideas from the estimation of (non-hidden) jump process [48, 8, 29], and calculate the dwell time and the number of jumps among the states. Another setting considered is when the hidden $\{X_t\}$ is a diffusion process with continuous state space, which follows the Stratonovich-Kushner and Zakai equations [60, 38, 62]. Parameter estimation in this case has taken quite different approaches. In [14, 12], the authors regard the parameters as being part of the hidden state. Parameter estimation can then be solved using state estimation. In [63, 25], the authors propose to discretize the time first, and then use the discrete EM formulation.

Given the different settings and algorithms in CT-HMM, our goal is to propose a unified framework for parameter estimation in CT-HMM. Our basic idea is to study the continuous-time limit of the classical discrete-time Baum-Welch algorithm. We will apply the Baum-Welch framework to both hidden jump process and hidden diffusion process, and show that the estimation problem can be solved using a similar approach even though the settings are quite different.

Section 3 considers CT-HMM for hidden jump process, where both the hidden states and observations take a finite set of values. Consider a system where the underlying states can switch between several discrete values, and we have a sensor that monitors the system in continuous time, whose output also takes discrete values. It is reasonable to model the hidden states $\{X_t\}$ as a jump process, and assume that the sensor output $\{Y_t\}$ changes every time $\{X_t\}$ jumps. Specifically, for each jumping time τ of $\{X_t\}$, resample Y_τ from the observation probability condition on X_τ , and X_t, Y_t remain constant during the holding period $[\tau, \tau')$, where τ' is the next jumping time of $\{X_t\}$. Here the holding time $\tau' - \tau$ is an exponentially distributed random variable, therefore this can be regarded as an extension of DT-HMM whose holding time is always 1. Applying the Baum-Welch framework to this continuous setting, the state estimation, i.e., the posterior distribution $\Pr\{X_t|Y_s, s \in [0, T]; \theta\}$ can be described by forward and backward piecewise ODEs. Parameter estimation can be done using the EM algorithm, where the parameter update formula consists of summing terms that correspond to the jumping times, as well as the integral terms for the holding periods.

Section 4 shows that the framework can also be applied to CT-HMM with hidden diffusion process, where the hidden states and observations take continuous values. Here we analyze the classical setting in the Stratonovich-Kushner and Zakai equations. The Zakai equation solves the optimal nonlinear filtering problem, which is the forward part in our framework. We give the corresponding SPDE for the backward part. By combining those we can solve the smoothing problem for state estimation. We then derive the continuous-time formula for the EM algorithm in parameter estimation. For linear Gaussian problem, we show that our results are consistent with the discrete-time Kalman filter and EM algorithm under the limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. For general nonlinear problems, we propose a Monte Carlo method based on particle filter and smoother to sample the posterior distribution of hidden states, and then update parameters from the samples in the EM algorithm.

While this work mainly focuses on the continuous-time states and observations, the Baum-Welch framework can also be applied to the setting where the observations occur at some different set of discrete times, and we show the corresponding results in Appendix A.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

In this paper, we use uppercase X_t, Y_t to denote random variables, lowercase x_t, y_t to denote the particular values of the random variables, and $\{X_t\}, \{Y_t\}$ to denote the stochastic processes. Let $\Pr\{\cdot\}$ be the probability distribution and $p(\cdot)$ be the probability density. Let $\Pr\{\cdot; \theta\}$ be the probability distribution corresponding to the parameters θ . Without ambiguity, we may simply denote the conditional probability $\Pr\{X_t = x_t|Y_t = y_t\}$ as $\Pr\{x_t|y_t\}$.

In continuous time, the subscript $x_{0:t}$ denotes all the x_s for $0 \leq s \leq t$. In some parts of the paper we may need discretization of the time space with step Δt . In this case we only consider x_t on the grid, i.e., $t = k\Delta t$ for some integer k , then $x_{0:t}$ denotes all the $x_{l\Delta t}$ for $l = 0, 1, \dots, k$, and $\Delta x_t = x_{t+\Delta t} - x_t$. Let $\mathbf{1}_{\{\cdot\}}$ be the indicator function. Let $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with $a_1, \dots, a_n$ on the main diagonal.

2.2 Expectation-maximization algorithm

The expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm is an iterative method to estimate parameters in statistical models. Let θ be the unknown parameters, and the model generates a set of unobservable latent variables X and a set of observed data Y . The goal is to calculate the maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters θ given the observations $Y = y$, i.e., $\theta^* = \arg\max_{\theta} L(\theta)$ where

$$L(\theta) = \log p(Y = y; \theta) = \log \int p(X = x, Y = y; \theta) dx. \quad (2.1)$$

In the case where the integral cannot be calculated directly, the EM algorithm takes an iterative approach as following. Assume that we can find a function $\mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta')$ such that $L(\theta) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta')$ and $L(\theta) = \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta)$ for all θ and θ' . For iterations $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, let $\theta^{k+1} = \arg\max_{\theta} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$, then

$$L(\theta^k) = \mathcal{Q}(\theta^k, \theta^k) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\theta^{k+1}, \theta^k) \leq L(\theta^{k+1}),$$

i.e., $L(\theta^k)$ is nondecreasing during the iterations. If L is upper bounded, the EM algorithm will converge to a local maximum.

Consider the following construction of $\mathcal{Q}$:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta') = \int p(x|y; \theta') \log \frac{p(x, y; \theta)}{p(x|y; \theta')} dx. \quad (2.2)$$

Since

$$L(\theta) = \log \int p(x, y; \theta) dx = \log \int p(x|y; \theta') \frac{p(x, y; \theta)}{p(x|y; \theta')} dx$$

and $\log(\cdot)$ is concave, we have $\mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta') \leq L(\theta)$. Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta) &= \int p(x|y; \theta) \log \frac{p(x, y; \theta)}{p(x|y; \theta)} dx \\ &= \int p(x|y; \theta) \log p(y; \theta) dx \\ &= \log p(y; \theta) = L(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

thus $\mathcal{Q}$ is a qualified construction.

The EM algorithm repeats the following two steps until convergence. In the *expectation step (E-step)*, calculate the conditional probability $p(X = x|Y = y; \theta^k)$; in the *maximization step (M-step)*, update the parameter as $\theta^{k+1} = \arg\max_{\theta} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$. In practice we may use

$$\mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta') = \int p(X = x|Y = y; \theta') \log p(X = x, Y = y; \theta) \quad (2.3)$$

instead of (2.2), since they give the same result in the M-step.

2.3 Baum-Welch algorithm

The Baum-Welch algorithm solves both the state estimation and parameter estimation for the classical DT-HMM. In a DT-HMM $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t = 0, \dots, T\}$, the hidden states $X_t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a Markov chain with transition probability P , and the observations $Y_t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ are sampled independently at each t according to the observation probability r , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ij} &= \Pr\{X_{t+1} = j | X_t = i\}, \\ r_i(y) &= \Pr\{Y_t = y | X_t = i\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and $y = 1, \dots, m$.

State estimation Assume that the probabilities P and r and the initial distribution $\pi_0(i) = \Pr\{X_0 = i\}$ are given, and we have observations $Y_t = y_t, t = 0, \dots, T$. The goal is to estimate the posterior distribution $\Pr\{X_t | y_{0:T}\}$. The Baum-Welch algorithm introduces two sets of probabilities

$$\alpha_t(i) = \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:t}\}, \quad \beta_t(i) = \Pr\{y_{t+1:T} | X_t = i\}, \quad (2.5)$$

that can be solved by the forward and backward equations inductively:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0(i) &= \pi_0(i)r_i(y_0), \quad \alpha_t(i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{t-1}(j)P_{ji}r_i(y_t), \\ \beta_T(i) &= 1, \quad \beta_t(i) = \sum_{j=1}^n P_{ij}\beta_{t+1}(j)r_j(y_{t+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Since

$$\Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:T}\} = \Pr\{y_{t+1:T} | X_t = i, y_{0:t}\} \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:t}\} = \alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i),$$

the posterior distribution is given by

$$\rho_t(i) = \Pr\{X_t = i | y_{0:T}\} = \frac{\alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \alpha_t(i')\beta_t(i')}. \quad (2.7)$$

Here we also calculate

$$\xi_t(i, j) = \Pr\{X_{t-1} = i, X_t = j | y_{0:T}\} = \frac{\alpha_{t-1}(i)P_{ij}\beta_t(j)r_j(y_t)}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \alpha_{t-1}(i')P_{i'j}\beta_t(j)r_j(y_t)}. \quad (2.8)$$

Parameter estimation Now assume that $\theta = (P, r)$ are the unknown parameters to be estimated. Let ρ and ξ be the state estimation based on $\theta = \theta^k$. From the EM algorithm (2.3), the parameter update is given by $\theta^{k+1} = \arg\max_{\theta} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) &= \sum_{x_{0:T}} \Pr\{x_{0:T} | y_{0:T}; \theta^k\} \log \Pr\{x_{0:T}, y_{0:T}; \theta\} \\ &= \sum_{x_{0:T}} \Pr\{x_{0:T} | y_{0:T}; \theta^k\} \left[\log \Pr\{x_0\} + \sum_{t=1}^T \log P_{x_{t-1}, x_t} + \sum_{t=0}^T \log r_{x_t}(y_t) \right] \\ &= C + \sum_{x_{0:T}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \Pr\{x_{t-1}, x_t | y_{0:T}; \theta^k\} \log P_{x_{t-1}, x_t} + \sum_{t=0}^T \Pr\{x_t | y_{0:T}; \theta^k\} \log r_{x_t}(y_t) \right] \\ &= C + \sum_{i,j} \sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t(i, j) \log P_{ij} + \sum_i \sum_{t=0}^T \rho_t(i) \log r_i(y_t), \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant not depending on (P, r) . Solving the optimization problem, the transition probability is updated as

$$P_{ij}^{k+1} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t(i, j)}{\sum_{j'} \sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t(i, j')} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t(i, j)}{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \rho_t(i)}, \quad (2.9)$$

and the observation probability is given by

$$r_i^{k+1}(y) = \frac{\sum_{t=0}^T \rho_t(i) \mathbf{1}_{y_t=y}}{\sum_{t=0}^T \rho_t(i)}. \quad (2.10)$$

2.4 Filtering problem

The goal of the filtering problem is to estimate the state of a stochastic dynamical system given some noisy measurements of the system. The earliest results are the Stratonovich-Kushner and Zakai equations [60, 38, 39, 62] that solve the optimal nonlinear filtering problems, and this line of work focus more on the theoretical derivation (see Section 4.2). From the application prospective, most previous work considers the discrete-time dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t+1} &= f(X_t) + W_t, \\ Y_t &= h(X_t) + V_t. \end{aligned}$$

(For real world problems in continuous time, one may discretize time first.) Two types of algorithms are widely used: Kalman filter and particle filter.

Kalman filter The Kalman filter [33] considers the linear case where the optimal filter has explicit solution. Assume that both f and h are linear and the initial distribution of X_0 is Gaussian, then the conditional distribution of the states is always Gaussian: $X_t|Y_{0:t} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, P_t)$. The Kalman filter gives the update rule from (μ_t, P_t) to (μ_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) . [53] gives the formula of corresponding smoother (RTS). The extended Kalman filter (EKF) is a finite dimensional approximation of the nonlinear dynamics, which assumes that the conditional distribution of X_t is approximately Gaussian. [9] analyzes the EKF in continuous time.

Particle filter The particle filter [28] applies sequential Monte Carlo methods to generate a set of samples (particles) to represent the conditional distribution of the states. For instance, later in (5.1) we approximate $\tilde{\pi}_t$ by $\hat{\pi}_t(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\xi_t^i}(x)$ with samples $\{\xi_t^i\}$. Here the dynamics f and h can be nonlinear and the noise $\{W_t\}$ and $\{V_t\}$ can be non-Gaussian. [16, 41, 40, 42] apply the particle filters to solve the Kushner equation. Extensions of particle filter include auxiliary particle filters [51], Gaussian sum particle filters [37], and Rao-Blackwellised particle filtering [13, 20]. The particle smoother is based on the samples in the filter with updated reweighting. The discrete-time particle smoother is proposed by [19], which is based on the update formula in [35].

3 CT-HMM with jump process

3.1 Problem settings

Definition. Denote a CT-HMM $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t \in [0, T]\}$ as (Q, r, π_0) if the hidden states $X_t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and the observations $Y_t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ are generated as following:

Hidden state $\{X_t\}$ is a jump process given by the initial probability $\pi_0(i) = \Pr\{X_0 = i\}$ and *generator* $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, i.e.

$$Q_{ij} = \lim_{\Delta t \downarrow 0} \frac{\Pr\{X_{t+\Delta t} = j | X_t = i\}}{\Delta t}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad i \neq j, \quad (3.1)$$

and $Q_{ii} = -\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij}$.

Observation Let $0 = \tilde{\tau}_0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\tau}_2 < \dots < \tilde{\tau}_{\tilde{S}} \leq T$ be the jumping time of $\{X_t\}$. At each $\tilde{\tau}_s$, the observation $Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s}$ is generated from

$$r_i(y) = \Pr\{Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s} = y | X_{\tilde{\tau}_s} = i\}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$, $y = 1, \dots, m$, and $Y_t = Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s}$ for $t \in [\tilde{\tau}_s, \tilde{\tau}_{s+1})$.

According to the definition above, both $\{X_t\}$ and $\{Y_t\}$ are piecewise constant functions in t :

$$X_t = \sum_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}} X_{\tilde{\tau}_s} \mathbf{1}_{[\tilde{\tau}_s, \tilde{\tau}_{s+1})}(t), \quad Y_t = \sum_{s=0}^S Y_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_s, \tau_{s+1})}(t), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\{\tilde{\tau}_s\}_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}}$ are the jumping time of $\{X_t\}$, and $\{\tau_s\}_{s=0}^S$ are the discontinuities of $\{Y_t\}$. A key point is that $\{\tau_s\}_{s=0}^S \subseteq \{\tilde{\tau}_s\}_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}}$ since $\{X_t\}$ may jump at $\tilde{\tau}_s$ but generate the same $Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s} = Y_{\tilde{\tau}_{s-1}}$. So the *embedded Markov chain* $\{(X_{\tilde{\tau}_s}, Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s})\}_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}}$ is a DT-HMM, but $\{(X_{\tau_s}, Y_{\tau_s})\}_{s=0}^S$ is not. Since we can only observe $\{Y_t\}$ and $\{\tau_s\}_{s=0}^S$ instead of $\{\tilde{\tau}_s\}_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}}$, we cannot apply the DT-HMM methods directly.

Comparison with related work Before proceeding with the detailed calculation, we compare our setting with previous work where CT-HMM with hidden jump process are modeled under different assumptions.

The first line of previous work assumes that $\{Y_t\}$ can only be observed at some discrete time points [10, 30, 43, 44]. One of the applications is modeling disease progression, where the disease states can be described as a jump process, and the observations of patients are noisy and arrive irregularly in time. Under this setting, it is reasonable to assume that the observations are conditionally independent and may not be synchronized with the jumps. However, the discrete-observation setting cannot be extended to the continuous-observation setting by simply taking the continuous limit. Let N be the number of observations. If we keep increasing N , the observations $\{Y_t\}$ cannot be continuous in t if they are conditionally independent; meanwhile, the state estimation will be more and more accurate, and we will get perfect estimation $X_t = x_t$ almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the discrete-observation setting can also be solved by the Baum-Welch framework, and we list the corresponding results in Appendix A.

The second line of work assumes continuous observations $\{Y_t\}$ that are not conditionally independent. Although here the number of observations $N = \infty$, the state estimation still has a proper posterior distribution. [26, 55, 56, 54] consider the Markov-modulated Poisson processes where $\{Y_t\}$ is a Poisson process whose rate is determined by $\{X_t\}$, and [7, 36] consider a more general batch Markovian arrival process. [23, 24] considers the Markov-modulated Markov processes where $\{Y_t\}$ is a non-homogeneous jump process whose generator is determined by $\{X_t\}$. [47] further considers the bivariate Markov chain where $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ together is a jump process. [43] has similar settings as ours except that they need to know the underlying jumping time $\{\tilde{\tau}_s\}$, while we only require $\{\tau_s\}$ from $\{Y_t\}$. In addition, our setting can be regarded as a natural extension of the classical case since the embedded chain $\{(X_{\tilde{\tau}_s}, Y_{\tilde{\tau}_s})\}_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}}$ is a DT-HMM. Although a DT-HMM $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ is also a bivariate Markov chain, people usually further assume that $\{X_t\}$ itself is a Markov chain, and Y_t depends on X_t only, which is more similar to our setting.

From the methodology perspective, previous derivations usually follow the standard approach of parameter estimation for (non-hidden) jump process [48, 29], calculating the dwell time of each hidden state

and the number of jumps between two states. Here we take a more straightforward approach based on the Baum-Welch framework. See the end of Section 3.3 for a detailed comparison. The unified framework can be applied to all the previous setting easily, and Section 4 shows that it also works for hidden diffusion process.

3.2 State estimation

For state estimation, we assume that the model (Q, r, π_0) are given, and we have continuous-time observations $Y_t = y_t$, $t \in [0, T]$. For parameter estimation, we assume that the generator Q is unknown and needs to be calculated by the EM algorithm.

Theorem 1. *For a CT-HMM (Q, r, π_0) defined above, assume that the observations $Y_t = y_t$, $t \in [0, T]$. Let the row vector $\alpha_t = [\alpha_t(1) \cdots \alpha_t(n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ and the column vector $\beta_t = [\beta_t(1) \cdots \beta_t(n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ be the solutions of the forward and backward piecewise ODEs respectively*

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_0 = \pi_0 R(y_0), \\ \dot{\alpha}_t = \alpha_t [D + (Q - D)R(y_{\tau_s})], & t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \\ \alpha_{\tau_s} = \alpha_{\tau_s^-} (Q - D)R(y_{\tau_s}), \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\begin{cases} \beta_T = 1, \\ \dot{\beta}_t = -[D + (Q - D)R(y_{\tau_s})]\beta_t, & t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \\ \beta_{\tau_s^-} = (Q - D)R(y_{\tau_s})\beta_{\tau_s}, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where $D = \text{diag}(Q_{11}, \dots, Q_{nn})$, $R(y) = \text{diag}(r_1(y), \dots, r_n(y))$ and the left limit $\alpha_{\tau_s^-} = \lim_{t \uparrow \tau_s} \alpha_t$. Then the posterior distribution of the hidden states satisfies

$$\rho_t(i) = \Pr\{X_t = i | Y_s = y_s, s \in [0, T]\} = \frac{\alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)}{\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0}, \quad (3.6)$$

where the inner product $\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_0(i)\beta_0(i)$.

To prove the theorem, we first discretize $[0, T]$ with time step Δt and then take limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. Note that in the following derivation the convergence of the stochastic process under the limit is nontrivial and requires more careful stochastic analysis. Here we only focus on illustrating the main idea and omit the detailed technical analysis.

An important property is that $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ together is a Markov process with transition probability

$$\Pr\{X_{t+\Delta t} = j, y_{t+\Delta t} | X_t = i, y_t\} = \begin{cases} (1 + Q_{ii}\Delta t)\mathbf{1}_{y_{t+\Delta t}=y_t}, & j = i, \\ Q_{ij}r_j(y_{t+\Delta t})\Delta t, & j \neq i. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Here we omit the $o(\Delta t)$ terms on the right hand side. Then the Baum-Welch forward-backward algorithm for DT-HMM can be modified as follows.

In the forward equation, let

$$\alpha_t(i) = \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:t}\} \Delta t^{-s}, \quad t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}),$$

(Later we will show that the limit of the right hand side exists when taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.) The initial probability

$\alpha_0(i) = \pi_0(i)r_i(y_0)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{X_{t+\Delta t} = i, y_{0:t+\Delta t}\} &= \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr\{X_{t+\Delta t} = i, X_t = j, y_{0:t+\Delta t}\} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr\{X_{t+\Delta t} = i, y_{t+\Delta t} | X_t = j, y_t\} \Pr\{X_t = j, y_{0:t}\} \\ &= (1 + Q_{ii}\Delta t) \mathbf{1}_{y_{t+\Delta t}=y_t} \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:t}\} + \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ji}r_i(y_{t+\Delta t})\Delta t \Pr\{X_t = j, y_{0:t}\},\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\alpha_{t+\Delta t}(i) = \begin{cases} \alpha_t(i) + \left[\alpha_t(i)Q_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_t(j)Q_{ji}r_i(y_t) \right] \Delta t, & y_{t+\Delta t} = y_t, \\ \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_t(j)Q_{ji}r_i(y_{t+\Delta t}), & y_{t+\Delta t} \neq y_t. \end{cases}$$

Taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we get the forward piecewise ODE (3.4).

In the backward equation, let

$$\beta_t(i) = \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = i, y_t\} \Delta t^{-(S-s)}, \quad t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}).$$

Then the boundary condition $\beta_T(i) = 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{y_{t:T} | X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{t-\Delta t}\} &= \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr\{X_t = j, y_{t:T} | X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{t-\Delta t}\} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = j, y_t\} \Pr\{X_t = j, y_t | X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{t-\Delta t}\} \\ &= \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = i, y_t\} (1 + Q_{ii}\Delta t) \mathbf{1}_{y_{t-\Delta t}=y_t} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq i} \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = j, y_t\} Q_{ij}r_j(y_t)\Delta t,\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\beta_{t-\Delta t}(i) = \begin{cases} \beta_t(i) + \left[Q_{ii}\beta_t(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij}r_j(y_t)\beta_t(j) \right] \Delta t, & y_{t-\Delta t} = y_t, \\ \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij}r_j(y_t)\beta_t(j), & y_{t-\Delta t} \neq y_t. \end{cases}$$

Taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we get the backward piecewise ODE (3.5).

Now calculate $\rho_t = \Pr\{X_t = i | y_{0:T}\}$ in (3.6) from α_t and β_t . Since

$$\Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:T}\} = \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = i, y_t\} \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:t}\} = \alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)\Delta t^S,$$

and

$$\Pr\{y_{0:T}\} = \sum_i \Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:T}\} = \sum_i \alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)\Delta t^S = \alpha_t \cdot \beta_t \Delta t^S,$$

the inner product $\alpha_t \cdot \beta_t$ is constant for all t . Therefore,

$$\rho_t(i) = \frac{\Pr\{X_t = i, y_{0:T}\}}{\Pr\{y_{0:T}\}} = \frac{\alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)}{\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0}.$$

3.3 Parameter estimation

In case when the generator Q is an unknown parameter in the model, it can be estimated by the following EM algorithm.

Algorithm 2. For a CT-HMM (Q, r, π_0) defined above, assume that the observations $Y_t = y_t$, $t \in [0, T]$, and Q is the unknown parameter. Let Q^0 be the initialization of the generator, then repeat the following E-step and M-step to update Q^k , $k = 0, 1, \dots$ until convergence.

E-step: under the current estimate $Q = Q^k$, solve the forward and backward piecewise ODEs (3.4) and (3.5) for α_t and β_t , and calculate the posterior distribution ρ_t from (3.6).

M-step: update the generator from Q^k to Q^{k+1} using

$$Q_{ij}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{(\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0) \int_0^T \rho_t(i) dt} \left[\sum_{s=0}^S \int_{\tau_s}^{\tau_{s+1}} \alpha_t(i) Q_{ij}^k r_j(y_{\tau_s}) \beta_t(j) dt + \sum_{s=1}^S \alpha_{\tau_s^-}(i) Q_{ij}^k r_j(y_{\tau_s}) \beta_{\tau_s}(j) \right] \quad (3.8)$$

$$\text{for } j \neq i, \text{ and } Q_{ii}^{k+1} = - \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij}^{k+1}.$$

The goal of the E-step is to calculate the posterior distribution $\Pr\{X_t | y_{0:T}; Q^k\}$ under the current generator Q^k . This is equivalent to the previous state estimation problem if we replace the true generator Q by Q^k . Besides α_t , β_t and ρ_t , here we also need to calculate

$$\xi_t(i, j) = \Pr\{X_{t-\Delta t} = i, X_t = j | y_{0:T}\}.$$

under the time discretization. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{X_{t-\Delta t} = i, X_t = j, y_{0:T}\} \\ = \Pr\{y_{t+\Delta t:T} | X_t = j, y_t\} \Pr\{X_t = j, y_t | X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{t-\Delta t}\} \Pr\{X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{0:t-\Delta t}\}, \end{aligned}$$

we can show that

$$(\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0) \xi_t(i, j) = \begin{cases} \alpha_{t-\Delta t}(i) (1 + Q_{ii} \Delta t) \beta_t(i), & y_{t-\Delta t} = y_t, j = i, \\ \alpha_{t-\Delta t}(i) Q_{ij} r_j(y_t) \beta_t(j) \Delta t, & y_{t-\Delta t} = y_t, j \neq i, \\ 0, & y_{t-\Delta t} \neq y_t, j = i, \\ \alpha_{t-\Delta t}(i) Q_{ij} r_j(y_t) \beta_t(j), & y_{t-\Delta t} \neq y_t, j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

The goal of the M-step is to calculate the maximum-likelihood estimation of the parameter Q given the current estimation of $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$. Under the time discretization, the update formula of the EM algorithm (2.3) gives $Q^{k+1} = \arg\max_Q \mathcal{Q}(Q, Q^k)$, where

$$\mathcal{Q}(Q, Q^k) = \sum_{x_{0:T}} \Pr\{x_{0:T} | y_{0:T}; Q^k\} \log \Pr\{x_{0:T}, y_{0:T}; Q\}.$$

Let α_t , β_t , ρ_t and ξ_t are calculated in the E-step with respect to Q^k . Since $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ together is a Markov process with transition probabilities (3.7),

$$\Pr\{x_{0:T}, y_{0:T}; Q\} = \Pr\{x_0, y_0\} \prod_{t=\Delta t}^T \Pr\{x_t, y_t | x_{t-\Delta t}, y_{t-\Delta t}; Q\}.$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}(Q, Q^k) &= \sum_{x_{0:T}} \Pr\{x_{0:T}|y_{0:T}; Q^k\} \left[\log \Pr\{x_0, y_0\} + \sum_{t=\Delta t}^T \log \Pr\{x_t, y_t|x_{t-\Delta t}, y_{t-\Delta t}; Q\} \right] \\
&= \sum_{x_0} \Pr\{x_0|y_0; Q^k\} \log \Pr\{x_0, y_0\} \\
&\quad + \sum_t \sum_{x_{t-\Delta t}, x_t} \Pr\{x_{t-\Delta t}, x_t|y_{0:T}; Q^k\} \log \Pr\{x_t, y_t|x_{t-\Delta t}, y_{t-\Delta t}; Q\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Pr\{x_0, y_0\}$ in the first term does not depend on Q , we only need to maximize the second term

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_t \sum_{x_{t-\Delta t}, x_t} \Pr\{x_{t-\Delta t}, x_t|y_{0:T}; Q^k\} \log \Pr\{x_t, y_t|x_{t-\Delta t}, y_{t-\Delta t}; Q\} \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \sum_t \xi_t(i, j) \log \Pr\{X_t = j, y_t|X_{t-\Delta t} = i, y_{t-\Delta t}; Q\} \\
&= \sum_i \sum_t \xi_t(i, i) \log(1 + Q_{ii}\Delta t) + \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_t \xi_t(i, j) [\log(Q_{ij}\Delta t) + \log r_j(y_t)].
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(1 + Q_{ii}\Delta t) + \sum_{j \neq i} (Q_{ij}\Delta t) = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_t(i, j) = \rho_{t-\Delta t}(i)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{ij}^{k+1} &= \frac{\sum_t \xi_t(i, j)}{\sum_{j'=1}^n \sum_t \xi_t(i, j')\Delta t} = \frac{1}{(\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0) \sum_t \rho_{t-\Delta t}(i)\Delta t} \\
&\quad \cdot \left[\sum_{y_{t-\Delta t}=y_t} \alpha_{t-\Delta t}(i) Q_{ij}^k r_j(y_t) \beta_t(j) \Delta t + \sum_{y_{t-\Delta t} \neq y_t} \alpha_{t-\Delta t}(i) Q_{ij}^k r_j(y_t) \beta_t(j) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

for $j \neq i$. Taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we will have the update (3.8) in Algorithm 2.

Comparison with the bivariate Markov process The bivariate Markov process [47] assumes that $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ together is a jump process. This is closely related to our setting. In our setting $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ is also a bivariate Markov process with special structure. On the other hand, in the bivariate Markov process if we rewrite $\tilde{X}_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ together as the hidden state and keep $\tilde{Y}_t = Y_t$ as the observation, then $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)\}$ fits in our setting. In this case $\tilde{Y}_t$ is a *partial observation* of $\tilde{X}_t$, while our setting allows that $\tilde{Y}_t$ is not necessarily part of $\tilde{X}_t$, but contains *partial information* of $\tilde{X}_t$.

The following is a comparison of the results. For the state estimation, [47] derives the forward and backward recursion similar to our equations for α_t and β_t . They are defined on the jumping time $t = \tau_s$ only, but can be generalized to any $t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1})$. In addition, in our setting we need to calculate the jump of α_t and β_t from τ_s^- to τ_s .

For the parameter estimation, [47] considers the dwell time $D(i)$ and the number of jumps $m(i, j)$ as

$$D(i) = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_t=i\}} dt, \quad m(i, j) = \sum_{s=0}^{\tilde{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{\tau_s^-}=i, \tilde{X}_{\tau_s}=j\}},$$

where $\tilde{X}_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ and $\tilde{\tau}_s$ is the jumping time of $\{\tilde{X}_t\}$ (instead of $\{Y_t\}$). The EM algorithm updates the generator as

$$Q_{ij}^{k+1} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[m(i, j)|y_t, t \in [0, T]; Q^k]}{\mathbb{E}[D(i)|y_t, t \in [0, T]; Q^k]}.$$

Note that [47] uses the update formula without proof (can be derived using ideas similar to [56]), and then calculates the conditional expectation of $D(i)$ and $m(i, j)$. In our setting, they can be calculated in the same way by restricting the generator such that $\{Y_t\}$ jumps simultaneously with $\{X_t\}$. However, we get a more concise formula (3.8) than the one above using conditional expectations, and their results can also be derived from. In addition, the bivariate Markov process might be hard to calculate when the sizes of the state and observation spaces m and n are large ([47] only runs a numerical experiment for $m = n = 2$).

4 CT-HMM with diffusion process

4.1 Problem settings

In this section, we analyze another type of CT-HMM where the hidden process is a diffusion process, and the hidden states and observations take continuous values. We consider the same setting as the Stratonovich-Kushner and Zakai equations. Assume that the hidden process $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the observations $Y_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are given by SDEs

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= f(X_t)dt + \sigma dW_t, \\ dY_t &= h(X_t)dt + \eta dB_t, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where the drift terms $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$; the noise terms $\{W_t\}$ and $\{B_t\}$ are independent n -dimensional and m -dimensional Brownian motions respectively. Here we assume that σ and η are scalars for brevity, and all the results can be easily extended to the case when they are matrices. Let the initial distribution of X_0 be $\pi_0(x) = p(X_0 = x)$, and the time period $t \in [0, T]$.

4.2 State estimation

State estimation is closely related to the filtering and smoothing problem (see Section 2.4). The optimal nonlinear filtering of the diffusion model (4.1) is solved by the *Stratonovich-Kushner equation* [60, 38, 39] that describes the dynamics of the density of the states condition on the *previous* observations $\tilde{\pi}_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_{0:t})$.

$$d\tilde{\pi}_t(x) = \mathcal{L}^* \tilde{\pi}_t(x) + \frac{1}{\eta^2} \tilde{\pi}_t(x) [h(x) - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \tilde{\pi}_t} h(X)]^\top [dY_t - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \tilde{\pi}_t} h(X)dt]. \quad (4.2)$$

(See Theorem 3 for the definition of the operators $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^*$.) The *Zakai equation* [62] introduces a simplified dynamics for the unnormalized conditional distribution $\pi_t(x) = \tilde{\pi}_t(x) Z_t$ with some constant Z_t , and we take it as the forward part (4.4). The corresponding smoothing problem considers the density of the states condition on the *whole* observation process $\rho_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_{0:T})$. [2] derives the differential equation

$$\frac{d\rho_t(x)}{dt} = \frac{\rho_t(x)}{\tilde{\pi}_t(x)} \mathcal{L}^* \tilde{\pi}_t(x) - \tilde{\pi}_t(x) \mathcal{L} \left[\frac{\rho_t(x)}{\tilde{\pi}_t(x)} \right]. \quad (4.3)$$

Unlike (4.3) where the equation of the smoother ρ_t contains the filtered $\tilde{\pi}_t$, here we follow the approach in [50, 11, 49], writing the smoother as the product of two terms that are the solutions of the forward and backward SPDEs respectively, which goes in line with the Baum-Welch framework.

Theorem 3. *For a CT-HMM with hidden diffusion process defined above, let π_t and β_t be the solutions of the forward and backward SPDEs respectively*

$$\pi_0(x) = p(X_0 = x), \quad d\pi_t(x) = \mathcal{L}^* \pi_t(x)dt + \eta^{-2} \pi_t(x) h^\top(x) dY_t, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\beta_T(x) = 1, \quad d\beta_t(x) = -\mathcal{L} \beta_t(x)dt - \eta^{-2} \beta_t(x) h^\top(x) [dY_t - h(x)dt], \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^* \pi_t(x) &= -\nabla \cdot [f(x) \pi_t(x)] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla^2 \pi_t(x), \\ \mathcal{L} \beta_t(x) &= f(x) \cdot \nabla \beta_t(x) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla^2 \beta_t(x);\end{aligned}$$

the gradient operator $\nabla = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} \right]$, and the Laplace operator $\nabla^2 = \nabla \cdot \nabla = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$. Then the posterior distribution of the hidden states is given by

$$\rho_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_s = y_s, s \in [0, T]) = \frac{1}{Z_T} \pi_t(x) \beta_t(x) \quad (4.6)$$

for some normalization factor Z_T .

The proof is based on the derivation of the Zakai equation and we give the sketch here. One can follow [49] for the complete proof.

Since $dY_t = h(X_t)dt + \eta dB_t$, from Girsanov theorem, define an equivalent measure Q by

$$dQ = M_T^{-1} dP, \quad M_t = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2\eta^2} \int_0^t h^\top(X_s) h(X_s) ds + \frac{1}{\eta^2} \int_0^t h^\top(X_s) dY_s \right].$$

Then under measure Q , $\{Y_t/\eta\}$ is a Brownian motion and $\{M_t\}$ is a martingale, while $\{X_t\}$ and $\{Y_t\}$ are independent. For any function g , let

$$\psi_t[g] = \mathbb{E}_P[g(X_t) | Y_{0:t}], \quad \varphi_t[g] = \mathbb{E}_Q[g(X_t) M_t | Y_{0:t}], \quad Z_t = \varphi_t[1] = \mathbb{E}_Q[M_t | Y_{0:t}],$$

one can show that

$$\psi_t[g] = \varphi_t[g] / Z_t.$$

Since $\{X_t\}$ and $\{Y_t\}$ are independent under Q , we can derive the dynamics of $\varphi_t[g]$ as

$$d\varphi_t[g] = \varphi_t[\mathcal{L}g]dt + \varphi_t \left[g \frac{h^\top}{\eta^2} \right] dY_t. \quad (4.7)$$

Assume that we can write $\varphi_t[g] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x) \pi_t(x) dx$, then π_t is an unnormalized density $\pi_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_{0:t}) Z_t$, and satisfies the adjoint of (4.7), i.e., the Zakai equation (4.4).

Furthermore, let the smoothing component be

$$\beta_t(x) = \mathbb{E}_Q[M_T / M_t | X_t = x, Y_{0:T}],$$

then one can show that $\rho_t(x) = \pi_t(x) \beta_t(x) / Z_T$, and β_t satisfies the backward SPDE (4.5). We can also calculate that

$$\frac{d\rho_t(x)}{dt} = \frac{1}{Z_T} [\beta_t(x) \mathcal{L}^* \pi_t(x) - \pi_t(x) \mathcal{L} \beta_t(x)], \quad (4.8)$$

which is equivalent to (4.3).

4.3 Parameter estimation

For simplicity, we assume that only f contains unknown parameters $f = f(x; \theta)$. The following is the EM algorithm.

Algorithm 4. For a CT-HMM with hidden diffusion process defined above, assume that the observations $Y_t = y_t$, $t \in [0, T]$, and $f = f(x; \theta)$ where θ is the unknown parameter. Let θ^0 be the initialization of θ , then repeat the following E-step and M-step to update θ^k , $k = 0, 1, \dots$ until convergence.

E-step: using the current value of the estimated $\theta = \theta^k$, solve the forward and backward SPDEs (4.4) and (4.5) for π_t and β_t respectively, and calculate the posterior distribution ρ_t from (4.6).

M-step: update the parameter by $\theta^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \theta^k)$ where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \theta^k) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[\|f(x; \theta)\|_2^2 - 2f^\top(x; \theta) \left[f(x; \theta^k) + \frac{\sigma^2 \nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)} \right] \right] dx dt. \quad (4.9)$$

The E-step is equivalent to the state estimation discussed above. So we will focus on the M-step. We still discretize $[0, T]$ with time step Δt and then take limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. The parameter update formula (2.3) gives $\theta^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$ where

$$\mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) = \int p(x_{0:T} | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \log p(x_{0:T}, y_{0:T}; \theta) dx_{0:T} \quad (4.10)$$

(the integral takes over $dx_{0:T} = dx_0 dx_{\Delta t} dx_{2\Delta t} \cdots dx_T$). Notice that

$$p(x_{0:T}, y_{0:T}; \theta) = p(x_0) \prod_{t=0}^{T-\Delta t} p(\Delta x_t | x_t; \theta) \prod_{t=0}^T p(\Delta y_t | x_t),$$

where

$$p(\Delta x_t | x_t; \theta) = \frac{1}{Z_f} \exp \left[-\frac{\|\Delta x_t - f(x_t; \theta)\Delta t\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2 \Delta t} \right]$$

for $Z_f = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}$, and $p(x_0)$, $p(\Delta y_t | x_t)$ do not depend on θ . So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) &= \int p(x_{0:T} | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \left[\log p(x_0) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-\Delta t} \log p(\Delta x_t | x_t; \theta) + \sum_{t=0}^T \log p(\Delta y_t | x_t) \right] dx_{0:T} \\ &= \int p(x_0 | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \log p(x_0) dx_0 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-\Delta t} \int p(x_t, \Delta x_t | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \log p(\Delta x_t | x_t; \theta) dx_t dx_{t+\Delta t} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=0}^T \int p(x_t | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \log p(\Delta y_t | x_t) dx_t. \end{aligned}$$

Only the second summation term depends on θ , whose integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\int p(x_t, \Delta x_t | y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \log p(\Delta x_t | x_t; \theta) dx_t dx_{t+\Delta t} \\ &= -\log Z_f - \int \rho_t(x_t) p(\Delta x_t | x_t, y_{0:T}; \theta^k) \frac{\|\Delta x_t - f(x_t; \theta)\Delta t\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2 \Delta t} dx_t dx_{t+\Delta t} \\ &= C - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \int \rho_t(x_t) [\|f(x_t; \theta)\|_2^2 \Delta t - 2f^\top(x_t; \theta) \mathbb{E}[\Delta x_t | x_t, y_{0:T}; \theta^k]] dx_t \\ &= C - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \int \rho_t(x) [\|f(x; \theta)\|_2^2 \Delta t - 2f^\top(x; \theta) \mathbb{E}[\Delta x | X_t = x, y_{0:T}; \theta^k]] dx, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant and not depending on θ . Therefore, $\theta^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \theta^k)$ where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \theta^k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{t=0}^{T-\Delta t} \rho_t(x) [\|f(x; \theta)\|_2^2 \Delta t - 2f^\top(x; \theta) \mathbb{E}[\Delta x | X_t = x, y_{0:T}; \theta^k]] dx.$$

Now take $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \theta^k) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[\|f(x; \theta)\|_2^2 - 2f^\top(x; \theta) \frac{d}{d\tau} \bigg|_{\tau=0} \mathbb{E}[X_{t+\tau} | X_t = x, y_{0:T}; \theta^k] \right] dx dt,$$

and from (4.6) we can calculate that

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \bigg|_{\tau=0} \mathbb{E}[X_{t+\tau} | X_t = x, y_{0:T}] = f(x) + \frac{\sigma^2 \nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)}.$$

Therefore, (4.9) holds in Algorithm 4.

5 Monte Carlo method

For some simple cases like the linear Gaussian dynamics (Appendix B), we may have explicit solutions of the SPDEs (4.4) and (4.5). In general cases, however, we have to resort to numerical solutions of the Stratonovich-Kushner and Zakai equations. A direct approach is the *finite-difference splitting*. One can take a fixed non-random grid $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ in the state space, and calculate $\pi_t(x_i)$ to approximate the evolving measure. See the line of work [5, 6, 27, 32] for the theoretical proof of the convergence of this kind of numerical schemes. However, for a d -dimensional state space with uniform grid size h , the number of grid points will be $O(h^{-d})$, which is unaffordable for high-dimensional problems. Note that for the particle filter, the convergence rate is $CN^{-1/2}$. Though C might have exponential dependence in d , this is different from the situation when the rate itself depends on d . In practice the Monte Carlo method makes it possible to solve some high-dimensional problems like (6.5) with much fewer samples.

In the following we propose a Monte Carlo sampling method to combine with the parameter update (4.9). For state estimation, notice that $\pi_t(x_t) \propto p(X_t = x_t | y_{0:t})$ and $\rho_t(x_t) = p(X_t = x_t | y_{0:T})$, we can modify the particle filter and smoother to generate samples to describe those posterior distributions. For the objective (4.9) in the parameter estimation, the integral over x can be calculated by summing over the samples. Note that we take the vanilla particle filter as illustration. The continuous formulation also gives us more freedom to adaptively choose proper discretization and sampling scheme.

First, we solve the filtering problem $\tilde{\pi}_t(x) = p(X_t = x | y_{0:t})$. Discretize $[0, T]$ with time step Δt . For each $t = 0, \Delta t, 2\Delta t, \dots, T$, we will have N samples ξ_t^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, such that the filtered $\tilde{\pi}_t(x)$ can be approximated by

$$\hat{\pi}_t(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\xi_t^i}(x). \quad (5.1)$$

Let $\xi_0^i \sim \pi_0$ be i.i.d. samples of the initial distribution. Assume that we already have ξ_t^i . Resample

$$\tilde{\xi}_t^i \sim \sum_{i'=1}^N \frac{p(\Delta y_t | X_t = \xi_t^{i'})}{\sum_{i'=1}^N p(\Delta y_t | X_t = \xi_t^{i'})} \delta_{\xi_t^{i'}}(x)$$

independently, then the distribution of $\tilde{\xi}_t^i$ satisfies $p(X_t | y_{0:t+\Delta t})$. Thus we can sample

$$\xi_{t+\Delta t}^i = \tilde{\xi}_t^i + f(\tilde{\xi}_t^i) \Delta t + \sigma \Delta W_t^i, \quad \Delta W_t^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t) \text{ i.i.d.},$$

and $\xi_{t+\Delta t}^i$ is a set of samples for $t + \Delta t$.

Next, we solve the smoothing problem $\rho(x) = p(X_t = x | y_{0:T})$, approximating it by weighting the samples

$$\hat{\rho}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i \delta_{\xi_t^i}(x). \quad (5.2)$$

We calculate the weight w_t^i backwards for $t = T, T - \Delta t, T - 2\Delta t, \dots, 0$. Since $\tilde{\pi}_T = \rho_T$, we have $w_T^i = 1/N$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_t(x_t) &= p(X_t = x_t | y_{0:T}) \\
&= \int p(X_t = x_t | X_{t+\Delta t} = x_{t+\Delta t}, y_{0:T}) p(X_{t+\Delta t} = x_{t+\Delta t} | y_{0:T}) dx_{t+\Delta t} \\
&= \int p(x_t | x_{t+\Delta t}, y_{0:t+\Delta t}) p(x_{t+\Delta t} | y_{0:T}) dx_{t+\Delta t} \\
&= \int \frac{p(x_{t+\Delta t}, \Delta y_t | x_t) p(x_t | y_{0:t})}{\int p(x_{t+\Delta t}, \Delta y_t | x'_t) p(x'_t | y_{0:t}) dx'_t} p(x_{t+\Delta t} | y_{0:T}) dx_{t+\Delta t} \\
&= \tilde{\pi}_t(x_t) \int \frac{p(x_{t+\Delta t} | x_t) p(\Delta y_t | x_t)}{\int p(x_{t+\Delta t} | x'_t) p(\Delta y_t | x'_t) \tilde{\pi}_t(x'_t) dx'_t} \rho_{t+\Delta t}(x_{t+\Delta t}) dx_{t+\Delta t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Replace $\tilde{\pi}_t$ and $\rho_{t+\Delta t}$ by $\hat{\pi}_t$ and $\hat{\rho}_{t+\Delta t}$ respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}_t(x_t) \hat{\rho}_t(x_t) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\xi_t^i}(x_t) \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | x_t) p(\Delta y_t | x_t) w_{t+\Delta t}^j}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i'=1}^N p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^{i'}) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^{i'})} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^i) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^i) w_{t+\Delta t}^j}{\sum_{i'=1}^N p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^{i'}) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^{i'})} \delta_{\xi_t^i}(x_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the weights are calculated as

$$w_t^i = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^i) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^i) w_{t+\Delta t}^j}{\sum_{i'=1}^N p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^{i'}) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^{i'})}. \quad (5.3)$$

In addition, since

$$\beta_t(x_t) \propto \frac{\rho_t(x_t)}{\tilde{\pi}_t(x_t)} = \int \frac{p(x_{t+\Delta t} | x_t) p(\Delta y_t | x_t)}{\int p(x_{t+\Delta t} | x'_t) p(\Delta y_t | x'_t) \tilde{\pi}_t(x'_t) dx'_t} \rho_{t+\Delta t}(x_{t+\Delta t}) dx_{t+\Delta t},$$

let

$$\hat{\beta}_t(x_t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | x_t) p(\Delta y_t | x_t) w_{t+\Delta t}^j}{\sum_{i'=1}^N p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | \xi_t^{i'}) p(\Delta y_t | \xi_t^{i'})}, \quad (5.4)$$

then β_t can be approximated by $\hat{\beta}_t$ (times a constant factor, which will be eliminated in the $\nabla \beta_t / \beta_t$ term in (4.9)). Since both $p(\xi_{t+\Delta t}^j | x_t)$ and $p(\Delta y_t | x_t)$ are Gaussian, the gradient $\nabla \hat{\beta}_t(x_t)$ can be calculated analytically. Notice that $w_t^i = \hat{\beta}_t(\xi_t^i)$.

Now we can apply the Monte Carlo approach to the Algorithm 4 for parameter estimation. In the E-step, the posterior distributions can be sampled as above. In the M-step, the parameter update (4.9) can be modified as $\theta^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\theta} \hat{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$ where

$$\hat{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i \left[\|f(\xi_t^i; \theta)\|_2^2 - 2f^\top(\xi_t^i; \theta) \left[f(\xi_t^i; \theta^k) + \frac{\sigma^2}{w_t^i} \nabla \hat{\beta}_t(\xi_t^i) \right] \right]. \quad (5.5)$$

If $f(x; \theta)$ is linear in θ (may be nonlinear in x): $f(x; \theta) = A(x)\theta + b(x)$, then

$$\hat{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i \left[\theta^\top A^\top(\xi_t^i) A(\xi_t^i) \theta - 2[A(\xi_t^i) \theta + b(\xi_t^i)]^\top \left[A(\xi_t^i) \theta^k + \frac{\sigma^2}{w_t^i} \nabla \hat{\beta}_t(\xi_t^i) \right] - \|b(\xi_t^i)\|_2^2 \right],$$

and we have the explicit solution

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{k+1} &= \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \hat{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) \\ &= \theta^k + \sigma^2 \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i A^\top (\xi_t^i) A (\xi_t^i) \right]^{-1} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^N A^\top (\xi_t^i) \nabla \hat{\beta}_t (\xi_t^i) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (5.6)$$

In the general case when (5.5) has no explicit solution, we may solve θ^{k+1} using gradient-based methods.

Discussion about previous parameter estimation methods in applications Here we briefly discuss the previous related work on parameter estimation. In [14, 12], the authors regard the parameter θ as part of the hidden state. They consider $\tilde{X}_t = (X_t, \theta)$ with dynamics

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{t+1} \\ \theta_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(X_t) \\ \theta_t \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} W_t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and apply state estimation methods for $\{\tilde{X}_t\}$.

A more effective approach is to apply the EM algorithm with state estimation and parameter update alternately. [58] proposes an EM algorithm for discrete-time Kalman filter. [17] considers continuous diffusion process, and gives theoretical formulas for the EM algorithm. [11] further compares direct maximization of the likelihood function with the EM algorithm, and shows that smoothing is necessary for the EM approach. For practical problems, however, most previous work still considers discrete-time settings. In particular, [57, 63, 25, 46] all take the following approach. Recall the parameter update $\theta^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} Q(\theta, \theta^k)$ for Q defined in (4.10). The E-step uses the particle filter and smoother to sample from $p(X_{0:T}|y_{0:T}; \theta^k)$. Instead of simplifying the objective, they calculate $Q(\theta, \theta^k)$ directly as a sum over the discrete time grid and samples. Then the M-step maximizes over θ using the gradients $\nabla_{\theta} Q(\theta, \theta^k)$. As a comparison, we rewrite $Q(\theta, \theta^k)$ in the continuous form. The explicit solution of the linear case comes as a straightforward byproduct. In the nonlinear case, we use the standard particle filter and smoother. But note that the continuous formulation gives us more freedom to adaptively choose proper discretization and sampling scheme (like the extensions of particle filter) for better performance.

6 Simulation results

6.1 Generator of hidden jump process

We first implement our algorithm for the CT-HMM with hidden jump process in Section 3. Notice that the piecewise ODEs (3.4) and (3.5) for state estimation, if solved directly, may lead to overflow or underflow of α_t and β_t for large T , and we modify the implementation as follows: at each τ_s , adaptively choose $\kappa_s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then update

$$\alpha_{\tau_s} = \kappa_s \alpha_{\tau_s^-} (Q - D) R(y_{\tau_s}), \quad \beta_{\tau_s^-} = (Q - D) R(y_{\tau_s}) \beta_{\tau_s} / \kappa_s.$$

The dynamics between (τ_s, τ_{s+1}) remains the same.

Here we test two simulation models:

1. A complete graph with $n = 5$ states as [44]. The generator Q is randomly drawn as $-Q_{ii} \sim \mathcal{U}[1, 5]$, $Q'_{ij} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$ and $Q_{ij} = \frac{Q'_{ij}}{\sum_{j' \neq i} Q'_{ij'}} (-Q_{ii})$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$, $i \neq j$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the uniform distribution. We initialize $Q_{ii}^0 = -3$ and $Q_{ij}^0 = 3/4$ for the EM algorithm.




Figure 1: The simulation results for the CT-HMM with hidden jump process. Top: the distance $\|Q^k - Q\|_F$ under the Frobenius norm during the EM iterations for different noise levels σ and total time T . Complex models may require larger T to avoid overfitting, and the convergence is faster for smaller noise level σ . Bottom: the posteriors distribution $\rho_t(i)$ for each i based on the true generator Q and estimated $\hat{Q}$. The EM algorithm indeed converges. ρ_t jumps at each τ_s , but may still have significant changes between (τ_s, τ_{s+1}) . Here $n = 5$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $T = 1000$ and we only show the results for $t \in [0, 20]$.




Figure 2: The simulation results for bearings-only tracking (6.1). Top: the estimated acceleration during the EM iterations. Here we repeat the simulations 5 times, and plot the mean and standard deviation. Bottom: the true trajectories and the estimation based on estimated (a_x^k, a_y^k) . The 3 figures show 3 of the 5 simulations. The light green lines are the trajectories for $k = 175, 180, 185, \dots, 200$, and the dark green line is their average. We also mark the positions at time points $t = 0, 0.5, 1, \dots, 3$ to compare the bearings.

2. A sparse graph with $n = 20$ states. For each state $i = 1, \dots, 20$, randomly choose another 5 states $V_i \subset \{1, \dots, 20\} \setminus \{i\}$, $|V_i| = 5$, and let $Q_{ij} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$ for $j \in V_i$, $Q_{ii} = -\sum_{j \in V_i} Q_{ij}$ and $Q_{ij} = 0$ for $j \notin V_i \cup \{i\}$. The initialization $Q_{ii}^0 = -19/8$ and $Q_{ij}^0 = 1/8$.

For both of the models, the observations $Y_t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ are given by $r_i(i) = 1 - 2\sigma$ and $r_i(i-1) = r_i(i+1) = \sigma$ (let $r_1(0) = r_1(n)$ and $r_n(n+1) = r_n(1)$). Assume that the state starts from $X_0 = 1$, i.e., $\pi_0 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$. We test different noise level σ and total time T .

Figure 1 shows the simulation results. The top two figures show the convergence of Q^k for both models. Complex models may require larger T to avoid overfitting, and the convergence is faster for smaller noise level σ . The bottom two figures compare the state estimation $\rho_t(i)$ for each i based on the true generator Q and estimated $\hat{Q}$. We can see that the EM algorithm indeed converges. In addition, ρ_t jumps at each τ_s , but may still have significant changes between (τ_s, τ_{s+1}) .

6.2 Bearings-only tracking

The bearings-only tracking is a widely used test problem for filtering methods. The goal is to track an object moving in the x - y plane, and a fixed observer at the origin takes noisy measurements of the target bearings. The problem can be tracked back to [1]. [28, 51] analyze its linear discrete-time dynamics, and

[41, 40] consider the continuous-time hidden process with discrete-time observation. Here we assume that both the hidden states and observation occur in continuous-time as

$$\begin{aligned} d \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \dot{x} \\ y \\ \dot{y} \end{bmatrix}_t &= \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ a_x \\ \dot{y} \\ a_y \end{bmatrix}_t dt + \sigma dW_t, \\ d\varphi_t &= \arctan(y_t/x_t)dt + \eta dB_t. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Here the position and volatility $(x, \dot{x}, y, \dot{y})_t$ is the hidden state, the acceleration (a_x, a_y) is the unknown parameter, and the angle φ_t is the observation. (Unlike our general notations, in this problem we sometimes use lower case letters as random variables).

Assume that the initial position $(x_0, y_0) = (0, 1)$, the initial volatility $(\dot{x}_0, \dot{y}_0) = (1, 0)$, the noise $\sigma = 0.1$, $\eta = 0.02$, and the total time $T = 3$. The true value of the acceleration is $(a_x, a_y) = (-0.5, -1)$, and we initialize $a_x^0 = a_y^0 = 0$. The time discretization $\Delta t = 0.01$ and the number of samples $N = 128$. We simulate the true trajectory and observations 5 times, and run the EM algorithm for each of them. Figure 2 (top) shows the mean and standard deviation of estimated (a_x^k, a_y^k) during the 5 runs. The estimations converge to near the true values, and we can expect that more repeated simulations and longer T may improve the accuracy.

We are also interested in recovering the true trajectory. Let $(\hat{a}_x, \hat{a}_y)$ be the estimation from the EM algorithm. Taking the Monte Carlo state estimation under $(a_x, a_y) = (\hat{a}_x, \hat{a}_y)$, we have samples $\{\xi_t^i\}$ for the filter and weights $\{w_t^i\}$ for the smoother. Then the true states x_t can be estimated by the simple or weighted average as

$$\hat{x}_t^{\text{filter}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_t^i, \quad \hat{x}_t^{\text{smooth}} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i \xi_t^i, \quad t = 0, \Delta t, \dots, T. \quad (6.2)$$

For the bearings-only tracking problem, since we only observe the angle but not the radius, a single estimation path may not exactly coincide with the true trajectory. Here we take the last few iterations $k = 175, 180, 185, \dots, 200$. For each k , repeat the Monte Carlo smoother estimation (6.2) 5 times, and calculate the average of the 5 estimated trajectories. In Figure 2 (bottom), the light green lines are the average trajectories for each k , and the dark green line is the average of the light green lines. We also mark the positions for time points $t = 0, 0.5, 1, \dots, 3$ to compare the bearings. We can see that after the averaging, the dark green line is close to the true trajectory (blue), and shares similar bearing at the same time points.

6.3 Cubic sensor problems for matrix estimation

In the cubic sensor problems [59, 34], the observation has the same dimension as the hidden state, and is given by $h([x_1, \dots, x_d]) = [x_1^3, \dots, x_d^3]$. Here we assume that f is linear, then the dynamics is given by

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= FX_t dt + \sigma dW_t, \\ dY_t &= X_t^3 dt + \eta dB_t. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

First consider the case that the whole matrix F is the unknown parameter to be estimated, i.e., $\theta = F$. Then the parameter update (5.5) in our Monte Carlo method becomes

$$F^{k+1} = \underset{F}{\operatorname{argmin}} \hat{Q}(F, F^k) = F^k + \sigma^2 \left[\sum_{t,i} \nabla \hat{\beta}(\xi_t^i) \xi_t^{i\top} \right] \left[\sum_{t,i} w_t^i \xi_t^i \xi_t^{i\top} \right]^{-1}. \quad (6.4)$$




Figure 3: The cubic sensor problem for the matrix parameter estimation (6.3). The upper left figure shows the distance $\|F^k - F\|_F$ under the Frobenius norm during the iterations. The EM algorithm converges fast for all the noise levels, while the larger noise level has faster convergence rate but lower accuracy. Then we calculate the solutions of the filter and smoother based on $\hat{F}$. The other three figures compare the solutions and the true trajectories under different noise levels. The solution of the smoothing is indeed smoother and closer to the true trajectory.

Now let the dimension $d = 2$, the true matrix $F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, the initial condition $X_0 = [1, 0]$ at $t = 0$, and $T = 10$. We test different noise levels $\sigma = \eta = 0.2, 0.5, 1.0$. For each level, take the discretization $\Delta t = 0.02$, the number of samples $N = 128$, and the initialization $F^0 = 0$. Figure 3 shows that F^k converges fast for all the noise levels, while larger noise level has faster convergence rate but lower accuracy. In the end we get estimation

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{F} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.00 & 0.88 \\ -0.98 & -0.01 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \eta = 0.2, \\ \hat{F} &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.10 & 0.83 \\ 1.02 & -0.01 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \eta = 0.5, \\ \hat{F} &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.19 & 0.87 \\ -1.12 & 0.10 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \eta = 1.\end{aligned}$$

We further calculate the solutions of the filter and smoother (6.2) based on $\hat{F}$. Instead of taking average of trajectories as the previous problem, here we only generate a single estimated trajectory for each noise level. Comparing with the true trajectory of X_t . We can see that the solution of the smoothing is indeed smoother and closer to the true trajectory.

6.4 High dimensional linear dynamics

Here we apply our Monte Carlo method to a problem with high dimensional state space. In the cubic sensor dynamics (6.3), let $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the tridiagonal matrix

$$F = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & & \\ & 1 & -2 & 1 & \\ & & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ & & & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.5)$$

where the scalar λ is the unknown parameter to be estimated. We consider different dimensions $d = 5, 15, 25$, and take $\lambda = 5, 25, 50$ respectively. For each dimension, consider different noise levels $\sigma = 0.2, 0.5, 1.0$ and fix $\eta = 0.01$. Let the initial condition

$$X_0 = \left[-1, -1 + \frac{2}{d-1}, -1 + \frac{4}{d-1}, \dots, 1 - \frac{2}{d-1}, 1 \right],$$

and $T = 1$. In Figure 4 we generate hidden processes $\{X_t\}$ for different d , λ and σ .

For each experiment, take $\Delta t = 0.005$, the number of samples $N = 128$, and the initialization $\lambda^0 = 0$. Figure 5 shows the simulation results. The EM algorithm with Monte Carlo method is efficient even for high dimensional problem. The higher the dimension, the more iterations are required. We also see that at larger noise level the convergence is faster at the beginning but is more volatile afterwards. The solutions of the filter and smoother (6.2) based on the estimated $\hat{\lambda}$ are also close to the true path of $\{X_t\}$.

6.5 Lorenz 96 model

The Lorenz 96 model is a dynamical system proposed by Edward Lorenz in 1996 [45], and is commonly used in data assimilation. Denote the components of the hidden state as $X_t = [X_{1,t}, X_{2,t}, \dots, X_{d,t}]$. Consider the following dynamics

$$\frac{dX_{i,t}}{dt} = (X_{i+1,t} - X_{i-2,t})X_{i-1,t} - X_{i,t} + F + \sigma W_t, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (6.6)$$




Figure 4: The hidden process $\{X_t\}$ for the scalar parameter estimation problem (6.5). Each line shows the dynamics of one component of X_t . Here we take different dimension d , parameter λ and noise σ .




Figure 5: The cubic sensor problem (6.3) for the scalar parameter estimation (6.5). Top: $d = 5, \lambda = 5$; middle: $d = 15, \lambda = 25$; bottom: $d = 25, \lambda = 50$. The first row shows the update of λ^k during the iterations. The solutions of the filter and smoother calculated using $\hat{\lambda}$, and the relative error $\|\hat{x}_t - x_t\|_2 / \|x_t\|_2$ is shown in the second column.




Figure 6: The Lorenz 96 model (6.6) with cubic sensor observations (6.3). The upper left figure is the dynamics of the components of X_t under the force $F = 8$ and initialization $X_{i,0} = F$, which shows the chaotic behavior after starting from the equilibrium. The upper right figure shows that the distance $|F^k - F|$ converges fast during the iterations. Then we calculate the solutions of the filter and smoother based on $\hat{F}$. The bottom left figure shows that the smoother solution is close to the true trajectory, and indeed captures the chaotic behavior. The bottom right figure gives the relative error $\|\hat{x}_t - x_t\|_2 / \|x_t\|_2$.

where $X_{-1,t} = X_{d-1,t}$, $X_{0,t} = X_{d,t}$ and $X_{d+1,t} = X_{1,t}$. The scalar F is a forcing constant. The observations still follow the cubic sensor (6.3).

Assume that the force F is the unknown parameter to be estimated. Following [46], set the true value $F = 8$ that is commonly known to cause chaotic behavior. Let the dimension $d = 10$ and initialize the state from the equilibrium $X_{i,0} = F$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. Let the noise $\sigma = 1$, $\eta = 5$ and the total time $T = 1$. Take the discretization $\Delta t = 0.05$ and the number of samples $N = 128$.

Figure 6 shows the simulation results. We can see that the hidden states show chaotic behavior after starting from the equilibrium. The parameter estimation $\hat{F}$ nevertheless converges fast to the true value. We also calculated the solution of the filter and smoother (6.2) based on the estimated $\hat{F}$. The relative error is small, and the state estimation indeed captures the chaotic behavior.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a unified framework to formally obtain the state and parameter estimation for CT-HMM by taking the continuous-time limit of the Baum-Welch algorithm. We also propose a Monte Carlo approach for numerically handling the continuous formulation based on the standard particle filter and smoother, which may be further improved by using adaptive filtering methods. For the CT-HMM problems in practice, instead of discretizing time from the beginning, now one can first derive the continuous equations following our framework, and then choose the proper discretization and sampling scheme for better performance. Our numerical results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Prof. Ramon van Handel for his valuable suggestions on a previous draft of this paper. This work is supported by a gift to Princeton University from iFlytek.

References

- [1] Vincent Aidala and Sherry Hammel. Utilization of modified polar coordinates for bearings-only tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 28(3):283–294, 1983.
- [2] Brian D. O. Anderson. Fixed interval smoothing for nonlinear continuous time systems. *Information and Control*, 20(3):294–300, 1972.
- [3] Leonard E. Baum and Ted Petrie. Statistical inference for probabilistic functions of finite state markov chains. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 37(6):1554–1563, 1966.
- [4] Leonard E. Baum, Ted Petrie, George Soules, and Norman Weiss. A maximization technique occurring in the statistical analysis of probabilistic functions of markov chains. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 41(1):164–171, 1970.
- [5] Alain Bensoussan, Roland Glowinski, and Aurel Raşcanu. Approximation of the zakai equation by the splitting up method. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 28(6):1420–1431, 1990.
- [6] Alain Bensoussan, Roland Glowinski, and Aurel Raşcanu. Approximation of some stochastic differential equations by the splitting up method. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 25(1):81–106, 1992.
- [7] Lothar Breuer. An em algorithm for batch markovian arrival processes and its comparison to a simpler estimation procedure. *Annals of Operations Research*, 112(1):123–138, 2002.
- [8] Roger Brockett. Stochastic control. *Lecture Notes, Harvard University*, 2009.

- [9] Robert Grover Brown and Patrick Y. C. Hwang. *Introduction to random signals and applied Kalman filtering*, volume 3. Wiley New York, 1992.
- [10] Alexandre Bureau, Stephen Shiboski, and James P. Hughes. Applications of continuous time hidden markov models to the study of misclassified disease outcomes. *Statistics in medicine*, 22(3):441–462, 2003.
- [11] Fabien Campillo and François Le Gland. Mle for partially observed diffusions: direct maximization vs. the em algorithm. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 33(2):245–274, 1989.
- [12] Fabien Campillo and Vivien Rossi. Convolution particle filter for parameter estimation in general state-space models. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 45(3):1063–1072, 2009.
- [13] Olivier Cappé, Eric Moulines, and Tobias Rydén. *Inference in hidden Markov models*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [14] Jianye Ching, James L. Beck, and Keith A. Porter. Bayesian state and parameter estimation of uncertain dynamical systems. *Probabilistic engineering mechanics*, 21(1):81–96, 2006.
- [15] D. Clements and B. Anderson. A nonlinear fixed-lag smoother for finite-state markov processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 21(4):446–452, 1975.
- [16] Dan Crisan and Terry Lyons. A particle approximation of the solution of the kushner–stratonovitch equation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 115(4):549–578, 1999.
- [17] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. Parameter estimation of partially observed continuous time stochastic processes via the em algorithm. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 23(1):91–113, 1986.
- [18] Li Deng and Jon W. Mark. Parameter estimation for markov modulated poisson processes via the em algorithm with time discretization. *Telecommunication Systems*, 1(1):321–338, 1993.
- [19] Arnaud Doucet, Simon Godsill, and Christophe Andrieu. On sequential monte carlo sampling methods for bayesian filtering. *Statistics and computing*, 10(3):197–208, 2000.
- [20] Arnaud Doucet, Nando De Freitas, Kevin Murphy, and Stuart Russell. Rao-blackwellised particle filtering for dynamic bayesian networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3853*, 2013.
- [21] Robert J. Elliott and Vikram Krishnamurthy. Exact finite-dimensional filters for maximum likelihood parameter estimation of continuous-time linear gaussian systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 35(6):1908–1923, 1997.
- [22] Robert J. Elliott and Hailiang Yang. Forward and backward equations for an adjoint process. In *Stochastic Processes*, pages 61–69. Springer, 1993.
- [23] Robert J. Elliott, Lakhdar Aggoun, and John B. Moore. *Hidden Markov Models: Estimation and Control*, volume 29. Springer-Verlag New York, 1995.
- [24] Yariv Ephraim and William J. Roberts. An em algorithm for markov modulated markov processes. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 57(2):463–470, 2008.
- [25] Guodong Feng, Chunyan Lai, and Narayan C. Kar. Expectation-maximization particle-filter-and kalman-filter-based permanent magnet temperature estimation for pmsm condition monitoring using high-frequency signal injection. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 13(3):1261–1270, 2016.
- [26] Wolfgang Fischer and Kathleen Meier-Hellstern. The markov-modulated poisson process (mmp) cookbook. *Performance evaluation*, 18(2):149–171, 1993.

- [27] Patrick Florchinger and François le Gland. Time-discretization of the zakai equation for diffusion processes observed in correlated noise. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 35(4):233–256, 1991.
- [28] Neil J. Gordon, David J. Salmond, and Adrian F. M. Smith. Novel approach to nonlinear/non-gaussian bayesian state estimation. In *IEE proceedings F (radar and signal processing)*, volume 140, pages 107–113. IET, 1993.
- [29] Asger Hobolth and Jens Ledet Jensen. Summary statistics for endpoint-conditioned continuous-time markov chains. *Journal of applied probability*, 48(4):911–924, 2011.
- [30] Christopher H. Jackson. Multi-state models for panel data: the msm package for r. *Journal of statistical software*, 38(8):1–29, 2011.
- [31] Matthew R. James, Vikram Krishnamurthy, and Francois Le Gland. Time discretization of continuous-time filters and smoothers for hmm parameter estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42(2):593–605, 1996.
- [32] Arnulf Jentzen and Peter E. Kloeden. The numerical approximation of stochastic partial differential equations. *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 77(1):205–244, 2009.
- [33] Rudolph Emil Kalman. A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 82(1):35–45, 1960.
- [34] Tohru Katayama. Equivalent linearization kalman filter with application to cubic sensor problems. In *2013 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 1633–1638. IEEE, 2013.
- [35] Genshiro Kitagawa. Non-gaussian state space modeling of time series. In *26th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, volume 26, pages 1700–1705. IEEE, 1987.
- [36] Alexander Klemm, Christoph Lindemann, and Marco Lohmann. Modeling ip traffic using the batch markovian arrival process. *Performance Evaluation*, 54(2):149–173, 2003.
- [37] Jayesh H. Kotecha and Petar M. Djuric. Gaussian sum particle filtering. *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, 51(10):2602–2612, 2003.
- [38] Harold J. Kushner. On the differential equations satisfied by conditional probability densities of markov processes, with applications. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series A: Control*, 2(1):106–119, 1964.
- [39] Harold J. Kushner. Dynamical equations for optimal nonlinear filtering. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 3(2):179–190, 1967.
- [40] Harold J. Kushner. Numerical approximations to optimal nonlinear filters, 2008.
- [41] Harold J. Kushner and Amarjit S. Budhiraja. A nonlinear filtering algorithm based on an approximation of the conditional distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 45(3):580–585, 2000.
- [42] Harold J. Kushner and Paul G. Dupuis. *Numerical methods for stochastic control problems in continuous time*, volume 24. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [43] Jose Leiva-Murillo, Antonio Artés Rodríguez, and Enrique Baca-García. Visualization and prediction of disease interactions with continuous-time hidden markov models. In *NIPS 2011 Workshop on Personalized Medicine*. Citeseer, 2011.

- [44] Yu-Ying Liu, Shuang Li, Fuxin Li, Le Song, and James M. Rehg. Efficient learning of continuous-time hidden markov models for disease progression. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3600–3608, 2015.
- [45] Edward N. Lorenz. Predictability: A problem partly solved. In *Proc. Seminar on predictability*, volume 1, 1996.
- [46] María Magdalena Lucini, Peter Jan van Leeuwen, and Manuel Pulido. Model uncertainty estimation using the expectation maximization algorithm and a particle flow filter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01511*, 2019.
- [47] Brian L. Mark and Yariv Ephraim. An em algorithm for continuous-time bivariate markov chains. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 57(1):504–517, 2013.
- [48] Philipp Metzner, Illia Horenko, and Christof Schütte. Generator estimation of markov jump processes based on incomplete observations nonequidistant in time. *Physical Review E*, 76(6):066702, 2007.
- [49] Andrew Papanicolaou. Stochastic analysis seminar on filtering theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1936*, 2014.
- [50] E. Pardoux. Stochastic partial differential equations and filtering of diffusion processes. *Stochastics*, 3(1-4):127–167, 1980.
- [51] Michael K. Pitt and Neil Shephard. Filtering via simulation: Auxiliary particle filters. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 94(446):590–599, 1999.
- [52] Lawrence R. Rabiner. A tutorial on hidden markov models and selected applications in speech recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 77(2):257–286, 1989.
- [53] Herbert E. Rauch, F. Tung, and Charlotte T. Striebel. Maximum likelihood estimates of linear dynamic systems. *AIAA journal*, 3(8):1445–1450, 1965.
- [54] William J. Roberts, Yariv Ephraim, and Elvis Dieguez. On rydén’s em algorithm for estimating mmpps. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 13(6):373–376, 2006.
- [55] Tobias Rydén. Parameter estimation for markov modulated poisson processes. *Stochastic Models*, 10(4):795–829, 1994.
- [56] Tobias Rydén. An em algorithm for estimation in markov-modulated poisson processes. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 21(4):431–447, 1996.
- [57] Thomas B. Schön, Adrian Wills, and Brett Ninness. System identification of nonlinear state-space models. *Automatica*, 47(1):39–49, 2011.
- [58] Robert H. Shumway and David S. Stoffer. An approach to time series smoothing and forecasting using the em algorithm. *Journal of time series analysis*, 3(4):253–264, 1982.
- [59] Y. Steinberg, B. Z. Bobrovsky, and Z. Schuss. On the optimal filtering problem for the cubic sensor. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 7(3):381–408, 1988.
- [60] Ruslan Leontyevich Stratonovich. Optimum nonlinear systems which bring about a separation of a signal with constant parameters from noise. *Radiofizika*, 2(6):892–901, 1959.
- [61] W. Murray Wonham. Some applications of stochastic differential equations to optimal nonlinear filtering. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series A: Control*, 2(3):347–369, 1964.

- [62] Moshe Zakai. On the optimal filtering of diffusion processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 11(3):230–243, 1969.
- [63] Zhonggai Zhao, Biao Huang, and Fei Liu. Parameter estimation in batch process using em algorithm with particle filter. *Computers & chemical engineering*, 57:159–172, 2013.

A CT-HMM with discrete-time observations

While this paper mainly focuses on the continuous-time states and observations, in some applications like disease progression, we may only have observations at some discrete time points and they are assumed to be independent (see Section 3.1). The Baum-Welch framework can also be applied to this setting as we now show.

A.1 Hidden jump process

Here we modify the CT-HMM (Q, r, π_0) with hidden jump process in Section 3. The hidden states $\{X_t\}$ remains to be a jump process with generator Q and initial probability π_0 . Instead of continuous-time observations, here we assume that we only can observe at discrete time points $0 \leq \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_S \leq T$, and $Y_{\tau_s} \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ are independently generated from

$$r_i(y) = \Pr\{Y_{\tau_s} = y | X_{\tau_s} = i\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The following are the results for state estimation and parameter estimation given observations $Y_{\tau_s} = y_{\tau_s}$, $s = 1, \dots, S$.

State estimation Let $\alpha_t = [\alpha_t(1) \dots \alpha_t(n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ and $\beta_t = [\beta_t(1) \dots \beta_t(n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ be the solutions of the forward and backward piecewise ODEs respectively

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_0 = \pi_0, \\ \dot{\alpha}_t = \alpha_t Q, \\ \alpha_{\tau_s} = \alpha_{\tau_s^-} R(y_{\tau_s}), \end{cases} \quad t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\begin{cases} \beta_T = 1, \\ \dot{\beta}_t = -Q\beta_t, \\ \beta_{\tau_s^-} = R(y_{\tau_s})\beta_{\tau_s}, \end{cases} \quad t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the left limit $\alpha_{\tau_s^-} = \lim_{t \uparrow \tau_s} \alpha_t$, and $R(y) = \text{diag}(r_1(y), \dots, r_n(y))$. Then the posterior distribution of the hidden states satisfies

$$\rho_t(i) = \Pr\{X_t = i | Y_{\tau_s} = y_{\tau_s}, s = 1, \dots, S\} = \frac{\alpha_t(i)\beta_t(i)}{\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Parameter estimation Assume that the generator Q is the unknown parameter to be estimated. The EM algorithm can be applied: in the E-step, using the current estimate $Q = Q^k$, we solve the state estimation for α_t , β_t and ρ_t ; in the M-step, update the generator using

$$Q_{ij}^{k+1} = \frac{\int_0^T \alpha_t(i) Q_{ij}^k \beta_t(j) dt}{(\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0) \int_0^T \rho_t(i) dt} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for $j \neq i$, and $Q_{ii}^{k+1} = -\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij}^{k+1}$.

A.2 Hidden diffusion process

For the CT-HMM with hidden diffusion process in Section 4, take the same hidden process

$$dX_t = f(X_t)dt + \sigma dW_t,$$

with initial distribution π_0 , and assume discrete-time observations Y_{τ_s} , $s = 1, \dots, S$ from

$$r(y|x) = p(Y_{\tau_s} = y | X_{\tau_s} = x). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

State estimation For the filtering problem, the unnormalized distribution $\pi_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_{\tau_s} = y_{\tau_s}, \tau_s < t) Z_t$ (for some constant Z_t) satisfies the forward piecewise PDE

$$\begin{cases} \pi_0(x) = p(X_0 = x), \\ d\pi_t(x) = \mathcal{L}^* \pi_t(x) dt, & t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \\ \pi_{\tau_s}(x) = \pi_{\tau_s^-}(x) r(y_{\tau_s} | x), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $\pi_{\tau_s^-}(x) = \lim_{t \uparrow \tau_s} \pi_t(x)$. For the smoothing problem, let $\beta_t(x)$ be the solution of the backward piecewise PDE

$$\begin{cases} \beta_T(x) = 1, \\ d\beta_t(x) = -\mathcal{L} \pi_t(x) dt, & t \in [\tau_s, \tau_{s+1}), \\ \beta_{\tau_s^-}(x) = \beta_{\tau_s}(x) r(y_{\tau_s} | x), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

then the posterior distribution of the hidden states is given by

$$\rho_t(x) = p(X_t = x | Y_{\tau_s} = y_{\tau_s}, s = 1, \dots, S) = \frac{1}{Z_T} \pi_t(x) \beta_t(x). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Parameter estimation Assume $f(x) = f(x; \theta)$ where θ is the unknown parameter to be estimated. The EM algorithm is similar to the continuous-time observations. In the E-step, using the current estimate $\theta = \theta^k$, we solve the state estimation for π_t , β_t and ρ_t ; in the M-step, update the parameter using $\theta^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\theta} \tilde{Q}(\theta, \theta^k)$ where

$$\tilde{Q}(\theta, \theta^k) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_t(x) \left[\|f(x; \theta)\|_2^2 - 2f^\top(x; \theta) \left[f(x; \theta^k) + \frac{\sigma^2 \nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)} \right] \right] dx dt. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

B Hidden diffusion process with linear Gaussian dynamics

In this section, we apply our algorithm to the linear Gaussian dynamics for the CT-HMM with hidden diffusion process in Section 4. Here both f and h are linear and the initial distribution π_0 is Gaussian, thus the posterior distribution of the hidden state is always Gaussian. The continuous-time Kalman filter and associated parameter estimation has been given in many literatures [53, 17, 21], and here we would like to show the derivation under the Baum-Welch framework. We will see that the SPDEs (4.4) (4.5) in state estimation and the optimization (4.9) in parameter estimation have explicit solutions, and are consistent with the discrete-time Kalman filter and smoother as well as the EM algorithm under the limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

Let $f(x) = Fx$ and $h(x) = Hx$ where the matrices $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We also consider $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ to be matrices. The dynamics of the hidden process $\{X_t\}$ and the observation $\{Y_t\}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= FX_t dt + \sigma dW_t, \\ dY_t &= HX_t dt + \eta dB_t. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Assume that the initial distribution is Gaussian $X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, P_0)$. So the posterior distribution of X_t is always Gaussian.

B.1 Continuous-time Kalman filter and smoother

Given the Gaussian property in the linear case, to describe the posterior distribution of X_t , we only need to find the mean and variance from the SDEs (4.4) and (4.5). Here the SPDEs become

$$\begin{aligned} d\pi_t(x) &= \mathcal{L}^* \pi_t(x) dt + \pi_t(x) (Hx)^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} dY_t, \\ d\beta_t(x) &= -\mathcal{L} \beta_t(x) dt - \beta_t(x) (Hx)^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} (dY_t - Hx dt). \end{aligned}$$

One can prove that the solutions π_t and β_t are unnormalized Gaussian, and $\rho_t(x) = \pi_t(x)\beta_t(x)/Z_T$ is Gaussian, i.e., for each t there exist constants Z_t^π and Z_t^β , such that

$$\pi_t(x) Z_t^\pi \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t^\pi, P_t^\pi), \quad \beta_t(x) Z_t^\beta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t^\beta, P_t^\beta), \quad \rho_t(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t^\rho, P_t^\rho). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Solving the SPDEs, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu_t^\pi &= F\mu_t^\pi dt + P_t^\pi H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} (dY_t - H\mu_t^\pi dt), \\ \frac{dP_t^\pi}{dt} &= FP_t^\pi + P_t^\pi F^\top - P_t^\pi H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} HP_t^\pi + \sigma\sigma^\top, \\ d\mu_t^\beta &= F\mu_t^\beta dt - P_t^\beta H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} (dY_t - H\mu_t^\beta dt), \\ \frac{dP_t^\beta}{dt} &= FP_t^\beta + P_t^\beta F^\top + P_t^\beta H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} HP_t^\beta - \sigma\sigma^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t^\rho &= (P_t^\rho)^{-1} \left[(P_t^\pi)^{-1} \mu_t^\pi + (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta \right], \\ P_t^\rho &= \left[(P_t^\pi)^{-1} + (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For the initial conditions, $X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, P_0)$ gives $\mu_0^\pi = \mu_0$ and $P_0^\pi = P_0$. However, since $\beta_T(x) = 1$, we have $P_T^\beta = +\infty$ and μ_T^β is undefined. We can instead use $(P_T^\beta)^{-1} \mu_T^\beta = 0$, $(P_T^\beta)^{-1} = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d \left[(P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta \right] &= -F(P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta dt + (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \sigma\sigma^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta dt - H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} dY_t, \\ \frac{d(P_t^\beta)^{-1}}{dt} &= -F(P_t^\beta)^{-1} - (P_t^\beta)^{-1} F^\top + (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \sigma\sigma^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} - H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} H. \end{aligned}$$

As a comparison, in the following we consider Kalman filter and smoother under the limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. We will see that the result is consistent with the differential equations above.

The discretization of the model gives

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t+\Delta t} &= (I + F\Delta t)X_t + \sigma\Delta W_t, \\ \Delta Y_t &= HX_t\Delta t + \eta\Delta B_t, \end{aligned}$$

where we omit the $o(\Delta t)$ term. Here we use the notations in Kalman filter: for $t \leq s$, let

$$X_t | Y_{0:s} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{t|s}, P_{t|s}) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

be the distribution of X_t condition on $\Delta Y_0, \Delta Y_1, \dots, \Delta Y_{s-\Delta t}$ *without* ΔY_s . We will prove that $\mu_{t|t} = \mu_t^\pi$, $P_{t|t} = P_t^\pi$ and $\mu_{t|T} = \mu_t^\rho$, $P_{t|T} = P_t^\rho$.

For the filtering problem, we calculate $\mu_{t|t}$ and $P_{t|t}$. The discrete-time Kalman filter gives

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &= P_{t|t} H^\top \Delta t (H P_{t|t} H^\top \Delta t^2 + \eta \eta^\top \Delta t)^{-1}, \\ \mu_{t|t+\Delta t} &= \mu_{t|t} + K_t (\Delta Y_t - H \mu_{t|t} \Delta t), \\ P_{t|t+\Delta t} &= (I - K_t H \Delta t) P_{t|t}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{t+\Delta t|t+\Delta t} &= (I + F \Delta t) \mu_{t|t+\Delta t}, \\ P_{t+\Delta t|t+\Delta t} &= (I + F \Delta t) P_{t|t+\Delta t} (I + F \Delta t)^\top + \sigma \sigma^\top \Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &= P_{t|t} H^\top \eta^{-\top} \eta^{-1} + O(\Delta t), \\ \mu_{t+\Delta t|t+\Delta t} - \mu_{t|t} &= F \mu_{t|t} \Delta t + K_t (\Delta Y_t - H \mu_{t|t} \Delta t) + o(\Delta t), \\ P_{t+\Delta t|t+\Delta t} - P_{t|t} &= [F P_{t|t} + P_{t|t} F^\top - K_t H P_{t|t} + \sigma \sigma^\top] \Delta t + o(\Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

We get the continuous-time Kalman filter by taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, where $\mu_{t|t}$ and $P_{t|t}$ satisfy the same differential equations as μ_t^π and P_t^π (B.3) respectively.

For the smoothing problem, we need to calculate $\mu_{t|T}$ and $P_{t|T}$. According to the Rauch-Tung-Striebel smoother [53],

$$\begin{aligned} C_t &= P_{t-\Delta t|t} (I + F \Delta t)^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}, \\ \mu_{t-\Delta t|T} &= \mu_{t-\Delta t|t} + C_t (\mu_{t|T} - \mu_{t|t}), \\ P_{t-\Delta t|T} &= P_{t-\Delta t|t} + C_t (P_{t|T} - P_{t|t}) C_t^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_t &= I - (F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}) \Delta t + o(\Delta t), \\ \mu_{t-\Delta t|T} - \mu_{t|T} &= - \left[(F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}) \mu_{t|T} - \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1} \mu_{t|t} \right] \Delta t + o(\Delta t), \\ P_{t-\Delta t|T} - P_{t|T} &= - \left[(F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}) P_{t|T} + P_{t|T} (F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1})^\top - \sigma \sigma^\top \right] \Delta t + o(\Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we get the backward ODEs

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu_{t|T}}{dt} &= (F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}) \mu_{t|T} - \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1} \mu_{t|t}, \\ \frac{dP_{t|T}}{dt} &= (F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1}) P_{t|T} + P_{t|T} (F + \sigma \sigma^\top P_{t|t}^{-1})^\top - \sigma \sigma^\top, \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

where the initial conditions $\mu_{T|T}$ and $P_{T|T}$ are given by the previous filter.

Compare with our previous results, by plugging (B.3) in (B.4) we see that the ODEs for μ_t^ρ and P_t^ρ are exactly the same as (B.6). Notice that for Kalman smoother (B.6), the ODEs for $\mu_{t|T}$ and $P_{t|T}$ depend on the filter $\mu_{t|t}$ and $P_{t|t}$, while in our solution (B.3) and (B.4), the smoother $\rho_t \propto \pi_t \beta_t$, where the differential equations for π_t and β_t are independent. Later we will see that β_t plays an important role in the EM algorithm.

B.2 An EM algorithm for Kalman filter

In the linear dynamics (B.1), we assume that H , σ and η are given and F is the unknown parameter to be estimated. We further assume that σ and η are scalars instead of matrices for simplicity. With the current estimation $F = F^k$, let the solution of the E-step be μ_t^π , P_t^π , μ_t^β , P_t^β and μ_t^ρ , P_t^ρ . In the M-step, the parameter update (4.9) becomes $F^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_F \tilde{Q}(F, F^k)$ where

$$\tilde{Q}(F, F^k) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[x^\top F^\top F x - 2x^\top F^\top \left(F^k x + \frac{\sigma^2 \nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)} \right) \right] dx dt.$$

Since $\beta_t(x)$ is unnormalized Gaussian, i.e., $\beta_t(x) Z_t^\beta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t^\beta, P_t^\beta)$, we have

$$\frac{\nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)} = -(P_t^\beta)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\beta).$$

Furthermore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x \rho_t(x) dx = \mu_t^\rho, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x x^\top \rho_t(x) dx = \mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho,$$

the objective function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}(F, F^k) &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[x^\top F^\top F x - 2x^\top F^\top \left(F^k x - \sigma^2 (P_t^\beta)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\beta) \right) \right] dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[x^\top \left(F^\top F - 2F^\top F^k + 2\sigma^2 F^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \right) x - 2\sigma^2 x^\top F^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta \right] dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \left[(\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) : \left(F^\top F - 2F^\top F^k + 2\sigma^2 F^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \right) - 2\sigma^2 \mu_t^{\rho\top} F^\top (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \mu_t^\beta \right] dt \\ &= (F^\top F) : \int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt \\ &\quad - 2F : \left[F^k \int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt - \sigma^2 \int_0^T (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \left((\mu_t^\rho - \mu_t^\beta) \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho \right) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F^{k+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_F \tilde{Q}(F, F^k) \\ &= F^k - \sigma^2 \left[\int_0^T (P_t^\beta)^{-1} \left((\mu_t^\rho - \mu_t^\beta) \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho \right) dt \right] \left[\int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

In the following, we will show that our result is consistent with the discrete-time EM algorithm for linear dynamics.

First, we calculate the joint distribution of $(X_t, X_{t+\Delta t})$ condition on the whole observation $Y_{0:T}$. We know that

$$\pi_t(x) \propto p(X_t = x, Y_{0:t}), \quad \beta_t(x) \propto p(Y_{t:T} | X_t = x),$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} p(X_t = x, X_{t+\Delta t} = x' | Y_{0:T}) &\propto \pi_t(x) p(X_{t+\Delta t} = x', \Delta Y_t | X_t = x) \beta_{t+\Delta t}(x) \\ &\propto \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_t^\pi)^\top (P_t^\pi)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\pi) - \frac{1}{2\eta^2 \Delta t} \|\Delta Y_t - Hx\Delta t\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 \Delta t} \|x' - (I + F\Delta t)x\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (x' - \mu_{t+\Delta t}^\beta)^\top (P_{t+\Delta t}^\beta)^{-1} (x' - \mu_{t+\Delta t}^\beta) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So $(X_t, X_{t+\Delta t})$ are joint Gaussian. We can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_{t+\Delta t}|X_t = x, Y_{0:T}] &= \left[\frac{1}{\sigma^2 \Delta t} + (P_{t+\Delta t}^\beta)^{-1} \right]^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{\sigma^2 \Delta t} (I + F \Delta t) x + (P_{t+\Delta t}^\beta)^{-1} \mu_{t+\Delta t}^\beta \right] \\ &= x + F x \Delta t - \sigma^2 (P_t^\beta)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\beta) \Delta t + o(\Delta t) \\ &= x + F x \Delta t + \frac{\sigma^2 \nabla \beta_t(x)}{\beta_t(x)} \Delta t + o(\Delta t),\end{aligned}$$

which is consistent with our result. On the other hand, consider the covariance between $X_{t+\Delta t}$ and X_t , i.e.,

$$P_{t+\Delta t, t} = \mathbb{E}[(X_{t+\Delta t} - \mu_{t+\Delta t}^\rho)(X_t - \mu_t^\rho)^\top | Y_{0:T}],$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{t+\Delta t}|X_t = x, Y_{0:T}] = \mu_{t+\Delta t}^\rho - P_{t+\Delta t, t} (P_t^\rho)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\rho).$$

Denote

$$\dot{\mu}_t^\rho = \frac{d\mu_t^\rho}{dt}, \quad S_t = \left. \frac{dP_{t+\tau, t}}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0}.$$

One can calculate that $S_t = (F - \sigma^2 (P_t^\beta)^{-1}) P_t^\rho$. Now the objective function

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(F, F^k) &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) \left[x^\top F^\top F x - 2x^\top F^\top \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} \mathbb{E}[X_{t+\tau}|X_t = x, Y_{0:T}; F^k] \right] dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) [x^\top F^\top F x - 2x^\top F^\top [\dot{\mu}_t^\rho - S_t (P_t^\rho)^{-1} (x - \mu_t^\rho)]] dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t(x) [x^\top (F^\top F + 2F^\top S_t (P_t^\rho)^{-1}) x - 2x^\top F^\top (\dot{\mu}_t^\rho - S_t (P_t^\rho)^{-1} \mu_t^\rho)] dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T [(\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) : (F^\top F + 2F^\top S_t (P_t^\rho)^{-1}) - 2\mu_t^{\rho\top} F^\top (\dot{\mu}_t^\rho - S_t (P_t^\rho)^{-1} \mu_t^\rho)] dt \\ &= (F^\top F) : \int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt - 2F : \int_0^T (\dot{\mu}_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + S_t) dt.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}F^{k+1} &= \underset{F}{\operatorname{argmin}} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(F, F^k) = \left[\int_0^T (\dot{\mu}_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + S_t) dt \right] \left[\int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt \right]^{-1} \\ &= \left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{d\mu_t^\rho}{dt} \mu_t^{\rho\top} + \left. \frac{dP_{t+\tau, t}}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} \right) dt \right] \left[\int_0^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) dt \right]^{-1}.\end{aligned}\tag{B.8}$$

Comparing with the EM algorithm for discrete-time linear dynamics [58], the parameter update

$$I + F^{k+1} \Delta t = \left[\sum_{t=0}^T (\mu_{t+\Delta t}^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_{t+\Delta t, t}) \right] \left[\sum_{t=0}^T (\mu_t^\rho \mu_t^{\rho\top} + P_t^\rho) \right]^{-1}.$$

We can see that the formula (B.8) is the limit of the discrete case.